

Review of the Implementation of the Red List Programme Agreement

Charles Lusthaus, Review Leader

January 2005



Executive Summary

Introduction

Through its Species Survival Commission (SSC), IUCN has been assessing the conservation status of species, subspecies, varieties and subpopulations on a global scale for four decades in order to identify taxa threatened by extinction and to promote their conservation. The *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* provides taxonomic, conservation status and distribution information on taxa evaluated using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria. It is widely recognized as the world's most objective and authoritative assessment of species at risk of extinction. Last published in 2000 and updated in 2002 and 2003, the analysis included assessments of more than 18,000 species and showed that one in every four known mammal species and one in every eight known bird species are threatened. While the findings in 2000 were dire, the new update of the Red List, including over 38,000 species, will indicate that the state of many threatened species continues to deteriorate.

Recognizing the limitations of IUCN's financial, technical and scientific resources, four conservation organizations—BirdLife International, Conservation International (CI), NatureServe and the Ocean Conservancy¹—signed an agreement with IUCN to support the Red List Programme (RLP) in 2002.

Organizational changes, the upcoming World Conservation Congress in Bangkok, the perceived need of partners to clarify the Agreement and the signatories' expectations to improve its institutional, governance and managerial clauses all contributed to the timeliness of and support for the Review of the Red List Programme Agreement and Consortium.

This review, commissioned by the Director of the IUCN Global Programme, will provide Consortium stakeholders with an analysis of the Agreement and its functioning along with a set of recommendations to guide the Agreement's development and implementation in the future.

Methodology

Accordingly, this review is an assessment of the rationale, purpose, arrangements and operations of the Red List Agreement as implemented through the Consortium. Guided by an agreed Terms of Reference, Universalialia Management Group of Montreal, Canada was chosen to conduct the Review. An evaluation matrix (see Appendix V) and work plan was developed along with a set of concepts deemed useful in helping to assess the functioning of the Consortium. In general, the sources of data were limited with most information obtained through face-to-face and telephone interviews. These were supplemented by documents and site visits.

Specifically, Universalialia collected data from key informants at IUCN, Conservation International, NatureServe and BirdLife International, as well as with other stakeholders suggested by interview subjects at the partner organizations.

We visited the NatureServe and Conservation International offices in Washington, D.C., as well as IUCN's offices in Gland, Switzerland. In addition we met in London with a representative from the Cambridge based Red List Programme Secretariat.

The data collection was complemented by a review of documents from a range of sources, as well as literature on partnership evaluation from both the academic and practitioner fields. Literature on other partnership evaluations and effective organizational arrangements for partnerships are found in the bibliography in Appendix III.

¹ The Ocean Conservancy dropped out as a partner shortly after 9-11. In an interview with the Executive Director, it was made clear that their departure from the Consortium was due to their own internal issues; not those of the Consortium. Nevertheless, their departure left a significant gap in developing a more complete Red List.

Universalia developed interview protocols based on the evaluation matrix to guide the work. The interview protocols are linked to the original work plan questions developed in the review matrix.

Universalia employed content analysis techniques to review the various documents (minutes, interview notes, web documents, etc.), using the areas from the review matrix as broad themes.

Key Findings

This review has made a number of findings. Among them are:

- 1) The Red List Programme continues to need financial and technical support to meet the implementation schedule set down in its 2000 strategic plan and updated in 2004. Thus the rationale for the Agreement continues to be relevant.
- 2) The common principles, which underline the Red List Agreement, remain relevant today.
- 3) Consortium membership continues to meet the strategic interests of each of the four organizations.
- 4) While all partners agree to the Red List Programme vision, goal and objectives, some have diverging expectations with regards to the use of the Red List.
- 5) While the roles and responsibilities of the Red List Programme Committee are reasonably clear, this is not the case for the Consortium Members. It is unclear who is responsible for providing Consortium leadership and for developing a consortium model that works.
- 6) The Governance system has been able to balance the existing asymmetrical relationships within the Consortium. However, this is and will continue to be a source of concern.
- 7) There are no stated procedures for changing the Consortium Membership or for resolving Consortium disputes.
- 8) Strategic leadership is not apparent in the Consortium's work. There is no strategy or business plan to guide its work.
- 9) There is an overlap of activities between the Consortium and the Red List Programme Committee.
- 10) Consortium processes like problem solving, decision-making, risk management, conflict resolution and communication are at very early stages of evolution.
- 11) The credibility and the authority given to the IUCN Red List and its brand is a critical asset that requires protection.
- 12) The Consortium Agreement section on branding along with the draft branding policy might compromise the credibility of the IUCN Red List.
- 13) There is ambiguity among partners with regards to the recognition of contribution as well as ownership of the Red List products.
- 14) Joint financing campaigns and approaches in support of the Red List Programme have not been operationalized.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this review was to assess the performance of the partnership. Specifically, this study explored three aspects of the Consortium:

- The extent to which the rationale for the Consortium is still valid.
- The benefits of the Consortium to the four Red List partners.
- The extent to which the organizational arrangements, management and governance of the Consortium are effective and still appropriate.

In general, most of our informants had a positive estimation of the Consortium. In particular, they indicated that, compared to previous experiences in the Biodiversity Conservation Information System and World Conservation Monitoring Centre, the Red List Consortium seemed to be working. However, we found that despite this generally positive opinion, significant issues exist with respect to the institutional arrangements that threaten the sustainability of the Consortium and even the Red List itself.

Our findings suggest that the rationale for the Consortium is still valid, for both the Consortium itself and the member institutions. On a less positive note, the Consortium's original purpose was to "enhance the implementation of the Red List Programme" and to create synergy between the four signatories to generate additional resources. This, in most of our informants' eyes, has been a disappointment.

Our informants' general satisfaction with the Consortium masks some difficulties with the institutional arrangements. We found that the Agreement needs clarification in some areas and, in other areas, new sections should be written. While there are clear individual accountabilities to member organizations, there is not a clear institutional accountability.

The Consortium has taken an *ad hoc* approach to strategy, management and operations. Few resources have been put into its management. There has been little strategic leadership. IUCN was expected to do more in this regard. Moreover, our data suggests that there has been confusion with regard to the meetings of the Consortium and those of the Red List Programme Committee. This confusion is carried over into the identity and branding of the Consortium products. To conclude, while it makes sense to continue the Consortium, important adjustments need to be made to improve its governance, management and long-term sustainability.

Recommendations

1. The Consortium should continue, but it needs modification:

In general, our informants support the continuation of the Consortium, as do we. There is no doubt that the Red List Programme needs to obtain a significant amount of funding in order to meet its ambitious programme. Since Consortium Members are strong supporters of the Red List Programme, it makes sense that they would help in creating resources to enhance the Consortium. However, a foundational principle of the Consortium is that IUCN is the custodian of the Red List brand and that the Red List Programme Committee is the operational group that oversees the Red List's integrity, credibility and authority. Our concern is that, because of the creeping overlap between the RLP Committee and the Consortium, as illustrated by the process used to brand the Global Species Assessment (GSA), the role of the former as protector of the Red List is being eroded. In addition, the Consortium needs modification with respect to the institutional arrangements indicated below.

2. The purpose and function of the Consortium and the distinction between the Consortium and the Red List Programme Committee should be more clearly articulated:

The RLP Committee is a technical and scientific committee dedicated to improving the quantity and quality of the Red List. It is the key instrument to ensure that IUCN remains the protector of the Red List's integrity. Thus, the Committee participants should act as individuals who have the scientific and technical expertise to carry out this function, and not as institutional representatives.

On the other hand, the Red List Consortium is made up of institutional representatives, dedicated to "establish a formal basis for cooperation to enhance the implementation of the Red List Programme." This is defined in Section 11 of the Agreement, and the Annexes contain examples of what a "formal basis for cooperation and enhancement" means. It identifies human and financial resources dedicated to support the Red List Programme. While we felt that this distinction is clear in theory, it appears that it is not in practice. Thus we recommend that the role and function of the Consortium Committee be clarified and approved by its Members.

3. The Consortium Agreement needs to be clarified and updated:

The Red List Programme Agreement needs to be updated. While not all of these items need to be in the Agreement, it is important to clarify their meaning and include them as part of the framework by which the Consortium is governed.

Typical characteristics of a partnership agreement	Changes recommended
Clear vision and or goals of the agreement	No changes recommended
Clear statement of objectives and outcomes	We recommend that the Consortium should support the enhancement of the resources available to the Red List Programme to implement its objectives.
Clear expectations (roles and responsibilities) of the parties	We recommend that the Consortium clarify its expectations with respect to the provision of resources, fundraising and other activities. Once agreed to, there should be a review and reporting process.
The scope and identity of the partnership	We recommend that the Consortium clarify the scope of its activities. This should take the form of a specific TOR, which outlines the scope of work expected of the Consortium. It should answer the following questions: What is the function of the Consortium? How will it do work? What tasks is it allowed to engage in? For example, should it engage in fundraising? Should it undertake projects? Should it judge editorial content? How should it coordinate work with the RLP Committee?
Clear approach and process of implementing oversight	We recommend that the Consortium identify its accountability chain and the process it would use for oversight. For example, should there be a governing group and a management (operational) group (each having their own TORs)?
Clear model for a secretariat and engaging in work	We recommend that the Agreement clarify how work should get done. Does it support a secretariat? Will there be a rotating Chair? Is it an ad hoc group?
Capacities and funding arrangements	We recommend that there be some indication of the resources that ought to be made available to govern and manage the Consortium.
Clear process for dispute settlements and amending procedures	We recommend that there be an process for adjudicating disagreements between Consortium members.
Clear procedures for monitoring and evaluation	We recommend that the Consortium explicitly state the approach it wants to take for monitoring, reporting and evaluation.
Rules for leaving and expanding the group	Finally, we recommend that the Agreement include a process for both expanding and contracting the Consortium. Clearly, this would provide a way to enforce the commitments made by the institutions.

4. Senior institutional officials should be responsible for the governance of the Consortium. This should be separate from the more managerial and operational body, which has guided the Consortium in the past:

The Consortium has evolved over the last few years, but it needs to evolve further. There needs to be a body and/or a distinct process that oversees the Agreement and the governance system, and a body responsible for the management and operations of the work of the Consortium. This does not have to be a heavy structure.

5. Institutional members need to be more explicit about the management model most appropriate for managing the Consortium:

The institutional members will need to determine the type of management model that is most appropriate for Consortium. We recommend either developing a secretariat model with paid staff engaging in the work of the Committee or a rotating secretariat model in which members agree to rotate the secretariat function between the institutions or a combination of the two. There are positive and negative features to each model.

The recommended models require an understanding of both the technical as well as the managerial and operational requirements of the Consortium and the Red List Programme. Our review suggests that the managerial and operational aspects of the RL and the Consortium have not been adequately analyzed and articulated.

6. IUCN should clarify the relationship between the SIS and the Consortium:

SIS is a substantial project that has been in various stages of evolution in IUCN for the past decade. The Agreement implies that the Red List Programme Committee is responsible for overseeing the SIS's development, and thus in the context of the Agreement it is the Consortium that is responsible for fundraising for the SIS. This adds a level of complexity to both the Red List Programme and the Consortium that has not been adequately considered. We recommend that IUCN clarify the role of the SIS in relation to both the Red List Programme and the Consortium.

7. The branding policy of Consortium products along with the overall communication strategy needs to be developed in light of the role and function of the Consortium:

The Agreement states that all Red List products will be recognized “as in the form of an agreed acknowledgement listing of all parties.” What does this mean? The branding policy is in draft stage and is just coming to grips with some exceedingly touchy institutional issues. Yet we are unsure whether IUCN has fully reviewed the implications of the policy and its operation. If the function of the Consortium is to raise resources especially through fundraising, then it might be acknowledged in a less conspicuous place in publications—like on the inside cover with an acknowledgement of its resources.

The GSA exemplified our concern with the branding issue. This is a flagship Red List Product, but the new GSA will bear the new Consortium logo on its front cover, indicating that it is a joint publication. Is it? Does this type of branding protect the credibility of the IUCN Red List brand? We are not sure nor have we gotten the assurance that a comprehensive consultative review was done with the Consortium, the Red List Programme Committee (as required by the Agreement) and institutional signatories.

Our recommendation is that the product branding issue receives high-level consultation and deliberation. Furthermore, we recommend that the Consortium's branding policy be linked to an equally important communication strategy. Communication strategies typically outline the ways that communications will be used to transmit key messages to stakeholders.

Acronyms

CABS	Centre for Applied Biodiversity Science
CI	Conservation International
GAA	Global Amphibian Assessment
GSA	Global Species Assessment
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
RLA	Red List Authorities
RLP	Red List Programme
SIS	Species Information Service
SSC	Species Survival Commission
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
ToRs	Terms of Reference

Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 The IUCN Red List Context	1
1.2 Background to the Review	2
1.3 Objectives of the Review	2
2. Methodology	3
2.1 Approach to the Review	3
2.2 Sources of Data	4
2.3 Data Collection Tools, Instruments and Analysis	5
2.4 Schedule for the Review	5
3. Rationale of the Consortium	5
3.1 Introduction	5
4. Contributions and Benefits to the Red List Programme	8
4.1 Introduction	8
5. Institutional Arrangements of the Consortium	11
5.1 Introduction	11
5.2 Governance	12
5.3 Institutional Management	19
5.4 Other Institutional Issues	22
5.4.1 Transparency and Trust	22
5.4.2 Identity and Branding	23
5.4.3 Sustainability of the Consortium	25
6. Conclusions and Recommendations	26

Exhibits

Exhibit 1.1 Key Milestones of the Red List Consortium	1
Exhibit 3.1 Target for Selected Taxa Groups	6
Exhibit 5.1 Assessment of the Red List Programme Agreement	12
Exhibit 5.2 Roles and Responsibilities	14

Appendices

Appendix I Terms of Reference	30
Appendix II Stakeholders Consulted	33
Appendix III Selected Documents Reviewed	34
Appendix IV Interview Protocols	35
Appendix V Evaluation Matrix	37
Appendix VI List of Findings	39
Appendix VII Key Programmes of Partner Organizations	41
Appendix VIII The Red List Programme Agreement	44

1. Introduction

1.1 The IUCN Red List Context

Through its Species Survival Commission (SSC), IUCN has been assessing the conservation status of species, subspecies, varieties and subpopulations on a global scale for four decades in order to identify taxa threatened by extinction and to promote their conservation. The *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* provides taxonomic, conservation status and distribution information on taxa evaluated using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria. This system is designed to determine the relative risk of extinction, but the Red List also includes information on other taxa, including species that are already extinct in the wild. The Red List is available in a searchable database maintained by the IUCN on its Web Site.

The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species is widely recognized as the world's most objective and authoritative assessment of species at risk of extinction. Last published in 2000, the analysis included assessments of more than 18,000 species, 11,000 of which are threatened with extinction.² It showed that one in every four known mammal species and one in every eight known bird species are threatened. While the findings in 2000 were dire, the new update of the Red List, including over 38,000 species, will indicate that the state of many threatened species continues to deteriorate.

First conceived in 1963, the IUCN Red List System has set a standard for species listing and conservation efforts. Until the mid-1990s, the compilation of the Red List was essentially an ad hoc process, with publications appearing as the end point rather than as part of an ongoing trend analysis. In the mid 1990s, IUCN established the Red List Programme (RLP) Committee to support the development of the Red List. The RLP Committee is a subcommittee of IUCN's Species Survival Commission. It is responsible for implementing the Red List Programme and for producing a number of products including annual updates to the *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*TM, maintaining the Red List website, creating standards and guidelines, criteria, for review process and organizing workshops. The Chair of the RLP Committee is appointed by the Chair of the SSC, and reports the Executive Committee of the SSC.

The Red List has undergone a number of changes over the last decade that are germane to this review, including:

Exhibit 1.1 Key Milestones of the Red List Consortium

Date	Key Milestones
1994	Adoption of Red List Categories – revised several time over the last 5 years
1996	Mammals and Birds assessed against Red List Criteria
1997	Assessment of 10,000 Tree species using criteria
1998	First meeting of the Red List Programme Committee
1999	Appointment of 1 st Red List Officer to support the SSC Red List Programme Committee
2000	First global Red List analysis published as a loose leaf document with animal and plant assessments in a single electronically searchable list
2000	Red List Programme Agreement developed to support Red List Programme Committee
2001	Establishment of CI/IUCN Biodiversity Assessment Unit
2002	Red List Programme Agreement signed formed to support Red List Programme Committee
2002	First Global Amphibian Assessment completed
2004	Four organizations call themselves a Consortium and proceed to brand Consortium products
2004	Global Species Assessment completed

² The new analysis is slated to come out in October 2004.

Date	Key Milestones
2004	Global Amphibian Assessment completed
2004	Red List Indicators developed and published

The expansion of the taxonomic documentation was a major objective of the Red List Programme over the past Intersessional Programme period (2000-2004) and will be again in the next Intersessional period (2005-2008). Indeed, the Programme made major gains in the 1996 and 2000 Red Lists, when mammals and birds were employed as indicators to arrive at conclusions on the degeneration of global biodiversity. While this was an important step, the Red List Programme recognized that there remain significant gaps in the data, especially with regards to amphibians, plants, freshwater and marine species.

1.2 Background to the Review

In the face of this challenge, and recognizing the limitations of IUCN's financial, technical and scientific resources, four conservation organizations—BirdLife International, Conservation International (CI), NatureServe, and the Ocean Conservancy—entered into an agreement with IUCN “to enhance the implementation of the Red List Programme.”³ The Consortium Members agreed to pursue two major goals under the Agreement:

- To identify and document those species most in need of conservation attention if the global extinction rates are to be reduced.
- To provide a global index of the state of degeneration of biodiversity.

Red List products and services have been widely acclaimed and the demand for them has grown substantially, thus placing even more pressure on the partners for programme support. The end of 2004 will release two major products—the Global Amphibian Assessment (GAA) and the Global Species Assessment (GSA).

There has not been a review of either the Red List Programme Agreement nor of the Consortium that it created. However, a number of factors now make such a review timely. These include the arrival of a new Chair of the Species Survival Commission, the appointment of the Chair of the Red List Programme Committee by the new Chair of the SSC, as well as the need to report on the performance of the Agreement to the Bangkok World Conservation Congress in November 2004.

As the leadership of the SSC and the Red List Committee change, an external review will provide these groups with an analysis of the Agreement and its functioning along with a proposed set of recommendations to stimulate and guide discussion on the further development and implementation of the Agreement.

1.3 Objectives of the Review

Commissioned by the IUCN Director Global Programme as part of the cycle of IUCN Strategic Reviews, the purpose of the review is to assess the performance of the partnership since its inception.

The specific objectives set down in the Terms of Reference of the study⁴ are:

- 1) To assess the extent to which the rationale for the Consortium is still valid.
- 2) To assess the extent to which the organizational arrangements, management and governance of the Consortium are effective and still appropriate.

³ The Ocean Conservancy dropped out as a partner in 2001. In an interview with the Executive Director, it was made clear that their departure from the Consortium was due to their own internal issues; not those of the Consortium. Nevertheless, their departure left a significant gap in developing a more complete Red List.

⁴ As part of this study we will document the lessons learned and as well suggest an approach to partnership assessments.

- 3) To assess the benefits of the Consortium to the four Red List partners.
- 4) To document the lessons from the first years of experience with the Consortium.
- 5) To make recommendations related to the above issues for the future development, management and governance of the Red List Consortium.
- 6) To develop and test an approach and methodology for the review of partnerships that can be used in future IUCN reviews of other partnership arrangements

2. Methodology

2.1 Approach to the Review

There is growing enthusiasm in the public, private and non-profit sectors for a variety of novel inter-organizational relations, including partnerships, consortia, alliances, networks, and joint ventures. In particular, partnerships and consortia are promoted as the answer to many global challenges. However, it remains unclear whether or not these relationships actually enhance performance, and if so, how?

The assumption is that these new organizational relations will enhance results both quantitatively and qualitatively, and also result in synergistic rewards, where the outputs and outcomes of the partnership are greater than the sum of the individual partners' contributions. While a handful of studies have been done to test this assumption (cf Ellinger et al 2000, Shah and Singh 2001), most of the work in this area remains anecdotal. In short, synergistic rewards are sought, but they are rarely articulated and measured.

Reviews carried out on inter-organizational arrangements typically concentrate on results, but real change can only be promoted through a better understanding of how to improve the relevance and efficiency of the delivery of goods and services. Recent reviews in the private sector (Kaplan and Norton 2001) highlight the danger of over-emphasizing short-term benefits and ignoring important process dimensions. Outputs and outcomes are clearly important, but an awareness of the institutional arrangements, which support the development of results, is critical in making better strategic and managerial decisions.

While we understand the need to better analyze institutional arrangements that either support or detract from consortium results, there has been relatively little work done in this area. Good practice suggests that we identify and analyze the key factors that may influence the results of the partnerships. This would encompass the institutions and incentives governing the implementation of the policies and programs, including the agreement, leadership, governance, policies, formal and informal rules, resources, its operational model and programming approach.

In addition to institutional factors, personal relationships, the history, context, organizational stage of development and cultural compatibility affect the degree to which intended results are achieved. Consortia and partnerships are dynamic systems, constructed to solve significant problems that are elusive to single organizations. The programmatic and change logic inherent in these arrangements are often implicit, and the general assumptions and hypotheses that underlie these arrangements are not well known or clearly understood. They can be difficult to understand because, while a great deal of effort has gone into understanding the institutional workings of partnerships, there has been relatively little documentation of this human dimension. Consequently, it can be equally difficult to obtain reliable data on both the process and the results.

For all of their complexity, consortia, networks and partnerships have become much more important as NGOs have realized both their own limitations and those of national and international bodies. Many of the new institutional arrangements between and among organizations that have emerged are now expected to address global conservation challenges. The Red List Consortium is such an example.

Accordingly, this review is an assessment of the rationale, purpose, arrangements and operations of the Red List Agreement as implemented through the Consortium. Terms of Reference guided the assessment. A work plan was developed and identified a set of concepts deemed useful in helping to assess the functioning of the Consortium.

The key concepts and their definition as used in this review are;

- **Sharing common principles:** The Members of the Consortium share the same vision, values and modes of operating.
- **Clarity of structural arrangements:** Each organization understands and adequately implements its role and responsibilities as governor and operator. There is authority built into roles and relationships so that direction can be given and conflicts resolved.
- **Collaborative work processing:** Operational work planning, monitoring and reporting support the work of the Consortium and are negotiated in an open framework.
- **Oversight:** The Consortium has an appropriate oversight system for individual organizations, as well as itself.
- **Connectedness:** The Consortium has established adequate informal and formal communication networks at all levels to ensure it is appropriately linked to the individual member organizations.
- **Benefits:** The objectives of the Consortium are being achieved, and in the process the individual member organizations benefit from the opportunities created by the different organizations sharing and working together for a common cause.
- **Synergy:** The Consortium Members understand and contribute to the value-added premise of the Consortium. They recognize and act upon the potential that is created by organizations collaborating for a specific purpose.
- **Identity:** The Consortium has developed a positive identity distinct from the partners. The partners' identity is likewise distinct from the Consortium and they are committed to respect each other's independence.
- **Transparency:** The Consortium makes adequate information available to the partner organizations. Governors have adequate information for their decision-making roles and each partner's interests, as related to the mission of the Consortium, are clearly defined and communicated to others.
- **Trust:** The level of trust among the partners has increased over the life of the Consortium. There are opportunities and processes, which enable partners to build trust.
- **Institutional leadership:** The Consortium creates structures and processes that allow it to influence its members, and in turn be influenced in support of its goals.
- **Alignment:** The Consortium's work is complementary to and does not duplicate or compete with the work being performed by its members.
- **Management model:** The Consortium has a plan or management model for getting work done.

This is a review of the benefits and outputs of the Red List Consortium, and not of the quality or quantity of Red List Programme products. The main focus of the review is on how the Consortium supports the Programme.

2.2 Sources of Data

In general, the sources of data were limited in this review. Most information was obtained through face-to-face and telephone interviews. These were supplemented by documents and site visits.

Specifically, Universalia collected data from key informants at IUCN, CI, NatureServe and BirdLife International, as well as with other stakeholders suggested by interview subjects at the partner organizations. Appendix I contains the list of interviewees.

We visited the offices of NatureServe and Conservation International in Washington, D.C., IUCN's offices in Gland, Switzerland and met with the Cambridge based Red List Programme Secretariat staff in London.

The data collection was complemented by a document review. We sought documents from a range of sources, as well as literature on partnership evaluation from both the academic and practitioner field. These are listed in Appendix II.

2.3 Data Collection Tools, Instruments and Analysis

Universalialia developed interview protocols based on the evaluation matrix to guide the work. The interview protocols are based on the questions in the review matrix.

We employed content analysis techniques to review the various documents (minutes, interview notes, web documents, etc.), using the areas from the review matrix as broad themes.

2.4 Schedule for the Review

The sequence of activities for the review was organised as follows:

- Review matrix and work plan submitted by September 3rd
- Data collection throughout the month of September and October
- Draft report submitted on Monday October 18th⁵
- Feedback from IUCN on Draft report scheduled for October 25th
- Final report to be submitted Monday November 1st

3. Rationale of the Consortium

3.1 Introduction

The issues facing the review with respect to the rationale of the Consortium included whether the Agreement and the Consortium are as relevant today as it was when it began 4 years ago; whether the reasons for the four organizations forming a Consortium are still valid, and whether the Consortium continues to support the work of each partner.

Common Principles underlying the Red List Agreement⁶

The Red List should be available to all potential users on the Web and updated annually. It should be interactive.

The Red List should be expanded according to the Red List Programme strategy of 2000.

The process of undertaking status assessments should be clear and transparent.

The listing of species should be based on correct use of categories and best scientific information. The criteria should be open to challenge and correction.

The analysis of the Red List should be published at least every 5 years.

All parties should respect the intellectual property and other rights of data owners and suppliers.

The credibility and authority of the Red List data should be safeguarded. IUCN has the primary responsibility for this.

⁵ Please note that the report submitted on October 18th comprises only the core review of the Red List Consortium. The Lessons Learned from the review, as requested in the TORs, will be developed in a separate document, submitted in late November. This distinct report, 5-7 pages long, will present a set of concepts and approaches that will be developed into a discussion paper on how to evaluate Consortia, Partnerships and Networks.

⁶ These principles are inferred from the interviews conducted.

The principle purpose of the Red List Agreement was to support the implementation of the Red List Programme. In this context, one of the reasons to continue the Agreement is that the continuing need to raise resources to support the Red List Programme. We asked our interviewees if such a need remains.

In general, the rationale for the establishment of the Consortium was predicated on a set of common ideas. To review the rationale we analyzed documents and interviewed the parties on a wide range of issues related to their involvement in the Consortium.

Accordingly, the Red List Consortium would be relevant today if these ideas and principles continue to be true. At issue then is whether the circumstances that led to the creation of the Consortium in 2002 continue to exist today.

Finally, the rationale for continuing the Consortium should be based on the alignment of Consortium objectives with those of its member organizations.

Finding 1: The Red List Programme Committee continues to need financial and technical support to meet the implementation schedule set down in its 2000 strategic plan and updated in 2004. The rationale remains relevant.

The partners agreed to meet specific targets with regard to expanding the taxonomic coverage of the Red List. These targets were specifically detailed in the 'IUCN/SSC Red List Programme, A strategy for its development'. Exhibit 3.1 indicates targets for key Taxa.

Exhibit 3.1 Target for Selected Taxa Groups

Species Group	Number of species	Target year
Mammals	5000	2004
Birds	9000	2004
Reptiles	8000	2005
Amphibians	5000	2003
Freshwater fish	10000	2004
Marine Fish	11000	2005
Freshwater molluscs	20000	2005
Selected group of trees	10000	2005

The Red List has missed a number of these targets in the last few years: The Global Mammal Assessment deadline has been postponed to 2005, work on the Global Reptile Assessment has been delayed and the Marine Assessment was slowed down by the disengagement of Ocean Conservancy.

This highlights the necessity of increasing the resources devoted to the Red List Programme as well as the need for organizations to work collectively in fund raising activities. The Agreement states: "the amount of work required to document the Red List, especially with its expanding taxonomic base, is large, and this calls for a greatly increased investment in the Red List Programme."

Finding 2: The common principles, which underline the Red List Agreement, remain relevant today.

The Consortium Members have worked together with the RLP Committee for four years. In this time, they have increased the technical and scientific resources to support the Red List Programme. The Red List continues to gain recognition as a credible authoritative review of the state of species on a global level. Yet despite these successes, all Consortium Members agree that much more needs to be done.

Interviewees indicate that there has been insufficient progress to ensure a fuller representation of fresh water and marine species, and that neither invertebrates nor plants are adequately represented. Access to the data through the Species Information System remains limited and there is no widely accepted approach to creating an index of biodiversity.

In short, a considerable amount of effort and resources are required to support the achievement of the objectives of the IUCN Red List Programme as set out in the Agreement. With respect to resources, while the Agreement indicated that the four organizations would work together to secure funding, most progress in this area is linked to special projects that support one or two Consortium Member's strategic interests. The Consortium has shown little progress in joint fundraising.

Nevertheless, the Members of the Consortium still believed that their collaboration on the Red List could stimulate joint fundraising efforts:

“Joint fundraising is difficult. A couple of years ago we had a proposal that we were going to support. Nothing really happened! I think we were waiting for someone to take leadership and run with it—no one did. This is an area that I think IUCN should lead—they are the one that should drive this.”
(Interview 15)

The partners had hoped that collaborative fundraising efforts would demonstrate that they could work together in areas other than ‘technical work’. This has been a disappointment. As far back as 1997, minutes of the Executive Committee of the SSC indicate that the Members of the Consortium should seek significant funding from foundations. In 2000, the members agreed to develop a joint venture proposal to seek US\$10 million in funding. Discussions were held at the March 2001 meeting with respect to the need to develop a fundraising campaign, with a set of suggestions of how to do it, including hiring external resources. More discussions were held in May 2002 when the Consortium felt that “the SIS campaign and the Red List campaign are essentially the same and should be combined.” While informal meetings have occurred no formal discussions have been recorded after May 2002. This is a significant delay for the Consortium and diminishes its value to the RLP Committee.

Apart from funds, all organizations continue to support the identification and documentation of species. They have made progress in harmonizing and sharing data. For example, BirdLife, a Red List Authority, continues to collect data on Birds, conforming to the Red List Programme Committee Standards. The data is used by them and others to assess the state of biodiversity. There has been an ongoing discussion on how to improve the availability of the BirdLife data, and NatureServe has been harmonizing its data with the Red List data sets. As these data sets become more available to the Community of users, this will be another significant achievement of the work of the Red List Programme and the Consortium.

Despite this progress, the Red List Programme is under funded. Consequently, the need for resources and the rationale for the Consortium remain relevant.

Finding 3: While all partners agree to the Red List Programme vision, goal and objectives, some have diverging expectations with regards to the use of the Red List.

The partners widely recognize the importance of the Red List Programme to the conservation agenda. All parties agree that increased resources should be dedicated to the identification and documentation of endangered species as well as the development of an index on biodiversity.

Differences of opinion emerge when the question of the Red List's application is discussed. IUCN's perspective, as suggested by several respondents, is that it should remain a tool providing credible and high quality information on biodiversity to decision-makers. While the data should be analyzed against the Red List Categories, and judgments made on the state of a species, IUCN feels that there should be no identifiable institutional advocacy position taken within a Red List Committee document. At issue is the definition of what a RLP document is. This is discussed in Finding 27. The issue, as it relates to the Consortium's rationale, is that the RLP Committee's scientific and technical work should not be compromised. All organizations agree to this though, as noted, some partner organizations—specifically CI and BirdLife International—have strong advocacy components

to their core activities. Because of their organizational culture and conservation philosophy, these organizations are motivated to support the use of the Red List as an advocacy tool. Indeed, they would like to integrate some reference to their own methodologies within the new GSA and they note that this falls within the fourth objective of the Consortium Agreement. This has raised some concerns among Consortium Members.

RLP Committee minutes reveal that there has been an initial discussion on how the Red List should be used.⁷ While one partner mentioned that “SSC has always been careful to keep the Red List out of policy,” another suggested that conservation should be at the centre of the programme and that the Red List

should be shaped to target policy outcomes and engage policy-makers. It is the opinion of one IUCN representative that adding an “advocacy spin” to the Red List Programme publications could undermine its credibility as an independent scientific and technical group. If this occurs this would subvert one of the important reasons for the Consortium Agreement.

Vision, Goals and Objectives from Consortium Agreement

Vision

A world in which lack of information on the status of biodiversity is no longer a significant constraint to the achievement of effective conservation and sustainable forms of development.

Goals

To identify and document those species most in need of conservation attention if the global extinction rates are to be reduced.

To provide a global index of the state of degeneration of biodiversity.

Objectives

1. To assess, in the long term, the status of a selected set of species.
2. To establish a baseline from which to monitor the status of species.
3. To provide a global context for the establishment of conservation priorities at the local level.
4. To monitor, on a continuing basis, the status of representative selection of species (biodiversity indicators) that cover all the major ecosystems of the world.

4. Contributions and Benefits to the Red List Programme

4.1 Introduction

The Consortium's principle purpose was to “establish a formal basis for co-operation to enhance the implementation of the Red List Programme.” (p.1) The nature of the partners' commitments varied between organizations. The specific contributions were identified in the Annexes 2-6 of the Agreement, which states that the Members of the Consortium would contribute a total of approximately \$1.25 million (US) to the development of the Red List Programme per year. In addition, the Agreement indicates that the parties would collaborate to raise additional funds for the Red List Programme as outlined in an attached strategy document.

This section reviews the contributions of partners and the benefits to both the Red List Programme and the partners.

Finding 4: Being a Consortium member continues to meet the strategic interests of each of the four organizations. The Consortium benefits all organizations.

An important point of the review is to assess the extent to which the rationale of the Consortium relates to and is relevant to the mandate—and more specifically to the programmes—of BirdLife International, Conservation International, NatureServe and IUCN. Appendix V provides a review of the specific Red List related programme areas of each of these organizations.

BirdLife International joined the Consortium as “the leading authority on the status of the world’s bird species.”⁸ BirdLife has been a significant supporter of the Red Listing process and has had a long history of supporting the objectives of the Red List Programme. Specifically, it makes a valuable

⁷ Red List Programme Committee, March 6-7 2001, Day 1, item 2.

⁸ The Red List Programme Agreement, Annex 3, p.19.

contribution to the Red List Programme with its advanced data sets, multiple NGO partners, network of expert ornithologists and staff skilled in biodiversity assessment. It has been an active participant in SSC and its staff has worked on the Red List Programme Committee from its inception. BirdLife has been and remains a strong supporter of the Red List approach. Its data, along with the new amphibian data are central components to the Global Species Assessment.

Interviews with BirdLife suggest that its interest in continuing the Agreement remains strong, as does the rationale for the Consortium. The interviews suggest that the Consortium supports BirdLife's desire to have a credible and authoritative Red List. From their perspective, the more credible the Red List, the better it is for BirdLife. The organization's hope is for an improved Agreement with clarified expectations.

Conservation International (CI), through its Centre for Applied Biodiversity Science (CABS), was invited to join the Consortium because of CI's long experience in biodiversity work. CI has an "extensive expertise in conservation biology, including well-proven skills in state-of-the-art analyses of biodiversity data, and growing experience in the use of biodiversity indicators."⁹ In addition, CI is noted for its ability to raise funds, an institutional quality critical to the Consortium's long-term sustainability. When asked about the on-going relevance of the Agreement to CI, interviewees did not hesitate to speak about the importance of the Red List data. "We constantly use the data to show the links to hot spots. It is absolutely crucial to our work." (Interview 6)

Another CI official indicated that the Consortium's support for the Red List Programme was essential if the conservation community was to make progress in improving the way it assesses biodiversity. This official would have liked to have seen the Consortium make more progress. (Interview 10). In both cases, and in all CI interviews, the interviewees said that the Consortium continued to be relevant.

NatureServe's status as part of the Nature Conservancy (TNC) was under review at the time IUCN identified it as a strategic partner. Today, it is an independent organization that maintains "comprehensive conservation-related databases for North American species" and has expertise in managing biodiversity data sets for all the Americas.¹⁰ Having recently spun-off from TNC, NatureServe is a relatively new organization at an earlier stage of institutional evolution than its Consortium partners. However, members of its staff have had longstanding relationships with IUCN, SSC and the RLP Committee.

NatureServe's species data set has been a competitor with that of the Red List in North America, but this is much less the case today. Indeed, the Consortium has brought the work of NatureServe and the RLP together. As a NatureServe staffer observed, "we used to compete with the Red List. While in the area of global information the Red List is the authority, we feel that our data is the species authority for North America. As we harmonize our data set with the Red List and bring our work in line with theirs, we will have compatible data sets. This will be an important step in improving available data to those interested in biodiversity analysis." (Interview 6) As for relevance of the Consortium, interviews with NatureServe suggest that its business is moving toward value-added products that emerge from data.

NatureServe has a slightly different perspective from other Consortium members. It considers itself to be at a very early stage of organizational development. The organization's core funds are declining in relationship to project funds—a trend they see continuing in the near future. As a result, it views the Consortium as a potential instrument for engaging in their programmatic work as well as raising funds. In other words, not only do they see their data as a benefit to the Consortium, but they see their expertise in information technology as a service useful to the RLP Committee and the Consortium. For example, NatureServe has developed two projects with the Consortium which used its expertise to build a web site for the Amphibian Assessment and conduct a review of the SIS. NatureServe sees the Consortium linked to its work and new business plan.

⁹ The Red List Programme Agreement, Annex 4, p.20

¹⁰ The Red List Programme Agreement, Annex 5, p.21

Finally, IUCN and IUCN SSC have interesting perspectives on the relevance of the Consortium to their institutional interests. For example, one senior official asked “is it really in IUCN’s interest to have only four organizations associated with us in the Consortium when many other institutions provide valuable contributions to the Red List Programme? Are we potentially doing more harm than good?” This is countered by another IUCN official who saw the Consortium as “a necessary compromise to fulfill the ambitions of the Red List. We—IUCN—cannot do it alone”.

The SSC is the custodian and prime mover of the Red List Programme. It contributes its recognized expertise in the assessment methodology of threatened species and a well developed network of species specialist groups which use the methodology to collect data. Species conservation is its central concern and the Red List Programme is its brand. The questions of whether the Consortium makes sense to IUCN are twofold: First, is the support the RLP receives from the Consortium greater than the support it would have been given through historical bilateral relationships? Has the Consortium improved IUCN's Red List brand, or has it rather been diminished? After interviewing a number of senior IUCN officials, it is apparent that there is no consensus on either of these issues. Rather, there is a general feeling that the Consortium continues to be a good idea for IUCN given that there are relatively few new funds to increase its Red List work. In other words the Consortium continues to make sense for the purpose of increasing the resources (financial, informational, human) to support the Red List Programme.

The partners have thus far shown both a technical and financial commitment to the Consortium. All four want it to continue and consider improving its operations to be an important step. Interviews with all partners confirm their perspective that the rationale for their organizations is as strong today as it was at the Consortium's inception.

Finding 5: Most partners have worked towards fulfilling their operational and financial commitments. However, contributions are not documented nor are they formally monitored.

The partners' collective efforts contributed to the expansion of the coverage and qualitative enhancement of the Red List. By participating in the Consortium, each partner has taken on the responsibility of specific tasks as well as fundraising.

The RLP Committee receives biannual reports on the various ongoing species assessments. Individual representatives report progress on species groups, including global amphibian, bird, mammal and marine populations. The RLP Committee also considers improvements to the Species Information Service.

The extent to which organizations have fulfilled expectations varies among the partners. CI has contributed to the Red List Programme by developing the Global Amphibian Assessment in collaboration with IUCN. This task involves data collection, review, consolidation and analysis, and preparation of reports as well as the promotion of results.¹¹ In addition to this, CI has contributed to the data collection on mammals and contributes to the development of indicators. All of this has been in line with expectations. In fact, their contributions seem above expectations to some, but congruent with their own organizational interests.

BirdLife's main contribution to the Red List Programme is sharing data from *Threatened Birds of the World*. However, this publication is an independent product owned by BirdLife, which has developed a data set that is compatible to the Red List. BirdLife raises funds for resources for other initiatives more specifically related to the Red List itself. These include data review of Red List updates and web-based forum discussions to bring together worldwide expertise for the bird analyses that will be included in the 2004 Red List. BirdLife also creates additional Red List documentation, development of biodiversity indicators and undertakes fundraising as part of its Red List commitments.

Based on the review of the minutes, NatureServe appears to have been a less active member. Indeed, its specific contribution is only mentioned for the first time in the May 2003 committee meeting. The organization’s involvement relates to the redesign of the NatureServe website in 2002 with the

¹¹ Minutes of the Red List Committee meeting, March 2002, p.4.

inclusion of a link to the RLP site, the development of new data-sharing agreement with SIS, fundraising for the Global Amphibian Assessment website and the production of range maps for birds and mammals in the western hemisphere. People praise NatureServe's database as the "best in North America and good South American data as well" (Interviewee 18) and hope that it will be made available to Consortium Members and the public.

NatureServe says that its data will be compatible with the Red List relatively soon. Nevertheless, while all interviewees agree that NatureServe has made a significant contribution to the Consortium, it was widely hoped that it would be able to give more. IUCN has been actively involved in the Consortium by managing the Red List Programme at its headquarters in Cambridge, UK, by supporting the development of the SIS and by contributing to the Global biodiversity assessments with the crucial assistance of the SSC. The Red List is a programme of IUCN SSC and it is responsible for its continuation. In speaking to the IUCN Red List Secretariat, we discovered early in the review that no systematic data has been collected about the contributions made by Consortium Members towards the Red List Programme.

We asked IUCN to place a value on its own contribution. The IUCN finance department calculated the value to be CHF 800,000 per year (see Memo dated Sept 10, 2004), a considerably larger sum than the \$400,000US specified in the Agreement. Moreover, this amount does not include in-kind contributions made by the IUCN Specialist Groups. This type of data and feedback should be obtained regularly from all partners as part of the management of the Consortium.

As can be seen from this short analysis, the Red List Programme has benefited from the contributions made by the individual institutions of the Consortium. However, the extent to which these funds are simply "more of the same historical contributions of these organizations," or how much are additional as a result of the synergy and energy generated by the Agreement is unclear. We could not make a judgment on this. There are, however, mixed opinions on this amongst the interviewees.

We do know that the Red List Programme Committee has *not* benefited from the institutional synergies that could have emerged from the four organizations working together to raise funds. Though this was a potential benefit of the Consortium, the four organizations have undertaken no sustained collective fundraising efforts!

Finding 6: The Red List Programme Committee is in the process of producing significantly better products than the past. The Agreement has helped.

There is a general agreement that, over the last four years, the work of the Red List Programme Committee has improved in the quality and quantity of data and analysis. The partners say that the Global Species Assessment, to be released in November 2004, will be the best Red List product so far. Not only has the taxonomic coverage significantly expanded, but the documentation supporting the species assessment has also been revised and increased. Clear taxonomic standards have also been adopted and all listed species must now meet a set of minimum documentation requirements. The documentation and taxonomic validation has made the listing process far more transparent. There has been general consensus that product improvement can be linked, in part, to the work and dedication of the four organizations, among others, which was in part encouraged by the Agreement. Whether the GSA is a Red List Programme Committee product or a Consortium product will be discussed later.

In a similar way, The Global Amphibian Assessment (GAA) was just released and is gaining some notoriety. Besides the authors, whose product is this? Findings 25 to 27 review this issue. However, with respect to the question of benefits, it is clear that all the partners have benefited.

5. Institutional Arrangements of the Consortium

5.1 Introduction

We concluded in Section 3 that it makes sense for the organizations to continue to participate in the Consortium and pursue its objectives. However, we noted potential difficulties to the Consortium's continued relevance and the need to take advantage of the potential synergy amongst the partners. A major issue relates to each organization's vision about its place in the Consortium. We observed in

Section 4 that the Consortium supported the implementation of the Red List Programme, but suggested that the benefits could be enhanced.

In this section, we examine the strengths and weaknesses of the institutional arrangements that have led to the findings in Section 3 and 4. We have divided the institutional arrangements into three sections: governance, management and other institutional issues.

5.2 Governance

Governance refers to the agreed framework that should guide the behaviour of the Consortium Members to support the Red List Programme Committee, and the institutional mechanisms that hold the Members accountable to the Agreement. In this context, it is the network of formal and informal agreements, strategies, policies, procedures and rules that guide action. It provides direction for mobilizing resources and for the members, technical staff and volunteers that carry out its work. The governance system includes the vision, mission, goals, objectives, methodologies and ideas for action. It sets priorities, creates frameworks for monitoring and tries to create conditions that will produce a culture and incentive system that allows people to grow, learn, develop and produce desired results.

Consortium governance is different from typical organizational governance. In single organizations, the governance structure, normally represented by a board or a council, is typically part of a linear hierarchy and authority system. In contrast, there are often multiple chains of authority in consortia.

Finding 7: The Red List Programme Agreement forms the main governance framework within which the Consortium operates. This Agreement has worked reasonably well¹² over the last 4 years but needs significant updating.

The governance structure of most inter-organizational relationships is usually defined in a written agreement or memorandum. The level of formality and legality varies from one Consortium to another, but it is important for all parties to understand a number of characteristics of the relationship for it to be successful.

Exhibit 5.1 Assessment of the Red List Programme Agreement

Typical characteristics of a partnership agreement	Rating	Comments
Clear vision and/or goals of the agreement	Good	There is general agreement among all parties.
Clear statement of objectives and outcomes	Good, but this needs further clarification. There is no agreed strategy or plan that links these outcomes to the work of the Consortium Members.	Some informants raised the issue that the objective of a biodiversity index might be broader than the mandate of the RLP Committee.
Clear expectations (roles and responsibilities) of the parties	Fair: the members' expected contributions as well as their participation on the RLP Committee are clear. What remains unclear is their role as Consortium Members.	There is confusion between the expectations of the RLP Committee and the Consortium.
The scope and identity of the partnership	Fair	The Consortium members are supposed to raise resources as well as providing technical support to the RLP Committee. Section 13 of the Agreement provides some guidance on this. However, it is unclear whether the Consortium is supposed to produce products as opposed to funding products! It is equally unclear whether the Consortium has, or should have, an identity separate from its members.

¹² The Consortium was viewed as a group in its early stage of evolution. The various concerns and issues expressed are typical of early stage groups.

Typical characteristics of a partnership agreement	Rating	Comments
Clear approach and process of implementing oversight	Fair	While oversight for the RLP Committee is clear, there is no specific oversight provision for the Consortium.
Clear Consortium model for engaging in work	Fair	Individuals work for the Consortium as required. There is no agreement among the Consortium Members on their organizational model.
Capacities and funding arrangements	Fair, but many aspects remain unclear	The Consortium Members are extremely talented but have not used their organizational expertise for fundraising or building the capacity of the Consortium.
Clear process for dispute settlements and amending procedures	Not in Agreement	Section 15 of the Agreement does not provide a process for review of the Agreement, only the conditions for a change.
Clear procedures for monitoring and evaluation	Not in Agreement	Some confusion regarding the role of the Consortium and RLP Committee regarding M&E.
Rules for leaving and expanding the group	Not in Agreement	

In general, most informants expressed satisfaction with the Consortium's work. One remarked, "We participate in a lot of Partnerships. This one seems to work. In fact it is one of the best I work on. That is not to say that it does not need improvement—it does. That is what the review is all about—isn't it?" (Interview 2)

However, while they were pleased with the work of the Consortium, many of the interviewees expressed serious concerns about various aspects of the Agreement¹³.

Some Concerns about the Consortium Agreement:

"Has the Agreement protected the IUCN brand for the Red List? I think not. We need to fix the Agreement to do so or leave!" (Interview 16)

"There are some Consortium parties that have not lived up to the Agreement. What can be done?" (Interview 6)

"The Consortium has not produced any of the synergies implied in the Agreement. The members have simply supported their organizational interests." (Interview 9)

"How can we expand the Consortium to include others? There is no provision in the Agreement! We need to find others to fill in the gaps!" (Interview 11)

While most suggested that the Consortium has worked well, there is a clear perceived need for change. The Consortium has worked reasonably well because of the people who have been involved. In general, they have been working together for over a decade, have personal and professional commitments to this work and are able to make accommodations. Furthermore, there are significant positive changes being made that reinforce the individual efforts. However, these personal commitments appeals need to be complemented by a clearer and more complete set of understandings and agreements. The Consortium must make clearer arrangements regarding roles and responsibilities, its implementation of oversight, amendment of procedures and monitoring and evaluation processes.

¹³ It should be noted that interviewees were not fully conversant on "the Agreement." When we say that they had reservations about the Agreement it means that these reservations were stated as general reservations about the Consortium. We linked their stated concerns to that of the Agreement.

Finding 8: The function and purpose of the Consortium are clearly stated in the Agreement, but certain ambiguities remain with respect to how it is interpreted and implemented.

According to the Agreement, the purpose of the Consortium is “to establish a formal basis for co-operation to enhance the implementation of the Red List.” Section 11 of the Agreement elaborates on the concept of ‘co-operation’ and identifies collective fundraising as one of the Consortium’s main purposes.

As one informant stated, “monitoring the Species of the world is a huge task. Certainly bigger than anything IUCN can do. Yet this is our task and it is a good one—one which IUCN SSC and the Red List Programme Committee are well positioned to carry out” (Interview 3). From this perspective, the function of the Consortium is to bring resources to the table to support the implementation of the Red List Programme.

Some informants viewed the Consortium as just a starting point for increasing the resources to the Red List Programme. “We need the Consortium to help us think about how we are going to reach our goals. It needs to be more than simply a group of individual organizations who use the RLP Committee to further their own organizational ends. They need to be strategic helpers working toward a global information system on species. They need to link to the SIS. They need to identify other important groups that we can add as partners. We cannot just stand still. They (the Consortium) are linked to much larger resources; they need to use their influence.” (Interview12)

While the agreement indicates the individual contributions expected from each partner (see Exhibit 5.2 in the next finding), the specific mechanisms leading to collective work are unclear. The Agreement does not suggest whether the Consortium should establish a ‘common pool’ of resources or whether there should be a central financial system to oversee joint resource generation. Considering that collective action can stimulate increased synergy among partners, this issue should be carefully examined.

Finding 9: While the roles and responsibilities of the Red List Programme Committee are reasonably clear, this is not the case for the Consortium Members.

The function, roles and responsibilities associated with the work of the Consortium are inextricably linked to the work of the Red List Programme. From its inception, the Red List Programme Committee was viewed as a technical body composed of a combination of “technical and applied scientists representing a range of taxonomic groups, especially those over which there was concern.” (1997 minutes of Exec Committee) This technical mandate (of the RLPC) was supplemented by a mandate “to provide oversight to the partnership.” (Minutes of Exec Committee meeting 2001 p.16) In this context, the committee was given a mandate of “oversight of the standards and the branding of the Red List.”

It is clear in the Agreement that the Consortium is supposed to make financial and other contributions to the Red List Programme Committee to help it implement its work plan. The Agreement does not clearly define how the function of the Consortium relates to the function of the Red List Programme Committee. Several partners are unclear about what, aside from its fundraising function, sets the Consortium apart from the Committee. Exhibit 5.2 enumerates the responsibilities of the Consortium members as stated in the Agreement:

Exhibit 5.2 Roles and Responsibilities

Roles and responsibilities of partner organizations	
IUCN SSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Maintenance of the Red List office in Cambridge, with a minimum of two staff and an intern – Management of the Red List (reviewing submission of data, producing annual update to the List, analysis of biological parameters) – Maintenance of the existing SIS Central Service Unit, with a minimum of two staff (training, technical support, development of SIS software, management of the database)

Roles and responsibilities of partner organizations	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Fundraising: US\$ 400,000 per year
BirdLife International	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Implementation of the Global Red List Bird Programme, with a minimum of two staff (documentation and monitoring of Bird status, data management, development of indicators, contribution to Red List Governance, collaboration to the analysis of Red List information) – Fundraising: US\$ 300,000 per year
Conservation International	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Implementation of a biodiversity assessment unit, with a minimum of three staff (support to the development of new networks of RLAs, collaboration with new RLAs for assessments, oversight the production of global assessments, leadership on Worldwide Biodiversity assessment) – Fundraising: US\$ 300,000 per year
NatureServe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Development and data management relevant to assessing the status of Western hemisphere biodiversity, with a minimum of five staff (collaboration to specific assessments, collaboration to the development of biodiversity indicators) – Fundraising: US\$ 250,000 per year

These roles and responsibilities can be interpreted as nothing more than the normal work of the Consortium Members themselves. For example, BirdLife has the responsibility of assessing the status of birds, but that is already the mandate of the organization. Moreover is the expected \$300,000 contribution meant to be new funding or a valuation of contributions in kind? The expectations for all members are just as vague. Whether they have any responsibility to work together as a Consortium is not clear.

The Agreement does not clearly define roles and responsibilities other than the contribution of resources. What it does is raise a number of unanswered questions: Is the Consortium simply a body to oversee the members' individual contributions to the Red List, or is it a management committee that creates and implements fundraising and other resource strategies? Should it have a strategy and business plan closely linked to the RLP Committee? Should the Consortium have a technical role, or should that be left totally to the RLP Committee? How should it operate? Is it an informal group of RLP Committee members, or does it have an institutional mandate? Is the provision of data a financial contribution?

The Agreement states that Consortium Members will provide staff to sit on the RLP Committee to identify, document and analyze species information and raise funds. But this has proven to be very vague and in some ways indistinguishable from the normal organizational work they do as part of their own organizations. For example, when individuals sit on the RLP Committee, do they sit as institutional members or “individual experts?” What distinguishes their work in the committee from that of the Consortium?

Finding 10: While the Red List Programme Committee meetings were viewed as productive and open, the Consortium meetings were perceived to be more difficult.

Many stakeholders had the opportunity to participate in the open forum provided by the Red List Programme Committee. Our informants indicated that the Committee meetings provided them with opportunities to share their expertise, exchange experience, negotiate and resolve technical areas of conflict, and build consensus. The process of working through compromise helped to build trust between the participants.

Participants of the Red List Programme Committee meetings include several representatives from various organizations or SSC subcommittees.¹⁴ It is important to note that from one meeting to

¹⁴ Chair of the committee, representatives from each partner organizations (Birdlife, Conservation International/CABS, NatureServe, and initially Ocean Conservancy), SIS representative, Chair of the Standards and Petitions subcommittee, as well as the Chair of the Regional Applications Working Group. Also, SSC staff representatives include Red List Programme Officer and assistant, Acting Head of the Species Programme,

another, representatives of organizations may change as well as the number of people representing each organization. A typical Red List Committee meeting gathers approximately 20 people.

The committee uses these meetings to make decisions on governance (the appointment of subcommittees, Red List authorities) and process matters (appeal processes, Red List categories, policy on data sharing) as well as on the production of the Red List (website development, updates on various species assessments). However, the Committee does not address Consortium issues.

Consensus is the preferred method of making decisions within this committee, and is the regular line of authority within IUCN. The minutes of the March 2001 meeting note, “the main thing is that decisions are normally taken by consensus, and if this doesn’t work, we take decisions by vote.”

The Committee meetings are carefully documented, and it is clear from the minutes that members agree on action points collectively. Key action points adopted by members have ensured a sound division of tasks among partners, as well as a clarification of the methodology to be employed in carrying out the assessments. The work divisions based on distinct taxonomic assessments, which undertaken by specific partners according to their competencies, have proven profitable in expanding the coverage of the Global Red List.

Partners have agreed to gather after Committee meetings to discuss Consortium issues. Participants include representatives from partner organizations, the RLP Committee Chair and the Red List Programme Secretariat. The representatives of partner organizations, according to the Chair, were never officially sanctioned as called for in the Agreement. Items were discussed but closure was difficult. The partner meetings usually comprise 10-15 participants.

According to those informants, the partnership meetings were not as well organized as the Committee meetings. Indeed, the minutes of the partners’ meetings indicate a lack of clarity and coherence. While most topics discussed relate to key Consortium issues like branding and partnership expansion, some discussions are related more to the development of the Red List Programme itself. The partners’ meetings discuss matters like species assessments and data sharing policies even though these issues are also the concern of members of the Red List Committee meeting not in attendance.

The minutes of the first three partners’ meetings from 2001 to 2003 indicate that core issues like Consortium strategy and institutional arrangements were left out of the discussions, even though several partners stressed the importance of defining a clear partnership structure during the 2001 Red List Committee meeting. These issues were discussed during the May 2004 partners’ meeting. In 2004, key problems relating to the partnership were identified and the partners discussed the need for an external review. They cited the lack of collective action, the unclear distinction between Red List Committee and partnership meetings and the lack of leadership as pressing issues. We have found the same thing.

Finding 11: It is unclear who is responsible for providing Consortium leadership and for developing a consortium model that works.

What is the idea behind the Consortium? Is there an organizational or management model that can provide insight on how it should work? It became apparent in discussions with our informants that only superficial consideration has been given to conceiving the Consortium itself. In general, interviewees felt that the initial reason for the Consortium was only to raise new money, estimated at \$10,000,000, to support the Red List Programme. In fact, many interviewees never gave much thought to the idea of a consortium until quite recently. Consequently, there was no discussion of issues like the consortium model, the secretariat, roles, responsibilities, strategy, leadership and identity.

Several informants indicated that they expected that IUCN would provide the Consortium's leadership. As one put it: “We were at an SSC meeting in 1997 when we were discussing the need to increase the resources for the Red List work. Everyone knew that IUCN would not give more money

Plants Programme Officer as well as the CI/CABS/IUCN/SSC Biodiversity Initiative representatives. Observers from external organizations may also participate.

for this, and we also new that the Red List needed to stay as an IUCN product. That's how the Agreement started to be formulated. I remember in 1997, when the Red List Committee was just forming, we thought we should have Bilateral MOUs with the Committee and then it changed—I do not remember why. But all of a sudden in around 2000 we started talking about a Joint Venture, an Agreement. But it was always to support the development of the SSC Red List.”

From the outset, the members saw IUCN as the Consortium's leader. Things were different within IUCN, which accepted the leadership of the Red List Programme Committee, but not the Consortium. The Red List Programme Chair commented, “I feel very comfortable as the Red List Programme Chair... however, I did not feel comfortable as the Consortium Chair.” As we understand the situation, the two positions are perceived in quite different terms: The Chair of the Red List Programme is essentially the head of a scientific and technical committee, while the Consortium leads an institutional committee. Many interviewees made it clear that IUCN did not provide institutional leadership, nor did other Consortium members assume the leadership.

The lack of leadership from senior officials who have signed the Agreement has contributed to the confusing nature of the governance and Consortium model. What is the organizational image of the Consortium? How should it get work done? The Red List Programme Committee is a combination of volunteers, professionals who are paid to participate in the Committee, and the professional Secretariat staff. This is a formula that works for the Red List Programme Committee. The Secretariat, which is funded by IUCN, provides the Red List Programme Committee with administrative, managerial and technical support.¹⁵ Can a similar arrangement work for the Consortium? In general, the organizational model should follow the function of the Consortium, and this needs to be clarified.

In our experience three basic organizational models have been used to operate consortia. These are:

- The *ad hoc* approach
- The fixed secretariat approach
- The rotating secretariat approach

In this case, the members have taken an *ad hoc* approach to the Consortium. This usually happens at an early stage of a consortium's development, when none of the participants want to assume administrative and managerial responsibilities or they are waiting to see what happens. However, the *ad hoc* approach does not work for long and can lead to the failure of the consortium. Many good ideas have died due to this type of managerial and institutional neglect.

Finding 12: The governance system has been able to balance the existing asymmetrical relationships within the Consortium. However, this is and will continue to be a source of concern.

Consortia and partnerships often begin with the premise of mutual contribution and mutual benefit. While this is an interesting premise, it rarely occurs. Rather, some participants find they get a lot out of the arrangement and thus contribute more, while others receive less and contribute less. In the latter case, members fear that one party might dominate the Consortium, while in the former situation members fear that a partner is getting a ‘free ride’. In either case, the failure to monitor and discuss the situation puts the consortium in jeopardy. Both situations exist in the present Consortium.

On one hand, Consortium Members fear that CI plays a dominant role—maybe too dominant—because of the importance it places on the use of the Red List information for its own programmes. One informant wondered: “Should we really be doing reptiles next? Shouldn't we be doing marine or fresh water fish? The reason we are doing reptiles is that CI wants to do reptiles! They are too influential. Their money is too important in making decisions.” (Interview 5)

¹⁵ It should be noted that almost all interviewees indicated that quantity of work has escalated considerably, since the Agreement. They also noted that there has been relatively little increase in professional staff, thus causing a bottleneck within the RLP. Several asked whether the mandate of the Consortia included getting paid professional staff to support the RLP, not only getting funds for obtaining taxa data and analysis.

On the other hand, there is a perception that NatureServe has not contributed at the level expected. Another interviewee commented that, “NatureServe is sitting on a pile of important data that should be made available to the Red List. I thought this could be their real contribution, but it has not occurred. By the way, what have they contributed?” (Interview 16)

What is important from a governance perspective is not whether there are asymmetrical relationships, but whether there is a way to discuss and manage these relationships. Up to now, this has been managed through informal channels and discussions. However, it is important to create more formal ways to discuss these issues if the Consortium is to succeed.

Finding 13: There are no stated procedures for changing the Consortium Membership or for resolving Consortium disputes.

The expansion of the Red List Programme is a very ambitious project, and there are many possible ways to a more reliable analysis of species and trends in biodiversity. As this stage, the Red List Committee has the potential to develop a number of bilateral and multilateral partnerships. The issue is whether the development of partnership will provide the expected results.

Consortium membership has always been relatively exclusive, and most partners have been integrated based on their reputation and expertise. However the issue of expanding consortium membership arises as it becomes clear that it needs to increase the representation of freshwater fish, plants and invertebrates.

However, the Consortium appears to have no clear system or set of requirements to admit new members. The minutes of partners’ meetings reveal that there is ambiguity about what the financial contribution of new partners should be. However, clear procedures for changing partnerships are crucial in order to build a stable and sustainable Consortium.

Birdlife has developed formal operational procedures to explain the roles, responsibilities and workings of all its components. For example, to become a partner of Birdlife, a national NGO must meet a specific set of eligibility and admission criteria. These criteria relate to conservation expertise, legal status, human and financial capacity as well as experience in biodiversity data collection. The admission procedure involves a review process in which the Secretariat, the Regional Committee and the Global Council provide comments and recommendations. There is also a withdrawal clause.

BirdLife’s admission procedure can be used as an example for the Consortium. A dispute settlement clause is also necessary, but such a document has not yet been developed.

Finding 14: While SIS is embedded in the Agreement there is only recent evidence that it has been coordinated by the Committee and supported by the consortium.

SIS was developed as a data management initiative to centralize widely dispersed biodiversity data. The SIS aims to become a “biodiversity information resource that provides current, quality, spatially explicit biodiversity information to support scientific discovery, natural resource management, and policy formulation.” With its large network, which collectively holds the most comprehensive information on species, its support of a SIS team and its key position within the IUCN, the SSC is well positioned to develop this resource.

The Agreement states, “SIS is considered a legitimate part of the Work plan,” and specifies that SIS representatives are to be included on the Red List Committee. Annex 2 of the Agreement further stipulates that IUCN and the SSC are responsible for the maintenance of the SIS Central Service Unit. In turn, this unit is responsible for developing the software, managing the central database as well as training and providing technical support to SIS users.

How the SIS actually relates to the Red List Programme Committee and Consortium is an important strategic question that has not been addressed. The minutes of the March 2001 Red List Programme Committee meeting indicate that the SIS has its own Steering Committee to oversee its development. The SIS is expected to coordinate with the RLP Committee on matters of process, but its representatives’ participation at meetings is mostly to provide updates on the technical developments

and fundraising. Though the Consortium should have included the SIS in its deliberations, this has not been done until this year.

“The Red List Committee recognized that developing and completing the SIS is a major priority and a huge task. However, the Committee’s immediate priority is the annual production of the Red List and while SIS is unavailable, the current Red List database will continue to be used. While not a central concern of RLP Committee meetings, it was noted that ... incorporating Red List data into SIS at some point in the future should not be a major problem.” (RLC meeting December 2002). More recently, NatureServe and the SIS have been involved in discussions with the Moore Foundation. This has resulted in a needs assessment study. Notably, this activity is not included in the minutes of the Consortium. What remains an issue, however, is the SIS relations with the RLP Committee and the Consortium.

5.3 Institutional Management

The Agreement provides the foundation for the Consortium's governance and establishes a framework within which members are asked to behave. This section reviews how the Agreement has been administered, managed and led. As with governance, the management, administration and leadership of the Consortium have posed interesting challenges at both the strategic and operational level. From a strategic perspective, we have tried to address how well the Consortium has adjusted to changing internal and external conditions. Has the leadership been strategic? Has the Consortium engaged in internal and external scans? Has the structure been flexible? Are the roles and responsibilities appropriate? This section reviews the planning, implementation and monitoring work needed to meet the objectives of the Consortium from an operational perspective.

Finding 15: The basic approach to the management and administration of the Consortium is a joint discussion of Consortium Members at their semi-annual meetings. This is inadequate.

Interviews suggest that the management and administration of the Consortium has been largely unplanned. While the Agreement (Annex 2) indicates that the Red List Programme was to be managed by the IUCN Red List Officer, it is silent with respect to the management and administration of the Consortium.

For example, the Agreement states in Section 11, that “all parties agree to work collaboratively to raise funds for the implementation of the agreed work plan.” (Red List Programme Work plan) However, it does not specify which resources, human or financial, should be used to accomplish this. Moreover, the Agreement suggests that all issues arising from the RLP Committee that were deemed to be Consortium issues were to be discussed at the consortium meetings. The minutes indicate that these issues relate to partnership expansion, fundraising, communication strategy and branding. Yet little has been accomplished despite four years of discussions. There is no one designated to do the work!

Early documents suggested that the Consortium Members assumed that the IUCN Red List Programme Officer would administer and manage the Agreement. However, it became clear early on that this was unrealistic given the scientific technical responsibilities of the Red List Programme Officer. The Programme Officer attended Consortium meetings, but had relatively little time for this additional responsibility and, as a result, very little management or administration of the Agreement was actually done. For example, at the May 2004 meeting, several partners raised the issue of the lack of *collective* action (fundraising, joint analysis) in developing the Red List. The critique of the Consortium that appears in the minutes of this meeting suggests that its members have engaged more in individual action than collective or joint action, thus compromising the attainment of the goals of the Red List:

“Lack of collective action has compromised the second Red List Goal. ... Over the next quadrennium, we need a stronger goal commitment that everyone will work together on...” (Minutes of the Consortium Meetings May 2004)

Part of the reason for this lack of collective action might be that the Consortium has no management model to support collective action. Who will bring the groups together to support collective work?

Finding 16: Strategic Leadership is not apparent in the Consortium’s work. There is no strategy nor business plan to guide the work of the Consortium.

The idea of strategic leadership is relatively simple: Groups need a way to scan their external and internal environments in order to develop strategies and business plans that guide their actions. This has to be an ongoing process and, where necessary, they must be prepared to change direction. In carrying out strategic leadership, groups clarify their niches, identify potential products and services, and create ways to make the ‘vision’ a ‘living vision’. Strategic leadership is the ability to direct this process and obtain the support of those stakeholders responsible for action.

In the case of the Consortium, members have agreed to collectively support the implementation of the Red List Programme. The Red List Programme is part of the SSC Strategic Plan. The IUCN portion of the Red List Programme activities are set out in an annual work plan and budget and reviewed every four years as part of the IUCN Programme planning process and the World Conservation Congress review of the IUCN Programme and budget. It follows then that the Consortium requires its own strategy to link to the RLP strategy and work plan. It needs a model for strategic leadership.

There is little evidence in the minutes that the Consortium engaged in strategic leadership:

“Part of the problem is that not one person is taking the lead in pushing a programme vision forward.” (Minutes of the Partners Meetings May 2004)

In our interviews, representatives of CI, NatureServe and BirdLife all felt that IUCN should provide the Consortium’s strategic leadership. However, with the failure of IUCN to provide institutional leadership, this has not happened. (See Finding 11) There is a need for a conceptual and practical distinction between the RLP Committee—a technical and scientific committee of IUCN—and the Consortium, a joint venture of four organizations working together to improve the RLP resource base.

Finding 17: Neither the Consortium nor the RLP Committee has adequately reviewed the human resource requirements for its management and operations.

Interviewees have praised both the quantity and quality of changes to the Red List Programme. The RLP has approved more authorities, instituted better review procedures and dispute mechanisms, and the Red List includes significantly more taxa. The IUCN RLP Secretariat has been effective in collecting information for the expansion of the database and assuring that the data review goes as planned. In general, the annual web-based updates have been delivered, but there are backlogs and increasing the work load with data and taxa would only aggravate the situation.

No one anticipated until recently (IUCN now includes staff time for RLP in each project) the human resource issues associated with the increase work and aspirations in the RLP. Indeed, the Consortium’s failure to factor in the strategic, managerial and operational support required to operationalize support for the RLP Committee’s technical work is significant. The problem is that the Consortium has not worked out the details of how the Red List Programme should accommodate new operational cost associated with the additional work associated with Consortia success.

Finding 18: There is an overlap of activities between the Consortium and the RLP Committee. This is partly a consequence of the unclear roles and responsibilities identified in Finding 9.

When the roles of the RLP Committee and the Consortium are unclear, their activities tend to overlap:

“The Distinction between Red List Committee and Partnership has never been clear. At the start, we were going to start a fundraising campaign and this never happened. Now we talk about some of the same things—what makes one an RLP Committee meeting and one a partnership meeting. I think we are confused.” (Minutes of the Partners Meeting May 2004)

The Consortium’s activities are entangled with the work of the RLP Committee. Minutes of the partners’ meetings reveal that issues related to the Red List Programme are discussed in the

Consortium meetings. Marine issues, indicators analysis, data sharing policies, and assessment co-ordination are all identified in the minutes of the Consortium meetings.

This lack of clarity exists because, not only are the governance issues unclear, but there is no one to manage the meetings themselves. Indeed, when asked who was in charge of managing Consortium meetings, our informants replied that it was not clear.

Finding 19: Operational work planning and reporting within the IUCN Red List Programme Secretariat has supported progress of the Red List Programme. However, this is not the case for the Consortium.

The Agreement indicates that the partners are responsible for developing annual work plans in collaboration with the RLP Committee. A group normally plans and monitors its work through a formal work plan. This is an independent reference document that describes the deliverables to be developed, the timeframe for their delivery and the potential use of the Red List in upcoming external meetings like the Park Congress and World Conservation Congress. For example, the RLP Committee's May 2002 work plan specified that the production of a global biodiversity indicator analysis required the development of an indicator framework and a sampling strategy as well as the assessment itself.

The planning process is conducted through the biannual RLP Committee meetings, where key points are formally integrated in the minutes. These meetings allow the Committee to reassess the practicality of the targets, classify what actions should be taken, and to determine which partners will lead the various assessments. According to the minutes of the March 2001 meeting, the Committee planned assessments according to species groups and geographical coverage. Within each group, the tasks were coordinated according to the partners' established responsibilities.¹⁶ The Committee adopted action points to clarify the focus of work for the upcoming year, select potential collaborators, assign responsibilities and set the fundraising target.

The work plans of the RLP are more ambitious than the resources available to complete them. Exhibit 3.1, in Finding 1, illustrates that the RLP is significantly behind in its projections for finishing species work. These taxonomic targets are specifically detailed in the 'IUCN/SSC Red List Programme, A strategy for its development,' while interviewees indicate that the work planning process needs to be improved, there is a system in place that includes both planning and monitoring.¹⁷

One would expect that the Consortium would create a work plan focused on raising resources linked to those developed by the IUCN RLP, but curiously, it does not develop work plans with the exception of the work plan developed for the Global Species Assessment in 2004. There is no managerial or operational approach to getting work done.

Finding 20: There is no plan for developing potential new institutional relationships to enhance the implementation of the RLP Programme.

While the Consortium's lack of a mechanism to find new members is a governance issue, the strategic and managerial question is whether it should seek them at all. Our informants' opinions were mixed on this point. Some expressed the opinion that it would be a bad idea for the Consortium to add new members before it got its own house in order, while other interviewees said that it was vital to increase membership. Discussions were held in two out of the four Consortium meetings about expanding the membership. However, there does not appear to be any strategic analysis about this issue.

For example, the participation of several NGOs was discussed at the May 2003 meeting. The members asked the RLP Secretariat staff to invite one of the NGOs to the next meeting because of the resources it could bring to the Consortium. However, it is not clear on what basis this invitation was

¹⁶ Amphibians, birds, mammals, reptiles, fresh water fish, marine fish, fresh water and terrestrial molluscs, other invertebrates, trees.

¹⁷ It should not be interpreted that we are assessing the content of the work planning process of IUCN. Rather, we are suggesting that the process of work planning and monitoring are in place and being used.

made nor which strategy was used to enlarge the Committee. Our informants indicated that expansion was required to make up for the shortage of data for groups like plants, marine species, fresh water species and invertebrates.

Finding 21: Consortium processes like problem solving, decision-making, risk management, meeting skills, conflict resolution and communication are at very early stages of evolution.

The Consortium has developed relatively informally. The progress that has been made has been more the result of the hard work and dedication of individuals serving on the Consortium than the way it is organized or managed. Meetings are held, problems are addressed and decisions are made, but the same issues continue to reoccur and relatively little progress seems to be made on organizational and managerial issues. This is the sign of a group that is at an early stage of evolution. While the Consortium has been an official entity for two years, it was four years in the making, and in that time it has met formally only four times, and then only for very short periods of one or two hours.

Finding 22: The Consortium has not adequately managed the horizontal issues arising in the communication function.

Open and clear communications are essential to the collaborative efforts of a partnership. A formal process of communication is necessary to maintain a consistent information flow between partners. This can include regular updates through newsletter mailings and weekly phone calls. Electronic means have been used to facilitate coordination among partners but face-to-face communications through regular meetings remain crucial.

Functions like communications need to be managed across organizational boundaries. The normal process is to develop a joint communication strategy for internal and external use. All of the member organizations and the outside world hear the same messages. Communications' specialists normally develop work plans for the Consortium once a strategy is developed. Coordination routines would be established through meetings and policies and procedures. This work would be managed by both their regular supervisors and the Consortium management if it existed.

There is no strategy at this stage, and the communication officers (of the four organizations) have not established coordination routines within the Consortium. The one exception is the draft branding policy led by IUCN, which most interviewees say, is just a first step in developing a branding approach.

5.4 Other Institutional Issues

5.4.1 Transparency and Trust

Trust is an essential building block of a working partnership. It takes time to create and it is more likely to develop when the partners share a vision of the future. Trust can also be inherited through past relationships or acquired through dialogue and participation. Whatever the history of the partnership, confidence in each other's intentions and skills is more likely to develop if organizations demonstrate willingness to communicate openly, compromise for consensus and explore new ideas.

Transparency demands that partners be forthcoming about their limitations, expectations, objectives and potential competition that could arise from them, as well as with regards to benefits.

Transparency implies openly sharing and exchanging information.

Finding 23: All parties agree that the Red List Agreement has helped build trust among the four organizations. But significant work remains to be done.

Most Consortium Members have been collaborating with each other for almost a decade. They have helped develop the vision and are committed to its goals. This history of working relationships has helped build trust, and most of the individuals involved know what to expect from each other. This has been translated to their institutional relationships as well.

While personal relationships within the Consortium have improved trust levels, the difficulties with the Agreement and the low level of formalization of the Consortium has hindered the development of institutional trust. The lack of formal terms of reference has made it difficult to distinguish between the Consortium and the RLP Committee.

Trust facilitators such as the experience of success, predictable communications and positive social relations, have played a positive role in the building of trust in the Consortium. On the other hand the lack of clarity with respect to schedules and plans, problems with follow up, unrealistic expectations and the lack of substantive feedback have had a negative effect.

Our informants have said that trust amongst the Consortium Members has increased. This view is colored in part by the impending release of the GAA and GSA. Although the interviewees are enthusiastic about these events, they are concerned that the relationships that have been built are institutionally fragile. The Consortium has to manage the required changes and possibility of new participants for trust to be increased.

Finding 24: Partner organizations express a certain level of reticence to share data that will be analyzed and reviewed by other organizations. This has created concerns about transparency.

We set out to review three ideas: Is adequate Consortium information available to the expert partner organizations? Do the individuals who govern the Consortium have adequate information to make decisions? Finally, are each partner's interests, as related to the Consortium's mission, clearly defined and communicated? We have dealt with the first two questions, and will address organization transparency in this section.

While progress has been made, some Consortium Members want more data transparency from BirdLife and, data availability from NatureServe. The issue of transparency has ramifications at the highest levels. The Agreement calls for data transparency and availability. The signatories supported this notion but it has been difficult to resolve. Is data sharing a 'real' issue? Both BirdLife and NatureServe told us that the data sharing issue is a technical issue. Yet, throughout our interviews, the concern about their transparency existed. The issue for us is how to get problem resolution at higher-level institutional issues e.g. transparency, particularly when there is no high level institutional governance mechanism.

Finally, the third issue is one of potential concern. The four partners share the same goal but their institutional interests as discussed earlier are different. In our interviews we found that there was a concern that the four organizations have not had nor taken the opportunity to review their own institutional interests for participating and continuing in the consortium. This is potentially problematic.

5.4.2 Identity and Branding

To what extent should the Consortium develop an identity distinct from its individual members? Is it even sensible to do so? Whether the Consortium achieves a distinct identity depends in large measure on the value and practicality of such an idea and on the members' long-term interests and ability to relinquish some part of their own identity when working towards collective actions or products. For now, the identity and branding of the Red List are still intertwined with the organizations themselves.

Finding 25: The credibility and the authority given to the IUCN SSC Red List and its brand is a critical asset. All Consortium Members say it needs to be protected.

The issues of identity, branding and ownership are tied into the foundational product—the "IUCN Red List." The systems used to create the Red List are seen as authoritative and credible. Our informants stressed that their individual organizations participate in the Consortium because of the credibility of the Red List. Consequently, the brand they need to protect is the "IUCN Red List." Members recognize that it is in their best interests to safeguard this brand. Everyone in the Consortium believes that they benefit if the brand is maintained and the Red List Programme improves.

The SSC¹⁸ is charged with the task of protecting the technical quality of the Red List brand, but it has delegated this responsibility to the RLP Committee. The Programme Committee is a technical body, which provides technical oversight of the Red List. In contrast, the Consortium is a group of organizations that have agreed to join together in support to the development of the Red List Programme. The interest of the Consortium is institutional and there is consequently a certain pressure and tension between it and the RLP Committee.

The Consortium's identity needs to be tied to two principles:

- Its support to ensure the authority and credibility of the IUCN Red List.
- Its support to the development of the Red List in such a way that it retains its authority and credibility.

Finding 26: The Consortium Agreement section on branding along with the draft branding policy might compromise the credibility attached to the IUCN Red List.

The Agreement contains a specific clause relating to acknowledgements and logos. It stipulates that: "... the parties agree that a special branding of the Red List Programme will be developed, in which each Party will be recognized. This branding will be developed and agreed by the Red List Programme Committee, and will appear on all Red List Programme publications..."

The Consortium reaffirmed the importance of a distinct branding logo in a number of meetings. A branding policy was developed following partners' discussions in August 2004. This specifies that the branding must allow equal credit and recognition of each member organization's contributions in order to avoid any misrepresentation of the Red List. The current logo identifies "The Red List Consortium" along with the logos of the individual members. This kind of arrangement is quite common and places emphasis on the contributing organizations and not the Consortium.

However, there is possible confusion with regard to the branding policy's aims. One of the three aims calls for the Consortium to help "build the reputation, brand and name of the IUCN Red List as a source of credible biodiversity information."

The aim of strengthening the IUCN Red List brand seems to contradict the policy of giving all partners equal recognition by placing their logos alongside the Consortium logo. It is not clear how the Red List remains a specific IUCN product when each partner is recognized for its individual contribution. An example of this confusion is the GSA, which was undertaken by the SSC in 1996 and 2000, before the Agreement was signed and is thus clearly a product of IUCN. Yet it now carries the logo of the Consortium. Although the Agreement states that the brand "will be developed and agreed by the Red List Programme Committee," it appears that the issue has been discussed by the Consortium itself.

Without presupposing which direction the branding issue should take, we believe it reflects questions about the focus of the Consortium: Is it a resource-generating arm of the Red List Programme? Should it produce products, and if so, what types of products? How should it relate to the RLP Committee?

Finding 27: There is ambiguity among partners with regards to the recognition of contribution as well as ownership of the Red List products.

What is a Consortium product? The policy on branding identifies the current products as the 2004 Global Species Assessment, the Red List websites, brochures, posters, exhibition displays, compact discs and other Consortium-supported publications.

¹⁸ SSC strategy calls for the expansion of the Red List. The expansion is limited by the amount of resources it can raise. Since IUCN has limited the core funds in support of the Red List this has led to SSC seeking alternative means to meet its objectives. The Consortium is seen as an innovative way SSC can increase the resources needed for the Red List expansion.

According to the Agreement, IUCN SSC is the custodian of the Red List and “holds the rights and responsibilities associated with it.” At this stage, IUCN is still the rightful owner of the Red List and the principal decision-maker with regard to its use. Yet, the development of the enhanced Red List products would not be possible without the engagement of various partners. How can IUCN recognize these contributions and at the same time maintain the integrity of the brand? This issue is far from being resolved.

Two releases help illustrate the issue. The publication of important assessments and products like the *Threatened Birds of the World* and the upcoming Global Amphibian Assessment (GAA) has raised ownership and branding questions. For example, *Threatened Birds of the World* is clearly BirdLife’s own effort. It compiled the data, performed the analysis and published the book. The Consortium’s added value for BirdLife is that it is part of a “credible comprehensive data system” that covers more than birds. But does that mean IUCN SSC be recognized in any way? What is appropriate?

On the other hand, the GAA has primarily involved work by CI and IUCN and, to a much lesser extent, NatureServe. Is it thus a consortium product? Is it a RLP product? Who should be recognized and for what?

Part of the answer to these questions emerges from the clarification of roles and functions of the various groups. Thus a policy on branding and recognition should include the following components:

- Recognition of authorship
- Recognition of the specific data providers (specialist groups) if they can be individually identified
- Recognition of the important role the Red List Committee and SSC play in maintaining standards
- Recognition of the role of the Consortium (rather than the individual institutions) in its role with respect to resourcing the Red List Programme

These are important institutional issues that need to be dealt with through a policy and process that can discuss individual cases. While recognizing that the draft branding policy is a first draft, we do not believe it has been adequately vetted or thought out. This needs urgent attention. There also needs to be a forum through which branding issues can be raised and adjudicated. Similarly, there needs to be serious consideration given to “the definition of a Consortium product.” It is confusing in the Agreement and it is confusing in operation.

5.4.3 Sustainability of the Consortium

One question that must be answered is whether the RLP’s current resource shortfall is a short or long-term problem? If it is a short-term issue, then it is not necessary for the Consortium to continue. However, if it is a long-term issue, then the sustainability of the Consortium, or some kind of support mechanism for the RLP, is necessary.

Finding 28: As with other strategic issues faced by the Consortium, its sustainability has not been addressed.

The RLP Committee is a delegated body of the IUCN SSC made up of volunteers. It links to the strategy of the IUCN SSC and is funded as a component of the SSC through IUCN core funds. Thus, its sustainability is linked to the SSC strategy, Programme and IUCN resources.

Throughout this report we have argued that the Consortium has operated as an ad hoc group. The sustainability of the Consortium will in part depend on its ability to develop a clearer sense of itself. In the short term, the makeshift arrangements can continue as long as individuals are willing to continue and are not required to put in too much effort. However, this is not sustainable for any length of time.

Decisions need to be made about the Consortium’s functions, structure and operations if it is to sustain itself and raise resources for the RLP. This would require more than programmatic resources—it requires managerial resources. Who will support this? Conversations with IUCN

indicate that it plans to budget no additional managerial or operational resources for the Consortium. The same is true for the other members. Thus in the short term, it appears that existing pattern will continue unless some strategic decisions are made.

An alternative scenario is to set the Consortium up solely for the purpose of finding a significant donor to fund the development of the RLP over the medium term. In such a case, the Consortium would continue until funding is secured and then disband.

From our perspective, the sustainability of the Consortium is linked to the purpose of the Consortium—long term or short term.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The purpose of this review was to assess the performance of the partnership. Specifically, this study explored three aspects of the Consortium:

- The extent to which the rationale for the Consortium is still valid.
- The benefits of the Consortium to the four Red List partners.
- The extent to which the organizational arrangements, management and governance of the Consortium are effective and still appropriate.

In general, most of our informants had a positive estimation of the Consortium. In particular, they indicated that, compared to previous experiences in the Biodiversity Conservation Information System and World Conservation Monitoring Centre, the Red List Consortium seemed to be working. However, we found that despite this generally positive opinion, significant issues exist with respect to the institutional arrangements that threaten the sustainability of the Consortium and even the Red List itself. This section summarizes our findings and provides recommendations to improve the working of the Consortium.

Does it make sense for the Consortium to continue? Our findings suggest that the *rationale* for the Consortium is still valid, for both the Consortium itself and the member institutions. At the Consortium level, our informants agreed that the Red List Programme will continue to need considerably more resources than IUCN can provide over the next 5 years.¹⁹ Members stressed their dependency on the credibility and authority of the IUCN Red List as a primary benefit of the Consortium. One member cited the enormity of the challenge and the need for significant resources—a need that only a consortium might meet. Another member stressed the benefits of participating in a group with other organizations. All were committed to expanding the Red List and saw the vision articulated in the Agreement as appropriate.

On a less positive note, the Consortium's original purpose was to “enhance the implementation of the Red List Programme,” and of its rationale to create synergy between the four signatories to generate additional resources. This, in most of our informants' eyes, has been a disappointment.

A number of issues emerged from the analysis of the data on institutional arrangements. On the positive side, most interviewees support the Consortium and the direction it had taken. However, this general satisfaction masks some difficulties with the institutional arrangements. We found that the Agreement needs clarification in some areas and, in other areas, new sections should be written.

For example, there has been confusion with respect to the role and function of the Consortium. Our review indicates that, while there are clear individual accountabilities to member organizations, there is not a clear institutional accountability. In other words, how does the Consortium hold itself

¹⁹ One interviewee asked why IUCN hasn't engaged in “big” fundraising for the Red List Programme. The interviewee suggested that foundations and organizations such as the GEF and the World Bank, should have been solicited for funds. We do not know whether or not IUCN has or has not done this. We do know that it appears that IUCN's strategy for raising resources for the Red List Programme is linked to this Consortium.

accountable for the things it says it will do. We make a number of recommendations with regard to the Agreement and Consortium governance below.

We found that, with respect to institutional management, the Consortium has taken an ad hoc approach to strategy, management and operations. Few resources have been put into its management. There has been no strategic leadership, particularly from IUCN. Moreover, our data suggests that there has been confusion with regard to the meetings of the Consortium and those of the RLP Committee. This confusion is carried over into the identity and branding of the Consortium products. While our conclusion relating to rationale indicates that it makes sense to continue the Consortium, we also conclude that important adjustments need to be made to improve its governance, management and long-term sustainability. It is in this context that we make the following recommendations for Consortium Members.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The Consortium should continue, but it needs modification.

In general, our informants support the continuation of the Consortium, as do we. There is no doubt that the Red List Programme needs to obtain a significant amount of funding in order to meet its ambitious programme. Interviews with IUCN officials indicate that the funds to support the RLP must be generated from the outside. Since Consortium Members are strong supporters of the RLP, it makes sense that they would help in creating resources to enhance the Consortium. However, a foundational principle of the Consortium is that IUCN is the custodian of the Red List brand and that the Red List Programme Committee is the operational group that oversees the Red List's integrity, credibility and authority. Our concern is that, because of the creeping overlap between the RLP Committee and the Consortium, as illustrated by the process used to brand the GSA, the role of the former as protector of the Red List will be eroded. In addition, the Consortium needs modification with respect to the institutional arrangements indicated below.

Recommendation 2: The purpose and function of the Consortium and the distinction between the Consortium and the RLP Committee should be more clearly articulated.

In reading the minutes of the SSC Executive (from 1997 onward), the RLP Committee and Consortium meetings, and carrying out over twenty interviews with key actors, our conclusion is that the RLP Committee is a technical and scientific committee dedicated to improving the quantity and quality of the Red List. It is the key instrument to ensure that IUCN remains the protector of the Red List's integrity. Thus, the Committee participants should act as individual experts who have the scientific and technical training to carry out this function, and not institutional representatives.

On the other hand, the Red List Consortium is made up of institutional representatives, dedicated to "establish a formal basis for cooperation to enhance the implementation of the Red List Programme." This is defined in Section 11 of the Agreement, and the Annexes contain examples of what a "formal basis for cooperation and enhancement" means. The Agreement identifies human and financial resources dedicated to support the Red List Programme. While we felt that this distinction is clear in theory, it appears that it is not in practice. Thus we recommend that the role and function of the Consortium Committee be clarified and approved by its Members, along the following areas:

- The Consortium Committee is made up of institutional representatives who have a mandate to engage their institution in resource development and fundraising for the RLP.
- The Consortium Committee primary function is to help increase the human, financial and technological resources needed to enhance the implementation of the Red List. Examples of this are provided out in Section 11 of the Agreement.
- In particular, the four member organizations need to make a special effort to find ways to work together to increase the resources available to the Red List Programme.

Recommendation 3: The Consortium Agreement needs to be clarified and updated.

The Red List Programme Agreement needs to be updated. While not all of these items need to be in the Agreement, it is important to clarify their meaning and include them as part of the framework by which the Consortium is governed.

Typical characteristics of a partnership agreement	Changes recommended
Clear vision and or goals of the agreement	No changes recommended
Clear statement of objectives and outcomes	We recommend that the Consortium should support the enhancement of the resources available to the Red List Programme to implement its objectives.
Clear expectations (roles and responsibilities) of the parties	We recommend that the Consortium clarify its expectations with respect to the provision of resources, fundraising and other activities. Once agreed to, there should be a review and reporting process.
The scope and identity of the partnership	We recommend that the Consortium clarify the scope of its activities. This should take the form of a specific TOR, which outlines the scope of work expected of the Consortium. It should answer the following questions: What is the function of the Consortium? How will it do work? What tasks is it allowed to engage in? For example, should it engage in fundraising? Should it undertake projects? Should it judge editorial content? How should it coordinate work with the RLP Committee?
Clear approach and process of implementing oversight	We recommend that the Consortium identify its accountability chain and the process it would use for oversight. For example, should there be a governing group and a management (operational) group (each having their own TORs)?
Clear model for a secretariat and engaging in work	We recommend that the Agreement clarify how work should get done. Does it support a secretariat? Will there be a rotating Chair? Is it an ad hoc group?
Capacities and funding arrangements	We recommend that there be some indication of the resources that ought to be made available to govern and manage the Consortium.
Clear process for dispute settlements and amending procedures	We recommend that there be an process for adjudicating disagreements between Consortium members.
Clear procedures for monitoring and evaluation	We recommend that the Consortium explicitly state the approach it wants to take for monitoring, reporting and evaluation.
Rules for leaving and expanding the group	Finally, we recommend that the Agreement include a process for both expanding and contracting the Consortium. Clearly, this would provide a way to enforce the commitments made by the institutions.

Recommendation 4: Senior institutional officials should be responsible for the Governance of the Consortium. This should be separate from the more managerial/operational body, which has guided the Consortium in the past.

The Consortium has evolved over the last few years, but it needs to evolve further. There needs to be a body that oversees the Agreement and the governance system and a separate body involved in management and operations of the work of the Consortium. In short, there needs to be a governance committee and a management committee. The policy body might schedule meetings every year or two with a mandate to oversee the Agreement and change it as required. It would review high-level strategic issues. The management committee would oversee the work of the Consortium-providing resources for the Red List Programme. It would operationalize the management model and develop a strategy and yearly work plan for the Consortium. Finally, it would be responsible to monitor the work being done and be responsible for informing each of the member organizations about the progress being made by the Consortium.

Recommendation 5: Institutional members need to be more explicit about the management model most appropriate for “Managing the Consortium.”

The institutional members will need to determine the type of Secretariat model that is most appropriate for the Consortium. We suggested four approaches and recommend the Consortium consider 2, 3 and 4.

- 1) The Ad Hoc Model: This is essentially the existing model, but we feel it has outlived its usefulness.
- 2) The Secretariat Model: This is when the Consortium has a paid staff engaging in the work of the Committee.
- 3) The Rotating Secretariat Model: This is when Consortium Members agree to rotate the secretariat function between the institutions.
- 4) A combination of 2 and 3

The recommended models require an understanding of both the technical as well as the managerial and operational requirements of the Consortium and the RLP. Our review suggests that the managerial and operational aspects of the RL and the Consortium have not been adequately analyzed. Costs associated with adding additional work to the RLP Secretariat need to be studied and included in the funds raised by the Consortium.

Recommendation 6: IUCN should clarify the relationship between the SIS and the Consortium.

SIS is a substantial project. It has been in various stages of evolution within IUCN for the past decade or so. The Agreement states that the RLP Committee is responsible for overseeing the SIS’s development, and consequently the Consortium is responsible for its fundraising. This adds a level of complexity to both the RLP and the Consortium that has not been adequately considered. We recommend that IUCN clarify the role of the SIS in relation to both the RLP and the Consortium.

Recommendation 7: The branding policy of Consortium products along with the overall communication strategy needs to be developed in light of the role and function of the Consortium.

The Agreement states that all Red List products will be recognized “as in the form of an agreed acknowledgement listing of all parties.” What does this mean? The branding policy is in draft stage and is just coming to grips with some exceedingly touchy institutional issues. Yet we are unsure whether IUCN has fully reviewed the implications of the policy and its operation. If the function of the Consortium is to raise resources especially through fundraising, then it might be acknowledged in a less conspicuous place in publications—like on the inside cover with an acknowledgement of its resources.

The GSA exemplified our concern with the branding issue. This is a flagship IUCN Red List Product, but the new GSA will bear the new Consortium logo on its front cover, indicating that it is a joint publication. Is it? Does this type of branding protect the credibility of the IUCN Red List brand? We are not sure nor have we gotten the assurance that a comprehensive consultative review was done with the Consortium, the Red List Programme Committee (as required by the Agreement) and institutional signatories.

Our recommendation is that the product branding issue receives high-level consultation and deliberation. Furthermore, we recommend that the Consortium’s branding policy be linked to an equally important communication strategy. Communication strategies typically outline the ways that communications will be used to transmit key messages to stakeholders. They are enabling tools for raising funds.

Appendix I Terms of Reference

Review of the Implementation of the Red List Programme Agreement

Background and Rationale for the Review

The Red List Programme Agreement was signed in 2002 by four partner organisations:

- IUCN Secretariat and Species Survival Commission (based in Gland)
- NatureServe (based in Washington D.C.)
- BirdLife International (based in Cambridge)
- Conservation International – Centre for Applied Biodiversity Science (based in Washington D.C.)

This agreement gave birth to the Red List Consortium. At the start-up of the Consortium, the Ocean Conservancy was also involved but decided to drop out.

Since its inception, the Consortium has produced and published the *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*TM on an annual basis and communicated the results globally and regionally. The Red List products have been widely acclaimed and the demand for the products and services has grown substantially, thus placing even more pressure on the partnership to perform well and deliver more in the future. The Consortium is currently preparing the 2004 Red List and a publication (the Global Species Assessment).

An evaluation of the Red List Consortium is timely in that there has never been a review of its effectiveness to identify ways of strengthening the Consortium in the future. In addition, with the current changes in the management and leadership of SSC (including the Red List Committee) an external review will provide the new leadership with a set of recommendations to guide future development and implementation of the Consortium. Current factors that support the need for an external evaluation include—the arrival of a new Chair of the Red List Committee; the arrival of a new Chair of the Species Survival Commission; a need for improvement in managing the partnership from a governance perspective; a feeling of unequal contribution among the partners; and the need to report on the performance of the Consortium to the Bangkok World Conservation Congress in November, 2004.

Purpose and Objectives of the Review

The overall purpose of the Review is to review the performance of the partnership since its inception. The specific objectives of the Review are:

- 1) To assess the extent to which the rationale for the Consortium is still valid.
- 2) To assess the extent to which the organizational arrangements, management and governance of the Consortium are effective and still appropriate.
- 3) To assess the benefits of the Consortium to the four Red List partners.
- 4) To document the lessons from the first years of experience with the Consortium.
- 5) To make recommendations related to the above issues for the future development, management and governance of the Red List Consortium.
- 6) To develop and test an approach and methodology for the evaluation of partnerships that can be used in future IUCN reviews of other partnership arrangements.

Audience for the Review

The Review has been commissioned by the IUCN Director - Global Programme, and is managed by the M&E Unit.

The audience for the Review is the senior management of the four partner organisations of the current Red List Partnership: IUCN (Secretariat and SSC), NatureServe, BirdLife International, Centre for Applied Biodiversity Science – Conservation International.

Performance areas, issues and questions

A detailed Evaluation Matrix will be developed as a first step in the Review, outlining the main performance areas, questions and sub questions that will be covered in the Evaluation. A preliminary list of performance areas and issues to be explored include the following:

- The rationale, mandate, purpose of the Consortium
- The effectiveness of organisational arrangements and structure of the Consortium, including roles and responsibilities of all the partners, contribution of partners (human, financial, intellectual, products)
- The effectiveness of management, leadership of the Consortium (horizontal management, nature of the relationship of each partner to the Consortium), including coordination and communication
- Benefits of the Consortium to partners, expectations, value added
- Synergies created by the Consortium, catalytic effects
- Governance, accountability and oversight of the Consortium
- Responsiveness of the Consortium and its individual partners
- Sustainability of the Consortium
- Lessons, factors of success and limiting factors
- Alternatives models for partnerships

Detailed questions for each of these areas/issues will be developed in the Evaluation matrix.

Since this Consortium evaluation is a new focus for evaluation in IUCN, the aspects that the evaluation does not cover should be noted. This evaluation is not an evaluation of:

- the quality of the Red List (whether it is good, bad, adequate, etc.)
- the impact of the Red List (whether it is used, making a difference, etc.)
- the various products developed by the Red List Partners
- the four organizations involved in the partnership

Methodology

Data collection will include the following:

- Interviews: most of the data will be collected through interviews, either in person, by telephone or by group discussion. Questionnaires do not make sense in this context given the nature of the questions and the population size. Annex 1 contains a preliminary list of Key Informant interviewees.
- Visits: visits will be carried out to partner organizations in Washington D.C., Cambridge UK and Gland Switzerland.

- Documents will be reviewed including, but not limited to:
 - The Red List Programme Agreement;
 - The Red List Programme, work plan and organizational structure;
 - Minutes of the Red List Programme Committee meetings;
 - Documents produced by the Partnership;
 - Literature on other evaluations of partnerships and effective organizational arrangements for partnerships.

Timeframe for the Review

- Terms of Reference drafted and circulated by mid July.
- Evaluation matrix and work plan submitted by late July.
- Data collection mid August to mid September.
- Draft final report: October 1
- Feedback from IUCN on Draft report: October 15
- Final report: November 1, 2004
- The evaluation will be completed in time to report the findings and recommendations to the SSC Executive Committee meeting at the Bangkok World Conservation Congress, November, 2004.

Budget for the Review

The costs of the evaluation are being covered by the IUCN Global Programme and M&E Initiative, including travel, professional fees and expenses.

Annex 1: Preliminary List of Key Informants Internal to the Red List Consortium

(As the evaluation matrix is developed with the appropriate questions for internal and external audiences, additional data sources will be identified. The following list should therefore be regarded as preliminary):

- Achim Steiner (DG, IUCN)
- Michael Rands (DG, BirdLife International)
- Mark Schaefer (CEO, NatureServe)
- Russell Mittermeier (President, Conservation International)
- Gustavo Fonseca (Director, Centre for Applied Biodiversity Science and Conservation International)
- Roger Rufe (President and CEO, The Ocean Conservancy)
- Representatives of the Red List Programme Committee
- Representatives from the Species Survival Commission
- IUCN Secretariat for the Red List Programme
- IDRC, UNDP, OED, UNICEF and other agency evaluation units with experience in approaches, criteria and methodologies for evaluating partnerships.

Appendix II Stakeholders Consulted

Organization	Unit	Name
NatureServe		Mark Schaefer Bruce Stein Larry Sugarbaker
Conservation International Center for Applied Biodiversity Science & Conservation International		Gustavo Fonseca Tom Brooks Mike Hoffman Anna Rodriguez Jorgen Thomsen
Ocean Conservancy		Roger Rufe
Birdlife International		Alison Stattersfield Stuart Butchart Leon Bunnun
IUCN Secretariat	Senior Secretariat staff	Bill Jackson Achim Steiner Jeff McNeely Sue Mainka Steve Edwards Zenda Ofir (consultant)
	Species Programme staff	Jean-Christophe Vié Wendy Strahm Anna Knee Mariano Gimenez-Dixon Simon Stuart (CI/IUCN Biod Unit) Janice Long (CI/IUCN Biod Unit) Neil Cox (CI/IUCN Biod Unit) Craig Hilton Taylor (Red List Programme)
IUCN SSC	Chair	David Brackett
	Incoming candidate Chair	Holly Dublin
	Red List Programme Committee	Georgina Mace Jonathan Baillie Resit Akcakaya Amie Brautigam Mike Maunder

Appendix III Selected Documents Reviewed

Documents Reviewed
Minutes of the Red List Programme Committee Meetings (March 2001, November 2001, May 2002, December 2002, May 2003, November 2003)
Minutes of the Partners meetings (March 2001, May 2002, May 2003, May 2004)
“The Red List Programme Agreement”, signed in July 2002
Species Survival Commission (SSC), “Strategic Plan 2001-2010”, October 2000.
Species Survival Commission (SSC), “Strategic Plan 2001-2010, 2005-2008 Component Programme Plan”, 2004
Birdlife International, “How Birdlife works; Operational Procedures of Birdlife International”, November 2003.
Ekos Research Associates, “Lessons learned on Partnerships”, October 1998
OED Working Paper Series No.6, Simon Maxwell & Tim Conway, “Perspective on Partnership”, 2000.
Integrated Care Network, “Criteria for evaluating partnerships”, 2002
National network for Collaboration Framework, “Collaboration framework- Addressing Community Capacity”, 1995
Connie Coley Loden, “Strategic Partnering, Partnering for change”, 2002.
IBM Centre for the Business of Government, “Collaboration, Using Networks and Partnerships”, 2004
World Bank Series on Evaluation and Development Volume 6, “Evaluation & Development, the Partnership dimension”, 2004
Ellinger, A. E., Keller, S. B., & Ellinger, A. D. (2000). “Developing Interdepartmental Integration: An Evaluation of Three Strategic Approaches for Performance Improvement.” <i>Performance Improvement Quarterly</i> , 13(3), 41–59.
Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). “The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action.” Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.
Shah, J., & Singh, N. (2001). “Benchmarking Internal Supply-Chain Performance: Development of a Framework.” <i>Journal of Supply Chain Management</i> , 37(1), 37–47.

Appendix IV Interview Protocols

Informants from NatureServe, Birdlife, Conservation International & SSC

Introduction

- Please describe your role within your organization; and within the Red List Consortium.

Rationale

- Explain the evolution of your involvement in the Consortium.
- In your opinion, are the original principles of the Red List Consortium still relevant? Do partners share the same consortium expectations and principles? Explain.
- Are the principles of the consortium relevant to the mandate of your organization?
- What are your present expectations of the Consortium?

Institutional Arrangements

- How would you characterize the Governance and management of the Consortium?
 - Is there a governance structure adequately balanced among Consortium members? Does it provide adequate oversight? Does it adequately provide direction to the Consortium?
- How would you characterize the management of the Consortium?
 - Is there a strategy that guides the Consortia? (other than the Agreement)
 - Does the management of the Consortium adequately operationalize the Agreement?
 - Is the planning process useful and efficient?
 - Are the roles and responsibilities of each partner clear?
 - Are the work plans developed and activities monitored adequately to reach the Programme's mandate? Is the planning and monitoring allowing the delivery of the Red List outputs in a timely fashion?
 - Is the infrastructure available adequate?
 - Do you consider the financial systems to be adequate?
 - In your opinion, are the Secretariat's communications and coordination systems allowing the Consortium to function adequately?
 - Are the financial systems well managed?
- How would you describe your organization's commitment to the terms of the Agreement? (financial, operational) Do you consider that other partners are fulfilling expectations? What changes would you make to the Agreement?

Transparency, Identity & Trust

- To what extent are the partners driven by a common long-term vision?
- Do you have access to adequate and sufficient information on the activities of the Consortium? Are the interests of each partner clearly communicated to others?
- Do you consider that the Consortium has developed a positive identity distinct from partners? And vice versa?
- Has the level of trust among the partners increased over the life of the Consortium? Are there opportunities to foster trust?
- Does the Consortium have an identity unto itself? Should it have? Can it or should it have its own Brand?
- Are products and services of the Consortium clearly identified?

Benefits

- What are the main benefits that the Consortium brings to your organization?
- Do you benefit from potential synergy that arise from your collaboration with partners? What are the Consortium synergies?
- Do you benefit from learning opportunities that emerge from sharing information with partners?
- Are the consortium spawning resources to your organization?

Sustainability

- To what extent has the Consortium secured an adequate source of funding? Is it diversified?
- To what extent are the partners driven by a common long-term vision?

Other Issues

Appendix V Evaluation Matrix

Issues	Questions	Sources of Data	Data Collection Methodology
Rationale for the consortium	Has the establishment of a consortium supported the expansion (financial, HR, Knowledge) and the development of the Red List Programme?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners Other partners Donors	Interviews Document review
	Are the original aims and principles of the Consortium still relevant? Is there a common vision for all the organizations of what the Consortium can and should be?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews
	Are IUCN, Nature Serve, Birdlife International and Conservation International the appropriate organizations to support the development of the Red List Programme? Should other organizations be part of the Consortium? Is the mix right?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners Other partners Donors	Interviews
	Is the rationale of the Consortium relevant to each partner organization's mandate & programme? – IUCN – Nature Serve – Birdlife International – Conservation International	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews Document Review
Appropriateness of Organizational Arrangements	Is there an appropriate strategy for the Consortium?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews Document Review
	Are the roles and responsibilities of each partner organization appropriate? (Is there a Consortium champion?)	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners Other partners	Interviews
	To what extent are partner organizations fulfilling governance and operational expectations? Do partners have capacity to meet expectations?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews Document review
	Are the Secretariat communications and coordination mechanisms perceived as adequate for working groups? Governors? Stakeholders?	Experts	Interviews Document Review
	Are operational work planning, monitoring and reporting adequate to meet expectations? Does operational management allow output delivery in a timely fashion? (Are the outputs owned collectively? by a single partner?)	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews Document Review
	Are the consortium financial systems adequate?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners Donors	Interviews Document Review
	Is there adequate infrastructure available to support the consortium?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews Document Review

Review of the Red List Programme Agreement

Issues	Questions	Sources of Data	Data Collection Methodology
Appropriateness of Organizational Arrangements (cont'd)	Is there a governance structure, which provides appropriate oversight to the Consortium?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews
Transparency	Is adequate consortium information available to the expert partner organizations? Do governors have adequate information for their decision-making roles? Alternatively, are each partner's interests, as related to the mission of the Consortium, clearly defined and communicated to others?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews
Identity	Has the Consortium developed a positive identity distinct from the partners? Are the partners identity likewise, separate and distinct from the consortium? Are partners committed to respect the independence of each partner?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners Other partners	Interviews
Trust	Has the level of trust among the partners increased over the life of the Consortium? Are there opportunities and processes, which enables partners to build trust?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews Document review
Sustainability	To what extent are the different partner organizations driven by a long-term vision and perspective?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews Document review
	To what extent has the Consortium secured an adequate source of funding? Is it diversified?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners Donors	Interviews Document review
Benefits to partners	What are the main 1) programme & 2) organizational benefits for each partner organization?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews
	What are the main benefits to the environmental movement?	IUCN Secretariat Donors	Interviews
	Do the partners understand and contribute to the value added premise of the consortium? Do they recognize and act upon the synergy that is created by the organizations collaborating for a specific function?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews
	Do members support and benefit from the learning opportunities created by different organizations sharing and working together for a common cause?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews
	Is the Consortium spawning resources to partner organizations? If not, is it diverting resources away from their core programmes?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners	Interviews

Appendix VI List of Findings

- Finding 1: The Red List Programme Committee continues to need financial and technical support to meet the implementation schedule set down in its 2000 strategic plan and updated in 2004. The rationale remains relevant.
- Finding 2: The common principles, which underline the Red List Agreement, remain relevant today.
- Finding 3: While all partners agree to the Red List Programme vision, goal and objectives, some have diverging expectations with regards to the use of the Red List.
- Finding 4: Being a Consortium member continues to meet the strategic interests of each of the four organizations. The Consortium benefits all organizations.
- Finding 5: Most partners have worked towards fulfilling their operational and financial commitments. However, contributions are not documented nor are they formally monitored.
- Finding 6: The Red List Programme Committee is in the process of producing significantly better products than the past. The Agreement has helped.
- Finding 7: The Red List Programme Agreement forms the main governance framework within which the Consortium operates. This Agreement has worked reasonably well over the last 4 years but needs significant updating.
- Finding 8: The function and purpose of the Consortium are clearly stated in the Agreement, but certain ambiguities remain with respect to how it is interpreted and implemented.
- Finding 9: While the roles and responsibilities of the Red List Programme Committee are reasonably clear, this is not the case for the Consortium Members.
- Finding 10: While the Red List Programme Committee meetings were viewed as productive and open, the Consortium meetings were perceived to be more difficult.
- Finding 11: It is unclear who is responsible for providing Consortium leadership and for developing a consortium model that works.
- Finding 12: The governance system has been able to balance the existing asymmetrical relationships within the Consortium. However, this is and will continue to be a source of concern.
- Finding 13: There are no stated procedures for changing the Consortium Membership or for resolving Consortium disputes.
- Finding 14: While SIS is embedded in the Agreement there is only recent evidence that it has been coordinated by the Committee and supported by the consortium.
- Finding 15: The basic approach to the management and administration of the Consortium is a joint discussion of Consortium Members at their semi-annual meetings. This is inadequate.
- Finding 16: Strategic Leadership is not apparent in the Consortium's work. There is no strategy nor business plan to guide the work of the Consortium.
- Finding 17: Neither the Consortium nor the RLP Committee has adequately reviewed the human resource requirements for its management and operations.

- Finding 18: There is an overlap of activities between the Consortium and the RLP Committee. This is partly a consequence of the unclear roles and responsibilities identified in Finding 9.
- Finding 19: Operational work planning and reporting within the IUCN Red List Programme Secretariat has supported progress of the Red List Programme. However, this is not the case for the Consortium.
- Finding 20: There is no plan for developing potential new institutional relationships to enhance the implementation of the RLP Programme.
- Finding 21: Consortium processes like problem solving, decision-making, risk management, meeting skills, conflict resolution and communication are at very early stages of evolution.
- Finding 22: The Consortium has not adequately managed the horizontal issues arising in the communication function.
- Finding 23: All parties agree that the Red List Agreement has helped build trust among the four organizations. But significant work remains to be done.
- Finding 24: Partner organizations express a certain level of reticence to share data that will be analyzed and reviewed by other organizations. This has created concerns about transparency.
- Finding 25: The credibility and the authority given to the IUCN SSC Red List and its brand is a critical asset. All Consortium Members say it needs to be protected.
- Finding 26: The Consortium Agreement section on branding along with the draft branding policy might compromise the credibility attached to the IUCN Red List.
- Finding 27: There is ambiguity among partners with regards to the recognition of contribution as well as ownership of the Red List products.
- Finding 28: As with other strategic issues faced by the Consortium, its sustainability has not been addressed.

Appendix VII Key Programmes of Partner Organizations

BirdLife International

As described below, Birdlife International's five key programmatic areas are conservation science, action on the ground, advocating change, developing capacity and building awareness.

Birdlife International's mandate and key programmes	
Mandate	BirdLife's aims are to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prevent the extinction of any bird species - Maintain and where possible improve the conservation status of all bird species - Conserve and where appropriate improve and enlarge sites and habitats important for birds - Help, through birds, to conserve biodiversity and to improve the quality of people's lives - Integrate bird conservation into sustaining people's livelihoods.
Key programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conservation science - Action on the ground - Advocating change - Developing capacity - Building awareness

The Consortium's mission of scientific data collection is directly linked to Birdlife International's core science programme, which consists mainly of research, synthesis and the management of data on bird species, sites and habitats. Indeed, the assessment and measurement of biodiversity status—a key component of the Red List Programme—is one of Birdlife International's main areas of expertise. The Consortium's rationale is therefore extremely relevant to Birdlife International's Science programme, since it allows best practice sharing that can contribute to the development of Birdlife International's work.

Capacity building, another key programme at Birdlife International, can be seen as a motivation for its decision to join the Consortium. Birdlife International's objective to share its achievements and collaborate with organizations that can contribute to avian conservation may have been an important incentive.

However, the Consortium's mandate does not appear to be as closely linked to the other programmatic areas of Birdlife International, especially advocacy. The Agreement stipulates that the Red List Programme should make reliable information available to support the conservation activities of governments, NGOs and others. However, the agreement does not specify advocacy for policy change as Consortium objective. As the Red List Programme document states, "The IUCN Red Lists are widely recognized as ... apolitical global approach for evaluating the conservation status of plant and animal species." In this sense, Birdlife International's participation in the Red List Consortium contributes directly to its efforts to get the needs of birds and biodiversity on the public policy agenda.

Moreover, conservation actions on the ground and building awareness on conservation issues, which are key programmes at Birdlife International, do not correspond to the key objectives of the Consortium.

Conservation International

Conservation International (CI) aims to address urgent conservation issues through several strategies and programmes identified below.

Conservation International's mission and key programmes	
Mission	CI's mission is to conserve the Earth's living natural heritage, our global biodiversity, and to demonstrate that human societies are able to live harmoniously with nature.
Key programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research and Science through the Center for Applied Biodiversity Science (CABS) - Business and Environment through the Center for Environmental Leadership in Business - Protected Areas - Conservation Investments - Conservation enterprise - Policy and Economics - Ecotourism - Education and awareness - Population and environment - Clim change ate

As with Birdlife International, the Consortium's rationale appears highly relevant to CI's research & science programme. CI aims to strengthen research capabilities through the Center for Applied Biodiversity Science (CABS), in order to accurately identify and quickly respond to emerging biological diversity threats. CI's participation in the expansion of the Red List Programme not only allows it to access scientific data which can be useful to its research initiatives, but it also improves more specific areas of its work. This is particularly the case with the research conducted by CABS in Amphibian and Reptile conservation. CABS seeks research and conservation responses to threats facing amphibians and reptiles, which is closely related to the mission of the Red List.

Some of CI's other programming areas, such as Business and Environment, Protected Areas, Conservation Investments, Ecotourism and Awareness raising are not directly linked to the rationale of the Consortium. Many of CI's programmes have to do with creating common initiatives with various stakeholders for capacity building, funding conservation initiatives or leading advocacy work on conservation issues. Joint efforts to collect data on endangered species do not necessarily feed into these initiatives or into the larger mandate of Conservation International.

NatureServe

NatureServe's mandate is primarily concerned with data collection and management and product development.

NatureServe mission and key programmes	
Mission	NatureServe is dedicated to providing the scientific information and tools needed to help guide effective conservation action.
Key activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scientific standards - Database development - Database management - Information dissemination - Product marketing and distribution

The rationale of the Consortium appears to be relevant to most of NatureServe's key activities. Best practices might emerge from the collective effort to enhance the Red List's biodiversity status to benefit NatureServe's scientific standards establishment, at-risk species development database, and database management system design.

IUCN

IUCN's mission and key results area	
Mission	Influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.
Six Key Results Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understanding biodiversity - Social equity - Conservation Incentives - International Agreements, Processes, Institutions for Conservation - Ecosystem and sustainable livelihoods factors - Programme delivery

The rationale of the Consortium is very relevant to the IUCN since it directly relates to the organization's primary result area—understanding biodiversity. Indeed, the data collection endeavor undertaken by members of the Consortium directly contributes to the generation and dissemination of knowledge about natural systems and the species that inhabit them. In turn, enhanced biodiversity knowledge builds into other key areas such as the promotion of efficient environmental governance and sustainable management of ecosystems.

In all cases, the mandates and programmes of the member organizations rely on high-quality and trustworthy data. The Red List Programme's goals and objectives imply that this is occurring. However, while the Consortium provides a base for further improvement, this alone may not be sufficient.

Appendix VIII The Red List Programme Agreement