

IUCN
GLOBAL PROGRAMME TEAM
FOREST CONSERVATION PROGRAMME

FOREST CONSERVATION PROGRAMME REVIEW REPORT

*Prepared by the IUCN FCP Review Team:
Alejandro C. Imbach, Team Leader
Hosny El-Lakany, International Forestry Expert
Nicholas K. Ngece, IUCN-EARO, Team Member*

OCTOBER 2007

FOREST CONSERVATION PROGRAMME REVIEW REPORT

SUMMARY OF REVIEW FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A Programmatic Review of the IUCN Forest Conservation Programme (FCP) and the overall IUCN Forest Team (FCP and the IUCN Regional Forest Programmes) was carried out between April and July 2007. The Review included visits and interviews to the IUCN HQ and seven Regional Offices. The Review Team consisted of Hosny El-Lakany, Nicholas Ngece and Alejandro C. Imbach (Team Leader).

The Review was focused on the FCP performance in terms of strategic direction, relevance and management. It also looked at the relationships between FCP and the Regional Forest Programmes and their collective experience (The Forest Team) in the context of the IUCN decentralization and regionalization process.

MAIN FINDINGS

The main findings, organized by area are as follows.

FCP Strategic Direction and Relevance in a global context

- a. Programmatic directions of IUCN/FCP are in line with trends prevailing in the sector in general. FCP often leads change.*
- b. The clear shift from traditional biodiversity conservation in Protected Areas towards sustainable management beyond protected areas for their multiple functions and benefits is globally dominant at present in research, development and financing.*
- c. FCP's growing interest in forest management outside protected areas is commendable as it represents a key area of leadership for IUCN in terms of overall sustainable development.*
- d. Current overarching objectives of comparable programs around the world are to enhance livelihood by contributing to improved policies and practices related to the management and use of forests coupled with special emphasis on policies governing other sectors which have impact on forests.*
- e. Holistic linkages between livelihoods and sustainability, of which conservation of biological diversity is an integral component, are now high on the global agenda, and FCP can justifiably claim leadership as it is in the fore front*
- f. FCP, which started mainly focused on forest conservation activities, has evolved towards a broader focus that looks at broader context issues (poverty reduction, use of natural resources, governance systems and other) as an overarching frame in which its forest biodiversity conservation efforts operate.*
- g. This evolution has been, and will continue to be difficult, but worth pursuing as other international organizations in this field are also adopting this approach.*
- h. Within intense global interest in the role of forest in adaptation to and mitigation of climate change and the significant role of REDD, there will be an imminent paradigm shift in emphasis, political interest and funding.*
- i. Current FCP programmatic directions recognize the tradeoffs between conservation and development programs and strive to explore ways and means to equitably balance the delivery of both objectives simultaneously.*
- j. Achieving such a complex objective in a given landscape is beyond the capabilities of the individual organizations, hence developing and maintaining partnerships are vital for the future success of FCP.*

FCP Management

The management review of FCP addressed the following areas: Programme development; Budget management; Staffing; Networking; Policy making; Communications and knowledge management, and Leadership.

- a. In overall terms, FCP is a well managed Global Programme that is making significant contributions to the fulfillment of the IUCN Mission.*
- b. This assessment should not obscure the fact that there are several areas in which the current work can and should be improved and extended. There are several lines of work, partners and issues that need to be addressed as soon as additional resources are obtained or accessed.*

- c. *Having established these limitations, it is also necessary to recognize the efforts of the FCP management to set priorities and to maintain them in spite of complains and pressures to do other things. Therefore, the review team wished to highlight the good management practice of setting and maintaining priorities rather than a probably less useful analysis about whether or not the right priorities were established. Just for the record, the Review Team confirmed the prioritization made by FCP in all areas with very few exceptions.*
- d. *There are two new elements in FCP that are having impact in the operational capacities of the Programme due to the high level of attention and time from senior management staff they require. They are the implementation of the new Landscapes and Livelihoods Strategy (LLS) started last January and the Climate Change unit embedded in FCP. Both are large initiatives that are going to grow significantly over the next few years and both are draining senior management capacities of FCP significantly, to the point that FCP itself may be at risk within very few years unless additional senior staff is appointed to the team to deal with these two new elements. In fact, LLS has taken staff resources from FCP (the LLS Coordinator was the full-time Deputy Head of FCP) but FCP has not been able to fill the gap yet. At the same time, while Climate Change has one senior staff member, the top management directives to FCP are more demanding than a couple of years ago and surely this is not going to be reduced in the near future.*

Regional Forest Programmes (RFPs) Overview

- a. *Over the last years there was a general trend towards diminished Regional Forest Programmes. This was not deliberately planned or decided by IUCN, and some Regions are less affected than others.*
- b. *There is a general decline in the implementation of field projects by the RFPs, with some exceptions as EARO.*
- c. *All RFPs seems to be suffering from declining budgets whose origins are mixed (changes in donor priorities, capacity constraints, changes in the allocation mechanisms of IUCN core funds, etc.). A significant change happened over the last decade by which the RFPs that used to raise their own large field projects shifted to become dependent on the large global initiatives negotiated by FCP such as SVBC, LLS and other.*
- d. *RFPs staffing is another area affected by changes such as staff reductions, high staff turnover and/or slow recruiting processes to fill empty positions. There have been also several cases of RFP staff shifted to other higher Regional positions. The common effect is a reduction in the capacity to implement cutting-edge work promoted from FCP.*
- e. *At the same time, national and regional networking (sometimes coupled with policy influencing work) as increased significantly, helped by the relatively high conceptual profile gained by FCP and the Forest Team in general through initiatives as FLR, Forest Governance, FLEGT and other.*
- f. *This overall situation is increasing the risks faced by the LLS implementation that is planned to be done by Regional Offices and local partners. The risks are not very high at the moment, but facing them successfully will require a substantive effort from the LLS Coordination Unit in terms of capacity building, supervision, field presence, etc. It is too early to assess whether or not the LLS CU budget will be enough to accommodate these demands, therefore a close monitoring of the situation is required.*
- g. *Another aspect to keep in mind is that the successful implementation of the LLS activities about knowledge management, networking and communications are going to increase the workload at regional and country level in the implementation sites. Therefore, it will be necessary to allow for the required budget considerations to fund these actions properly at this level. If LLS is going to prove the capacity to develop adequate field / policy links the adequate funding balance between these components (including actual field implementation) should be achieved in practice.*
- h. *In a way similar to the previous one, the establishment of baselines for the subsequent monitoring and evaluation of results and impacts will also require additional efforts and resources, particularly in those sites where activities are currently under implementation and the baselines were not developed by those other initiatives already active.*

The Forest Team

- a. *The Forest Team has a long and productive history and it is an enthusiastic and committed group*
- b. *In the last few years there has been a reduction in the physical presence of FCP staff in the regions, and a decrease in the regular meetings of the Team. The reasons given by FCP for that situation is that FCP engagement in the regions has shifted from one of trying to serve all regions generally to other that is more (ruthlessly) prioritized from the perspective of “where we should be (Brazil, China, Indonesia, etc) and what we should be doing “(FLEG, FLR, etc). As a consequence, BRAO has benefited more from FCP presence and support as has China, Brazil and BRAC. This also means that other areas have suffered - SUR outside Brazil and ROSA (in this last case also because they did not make the RFC staff investments required). There is a clear consensus among the RFPs about the significant importance of getting back both physical presence and regular Team meetings.*
- c. *The LLS implementation brings new challenges to the Forest Team. The first one is about strengthening and extending the Team, the second is about using properly the Knowledge Management and Communications components of LLS to strengthen the Team (and vice versa) and the third is to fully develop the LLS potential to create a new generation of regional projects able to revitalize the RFPs.*

The Forest Team in the context of IUCN regionalization and decentralization process

- a. *The IUCN regionalization and decentralization process is still on going*
- b. *The balance of institutional development between the center and the regions shifted in both directions along the years. Currently it is shifting towards the center.*
- c. *The importance of the Intersessional Programme (IP) grew with decentralization and regionalization as an instrument to maintain coherence within the Secretariat. The structure of the IP is still evolving.*
- d. *The funding model of IUCN is changing from Projects negotiated by single units (either central or regional) for their own implementation. This model does not have significant incentives for joint work. A new model based on large Projects negotiated from the Center but implemented through Regional Offices and other partners is emerging (WANI, LLS, SVBC, etc.). This model is showing potential to create incentives for joint work among different units of IUCN, both central and regional.*
- e. *This model has two variants, one decentralized and the other centralized. The decentralized model as practices by WANI and LLS has more potential for joint work and is unanimously preferred by the IUCN Regional Offices over the other one.*
- f. *The analysis of the Forest Team in the context of IUCN larger scale processes shows that FCP and the Forest Team are in a excellent situation to shape and strengthen a new model of operation for the IUCN Secretariat due to its history, the participatory and inclusive approach in place and the way in which the recent medium (SVBC) and large (LLS) projects are being handled.*
- g. *Looking at other overall- IUCN scale related issues, it can be concluded that:*
 - *The FCP and Forest Team Programmes and Projects contents are well aligned with the new IP model.*
 - *The new Projects were planned and are implemented in a fully cooperative and participatory way*
 - *The Forest Team (despite mentioned weaknesses) provides a good base for the successful interaction between IUCN components and with external stakeholders*
- h. *The implementation of LLS is a new and significant challenge, not only for the directly involved parts (FCP and RFPs) but also for the higher IUCN management levels (Regional Offices and IUCN Directors). This challenge requires attention and follow-up from higher management levels as the Global Programme Director and even the Director General. Among other issues, this attention means allocating time for visits, follow-up meetings, regular exchanges of experiences with other similar large Projects (e.g. WANI, MFF) and the dissemination of the lessons throughout the IUCN system among others.*

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of the Review Team are organized in 6 areas, and they are specifically addressed to the pertinent units

1. To IUCN and FCP Senior Management: Maintain the leadership in forest issues
 - 1.1. To maintain and enhance the leading role of FCP globally in supporting conservation of biodiversity outside Protected Areas while emphasizing their economic, social, cultural and ecological values, especially for the poor, through appropriate management
 - 1.2. Simultaneously, while being supportive to conservation of biodiversity and landscape restoration in forests outside Protected Areas, FCP management should be sensitive to new potential global paradigm shifts in this very dynamic sector, as maintaining a stable and cohesive FCP is essential for its success and the conservation of its leadership in the forest sector.
 - 1.3. To emphasize outcome-oriented activities and improve timely knowledge sharing and information exchange.
 - 1.4. To enhance collaboration with other IGO's and NGO's especially with the CPF.
2. To FCP and the Forest Team: Keep doing the good work
 - 2.1. To preserve the good perception that FCP has within and outside IUCN
 - 2.2. To preserve and enhance the leading role played in terms of the work relationships between a Global Programme and the Regional ones. Issues as strong participation, decentralized implementation, fair sharing of budgets and overheads and others are highly appreciated and are setting benchmarks in this area
 - 2.3. To maintain the priority setting processes and the consistent decisions with those priorities. Within available resources, it is hard to find significant areas for FCP to improve. Obviously there are other persons, programs and projects within IUCN that have priorities different than the FCP ones, but there is no way to ascertain that those priorities are better than the FCP ones. The good thing about FCP is that they have set priorities and they are acting accordingly; the fact that some of these priorities can be disputed is of secondary importance.
3. To FCP, LLS Coordination Unit and Regional Offices Directors: To manage adequately the risks brought by LLS to FCP and the Regional Forest Programmes
 - 3.1. The LLS Coordinator should allocate to LLS the entire time foreseen for the Project (90% of its time while keeping 10% as FCP Deputy Head) immediately. At the moment of the Review much more than 10% was allocated to FCP activities not directly related to LLS.
 - 3.2. A new person needs to be integrated into FCP to fill the gap left by the LLS Coordinator. The best alternative is to appoint a senior staff level person.
 - 3.3. LLS in Asia requires urgently a capable person dedicated to the LLS Project. Four of the eleven LLS sites are in Asia. There is neither a Coordinator of RFP in Asia nor a dedicated person to coordinate LLS. The best option is to urgently negotiate with the region to have the ELG1 Coordinator moved to (not additionally given) the LLS supervision position (see Annex 11)
 - 3.4. LLS in Africa seems to be managed well by the combination of efforts between EARO and LLS Coordination Unit, even when a clear recognition and support to the overall regional role played by the current EARO RFP Head is needed. This situation should be preserved.
 - 3.5. LLS in South America needs support from LLS Coordination Unit and FCP. There are less serious risks there given the fact that only one LLS site is there, but desirable scaling-out and scaling-up effects can be lost due to lack of experience, contacts, etc.
 - 3.6. Additional negotiations are needed to clarify expectations from both FCP and ORMA regarding LLS scope, reach and themes. The LLS process seems not to be enough well defined yet there.
 - 3.7. There is a need for a focal, dedicated and capable person from the LLS Coordination Unit / FCP assigned to assist the Latin America (both SUR and ORMA). This assistance is available to Africa and Asia sites. This is badly needed and it does not require a full-time position.

4. To FCP and LLS Coordination Unit: To manage adequately the opportunities brought by LLS to FCP and the Forest Team
 - 4.1. To use the opportunity that LLS is bringing to establish and operate a good M&E system. This has not been achieved in IUCN yet for a large Project more details in Annex 10)
 - 4.2. To use the opportunity that LLS is also bringing to establish a reasonably operating KM / Communications system (with emphasis in KM rather than Communications or IT), linking different types of stakeholders across geographical areas and between different levels (from local to global). If this is achieved, IUCN and FCP will benefit significantly(more details in Annex 10)
 - 4.3. To benefit from the opportunities that LLS is also bringing to develop capacities within IUCN regions by making use of its experts. There is a strong need to develop these capacities, particularly in those new areas addressed by LLS as the landscapes approaches, livelihoods, etc.
 - 4.4. To reinforce and revitalize the joint work of the Forest Team by having a more frequent physical presence of FCP staff in the RFPs and by revitalizing the Forest Team meetings
5. To Global Programme Director and FCP. To use, and benefit from, LLS to strengthen the IUCN regionalization and decentralization process
 - 5.1. To set an internal and formal conflict resolution process. The decentralized implementation of LLS is expected to create internal conflicts. An explicit and agreed process to deal with internal conflicts and problems and to solve them should be formally established, allowing for any part to turn to it when necessary. At the moment such a process does not exist.
 - 5.2. To make all needed efforts to fight the temptation to use LLS resources in the regions to address budget deficit issues. That requires frequent and effective presence in the regions and continuous and effective supervision and joint work by the LLS Coordination Unit and other higher levels.
 - 5.3. To extend M&E and lessons learned activities to include aspects of decentralization, regionalization, conflict resolution between FCP and the regions, capacity building progress, and other issues related not just to LLS/FCP but also relevant to broader aspects of the Center/ Regions relationships.
6. To Global Programme Director and FCP. To find solutions for the Climate Change management demands on FCP
 - 6.1. To make the necessary decisions to deal with the increasing senior management time demands posed by the Climate Change unit. There are different management solutions to the problem (shifting Climate Change out of FCP, hiring new senior staff for FCP or other), and the Review Team does not think that its recommendations should be at this level. But the point is that FCP management (in all its aspects) is being affected and the situation needs to be addressed

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of Findings and Recommendations	2
Table of Contents	7
List of Acronyms	8
1. Introduction	9
2. Objectives and Key Questions	9
3. Methodology	11
4. Review Results	13
4.1 The Forest Conservation Programme (FCP)	13
4.2 The IUCN Regional Forests Programmes (RFPs)	29
4.3 The IUCN Forest Team	34
4.4 The Forest Team experience and the IUCN decentrali- zation and regionalization process	37
5. Recommendations	43

ANNEXES (Volume 2)

Annex 1. Terms of Reference	
Annex 2. Review Matrix	
Annex 3. List of documents reviewed	
Annex 4. List of people interviewed / consulted	
Annex 5. Report on FCP Strategic Direction and Relevance	
Annex 6. FCP Project Pipeline Analysis	
Annex 7. FCP Income Analysis	
Annex 8. Arbor Vitae Newsletter Analysis	
Annex 9. List of FCP Publications	
Annex 10. Preliminary Paper 1: Analysis of LLS functions, positions and TOR	
Annex 11. Preliminary Paper 2: Analysis of LLS implementation and supervision arrangements in Asia	

ACRONYMS

ARO	IUCN Asia Regional Office
BRAO	IUCN Bureau Regionale pour la Afrique de l'Ouest
CARO	IUCN Central Africa Regional Office
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CPF	Collaborative Partnership on Forests
CI	Conservation International
CIFOR	International Center for Forestry Research
EARO	IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office
FAO	UN Food and Agriculture Organization
FCP	The IUCN Forest Conservation Programme
FLEGT	Forest Legislation, Empowerment, Governance and Trade
FLR	Forest Landscape Restoration
GEF	Global Environment Facility
ICRAF	International Center for Research on Agroforestry
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organization
LLS	Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy Project
MFF	Mangroves for the Future Project
ODA	Overseas Development Assistance
ORMA Office)	IUCN Oficina Regional para Mesoamerica (IUCN Mesoamerica Regional Office)
REDD	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation
RFP	Any of the IUCN Regional Forest Programmes
ROSA	IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa
SUR Office)	IUCN Oficina Regional para Sudamerica (IUCN South America Regional Office)
SVBC	Strengthening Voices for Better Choices Project
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFCCD	United Nations Framework Convention to Combat Desertification
UNFF	United Nations Forest Forum
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
WRI	World Resources Institute

1. INTRODUCTION

A Programmatic Review of the IUCN Forest Conservation Programme (FCP) and the overall IUCN Forest Team was carried out between April and July 2007, as part of the regular IUCN programme to review its different global and regional units.

The Review was requested by the Director of the IUCN Global Programme (Bill Jackson) and the Head of the IUCN Forest Conservation Programme (Stewart Maginnis). The organization of the evaluation was done by Alex Moiseev (IUCN Programme M&E Programme Officer). The Terms of Reference of the Evaluation are included as Annex 1.

This Review included

- Analysis of different Programme documents
- Visits and interviews to FCP staff and relevant IUCN HQ staff at IUCN Headquarters
- Visits and interviews to IUCN Regional and partners from 7 IUCN Regional Offices (SUR, ORMA, EARO, ARO, BRAO, CARO and ROSA)

The Review Team was composed of Hosny El-Lakani, Professor of International Forestry Policy at University of British Columbia (Canada), Nicholas Ngece, Project Manager of the IUCN Lembus Project in Kenya and Alejandro C. Imbach, a consultant Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Expert based in Costa Rica who also acted as the Team Leader.

BASIC TERMINOLOGY

At this very early stage it is convenient to clarify some basic terminology:

- The IUCN Forest Conservation Programme (FCP) is a global programme of IUCN, based at the IUCN Headquarters in Gland, Switzerland, and it is the organization technical umbrella in terms of forest related activities.
- IUCN is a decentralized organization structured in 10 Regional Offices whose geographical coverage reaches the entire world. Most of this Regional Offices have specific Regional Forest Programmes (RFP) to address the forest issues of each region; each RFP reports (directly or indirectly) to the pertinent Regional Director and keeps a close technical coordination with FCP.
- The IUCN Forest Team is the reunion of FCP with the RFPs. This Forest Team is a virtual structure because it is not formally established as a structural component of the IUCN Secretariat. Despite its virtual character, the members of the Forest Team meet periodically, participate in setting the direction of IUCN forest activities, exchange information and lessons, develop and implement projects, etc.

2. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, ISSUES AND KEY QUESTIONS

The main purpose of this review was to learn from the recent experience of delivering IUCN Forest Activities and identify factors that will improve this work. This review intends to address all aspects of IUCN Forest Activities from this and the previous Intersessional Periods and will seek to place the history and evolution of Forest Team in proper context since its inception.

The specific objectives of the review are:

1. To assess the programmatic direction of IUCN Forest Activities in the context of global and regional trends and priorities and approaches to forest conservation;
2. To assess the relevance and where possible outcomes or impact of IUCN forest activities.
3. To assess the viability, effectiveness and efficiency of the organizational structures that deliver IUCN Forest Activities, including the Forest Conservation Programme and the extended network of Forest Team.
4. To contextualize the experience of IUCN Forest Activities in the wider experience of IUCN Regionalization and Decentralization.
5. Based on the above, to develop conclusions and recommendations (including where appropriate, options and scenarios) to guide the future of forest work at IUCN.

Based on the above Objectives a set of Evaluation issues and Key Questions was prepared and agreed as the basic instrument to guide the review process. These Issues and Key Questions were:

Issues	Key Questions
Objective 1: To assess the programmatic direction of IUCN Forest Activities in the context of global and regional trends and priorities and approaches to forest conservation;	
Programmatic Direction and Leadership	How adequate is the direction of the Forest Conservation Programme in relation to the global trends, priorities and approaches to forest conservation?
	How adequate is the direction of the Forest Team in relation to the different regional trends, priorities and approaches to forest conservation?
	To what extent does the approach used by IUCN has created positive outcomes and impacts on forest conservation?
Objective 2: To assess the relevance (and where possible outcomes or impact) of IUCN forest activities.	
Relevance to global forestry trends and stakeholders	To what extent are IUCN Forest Activities relevant?
Outcomes and Impacts	What outcomes or impacts has Forest Team delivered through its activities?
Objective 3: To assess the viability, effectiveness and efficiency of the organizational structures that deliver IUCN Forest Activities, including the Forest Conservation Programme and the extended network of the Forest Team.	
Effectiveness	How effective were the different components of the Forest teams in delivering according the their plans?
	To what extent does the organizational structure of Forest Team facilitate or impede delivery of outputs and outcomes?
	To what extent are specialist functions adequately and effectively supported by Forest Team at different levels (HQ, regional, country)?
	To what extent are specialist functions adequately and effectively supported by Forest Team? (cont)
	To what extent do the networking functions of Forest Team adequately and effectively help deliver the Forest Activities
	To what extent is Forest Team effectively led and managed
Efficiency	To what extent does the organizational model of Forest Team efficiently deliver the Forest Activities?
Effectiveness and Efficiency	Based on the above, what gaps or impediments should Forest Team seek to address?

Issues	Key Questions
Objective 4: To contextualize the experience of IUCN Forest Activities in the wider experience of IUCN Regionalization and Decentralization.	
Regionalization and Decentralization	To what extent is the experience of the Forest Team typical or atypical of IUCN experience in Regionalization and Decentralization?
	What lessons can Forest Team take from the Regionalization and Decentralization process to apply to their context?

3. METHODOLOGY

Review matrix

Using the Objectives, Evaluation Issues and Key Questions as a starting point, the first step in the review process was the development of the pertinent Review Matrix. This matrix includes:

- Review Objectives
- Issues
- Key Questions
- Sub-questions
- Indicators
- Data sources and analysis methods

The complete Review Matrix used in this Review is included as Annex 2.

Organization of the work

The Review Team organized its work in three stages:

Stage 1. The first component of the Review was the analysis of the Strategic Direction and Relevance of the FCP. This aspect was primarily undertaken by Hosny El-Lakany, who completed it in the period April - May 2007. This part of the review was based in FCP and Regional Forest Programmes documentation, interviews and his own personal experience as ADG-FAO/Head of Forestry Department and Chairman of the CPF (Collaborative Partnership on Forests, comprising 14 international bodies dealing with forests and forestry)

Stage 2. The second component of the Review was about the work of the FCP and the Regional Forest Programmes (together the Forest Team) in general. This component was undertaken by Alejandro Imbach and Nicholas Ngece. This component included visits and interviews to the IUCN Headquarters and four IUCN Regional Offices (South America-SUR; Mesoamerica-ORMA, Eastern Africa-EARO and Asia-ARO). It also included phone interviews to IUCN staff and partners in three IUCN Regional Offices (Western Africa-BRAO; Central Africa-CARO and Southern Africa-ROSA) as well as review and analysis of documents and additional managerial information (ABC List, Budgets, etc)

Stage 3. Finally all members of the Review Team exchanged partial reports and came together for a final meeting at IUCN HQ to articulate the different findings and recommendations. Immediately after, the Review debriefing meeting took place at IUCN HQ. There were two debriefing sessions: the first for the senior staff who commissioned the Review and the second for the FCP staff. Their inputs were taken into consideration for the preparation of this Report.

Sources of Information

The sources of information for the Review were basically three:

1. Documents from IUCN, IUCN FCP, IUCN Regional Forest Programmes and Projects and other documents. The list of reviewed documents is included as Annex 3 of this Report.
2. Interviews to IUCN staff (at IUCN HQ and regions), partners and other stakeholders. The list of interviewed people is included as Annex 4.
3. Mandates and Work Programmes of various IGO's and NGO's addressing forestry issues.

Information analysis and results

The Programmatic Review was basically an expert assessment of the situation and overall performance of FCP and its relationships with the general Forest team, including an analysis of the Regional Forest Programme in the aspects affecting FCP.

As an expert assessment, it was not based in the quantitative analysis of surveys, questionnaires or other data gathering instruments, but in the expert integration and assessment of the information gathered from the different sources.

As one of the objectives of the Review was the provision of feedback and recommendations to the FCP Senior Management and other Senior Staff about emerging problems and opportunities to improve the Forest Team performance (particularly FCP), two Preliminary Papers addressing urgent emerging issues and specific requests were prepared and delivered during the Review process. The rationale for this procedure was the need to provide urgent and formal feedback to Senior Managers without waiting for the completion of the formal Review process. These Preliminary Papers are presented at the Results part of this Report and included as Annexes.

4. REVIEW RESULTS

The presentation of results is divided in four parts:

1. The IUCN Forest Conservation Programme
2. The IUCN Regional Forest Programmes
3. The IUCN Forest Team (FCP + Regions)
4. The operation of the Forest Team in the context of the IUCN regionalization and decentralization process

4.1 THE FOREST CONSERVATION PROGRAMME (FCP)

The Forest Conservation Programme is one of the IUCN Global Programmes. It is based at the IUCN Headquarters Ecosystems House in Gland, Switzerland. The FCP is active in conceptual development, forest policy, networking, field projects implementation and general coordination and support activities with other IUCN Global Programmes and with the IUCN Regional Offices throughout the world. Most of these Regional Offices have programs or units dealing with forest conservation issues (collectively named as Regional Forest Programmes -RFPs). While there are not formal structures linking FCP and the RFPs, they have established a virtual group known as the Forest Team. The word "virtual" in the previous sentence makes reference to the fact that the Forest Team is not a formal IUCN management structure represented in the organizational chart. In terms of the actual work, the Forest Team is a real and practical team doing joint work (e.g. the SVBC internal review), developing joint programs and projects (SVBC, LLS, RRI), exchanging ideas and experiences, etc.

Currently the FCP has a Programme Head, two Programme Officers, a Communications Officer, an Finance Officer and an Office Manager. The Climate Change area is currently located within FCP and it has a dedicated Senior Staff officer. In January 2007, the beginning of the Livelihoods and Landscapes Project (LLS) introduced several changes into the staff, as the former Assistant Head shifted to LLS Coordinator leaving a position still unfilled. LLS is now bringing new staff positions on administration, M&E and knowledge management.

FCP is implementing a dozen projects, most of them medium and small. The most important field project (besides LLS) is the Allanblackia one that started in Western Africa and it is now in process of expanding to the center of the continent as the potential and interest in this oil producing tree grows. This Project was well externally reviewed recently. The next in terms of budget is the Testing of ITTO biodiversity lines, implemented in several developing countries. The last medium-size project is about climate change adaptation in Zambia, whose importance is more on the development of the forest / adaptation to climate change links than the budget. In the same line, of low budget and high potential impact it is possible to mention the project on Land (forests) tenure and strategy in Liberia. From the above list it is evident that most of the direct FCP activities are in Central, South and Western Africa. The LLS coordination will also be based at FCP, while another FCP Project -Strengthening Voices for Better Choices- is being implemented on behalf of FCP by the Asia Regional Office.

The Programme keeps an active publications Programme led by the Arbor Vitae Newsletter, and it is also making active efforts to engage the IUCN members and Commissions in their projects and activities. In policy terms, FCP is active in several international efforts such as ITTO, UNFF, the FLEGT processes in the regions and the CPF.

All mentioned aspects, and a few other ones were included in this review of FCP. The results of the different FCP analyzed aspects are presented in the next sections under the following headings:

- Strategic direction & Relevance
- Management
- The Climate Change and LLS challenges

4.1.1 Strategic direction and Relevance

As indicated earlier, these aspects were reviewed by Dr. Hosny El-Lakany from UBC (Canada). His full Report on FCP Strategic Direction and Relevance is included as Annex 5.

Background, Objectives and Scope

This section of the report is intended to examine the programmatic directions and leadership of FCP in relation to global trends, priorities and approaches to forest conservation. It starts by reviewing the evolution of FCP and the changing priorities; then outlines briefly mandates and activities of other major players in the fields relevant to forest conservation with a view to consider the global paradigm shift. Finally, the congruence between FCT activities both globally and regionally and the global forestry framework is examined, leading to evaluating the programmatic directions of IUCN/FCP global relevance. Attempts were made to identify gaps in the present FCP and /or missed opportunities.

Evolution of IUCN Forest Conservation Programme in response to global challenges

The fundamental goal of the Forest Conservation Programme is to maintain and, where necessary, restore forest ecosystems to promote conservation, sustainable management and equitable distribution of the full range of forest goods and services.

The long term objectives of the program as originally developed as part of the IUCN/WWF/Forest for Life Strategy in 1996 and then reaffirmed in the Second World Conservation Congress in Amman in 2000 are:

- Establishing a network of ecologically representative, socially beneficial and effectively managed forest protected areas;
- Achieving environmentally appropriate, socially beneficial and economically viable management of forests outside protected areas;
- Developing and implementing environmentally appropriate and socially beneficial programs to restore deforested and degraded forest landscapes;
- Protecting forests from pollution and global warming by reducing polluting emissions and managing forests for resilience to climate change; and
- Ensuring that political and commercial decision-taking in other sectors safeguard forest resources and result in a fair distribution of associated costs and benefits.

The development of the IUCN/WWF/Forest for Life Strategy coincided with the early development of the IUCN Program in 2001-2004 and the IUCN Strategies: Knowledge, Empowerment and Governments. The Forests for Life Strategy is first and foremost a philosophical statement on how the world's forests are to be conserved, not only through protection, but also through sustainable use and restoration. The objectives were reaffirmed again. For the purpose of articulating its medium-term aims and objectives FCP, like other IUCN component programs, follows the IUCN Intersessional Program by producing framework planning documents developed every four years by the Union to guide its work between World Conservation Congresses.

According to the IUCN Forest Conservation Program for the Intersessional period 2005- 2008 the FCP mission was stated as: “in line with the global IUCN mission is to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve biodiversity in forest and tree-dominated landscapes and ensure that the use of forest resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable”. The document was intended to provide the program with a clear and comprehensive long-term direction for safeguarding the world’s forest and is, as such, expected to remain relevant for many years to come.

The strategic 2005 - 2008 program identified the following priorities:

- The need for workable strategies that value and conserve forest biodiversity,
- Ensuring forest conservation contributes to a just and equitable world and
- Ensuring conservation interventions leverage significant changes.

In trying to identify a niche for FCP, the 2005 - 2008 programme further stated that in every respect, in terms of the status, threats and opportunities, the figures associated with forests are huge. FCP resolved therefore, to build its engagement strategy on encouraging key stakeholders to modify their behaviour in such a way as to deliver long-term and equitable conservation. This concept has guided this part of the review.

In line with the global IUCN mission and vision, consistent with its strategic and operational boundaries and respecting the key priorities of its members, the problematic focus of the FCP in the 2005-2008 Intersessional period was on livelihoods and landscapes. Within this niche area FCP worked to provide knowledge, strength and capacity and promote equitable and sustainable government’s arrangements that conserve and improve the ecological integrity and resilience of forest and tree-dominated landscapes, including forest protected areas, while enhancing the quality and security of local people’s livelihoods.

Accordingly, the vision of the IUCN/FCP became “the world will have more extensive, more diverse and higher quality forest landscapes. These will meet human needs and aspirations fairly, while conserving biological diversity and fulfilling ecosystem functions necessary for all life on earth”. The goal of the program adopted a more realistic approach: “given that IUCN neither owned or manages forests, nor makes decisions about the use of the world’s forests, FCP can only realistically expect to make an impact and effect change through encouraging and persuading people to modify their behaviour”. FCP has proposed five programmatic objectives, each of which is in alignment with Key Result Areas of the global IUCN Intersessional Program. Each of the objectives represents an area of work where the FCP would try and effect changes in order to meet its goals.

In addition, FCP also proposed six objectives for program delivery:

1. Understanding forest biodiversity in a changing world
2. Understanding forest biodiversity as livelihood resource
3. Making forest values count
4. Supporting international forest policy to deliver tangible improvements in forest practices
5. Working with stakeholders to protect, manage and restore forest landscapes for the benefit of both people and nature
6. Effective and efficient forest conservation program delivery.

These six objectives were shaped in response to the changes in the global perceptions in the late 1990’s and early 2000’s that impact directly on the conservation of forest resources, and thus on the means available for IUCN to do business. There was a new paradigm emerging: donors, with a much sharper focus on poverty reduction, have all but walked away from a direct engagement

in forest and forest conservation issues (perhaps with the exception of illegal logging). Public awareness of, and interest in, forest loss and degradation has also sharply declined from where it stood at the end of the 1990s. Most international dialogues on forests move along in fits and starts and have experienced widespread disillusionment among Civil Society who believe that the will is not there among governments to find tangible and constructive ways out.

Cognizant of that dilemma, IUCN\FCP tried to respond to the evolving global priorities. The six objectives and associated twenty-seven "Results or Outcomes" cover a wide spectrum of forest conservation and related activities. It is clear that the programme has responded to paradigm shifts in global forestry from conservation per se to management of protected areas, ecosystem management and sustainable forest management.

As important as that, by the year 2000 FCP developed and applied what they called "the green thread" approach. At that moment FCP took the decision not to follow events (forums, congresses, etc.) but to take an issues driven approach to policy work focusing on specific issues as forest landscape restoration, governance, and others presented later. The green thread approach has had two main consequences:

1. Unlike other international NGOs, IUCN-FCP did not walk away from international policy meetings but did become much more selective on only investing in those where it could contribute something significant - e.g. FLR / FLEG /Poverty and Conservation. That decision meant (controversially in IUCN internal terms) spending more time in UNFF/ITTO/CPF and less at the CBD.
2. While still investing in international policy the "green thread approach" also means that FCP significantly shifted the balance from global processes to supporting national and regional processes where they find better likelihood to contribute to effective progress.

A Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) was developed as a framework which holds opportunities for people to win more and lose less. It is a question of bringing people together to identify, negotiate and implement what matters most to them across a landscape be it primary forest, secondary forest, agriculture or even degraded land. Taking restoration out of the conservation domain and putting it into the landscapes of communities, industrial plantations, agricultural and degraded forest lands puts policy concepts such as the ecosystem approach and sustainable forest management into practice.

By 2005, FCP managed to mainstream Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) into international forest dialogue. FCP was further integrated into practice through some projects. This is a concept that the Forest Team across IUCN has been implementing with members and partners in government, NGOs and the private sector as it fosters alliances, practical solutions and sustainability. It has gained considerable recognition by the international forest community. For example, the Forestry Commission of Great Britain is using FLR as a means to achieve competitive and innovative forestry that support health and well-being as well as being adaptable to changing environments due to climate change for example. IUCN/FCP has also managed to incorporate civil society and private sectors to contribute advice to governments working to combat illegal logging and other illicit forest activities (FLEG processes). IUCN has been involved in FLEG issues since 2001 and has a growing body of work in Africa, Asia, Europe and North Asia and Latin America. This work indicates that responding to these problems requires dealing with wider law enforcement and governance issues. These two areas of activities (FLR and FLEG) reflect the shift in global interests and consequently programmatic directions of FCP.

By the end of 2005, FCP has progressed in the implementing of the “green thread approach” and was working and planning work with all stakeholders who have a direct interest in forests, beyond just government forest departments and environmental NGOs, in the light of complex governance structures which influence the way in which landscape is organized or utilized. “FCP planned to work more with sectors in the mainstream of forestry such as the equitable decentralization processes, rights to resources and working with ministries such as Finance, Health, and Energy”. The second area of programmatic direction was to identify those biological and socioeconomic systems most vulnerable to climate change in order to reduce risk. The third issue was to include policy in the development of most field projects and further strengthen investments in strategic partnership, such as the Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration.

FCP endeavored to speed up knowledge flows and learning between field and policy as envisaged in the “green thread” approach, as there was (and is) a need to share the lessons across the regions to scale up the success. Finally, the time it takes for practice to inform policy and vice versa is too long. With the support of partners, FCP has built a strong focus around the scene of livelihood and landscapes that emphasized IUCN’s commitment towards making forest conservation and restoration economically and socially beneficial for the poor and other forest dependent communities. That strategic evolution has been appreciated internationally.

In these efforts FCP is still learning its ways, but early success at implementing SVBC and FLEG, in addition to the clear conceptual approach to LLS, has convinced donors that FCP is learning quickly and translating its new knowledge into new actions, making interesting for them to maintain and significantly increase their support to the FCP led processes.

Landscape Restoration became the central theme for FCP work by 2005/ 2006. The theme was regarded as the central theme around which to coordinate the programs activities and this thematic focus has been strengthened considerably over 2003-2004 Work Programme. The theme was central to demonstrating the link between biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods. Again, it has reflected global priorities well in place around 2005.

Another significant evolution of IUCN/FCP work took place in 2006 in response to emerging paradigms emphasizing rural poverty reduction while mainstreaming good environmental practice into productive landscapes. A Livelihood and Landscape Strategy (LLS) was developed to realize a vision of IUCN and partners aspiring to reduce global rural poverty. Three reasons guided this vision. The first is ethical; it would be immoral to blithely pursue conservation activities while in the very same location people who rely on natural resources are unable to meet even their basic needs. The second is pragmatic, as the same resources that the global community values for their intrinsic wealth are those that the rural population requires to sustain their livelihoods; in such situations the viability of nature conservation strategies is entirely contingent on economic and social drivers. The third is political, because if the world is to “value and conserve nature” then conservation must convincingly deliver against positive ‘mainstream’ outcomes, such as poverty reduction, rather than simply reacting against specific threats to biodiversity alone. The fact that this strategy is exclusively focused on those 88% of terrestrial landscapes that are not protected for nature conservation is in itself indicative of this new conservation thinking.

The overall goal of the LLS is “the effective implementation of national and local policies and programs that leverage real and meaningful change in the lives of rural poor, enhance long-term and equitable conservation of biodiversity and ensure sustainable supply of forestry-related goods and services in line with nationally-defined priorities”. Through the LLS process, which requires bringing together regional and national forest colleagues across IUCN, the IUCN Forest Team capacity and implementation will be strengthened in the key FCP strategic areas.

By 2006, IUCN/FCP had undergone an evolution in all its programmatic directions from conservation of biological diversity in “protected areas”, to landscape restoration, to livelihood and landscape strategies, that recognizes the absolute necessity of integrating conservation into productive landscape for the benefit of society, especially the rural poor.

Analysis of other key institutional players

A brief analysis of the key global organizations dealing with forestry issues was undertaken and it is presented in Annex 5. The organizations considered were:

- CIFOR
- ICRAF
- World Bank
- GEF
- FAO
- ITTO
- UNFF
- UNEP
- Post-UNCED Conventions (Biodiversity, Climate Change and Desertification)
- International NGOs (WWF, TNC, CI, WRI)

Examining the mandates, priorities and strategies of several allied international and regional bodies reveals that the programme of work and the programmatic directions of IUCN/FCP are in line with trends prevailing in the sector in general. The clear shift from traditional biodiversity conservation towards sustainable management beyond protected areas for multiple functions and benefits is globally dominant at present as far as research, development and financing are concerned. A significant development in IUCN’s policy has been prompted by the fact that FCP is more convinced now that the main threat to the rich resources of biodiversity in the forest is not logging; but rather the insatiable hunger for land needed to meet the world’s expanding demands for palm oil, soy beans, rubber and other tropical crops, or at times by large-scale infrastructure development such as road building and mining.

The current overarching objectives of comparable programs around the world is to enhance livelihood by contributing to improved policies and practices related to the management and use of forests and forested land coupled with special emphasis on policies governing other sectors which have impact on forests. The holistic linkages between livelihood and sustainability, of which conservation of biological diversity is an integral component are now high on the global agenda, and FCP can justifiably claim leadership as it is in the fore front in this connection.

This trend has been developed and to some extent implemented in response to having poverty reduction occupying a prominent position in MDGs. FCP, which started mainly focused on forest conservation activities, has evolved towards a broader focus that looks at broader context issues (poverty reduction, use of natural resources, governance systems and other) as an overarching frame in which its forest biodiversity conservation efforts operate. Obviously, incorporating these contextual issues successfully into the guiding work on forest conservation and management has not been ‘smooth sailing’.

In a global interinstitutional scale, these efforts are pursued by the World Bank, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). The recent developments in the UNFCCC are adopting that approach as well. One would expect that within the global interest in the role of forest in adaptation to and mitigation of climate change and the significant role of Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD), there will be an imminent paradigm shift in emphasis and interest. This will most likely be followed by a shift in ODA and other multi- and bi-lateral aid. The private sector is bound to increase investment in this domain as well, and certainly, IUCN/FCP will have to respond to these new challenges

Current IUCN/FCP programmatic directions recognizes the tradeoffs between conservation and development programs and strives to explore ways and means to equitably balance both objectives simultaneously, within a landscape, aspiring to find a mix of land uses that satisfy livelihood and development needs while maintaining forest biodiversity. Achieving such a complex objective in a given landscape is beyond the capabilities of the individual organizations, hence developing and maintaining partnerships are vital for the future success of IUCN/FCP.

Conclusions

- k. Programmatic directions of IUCN/FCP are in line with trends prevailing in the sector in general. FCP often leads change.
- l. The clear shift from traditional biodiversity conservation in Protected Areas towards sustainable management beyond protected areas for their multiple functions and benefits is globally dominant at present in research, development and financing.
- m. FCP's growing interest in forest management outside protected areas is commendable as it represents a key area of leadership for IUCN in terms of overall sustainable development.
- n. Current overarching objectives of comparable programs around the world are to enhance livelihood by contributing to improved policies and practices related to the management and use of forests coupled with special emphasis on policies governing other sectors which have impact on forests.
- o. Holistic linkages between livelihoods and sustainability, of which conservation of biological diversity is an integral component, are now high on the global agenda, and FCP can justifiably claim leadership as it is in the fore front
- p. FCP, which started mainly focused on forest conservation activities, has evolved towards a broader focus that looks at broader context issues (poverty reduction, use of natural resources, governance systems and other) as an overarching frame in which its forest biodiversity conservation efforts operate.
- q. This evolution has been, and will continue to be difficult, but worth pursuing as other international organizations in this field are also adopting this approach.
- r. Within intense global interest in the role of forest in adaptation to and mitigation of climate change and the significant role of REDD, there will be an imminent paradigm shift in emphasis, political interest and funding.
- s. Current FCP programmatic directions recognize the tradeoffs between conservation and development programs and strive to explore ways and means to equitably balance the delivery of both objectives simultaneously.
- t. Achieving such a complex objective in a given landscape is beyond the capabilities of the individual organizations, hence developing and maintaining partnerships are vital for the future success of FCP.

4.1.2 FCP Management

The management of the Forest Conservation Programme has been analyzed from the following perspectives:

- Programme development
- Budget management
- Staffing
- Networking
- Policy making
- Communications and knowledge management
- Leadership

Programme Development

FCP has a long history in IUCN, being among the first Global Programmes that developed joint activities with IUCN regions, long before the beginning of the IUCN regionalization and decentralization process.

Through this 20-year long process, some of the key milestones in the development of the Programme were:

- The creation of the Programme and the establishment of the Forest Conservation Advisory Group (late 80s)
- The beginning of joint work with the IUCN Regions that started in the late 80s and continued until today. During this long period the joint work has also evolved, to the point that today there are global Projects designed and negotiated by FCP that are being implemented by regional Programmes (e.g. the Strengthening Voices for Better Choices Project that is implemented by the Asia Regional Office)
- Agreement with WWF (Forest for Life Strategy and Arbor Vitae) (late 90s)
- The conceptualization work on Poverty and Conservation (2002-3)
- The development of the concept and methods for Forest Landscape Restoration - FLR (2002)
- The development of work on Forest Governance linked to the FLEG and AFLEG processes and the SVBC Project (2004-5)
- Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy - LLS (2006-7)

While the previous paragraphs emphasize some key elements in the history of the FCP development, an analysis of the Project Pipeline (ABC list) since 2003 shows a clear path towards Programme consolidation in terms of broadening programmatic scope and reach as well as of budget growth and stability. This analysis can be consulted in Annex 6.

Having said that, it can also be noted that during the long LLS negotiation and approval process the non-LLS portfolio shrunk and that FCP is now (at the time of the Review) doing significant efforts to rebuild its project pipeline while starting LLS implementation.

Obviously, as the Programme developed the links and joint work with Member organizations and Commission experts also increased.

Budget management

Budget management is an essential issue in the review of any IUCN unit given the high reliance of the organization in Project funding, particularly at the level of Regional Offices and Programmes where usually more than 80% of the income comes from Project overheads and staff time charges. It is also essential for the overall Union whose capacity to absorb and write-off deficits is very limited given its structure and funding realities.

In terms of budget management FCP has a good and consistent record of on-target spending. Budget management was consistent with Programme development, so as Programme grew so did budget allowing for staff increases and building reserves. These reserves allowed for pursuing and negotiating larger initiatives as LLS, FLEG and SVBC (in fact, during 2006, the last year of LLS development and negotiation, FCP drew on its reserves to maintain the process while avoiding deficits).

A brief analysis of FCP income analysis is included as Annex 7, providing additional information about this issue.

One additional and relevant point in terms of budget management is that FCP has invested its resources to support the work at Regional Offices. Until recently most of IUCN RFPs receive an earmarked core contribution during the IUCN budget process. This contribution had its origins in the core contribution that FCP received a few years ago and that it shared with different RFPs as a way to support and develop forest conservation related work around the world. Changes in the management of core funds that came with the negotiation of IUCN Programme support with different donors led later to the pooling of all core resources into a single fund. But the original contributions to RFPs still exist in the form of funds allocated to them from the unrestricted core funds. At this point it is necessary to say that the mentioned pooling of resources also led to a reduction in the amount of core funds received by the RFPs, as the core funds are assigned to the Regional Offices and then redistributed there by the Regional Directors (or other structures delegated by them) who, facing different funding needs and urgencies, have finally reduced the amount of resources originally assigned to RFPs. These cuts can be very significant depending on the overall deficit/surplus situation of the specific office.

Other related aspect of budget management is the way in which FCP share budgets and overheads with the Regional Offices and RFPs (even when current overheads are considered as very inadequate, as in the case of LLS). When FCP engages with a Regional Office for the implementation of a Project, it usually provides a budget for the implementation of the activities and a proportion of the pertinent overhead as administration costs. In this way, the Regional Office becomes a partner who implements on behalf of FCP who is still accountable to the donor. This way of operation is widely considered as fair by the involved Offices and Programmes and has helped to develop the credibility of FCP in the IUCN Regions that perceives FCP as a desirable internal partner. This issue is analyzed with re details in Section 4.3: The Forest Team

Staffing

This analysis is restricted to a brief analysis of the staffing situation, and it does not include any aspects about the way in which the staff is managed. No complains or comments were raised about this issue during the interviews, but in complete fairness it is necessary to clarify that staff management was not specifically addressed.

FCP staff is composed as follows:

- FCP Head
- FCP Deputy Head (now shifted 80% to LLS Coordination)
- Senior Scientific Adviser (part-time, shared with LLS)
- Two Programme Officers
- Administrative Officer
- Secretary
- Communications officer (shared with LLS)
- Interns (one at the moment)
- Regular Consultants

A basic staffing analysis shows that, within available financial resources, the FCP staffing seems reasonably good. Perhaps a minor comment may be that while there is a good base of young professionals there is a notable scarcity of mid-level managers (just one person). In the future, and as it has happened in many other IUCN global and regional units, this second-tier weaknesses translate later in problems when senior staff retires, shift to other positions within the organization or moves to other organizations.

The second-tier weaknesses can be addressed either by hiring staff or by investing in developing junior staff skills or both. In the case of junior staff development, this requires a clear strategy and continuous supervision and monitoring in order to ensure a career development process. This strategy should be developed and implemented in close cooperation with the Human Resources Unit.

The efforts to develop the Programme in new areas such as Climate change and Livelihoods and Landscapes while maintaining the rest of FCP in operation meant, and still means, additional and significant demands on the senior staff time. This issue will be addressed later with more detail under Section 4.1.3, but at this point it is necessary to highlight that the senior staff overstretching has already started to show. Some of the usual signs are already there, such as intensive travelling schedules, internal and external complains about the difficulties to get in touch with senior staff and get quality attention from them, loss of presence in the regions, etc. These are typical and common signs of overstretching and they are not a source of concern if this overstretching is temporal. Apparently, this is the case and it is expected that some senior staff shortages caused by the new initiatives are going to be solved during 2007. It is convenient to keep a close monitoring of this situation to ensure that it is properly addressed. A broader analysis of the issues and recommendations will be found later under Section 4.1.3

Networking

Networking is acceptable as managed by FCP considering the available financial resources. There are several areas of networking, internal and external to IUCN.

Internally, there are 3 major areas: networking with other Global Programmes at IUCN HQ, networking with members and networking with Regional Offices and RFPs.

- *Other Global Programmes at IUCN HQ*

There are two key aspects to be pointed out here. The first is that FCP is well perceived by all other IUCN Global Programmes interviewed, which consider that FCP is a well managed Programme. Several of them also mentioned that there is space and need to increase joint work with FCP. These comments reflect more good intentions than actual possibilities, considering

that most probably neither they nor FCP are going to be able to add more collaborative work under the current system of institutional incentives.

The second aspect is that FCP has not prioritized the joint work with other Global Programmes, so despite the eventual contacts, the good perceptions and the recognition that more can be done, there is not much additional interaction to show. As mentioned before, this situation is due to the restricted financial resources and the prioritization made by FCP. It should also be mentioned that this situation is not happening just with FCP, but it is the regular one regarding the IUCN Global Programmes who, in general, work in isolation. This situation is stated as a fact and not as a positive or negative judgment, and it surely responds to the different positive and negative institutional incentives regarding joint work between Global Programmes that were not analyzed further in this Review.

- IUCN Members

FCP has an explicit policy to engage with member organization throughout the world related to forestry conservation work. As part of this policy, FCP has a Programme Officer dedicated part-time to member engagement activities. This assignation is relatively recent and there is some progress in the attempts to engage with IUCN members.

The initiative is commendable and should be continued and intensified as financial resources allow for that. Moreover, the articulation between networking with members and the communications and knowledge management activities (see next section) should be intensified as these last two develop more intensively as part of the LLS activities linked with FCP.

- Regional Forest Programmes (RFPs)

While this aspect is addressed at Section 4.3: The Forest Team, the situation can be summarized in terms of need of additional presence in Latin America and Asia and the revitalization of the regular Forest Team meetings. RFPs recognize the efforts of FCP to support them but they also find that more efforts are needed. There are large expectations about the potential of LLS to help filling these gaps.

Externally, FCP is linked to different formal and non-formal networks related to forest conservation and management issues. As in other cases, there is space and demand for FCP to engage more intensively and extensively in external networking, but the current priorities cannot be expanded until other urgent priorities such as putting in place adequate management structures for Climate Change and LLS are completed and staff time is freed to undertake new tasks.

Policy making

Many of the issues related to policy were already presented in Section 4.1.1 Strategic direction of the Programme. Therefore, this section will just summarize the key points.

As also mentioned in other management areas, FCP is actively working in global policy making but has set clear priorities about its engagement. Currently the basic priorities regarding policy are ITTO, UN Forest Forum (UNFF), the CPF (Collaborative Partnership of Forests) and the regional FLEGT (Forest Law, Empowerment, Governance and Trade). Recently the FCP played a significant role in the design of the World Bank Forest Policy.

There is close collaboration with ITTO since 2000. Currently, there is joint work regarding the Guidelines for Biodiversity Conservation in production forests, that were developed by FCP at ITTO request and that are currently being tested in several countries.

FCP also is active with UNFF before 2000. The FCP action was significant at this level, to the point that at UNFF5 the three Ministerial Roundtables at UNFF were about issues flagged by FCP: Poverty, FLEGT and Forest Landscape Restoration. As a complementing activity to the ones with UNFF, FCP is an active partner of CPF (Collaborative Partnership on Forests) with other 13 international organizations such as GEF, CIFOR, World Bank, ITTO, IUFRO, UNFF, UNFCCC, UNFCCC, UNEP, ICRAF and others).

There is an explicit decision from FCP about not to prioritize participation in the CBD process and meetings due to the need to prioritize efforts given limited resources, and also a view about the CBD scope expanding too much on forest issues and losing focus and, consequently, effectiveness.

There are potential and expectations for FCP involvement in other spaces (such as CBD) where IUCN plays a significant role as an organization. This may happen when new resources are negotiated or staff time is freed to allow for broader priorities.

Communications and Knowledge management

As in other areas, this one is considered as well managed within available financial resources, and there was also a prioritization of efforts.

One prioritized area was the publication and distribution of Arbor Vitae, The IUCN / WWF Forest Conservation Newsletter. Arbor Vitae is part of the joint products coming from the IUCN / WWF joint work on forest conservation issues. Over the years, FCP has taken a larger responsibility on the production of Arbor Vitae and the newsletter has been refocused and redesigned, shifting from a format based on the dissemination of diverse news towards other format where the articles are focused on a specific theme that changes from issue to issue.

A brief analysis of the contents and contributors to Arbor Vitae (included as Annex 8) shows a remarkable presence of articles from partners and from IUCN regional staff, showing the FCP effort to make Arbor Vitae an expression of the overall Forest Team including external partners.

Moreover, Arbor Vitae was recently reviewed achieving very positive results in terms of reach, usefulness and readers interest, as shown in the summary included in Annex 8.

In terms of publications, the complete list is significant (close to 120 titles until mid-2005) as shown in Annex 9. In the last few years there was a shift towards the production of commercial books and three important titles were produced over the last few years:

- SAYER, J.; MAGINNIS, S. (eds) 2005. Forests in landscapes. Ecosystems approaches to sustainability. London, Earthscan. 256 p.
- SAYER, J. (ed) 2005. The Earthscan Reader on Forestry & Development. London, Earthscan. 434 p.
- RIETBERGEN-McCRACKEN, J.; MAGINNIS, S.; SARRE, A. (eds) 2007. The Forest Landscape Restoration Handbook. London, Earthscan. 175 p.

A publication deserving to be mentioned specifically is the book on Conservation and poverty that presented the conceptual approach emerging from IUCN FCP experiences and lead into the landscapes and livelihoods approach. This publication was influential throughout IUCN and other organizations; its complete citation is as follows:

- FISHER, R.J.; MAGINNIS, S.; JACKSON, W.J.; BARROW, E.; JEANRENAUD, S. 2005. Poverty and Conservation. Landscapes, People and Power. IUCN FCP, Switzerland. Landscapes and Livelihood Series #2. 148 p.

Other communications areas are less impressive, such as the FCP website that is not updated and whose navigation is not very friendly. Both problems are not exclusive of the FCP website but general to the IUCN Website. According to different IUCN sources the entire IUCN Website is in process of redesign and much improved version is expected later in the year.

Knowledge management in FCP is still in its very early stages, but this is not surprising considering other constraints already mentioned (as overstretched staff, early stages of interaction with members) and not mentioned (limited M&E activities, capacity weaknesses at RFPs level). In any case, there is a strong component in LLS on communications and knowledge management that also includes FCP, and the initial efforts in this direction are currently under implementation.

Leadership

In this Review, the leadership aspects were addressed from two perspectives: programmatic leadership (already presented in Section 4.1.1) and operational leadership.

In operational terms, FCP is a leading Global Programme in IUCN regarding issues as:

- effective commitment to support IUCN decentralization and regionalization
- actual involvement of regions (despite being uneven) in different processes from programme/project development to implementation
- decentralized implementation of global projects (e.g. SVBC)
- sharing of Project budgets
- sharing of project overheads
- effective adoption of a participatory approach (including regional staff) for FCP Intersessional Programme development

This leadership is widely recognized at both central and regional levels and has contributed to create a very good perception of the Programme, both internally and externally.

Conclusions on FCP Management

In overall terms, FCP is a well managed Global Programme that is making significant contributions to the fulfilment of the IUCN Mission.

This assessment should not obscure the fact that there are several areas in which the current work can and should be improved and extended. In several previous sections the phrase and words “within available financial resources” and “prioritization” were used, signalling that prioritization allows for effective management under financial constraints but does not make everybody happy. There are several lines of work, partners and issues that need to be addressed as soon as additional resources are obtained or accessed.

Having established these limitations, it is also necessary to recognize the efforts of the FCP management to set priorities and to maintain them in spite of complains and pressures to do other things. It is very difficult to assess what the right priorities are as they depend significantly on the perceptions and experience of the managers who made the prioritization; moreover, any prioritization is always accompanied by the unhappy claims of those who were not prioritized. Therefore, the review team wished to highlight the good management practice of setting and maintaining priorities rather than a probably less useful analysis about whether or not the right priorities were established. Just for the record, the Review Team agrees with the criteria used by FCP to make their priorities.

4.1.3 The Climate Change and LLS challenges

As mentioned in the Programme Management part in the previous Section, over the last couple of years the evolution of FCP led to the engagement of the Programme in two new, additional and very large initiatives: Climate change (CC) and Livelihoods and Landscapes (LLS).

For different reasons both evolved quickly over the last year creating unexpected pressure and demands over the FCP staff and the consequent temporal loss of balance in the FCP operations. The key expression of this imbalance is the overload and overstretching affecting the FCP senior staff and the eventual risks that this overload is creating. Both cases are analyzed separately in the following sections.

- Climate Change

Climate change is not a new theme for IUCN. The organization had dedicated staff to this issue since the earlier years of the current decade. Given the need to find an adequate institutional niche for this theme and willing to avoid the creation of new understaffed units, the Climate change (CC) expert was integrated into the Forest Conservation Programme given the links between the early CC agenda (basically carbon sequestration, carbon trade markets and similar) and forest management and reforestation.

This situation changed dramatically over the last couple of year with the significant rise of fossil fuel prices, the overall recognition that climate change is happening, the growing obvious impact of climate change effects around the world, the subsequent fast emergence of the field of agro-fuels, bio-fuels and sustainable energy sources, the debate between mitigation and adaptation, the renewed discussions within the Tokyo Protocol on avoided deforestation, the negotiations about the follow-up of the Tokyo Protocol, etc.

Suddenly Climate change moved to the center of the environment and development agendas and IUCN with its limited capacities in this field followed the evolution of the agendas and become immersed in them. This process, complex *per se*, was made even more complex by the loss of the only person dedicated to it in 2005, and the assumption of that work by the FCP senior staff while the replacing position was defined and filled, something that took place in early 2007.

Even with the incorporation of the new staff, the CC position remained within FCP, and the new prominence gained by the issue also created additional time and dedication demands on the FCP management and on the FCP budget as the new demands were not balanced with additional financial resources for FCP (actually the FCP core allocation was reduced by 15%)

Currently, this situation has not changed and its future is still not clear. There are good reasons to create a separate Climate Change Programme or unit from a management point of view, but there also good programmatic reasons to keep it within an existing Programme in order to avoid the risk of having a unit operating in isolation. Regardless of the decision, it seems evident that this area is going to grow considerably over the next few years, particularly with the strong demand from all Regional Office to have the IUCN Secretariat to engage more intensively in adaptation issues.

Therefore, if this area is going to remain with FCP there is an urgent need to strengthen its staff, as well as the staff in the Regional Offices willing to engage in this theme. It is not reasonable to assume that FCP, under its current structure and funding, is going to be able to develop a broad, relevant and successful programme on climate change.

- *Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy Project (LLS)*

At the end of 2006 the negotiations between FCP and the Government of the Netherlands concluded successfully with the approval of the LLS Project whose implementation began in January 2007.

LLS will address four key thematic components: Poverty reduction, Governance, Landscape restoration, and Markets & Incentives. It will be field implemented in eleven geographical sites and countries as follows:

1. Upper Guinean Forest Landscapes / Ghana and Liberia
2. East and Southern African Forest Landscapes / Uganda, Tanzania and Mozambique
3. Sahelian Landscapes / Burkina Faso, Mali and Sudan
4. Congo Basin / Cameroon, Congo Brazzaville and the Central African Republic
5. African Great Lakes / Burundi, DRC and Rwanda
6. Mekong Region / Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Vietnam
7. South Asia / India
8. Western China / China
9. South-east Asia / Indonesia
10. South America / Brazil
11. Mesoamerica / México, Guatemala and El Salvador

With an overall budget of 80 million Euros (16 million contributed by the donor and 64 million to be raised as co-financing) LLS is currently the largest IUCN Project ever in terms of both overall budget and scope. Despite its size, LLS still needs to be seen as a leverage strategy. The type and depth of the changes pursued through LLS in these 11 sites implies a much larger financial support than LLS could provide make (easily one additional order of magnitude). Therefore, LLS has to be perceived as an instrument to raise significantly higher levels of funding and to bring much larger networks and efforts than today. Looking at LLS just as a collection of results and products to be delivered by spending a budget doing activities, may imply for most the involved Regional and Country Offices the waste of a unique opportunity.

While most of the LLS budget is going to be spent in the geographical sites by the partners (IUCN Regional Offices, member organizations and others), the Coordination Unit and other centralized tasks will be run by FCP, meaning that LLS will multiply by 2.5 the last FCP budget.

As any other large initiative, LLS presents opportunities and challenges to IUCN and FCP.

Opportunities

Besides the expected contribution to forest landscapes governance and restoration, LLS provides opportunities for significant expansion and improvement in key areas as:

- Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)
- Networking (internal and external)
- Knowledge management (KM)
- Communications

These four areas are closely interlinked while serving different purposes. Monitoring and evaluation provides feedback to management at different levels on performance and impact of the different activities while serving the mandatory function of reporting to donors and IUCN. At the same time several M&E products such as lessons learned, best practices, reports and other are valuable for knowledge management and communications.

Networking is very close to communications, both internal and external, so these two processes are also closely connected. Knowledge management is an extended process encompassing all units, field sites and activities implemented by LLS, looking for the extraction, organization, analysis, exchange and dissemination of knowledge. Therefore, KM is linked to M&E as mentioned, but also closely intertwined with communications and networking.

Having said all the above, it is not difficult to find that these functions are performed in isolated and dissociated ways in different organizations. Therefore, having succeeded in overcoming the first obstacle (having these functions funded) a significant challenge remains in front of LLS in the form of having these functions performed in a smoothly coordinated and efficient way.

Challenges

In terms of pure challenges, the way in which the implementation of LLS has been set is quite innovative for IUCN but also quite challenging. The main one is for the LLS Coordination Unit to coordinate and support the work in 11 field sites implemented by different internal IUCN partners (mostly Regional Offices) and external partner organizations.

Needless to say there is a lot to be gained by the new model in terms of credibility, knowledge sharing, actual synergies and real learning about how to run large decentralized operations. This potential is worthy of the challenges taken.

Perhaps the most crucial challenges over the first couple of years are going to be at the level of the Coordination Unit in terms of availability of senior management time and staffing. It is the assessment of the Review Team that the LLS designers underestimate the magnitude of the tasks of the Coordination Unit and therefore this Unit is somewhat under-budgeted and under-staffed. The interest in giving high priority to the field work and shared implementation with regional and country structures is understood and shared by the Review Team but, nonetheless, it seems to have gone a bit too far.

Some suggestions and ideas about how to deal with opportunities and challenges were discussed during the review and the debriefing meeting, as explained below.

Preliminary suggested actions

At the time of the review no major problems were actually happening. Some potential areas for problems were identified and discussed during the review. As a result, a Preliminary paper on the LLS implementing structure (Analysis of LLS functions, positions and TOR) was written and discussed during the first part of the review in May. This paper was focused on the LLS Coordination demands on senior staff time and its implications, as well as a brief analysis of the Monitoring & Evaluation and Knowledge Management functions and what they demand. This Preliminary Paper is attached as Annex 10.

Finally, but not less important, it is necessary to highlight that at the moment of the review no major problems were identified as actually taking place in LLS. What the review identified were potential areas for problems, some of them eventually in the near future; therefore and in order to contribute to the proper and timely addressing of them by the FCP and LLS managers the mentioned Preliminary papers were developed.

4.2 THE IUCN REGIONAL FOREST PROGRAMMES (RFPs)

4.2.1 Overall situation

This section is focused in the analysis of the regional units, programmes and other regional and country structures dealing with forest conservation issues, which are collectively named in this document as the Regional Forest Programmes (RFPs).

While this review was not focused in these regional programmes, the relationships between them and the FCP is a relevant part of the review. Therefore, the contents in this section are included as brief context analysis against which the review of the mentioned relationships is going to be presented (next section 4.3).

In general terms, and more as a perception than a researched fact, the overall situation of the IUCN Regional Offices where the RFPs are located seem more difficult than it was a few years ago. Obviously some of these Offices seem to be going through harder times than others, but in general it seems that most of them are dealing with larger portfolios with the same or less staff with the obvious signs of staff overstretching, relatively high staff turnover, problems to fill vacant positions, etc.

The exploration of the reasons for this perceived situation escaped the reach of this Review; a few aspects were discussed and explored when they were relevant to the forest conservation activities and they will be presented at section 4.4 as parts of the analysis of the FCP experience in the context of the IUCN decentralization and regionalization process. For the purpose of this section, the only point to be made is that the general institutional context in which the RFPs operate seems more difficult than a few years ago.

The overall situation of the RFPs will be examined in the following sections looking at the same issues that were described when analyzing FCP in the previous section:

- Programme development
- Budget management
- Staffing
- Networking
- Policy making
- Communications and knowledge management
- Leadership

Programme development

The RFPs programme development is uneven. Generally speaking it is good in Eastern Africa and in those regions (basically Central and western Africa) supported by FCP or EARO. Southern Africa does not have an RFP at the moment, but some forest related projects are under implementation.

Central America has a RFP active in policy issues but without significant field projects, South America is working actively in Brazil and with the Amazonian Treaty countries, basically supported by FCP projects (Strengthening Voices for Better Choices)

Asia has an RFP but the Programme does not have a Programme Coordinator since 2005, when the Coordinator at that time moved to the Strengthening Voices for Better Choices (SVBC) Project. Both the Head and the Programme Coordinator of the Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group where the Asia RFP is located are foresters, but they cannot dedicate enough time to develop the RFP. Despite this situation, ARO was able to negotiate and start the Mangroves for the Future Project that is centered in coastal zone management but has a significant mangrove forests component.

What is interesting to highlight is that, in general, the IUCN forest activities in most of the regions are led and supported by the large FCP Programmes (SVBC and LLS). This is a total reversal from the situation 10 years ago when the RFPs developed, negotiated and implemented their own forest activities based on priorities and support obtained within their regions. This point is mentioned as a fact to reflect upon, not necessarily as something good or bad or as a performance judgment, and it will be addressed with more detail in the "IUCN Funding models" section of Chapter 4.4 (The operation of the Forest Team in the context of the IUCN regionalization and decentralization process, page 38).

Budget management

Budget management is closely intertwined with Programme development and Staffing issues, so these 3 sections must be read and understood as a whole, besides their specific characteristics.

Generally speaking RFP budgets seem to be insufficient and many RFPs are struggling seriously to stay out of deficits. The simple fact that they are struggling and figuring out ways to stay out of deficits is a clear sign that they are actually in a deficit situation.

The ways in which deficits are addressed differ from region to region, but the most basic solutions seem to be moving staff to projects and reducing staff. Both solutions, added to high turnover in some places due to better job opportunities outside or lack of incentives inside, are sending some RFPs spiraling down. Whether or not they will be able to get out of that process or simply crash remains to be seen, and most probably it will differ from region to region.

Fortunately there is some good news about budgets in terms of the new initiatives. In fact, three of the four largest initiatives are related to forest conservation activities or have a strong component about it (LLS, Mangroves for the future and SVBC).

While fresh resources do not solve all problems, at least they provide an opportunity to rebuild the RFPs around new and relevant issues, and to use these large global projects as a platform to develop a new wave of project and activities with the potential to restore RFPs health.

Staffing

This is probably the most critical area for most of the RFPs. Some RFPs have lost their best staff members to other IUCN Regional positions such as Programme Coordinators (SUR), Global Programmes (ARO), other Programme positions (ARO), etc. In other cases (EARO) several RFP junior to mid-level staff members joined other organizations.

In the case of Asia, and given the fact that four of the 11 LLS sites are going to be implemented by that RFP, there was a need for an additional Preliminary Review Paper to help the different actors to make the required management decisions to address the emerging issues. This Preliminary Paper is attached as Annex 11.

On top of that, the new Projects (SVBC, LLS, etc.) are coming with new challenges such as forest landscapes restoration and management, forest governance, local livelihoods, etc. that are well ahead of the regular contents included in regular forest formal training. Moreover, the new IUCN Intersessional Programme (see Section 4.4 for more details) is bringing into the scenario another set of new issues (mostly climate change and energy) having relevant components and clear links with forests and forestry-related activities.

Therefore, finding professionals to staff these projects is not going to be easy, pushing internal capacity building to one of the top priorities for FCP, LLS, MFF and other projects.

In other words, new projects are bringing financial resources but not necessarily the capacity to implement them. So, priority in the allocation of money and time of the few existing experts should be allocated to internal capacity building. The issue of experts' availability should not be lost, as probably there are no more than half a dozen qualified persons in the entire IUCN Secretariat for the type of tasks brought by the new projects.

Networking

Networking is an area where most RFPs seem to have made good progress. In overall terms, it seems that most of the RFPs have faced their programmatic, budgeting and staffing constraints by increasing their networking efforts. In this way, RFPs are succeeding in staying as viable and desirable partners for other national, regional and international organizations despite the mentioned problems that are affecting them.

Other initiatives, either from IUCN (such as SVBC) or other organizations, have helped considerably in engaging and maintaining these networking efforts.

Therefore, RFPs are now more engaged in networking activities than they are in field work or field projects. This is a significant change from the situation a decade ago when the reverse situation happened; again, this is a fact for reflection and consideration and not a judgment on the RFPs or FCP performance.

Obviously one of the areas for reflection about these changes is that networking should be done on the basis of actual experiences in order to close knowledge loops, exchange lessons learned in practice, etc. Therefore, the loss of field experience cannot be replaced on the long run by simple networking.

Fortunately, processes as LLS combining field work with better networking have the potential to generate significant advantages for the knowledge management and communications efforts that LLS and other projects are planning to put in place.

Policy making

Several RFPs (as those in ORMA, SUR, EARO, BRAO and CARO) are engaged in influencing policy through different mechanisms, ranging from direct participation in national or regional processes to development of briefs and documents aimed to policy-makers.

Communications and Knowledge management

RFPs communication products are uneven across the regions. Eastern Africa and South America have a good number of good printed documents on forestry and forestry-related issues, but generally speaking publications or other communication products are not among the stronger points of RFPs.

Knowledge management is not developed across the system, but this situation should not be surprising considering the other constraints already mentioned. Moreover, there is not an acceptable knowledge management process even at the IUCN central level.

As stated before, LLS is providing a basis and an opportunity for the Forest team to develop a reasonably good knowledge management system for LLS, which can also be useful for FCP and other global and regional programmes in IUCN. As mentioned in the Preliminary Paper 1 (Annex 10) the role of the technical experts in knowledge management is essential, and it should be complemented but not replaced by communications or IT experts.

Regional Leadership

In all reviewed regions RFPs are valued stakeholders in several specific and related sectors such as forestry, but also protected areas, natural resources management and other. When asked about IUCN RFPs, other stakeholders usually express their satisfaction with RFP and also their interest in having more activities from the RFPs.

Some of issues spearheaded from FCP as Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) and Forest Governance helped the RFPs to stay as active and desirable partners in many spaces, particularly networking and policy ones.

In most cases the actual implementation of those ideas remains unfulfilled as the field implementation activities shrank significantly across the RFPs. The approval and beginning of LLS provides now a precious opportunity to move to field areas to practice and learn about the potential and constraints of the new concepts.

Conclusions

- a. Over the last years there was a general trend towards diminished Regional Forest Programmes. This was not deliberately planned or decided by IUCN, and some Regions are less affected than others.
- b. Another trend is the decline in the implementation of field projects by the RFPs, with some exceptions as EARO.

- c. All RFPs seems to be suffering from declining budgets whose origins are mixed (changes in donor priorities, capacity constraints, changes in the allocation mechanisms of IUCN core funds, etc.). A significant change happened over the last decade by which the RFPs that used to raise their own large field projects shifted to become dependent on the large global initiatives negotiated by FCP such as SVBC, LLS and other.
- d. RFPs staffing is another area affected by changes such as staff reductions, high staff turnover and/or slow recruiting processes to fill empty positions. There have been also several cases of RFP staff shifted to other higher Regional positions. The common effect is a reduction in the capacity to implement cutting-edge work promoted from FCP.
- e. At the same time, national and regional networking (sometimes coupled with policy influencing work) as increased significantly, helped by the relatively high conceptual profile gained by FCP and the Forest Team in general through initiatives as FLR, Forest Governance, FLEGT and other.
- f. This overall situation is increasing the risks faced by the LLS implementation that is planned to be done by Regional Offices and local partners. The risks are not very high at the moment, but facing them successfully will require a substantive effort from the LLS Coordination Unit in terms of capacity building, supervision, field presence, etc. It is too early to assess whether or not the LLS CU budget will be enough to accommodate these demands, therefore a close monitoring of the situation is required.
- g. Another aspect to keep in mind is that the successful implementation of the LLS activities about knowledge management, networking and communications are going to increase the workload at regional and country level in the implementation sites. Therefore, it will be necessary to allow for the required budget considerations to fund these actions properly at this level. If LLS is going to prove the capacity to develop adequate field / policy links the adequate funding balance between these components (including actual field implementation) should be achieved in practice.
- h. In a way similar to the previous one, the establishment of baselines for the subsequent monitoring and evaluation of results and impacts will also require additional efforts and resources, particularly in those sites where activities are currently under implementation and the baselines were not developed by those other initiatives already active.

4.3 THE IUCN FOREST TEAM

The IUCN Forest team is a virtual team integrated by FCP, the RFPs and other experts from IUCN Commissions. It is a virtual structure because it is not included as such in the formal structures and processes in IUCN, but it is also a team because they meet more or less regularly every 18 months and keep an active traffic of emails, documents and small informal side-meetings at other events.

It is at this level that the interaction between FCP and the RFPs take place and these interactions were part of aspects reviewed during the process reported in this paper.

In overall terms, the Forest Team is the one of the oldest within the IUCN Secretariat, as it started to exist more or less at the same time of the Wetlands one in the late 18980's. Since those years the team has gone through several ups and downs but there is a good history and a good record.

A few years ago, FCP was able to provide core funds to the few RFPs operating in different Regional Offices. With the changes in the way IUCN allocated core funds a few years ago, this support was diluted and, in some cases, almost lost. This situation weakened the work of the Forest team (more details about this in Section 4.4). Moreover, the creation of new RFPs in other offices finally made almost impossible for FCP to recuperate this mechanism.

The preparation, negotiation and approval of the Strengthening Voices for Better Choices (SVBC), the first global project negotiated by FCP and given to a Regional Office (Asia) to take care of implementation strengthened the links between FCP and the RFPs in several regions. The same happened with the Poverty and Conservation project funded by IUCN AAAC Fund that linked the work of FCP with RFPs in Asia and Africa. Finally, the participatory preparation of LLS again helped to strengthen the links between the different components of the Forest Team, and it is expected that the LLS implementation will intensify this process.

Currently, and as a consequence of the activities explained before, there is a substantial level of credibility and good will towards FCP and the Forest Team in all IUCN regions. There is also a genuine level of enthusiasm about LLS and the way in which its implementation has been planned.

There are also some weak points in the internal relationships of the Forest Team. The most frequently mentioned ones are:

- The need for more physical presence of the FCP staff in some regions (particularly Latin America and Asia)
- Along the same line, the need to recuperate the regular rhythm of the Forest Team meetings. Those meetings, planned to happen every 18 months have not taken place since the last Conservation Congress in Bangkok in late 2004. The March 2007 global LLS meeting in Montreux, Switzerland, helped to fill the gap, but this was a meeting focused on a particular Project (LLS) and not in Forest Team needs. All parts recognized and accepted the time stresses created by the preparation and negotiation of the LLS proposal, but now that this situation has been satisfactorily solved, there is an expectation about having again these Forest Team meetings that everybody values considerably.

The Forest Team and the implementation of the LLS

As almost all RFPs are involved in the implementation of LLS, there are also a few challenges for the Forest Team emerging from this implementation. In the opinion of the Review Team, there are three key challenging aspects to consider.

The first challenge for the Forest Team over the next 2 years is to make additional and significant efforts to strengthen the Team at several levels. As mentioned before, LLS is an innovative initiative that is trying to take to the field a number of issues that were conceptually developed over the last few years, but whose actual implementation still needs to be tested and validated. These issues are related with the shift towards a conceptual approach that look at the links between forest biodiversity conservation and its broader context (poverty and livelihoods, governance, natural resources issues, climate change, landscape-level approach, etc.) The first obstacle in this process is the understanding of the issues, which at the moment seems uneven and incomplete across the system, including partners and other stakeholders. Therefore, an efficient system needs to be put in place to ensure not just that the issues are understood and practiced as expected but also that experiences, lessons learned, best and worst practices, etc. are captured and circulated throughout the system.

There are several ways of doing this task, and the following one is offered as a suggestion to be considered by the FCP management. It goes along a series of general steps:

1. To define and strengthen a core forest group (formal or not), bringing together the staff members from the entire Forest Team (not just FCP) who have the best understanding of the issues addressed by LLS, field experience and commitment to team work. This group should meet periodically to assess the situation and challenges of LLS, support the Coordination Unit in setting the general directions and adjustments for the entire Programme, get involved in the capacity building processes in different regions, etc.

Members of this group should be chosen, not bureaucratically appointed; in other words this should not be a representational body but a top-experts one. Because of that, the FCP senior managers have to take the leadership in this task.

2. Develop the next circle of influence by revitalizing the current Forest Team, including the core group and all other key staff and non-staff persons from both LLS and RFPs. This Team can be organized to operate by large regions (e.g. Africa, Asia & Latin America) with regular general meetings of all members. This second group, the current Forest Team, will be devoted not only to the implementation of LLS but also to the development of their own technical and managerial capacities required for the successful implementation of LLS. One of the problems mentioned when over-viewing the RFPs was the uneven skills and capacities across the Forest Team to deal with the new issues brought by LLS and FCP. Therefore, the first goal of this Team for the first couple of year is to raise knowledge and skills to the same level across the Forest team in terms of the issues addressed by LLS.
3. Develop a third circle team including partners and other stakeholders outside IUCN and the RFPs. This circle (perhaps organized by countries or sub-regions, depending on what fits best) will be mostly managed by the members of the Forest Team. Developing this third circle will provide incentives for training and learning to the Forest team members but, more important, it will bring people from organizations outside IUCN to a sphere or work and trust very close to LLS and IUCN, and it will serve as first space to be reached by the LLS efforts on both communications and knowledge management.

The second challenge, in several ways related to the previous one, is having both Knowledge Management and Communications working within and between the mentioned circles.

When working properly, the interaction between these processes is expected to render significant benefits. On one hand, KM and Communications will provide a good opportunity to strengthen those circles and to start leveling internal understanding and skills to deal with the key FCP/LLS challenges (landscape, livelihoods, governance, restoration, etc). On the other hand, the proper organization and operation of these circles will help information and experience to move efficiently within the system facilitating the gathering, organization and analysis of the information and, later, its exchange and dissemination to partners, stakeholders and other relevant parties in different regions and countries.

The third challenge is to spin-off other global, regional and country initiatives based on the concepts and practice of LLS and the Forest Team experience in general. As mentioned before, the IUCN RFPs need to be revitalized and, in many cases, to get out of spiraling-down processes. LLS provides a golden opportunity for that.

But for this opportunity to become real, it is necessary first to recognize the need and the opportunity and secondly to make it happen. This is not going to be easy in a context in which RFPs and Regional Offices are struggling to stay out of deficits and where the existence of the temptation (and institutional incentives) to use LLS resources to balance deficits cannot be denied.

In other words, a second Phase of LLS beyond 2011 is possible, and there may be reasons to remain satisfied with that target. Definitively, this approach should not be the bet for the Forest Team. The funding, staffing and exchange spaces made possible by LLS should be used to provide a strong thrust to the entire IUCN work in forests and to revitalize to new heights in scope, reach and depth the regional and global work of IUCN regarding forest conservation.

Some implications

The challenges described above are full of promises but they do not come free. There are high transactions costs associated to its implementation that the FCP and LLS management should consider. The highest opportunity cost for the next two years for the Forest Team, FCP and LLS will be the time of the so-called "core group" or first circle.

Therefore, if the ways suggested previously are going to be followed there are a few decisions that need to be made immediately:

- a. to establish the group
- b. to start having frequent meetings of the group (face-to-face and virtual)
- c. to decide about both urgent and significant priorities of the group
- d. to start immediately to work on those priorities
- e. to cut off ruthlessly every other task, at least until the end of 2008

Conclusions

- a. The Forest Team has a long and productive history and it is an enthusiastic and committed group
- b. In the last few years there has been a reduction in the physical presence of FCP staff in the regions, and a decrease in the regular meetings of the Team. The reasons given by FCP for

that situation is that FCP engagement in the regions has shifted from one of trying to serve all regions generally to other that is more (ruthlessly) prioritized from the perspective of “where we should be (Brazil, China, Indonesia, etc) and what we should be doing” (FLEG, FLR, etc). As a consequence, BRAO has benefited more from FCP presence and support as has China, Brazil and BRAC. This also means that other areas have suffered - SUR outside Brazil and ROSA (in this last case also because they did not make the RFC staff investments required). There is a clear consensus among the RFPs about the significant importance of getting back both physical presence and regular Team meetings.

- c. The LLS implementation brings new challenges to the Forest Team. The first one is about strengthening and extending the Team, the second is about using properly the Knowledge Management and Communications components of LLS to strengthen the Team (and vice versa) and the third is to fully develop the LLS potential to create a new generation of regional projects able to revitalize the RFPs.

4.4 THE FOREST TEAM EXPERIENCE AND THE IUCN DECENTRALIZATION & REGIONALIZATION PROCESS

This section is aimed to analyze how the Forest Team influences and is influenced by some general processes that shaped and still shape the entire operation of the IUCN Secretariat. Perhaps the most important of these processes is the regionalization and decentralization one, but as explained below, two other significant aspects related with this process (IUCN Intersessional Plans and the IUCN funding model) should also be included in the analysis.

While the Forest Team was established before the regionalization and decentralization process (it was not even called Forest Team at that times), IUCN has been decentralized since the early nineties, therefore the development of the Forest Team along the last decade or more is framed in the regionalization and decentralization process. This process is still evolving as demonstrated by the recent communication from the IUCN Director General about reorganizing Regional Offices over the next couple of years.

While the regionalization and decentralization process is crucial for this analysis, the role of the IUCN Intersessional Programme (IUCN IP) should not be forgotten. According to the IUCN Statutes, the IUCN Secretariat should conduce its business in terms of implementing a Programme between successive sessions of the IUCN General Assembly (hence the name Intersessional). The IUCN General assembly is now an integral part of the IUCN World Conservation Congress, organized every 4 years, therefore the IUCN IP provides priorities and guidelines for the work of the Secretariat along those 4 year periods. The IUCN shift towards a regionalized and decentralized structure also meant an increasing importance of the IUCN IP as an instrument to keep consistence and coherence across all regions and programmes.

Finally, but not less important, the evolution of the IUCN funding model over the last decade also influenced the way in which the Forest Team operates and interacts with the other components on the Union.

Based on the previous points, this Section will present first a brief analysis of the three mentioned aspects (the regionalization and decentralization process, the IUCN IP and the IUCN funding model) and then the way in which these processes interact with the Forest Team will be addressed.

The IUCN Secretariat regionalization and decentralization process

The IUCN Secretariat started with a small Secretariat centered at the IUCN HQ in Switzerland. There were no regional offices or programmes and the Secretariat basically served the IUCN Commissions and implemented small projects.

During the 1980s field operations started and grew up significantly, being for several years centrally managed from IUCN HQ, until mid 1990s. This period was characterized by a strong growing of the field operations in the different countries and regions, leading slowly to the idea that a decentralized operation would be more efficient and cost-effective.

In the mid-1990s the regionalization and decentralization was established and a new structural position emerged, the Regional Directors, reporting directly to the IUCN Director General. This regionalization process was probably carried out too far and led to a deep financial crisis at the HQ level in the late 1990's that caused the loss of many staff members at the HQ.

Starting the new century, the pendulum started to move back and a recentralization process started to take place, helped by the establishment of the core framework funds (see next heading). Today, IUCN is still in a process of recentralizing while a parallel process taking place in the Regional Offices who are going to more difficult times as explained in a previous session. The connection between these two processes is not clear and obvious and there are good arguments in both directions: in trying to link them and in keeping both as taking place independently. This review did not explore this issue in detail as it was out of its mandate.

Most recently, and probably due to this relatively weak situation in several Regional Offices, a new step in the regionalization and decentralization process was taken with the decision to merge some Regional offices looking for more efficient operations. This recent decision (2007) shows that this long process has not come to an end yet.

One of the effects of this changing process was the growing importance of the IUCN Intersessional Programme, as an instrument useful to maintain the coherence and consistence of the actions across the different components of the Secretariat in a decentralized and regionalized institutional context. This issue is briefly analyzed at the next heading.

The IUCN Intersessional Programme (IUCN IP)

While the IUCN Programme, or more recently the IUCN Intersessional Programme, exists since the establishment of the Union, for many years it was a document prepared for the IUCN General Assembly expressing the broad priorities of the Union.

Since the IUCN Congress in Amman (2000) the Intersessional Programme gained profile as the instrument to guide the entire operations in the new decentralized IUCN. Obviously the transit from a centralized organization based on Programmes operating in significant isolation from each other to a decentralized organization implementing an agreed Programme was not an easy process. In fact the process is still evolving, particularly in the identification of the key guiding principles of the Programme. From the beginning it was decided that the Programme should be structured along key results to be achieved by the Union, providing clear common points to articulate the different activities of all components; what was difficult was the identification of the right set of results.

The IP 2001-2004 was organized in 7 Key Results Areas (Ecosystem management and restoration, International agreements and policy, Conservation incentives, Equitable distribution of costs and

benefits, Biodiversity assessment, Communications and Knowledge management and Management of the Union) and 3 Strategies (Knowledge, Empowerment and Governance). In the following IP (2005-2008) the strategies became the guiding principles and were converted in Key Result Areas. Both attempts constituted a step ahead, but none were completely satisfactory. Now, for the next IP (2009-2012) IUCN is presenting a new planning structure based on five themes (Biodiversity, Climate change, Energy, Poverty and Markets) and key specific results for each theme.

It is reasonably expected that this new theme-based structure, coupled with the large-Projects, will have a high potential to create the internal incentives leading to internal joint work within and between the different geographic and thematic units.

In the specific case of FCP and the Forest Team it is evident that the new IP provides a number of different entry points to articulate the work of different projects and different components of the same projects to larger issues such as biodiversity, climate change, energy, etc. How to use these IP thematic clusters formed by the convergence of different activities from different Programmes and units around the world remains a challenge to be addressed before the next IUCN Congress in late 2008.

Despite that, definitively there is potential for the Forest team to use this IP clusters to strengthen the current joint processes among different IUCN components and to develop new ones reaching for more influence and impact.

The IUCN funding models

The regionalization and decentralization process described above was influenced by the political and funding context, starting from the long process of growing environmental awareness that went from the Stockholm Conference on Environment and Development in 1972 to the Rio Conference of 1992 and the Report of the Brundtlandt Commission that took place within this period. It is in this period that the IUCN regional work is launched and flourished in most of the developing world regions.

In the years after Rio the momentum was maintained but slowly the attention started to shift to other pressing issues as poverty and security. The Johannesburg summit in 2002 clearly showed the depth of the shift and the issues of conservation and sustainable development were clearly sent to a second row in the international agenda. Most recently, the quickly emerging climate crisis is bringing the environment to the front row again, but under a new perspective: climate change

Up to around 2000, the IUCN funding model was based on Project overheads and staff time raised from Projects. In this era of Projects (and 14-20% overheads) the Regional Programmes had the advantage of being the places where the Projects happened. Therefore, this approach favored also by most of the donors allowed for the emergence and consolidation of the IUCN work in most of the regions and countries. The same model was not so useful for the IUCN Secretariat at HQ because of their obvious difficulties to implement projects in the field and also the potential for conflicts with the Regions.

Then, and gradually, two processes took place at the same time: overheads began to be cut down and IUCN was able to negotiate framework agreements.

This double process slowly strengthens the HQ based units and started to create financial constraints to the regions, leading to the situation we have today. At this point, it is useful to highlight two things: the first is that the income from the framework agreements is allocated to both HQ and Regional programmes on the basis of a participatory process with a peer-review process. The second is that IUCN decided to restrict the negotiation of framework agreements to the HQ, therefore constraining some well-developed regions to make a transition towards this type of agreements.

While these processes were taking place within IUCN, some donors started to shift to more explicit policy related interventions, wanting coherent delivery vehicles that work across regions and also able to penetrate down to country specific circumstances. Some IUCN Global Programmes (such as Water and Wetlands and FCP) realized that the IUCN structure offered this even when needing to further strengthen coherent and integrated delivery of M&E, knowledge management, networking and communication skills.

Therefore, a relatively new situation started to emerge with the negotiation and implementation of the Water and Nature Initiative (WANI) since 2003. A HQ-based global programme was able to develop and negotiate a large programme whose central coordination was at HQ but its implementation was done by the Regional Offices. The concept was closely followed by FCP and the Forest Team that in 2005 launched the SVBC (Strengthening Voices for Better Choices Project) following a similar model, but with the difference that the overall coordination was given to a Regional Office (Asia). Under the same approach the Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy (LLS), the largest IUCN Project ever, was launched with a similar approach in 2007. Almost simultaneously, the Asia Regional Office was able to negotiate another large Project: Mangroves for the Future (MFF) also multi-country, multi-theme and involving different IUCN regional and global Programmes as well as several national organizations from the 2004 tsunami affected participating countries.

These large Projects may be signaling a new change in the IUCN funding model, with interesting implications related to the way in which the different parts of the IUCN Secretariat work (or don't work) together.

In the previous model of Projects negotiated and run by the regions or the HQ programmes there was a perennial problem of isolation between Regional and HQ Programmes. As the projects were relatively small and developed and negotiated by a particular unit able to implement it, there were little incentives for joint work and the interactions between different units were mostly limited to subcontracting services.

In the new emerging large-Projects model it is possible to see more interactions and more joint work than ever before. This is due on one hand to the complexity of the activities but also to the vision of the Programme managers who made a clear choice of looking for participatory and inclusive design and implementation of these initiatives. This process, still emerging and evolving with each new experience, is slowly leading towards achieving an IUCN long-cherished dream: joint and coordinated work among its different global, regional and national components along different complexity levels (country / region / global).

One interesting aspect emerging from the review is the existence of difference styles (or models) to operate the Global / Regional joint efforts. This aspect is briefly analyzed in the following section.

Styles of running joint global / regional activities

Currently the large Projects and initiatives operated from HQ run in two models:

- a) Those that can be named as the cooperative ones (as WANI and LLS) in which the Projects are planned and implemented jointly between the regions and HQ. The staff working in the regions for these projects belong and report to the region (with additional reporting lines to HQ). Finally, but not less important, the received funding is distributed among the participants units according to the tasks and the overheads are shared.
- b) Those that can be named as the centralized ones (as Marine and Species) in which the projects are planned and implemented from HQ, the staff working in the field is managed as outposted from HQ and reports to HQ. There is little or no budget allocated to the regional offices and the main economic benefit for them is the possibility to use part of the time of the outposted staff for regional purposes.

The information collected from interviews show a clear and unanimous regional preference for the cooperative model that is perceived as more inclusive, more fair and bringing more benefits (particularly financial) to the Regional Offices

In this emerging field for IUCN of large cooperative Projects there is an aspect that should not be lost to the senior management. This aspect is that the cooperative model works very well in the absence of internal problems. But to expect a large project implemented in a decentralized way by different and parallel units based on internal agreements to run without problems is unrealistic. In fact, there are enough reasons at the moment to think that these Projects are going to face several problems linked to issues as inadequate staffing, poor delivery, low quality, badly chosen partners, etc.

In this area of solving internal problems there is some additional work to be done by IUCN, particularly at the senior management level.

In a way this is a new arena for IUCN as in the past the limited interaction between Regions and Global Programmes did not create too many problems as each part had their own money and responsibilities. Despite that, the limited existing experience shows that the HQ Programmes tend to leave these problems to be solved by the Regions, the Regions tend to explain the problems in terms of insufficient support, and similar reasons, or, in the worst situation, both parties engage in mutual blaming. In most of the cases, there are no clear cut, explicit solutions to the problems, and then, there is a trend towards having these problems become endemic and plaguing the entire operations.

Now, the increasing implementation of joint activities between Global programmes and regions on common projects for which the Global Programme takes responsibility in relation to the donor, but the actual actions are implemented in the field by regional offices and country teams is creating a situation where problems may become common. Therefore, it is necessary to create a formal mechanism to deal and to solve these problems in a participatory and efficient way.

There are different ways to establish this mechanism and the Review Team think that the choice is a management task. What can be recommended is to locate it at a high level within the Secretariat (maybe Global Programme level is an option) and it probably will require the involvement of M&E work to get the facts to support decision making. Both, the participation of Senior Managers in the process and a fact-based decision making process to solve conflicts are needed to establish the strong third party needed to break down the inertia and lead to effective conflict solutions.

Conclusions

The analysis of the Forest Team in the context of other IUCN larger scale processes shows that FCP and the Forest Team are in an excellent situation to shape and strengthen a new model of operation for the IUCN Secretariat due to its history, the participatory and inclusive approach in place and the way in which the recent medium (SVBC) and large (LLS) projects are being handled. There is considerable expectations and good will across the entire IUCN Secretariat regarding the recently started LLS process.

Looking at other related issues, it can be concluded that:

- The FCP and Forest Team Programmes and Projects contents are well aligned with the new IP model. That will facilitate the transition from the previous one and provide a good starting point for the new period.
- The new Projects were planned and are implemented in a fully cooperative and participatory way
- The Forest Team (despite mentioned weaknesses) provides a good base for the successful interaction between IUCN components and with external stakeholders

As already mentioned for the individual components (FCP and RFPs) the implementation of LLS is a new and significant challenge, not only for the directly involved parts (FCP and RFPs) but also for the higher management level (Regional Offices and IUCN Directors).

This challenge requires paying attention to the issues already mentioned when analyzing FCP and the RFPs. It also requires attention and follow-up from higher levels as the Global Programme Director and even the Director General. Among other things, this attention means allocating time for visits, follow-up meetings, regular exchanges of experiences with other similar large Projects (e.g. WANI, MFF) and the dissemination of the lessons throughout the IUCN system among others.

Addressing these challenges is far from impossible but requires obvious and explicit commitments. The potential rewards for the successful implementation of LLS are very significant. It may mean the consolidations of IUCN as one of the few world organizations able to implement and deliver on large-scale projects, with the unique characteristic and potential advantage of being an international member-based organization. This consolidation may well imply the beginning of a new era for the entire Union.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of the Review Team are organized in 6 areas, and they are specifically addressed to the pertinent units

1. To IUCN and FCP Senior Management: Maintain the leadership in forest issues
 - 1.1. To maintain and enhance the leading role of FCP globally in supporting conservation of biodiversity outside Protected Areas while emphasizing their economic, social, cultural and ecological values, especially for the poor, through appropriate management
 - 1.2. Simultaneously, while being supportive to conservation of biodiversity and landscape restoration in forests outside Protected Areas, FCP management should be sensitive to new potential global paradigm shifts in this very dynamic sector, as maintaining a stable and cohesive FCP is essential for its success and the conservation of its leadership in the forest sector.
 - 1.3. To emphasize outcome-oriented activities and improve timely knowledge sharing and information exchange.
 - 1.4. To enhance collaboration with other IGO's and NGO's especially with the CPF.
2. To FCP and the Forest Team: Keep doing the good work
 - 2.1. To preserve the good perception that FCP has within and outside IUCN
 - 2.2. To preserve and enhance the leading role played in terms of the work relationships between a Global Programme and the Regional ones. Issues as strong participation, decentralized implementation, fair sharing of budgets and overheads and others are highly appreciated and are setting benchmarks in this area
 - 2.3. To maintain the priority setting processes and the consistent decisions with those priorities. Within available resources, it is hard to find significant areas for FCP to improve. Obviously there are other persons, programs and projects within IUCN that have priorities different than the FCP ones, but there is no way to ascertain that those priorities are better than the FCP ones. The good thing about FCP is that they have set priorities and they are acting accordingly; the fact that some of these priorities can be disputed is of secondary importance.
3. To FCP, LLS Coordination Unit and Regional Offices Directors: To manage adequately the risks brought by LLS to FCP and the Regional Forest Programmes
 - 3.1. The LLS Coordinator should allocate to LLS the entire time foreseen for the Project (90% of its time while keeping 10% as FCP Deputy Head) immediately. At the moment of the Review much more than 10% was allocated to FCP activities not directly related to LLS.
 - 3.2. A new person needs to be integrated into FCP to fill the gap left by the LLS Coordinator. The best alternative is to appoint a senior staff level person.
 - 3.3. LLS in Asia requires urgently a capable person dedicated to the LLS Project. Four of the eleven LLS sites are in Asia. There is neither a Coordinator of RFP in Asia nor a dedicated person to coordinate LLS. The best option is to urgently negotiate with the region to have the ELG1 Coordinator moved to (not additionally given) the LLS supervision position (see Annex 11)
 - 3.4. LLS in Africa seems to be managed well by the combination of efforts between EARO and LLS Coordination Unit, even when a clear recognition and support to the overall regional role played by the current EARO RFP Head is needed. This situation should be preserved.

- 3.5. LLS in South America needs support from LLS Coordination Unit and FCP. There are less serious risks there given the fact that only one LLS site is there, but desirable scaling-out and scaling-up effects can be lost due to lack of experience, contacts, etc.
 - 3.6. Additional negotiations are needed to clarify expectations from both FCP and ORMA regarding LLS scope, reach and themes. The LLS process seems not to be enough well defined yet there.
 - 3.7. There is a need for a focal, dedicated and capable person from the LLS Coordination Unit / FCP assigned to assist the Latin America (both SUR and ORMA). This assistance is available to Africa and Asia sites. This is badly needed and it does not require a full-time position.
4. To FCP and LLS Coordination Unit: To manage adequately the opportunities brought by LLS to FCP and the Forest Team
 - 4.1. To use the opportunity that LLS is bringing to establish and operate a good M&E system. This has not been achieved in IUCN yet for a large Project more details in Annex 10)
 - 4.2. To use the opportunity that LLS is also bringing to establish a reasonably operating KM / Communications system (with emphasis in KM rather than Communications or IT), linking different types of stakeholders across geographical areas and between different levels (from local to global). If this is achieved, IUCN and FCP will benefit significantly(more details in Annex 10)
 - 4.3. To benefit from the opportunities that LLS is also bringing to develop capacities within IUCN regions by making use of its experts. There is a strong need to develop these capacities, particularly in those new areas addressed by LLS as the landscapes approaches, livelihoods, etc.
 - 4.4. To reinforce and revitalize the joint work of the Forest Team by having a more frequent physical presence of FCP staff in the RFPs and by revitalizing the Forest Team meetings
 5. To Global Programme Director and FCP. To use, and benefit from, LLS to strengthen the IUCN regionalization and decentralization process
 - 5.1. To set an internal and formal conflict resolution process. The decentralized implementation of LLS is expected to create internal conflicts. An explicit and agreed process to deal with internal conflicts and problems and to solve them should be formally established, allowing for any part to turn to it when necessary. At the moment such a process does not exist.
 - 5.2. To make all needed efforts to fight the temptation to use LLS resources in the regions to address budget deficit issues. That requires frequent and effective presence in the regions and continuous and effective supervision and joint work by the LLS Coordination Unit and other higher levels.
 - 5.3. To extend M&E and lessons learned activities to include aspects of decentralization, regionalization, conflict resolution between FCP and the regions, capacity building progress, and other issues related not just to LLS/FCP but also relevant to broader aspects of the Center/ Regions relationships.

6. To Global Programme Director and FCP. To find solutions for the Climate Change management demands on FCP
 - 6.1. To make the necessary decisions to deal with the increasing senior management time demands posed by the Climate Change unit. There are different management solutions to the problem (shifting Climate Change out of FCP, hiring new senior staff for FCP or other), and the Review Team does not think that its recommendations should be at this level. But the point is that FCP management (in all its aspects) is being affected and the situation needs to be addressed