

Species Programme Management Response

To the PriceWaterhouseCoopers Review of the
Species Programme
(March 2006)



Introduction

This organizational review of the IUCN Species Programme, commissioned by the Director Global Programme and the Head of the Species Programme aimed to provide analysis, findings and recommendations to support an organizational re-structuring. The IUCN Species Programme welcomes the review, and largely agrees with its recommendations.

The recommendations under Section A were of limited value in addressing key issues faced by the Species Programme. The numbered recommendations from the Review report, starting in Section B, address the challenges with more clarity and therefore more detailed responses and actions are provided in Sections B through D.

Management recognizes that the main challenge restricting IUCN from achieving a more integrated programme of work on Species are unclear roles and responsibilities and weak strategic direction on species from IUCN as an institution (as opposed to direction from SSC). Senior Management and the Commission Chair are aware of this problem and are taking steps to address it, including the SSC's strategic planning exercise and efforts to develop clear draft roles and responsibilities by the Secretariat.

A management response has been provided with two major inputs: a Task Force, comprising staff from GPT, CFDR and HMRG from all three Directorates of Programme, Strategies and Operations, as well as the Species Programme Head and Deputy Head was convened as a limited term body to assist the Head in responding to this review, and in implementing a change management process. In addition staff of the Species Programme at their three separate locations (IUCN HQ, Cambridge UK and Washington DC) each developed a response which was then, through a consultative process, developed into the one response.

We will report on the implementation of this response and action plan at the end of 2006 and then again at mid-year in 2007. Reporting after that time will be dependent on the status of implementation of the actions.

Acronyms

CFDR	Conservation Finance and Donor Relations
CI	Conservation International
DG	Director General
FTE	Full-time equivalent
GPT	Global Programme Team
HR	Human Resources
HRMG	Human Resources Management Group
PBIA	Policy, Biodiversity and International Agreements Unit
PWC	PriceWaterhouseCoopers
RL	Red List of Threatened Species
RLDB	Red List database
SIS	Species Information Service
SP	Species Programme
SSC	Species Survival Commission
SSS	Senior Species Scientist
TORs	Terms of Reference
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Center

Species Programme Review – Management Response to Recommendations

A. Mandate/Objectives of the Species Programme¹

Recommendation	Management response	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
A.1 The Species Programme of the IUCN should refine the definition of its objectives and the ensuing priority activities in which it will engage. It should then align its organizational model to support the most effective achievement of its objectives and to allow for the best allocation of the roles and responsibilities associated with its activities.	<p>Disagree. The objectives of the SP and the SSC in the 2005-2008 Quadrennial Programme are the same (as they should be). They need no further refinement.</p> <p>Priority activities up until the next Congress were addressed at the May 2006 SSC Steering Committee meeting and will be considered by the SP with feasible activities to be added.</p>	The organizational model (see below) should be aligned to maximise the chances of achieving the objectives.	By Autumn	See specific recommendations
A.2 IUCN senior management should clarify the mandate of the Species Programme by establishing an official and specific set of objectives to reflect what is expected of this part of the organization, specifically in relation to the challenge of serving the triple helix of members, regions and commissions. The objectives thus obtained should be clearly communicated to staff, SSC members and the wider IUCN membership, as should the governance arrangements monitoring SP's performance in achieving those objectives.	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>However, SP will clearly identify its outcomes and activities under KRA 6 (Programme Delivery) that distinguish its work from that of SSC. In the current Intersessional Period, this will be reflected in the Annual workplan, beyond that this will be reflected in the new Intersessional Plan.</p> <p>Implementation of this response and action plan will require the assistance of the Directorates of Programme, Strategies and Operations.</p> <p>However, sign-off on the rules of engagement between the Commission Chair and Species Programme will be required of the Commission Chair and the Director General.</p> <p>Senior Management should decide what to do with the Oracle donation (which was to IUCN – including support for SIS)</p>	<p>The SP works with the SSC to achieve the goals and objectives outlined in the mandate. The SP already has “an official and specific set of objectives” in the Congress-approved 2005-2008 Quadrennial Programme.</p> <p>SP and SSC are working toward common objectives, however the SP has objectives that are different from those of SSC in relation to supporting management, working with regions, fundraising, administration, supporting Congress and other key IUCN events, all within the “one programme.”</p> <p>(Use of words like mandate and objective are confusing; triple helix refers to the Members, Commissions and Secretariat, not to the Members, Commissions and Regions).</p>	Starting in the 2007 annual workplan and continuing in the intersessional planning process.	As part of Intersessional Programme planning.

¹ We have added a numbering system for ease of tracking. The Sections A, B, C and D correspond to the sections in the review report. Numbers in brackets refer to the original numbering system in the review report. Note that numbering was not used in Section A.

Recommendation	Management response	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>A.3 The objectives thus obtained and agreed upon should then clearly cascade into the individual Terms of Reference of each job posting, in a specific, measurable, and achievable form. This should be done irrespective of the person currently holding that position, and should be linked to realistic timeframes.</p>	<p>Agree, individual Terms of Reference will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Flowing from the above, the TORs of each job will be revised (some only minimally) to reflect what people will do in the new structure.</p>	<p>This will undertake this action with engagement of and assistance from HRMG.</p> <p>This will be a consultative process with an appropriate phasing in /out of new/ existing responsibilities.</p>	<p>Within six months after sign off of management response by senior management.</p>	<p>See specific recommendations</p>
<p>A.4 Finally, as part of gaining clarity on the role of SP, clear rules of engagement for interaction between the SSC Chair and the Programme (management and staff) need to be defined and communicated to all the parties concerned.</p>	<p>Agree, draft roles and responsibilities or rules of engagement will be developed. The Focal Point of Focal Points (currently Head of Programme on Protected Areas) with GPT will convene a meeting of the Focal Points to draft roles and responsibilities/rules of engagement by end of year.</p> <p>The draft roles and responsibilities/rules of engagement will be reviewed by all Commission Chairs, adjusted accordingly and submitted for sign-off by the Commission Chairs and Director General.</p>	<p>We note that setting rules of engagement is primarily the DG's responsibility and there is some guidance in the Statutes.</p> <p>Current rules i.e. Statutes 81 and 84, Sonloup accord etc. are relevant.</p> <p>Current issues and level of support (cost) have been documented.</p> <p>The will ensure that the role of the Secretariat focal point should be more clearly defined.</p> <p>The role of the Chair's Assistant also will also be clearly defined in relation to the above and likewise for any additional staff to be recruited by the SSC Chair.</p>	<p>End of year for draft, first quarter of 2007 for consultation and sign-off.</p>	

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>A.5 In moving towards the vision of redefining conservation work in terms of systems and cycles, <i>it essential that SP should engage more systematically and constructively with other IUCN programmes and with the regional offices.</i></p> <p>This objective could be achieved by identifying common programme objectives or areas where specific programme objectives are mutually dependent and supportive. At the early stages of designing workplans and elaborating budgets, these commonalities and interdependencies must be considered in order to ensure that interaction between SP and other programmes is structurally ensured.</p> <p>Although this requires significant effort at an early stage, we are convinced that SP will be able to realise economies of scale in return, and that teamwork and quality of outputs will be improved.</p> <p>Although we recognise that the technical nature of species work does not lend itself as well as that of some other thematic areas to an “empowerment” model based on regionalization and decentralization (as per IUCN’s declared strategic initiatives), SP would gain from a more collaborative and coordinated presence in the regional offices.</p> <p>It is easiest to achieve this recommendation on a case-by-case basis, depending on specific projects that can be carried out in cooperation with individual regional offices, rather than attempting to set in place an organization-wide initiative which would aim to install an SP focal point in all regional offices.</p>	<p>Agree, the Species Programme will commence a process of scoping interests from regions and global thematic programmes (on a selective basis), followed by development of joint concepts and projects.</p> <p>GPT will work with SP to help raise awareness, and explore approaches to improve collaboration with regional offices before the next programme.</p> <p>GPT will work with the Chair/Steering Committee to determine more effective and efficiency ways of supporting the SSC Network including financial and human resourcing.</p>	<p>There are a number of examples of successful collaboration and resources and interest permitting, SP is working hard to collaborate with other programmes, both regionally and global thematic programmes.</p> <p>However, much of the so-called global work done by the SP (working closely with the SSC) is already regional in focus.</p> <p>Our approach to collecting data – increasingly on utilisation / livelihoods we know is interesting to some regions. Rather than an ad hoc project by project approach there is scope to do something which plays to the core competencies of the programme of benefit to all regions.</p> <p>There is also a huge demand for national and regional red listing</p> <p>Using or expanding regional Species focal points should be considered</p> <p>Implementation of Action Plans may be a way to work with regions.</p> <p>Joint programme, particularly with regions will likely require different capacities, so SP will assess current and required capacities as joint programming is pursued.</p>	<p>As soon as feasible by mid 2007?</p> <p>May Council was used as an initial opportunity to scope out interest</p>	<p>One day to undertake a capacity analysis</p>

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>A.6 If the further recommendations offered at the end of this section are followed through, it will be simpler to arrive at a clear mapping of activities to objectives, linked to individual Terms of Reference and performance measures. This will also reflect the needs of the structural model that is adopted, with the right balance given to project and technical work on the one hand, and administrative and managerial duties on the other.</p>	<p>Refer to recommendations that follow</p>	<p>This recommendation is difficult to follow. We believe that this is instructing us to recheck the individual terms of reference against the needs of the reorganized organizational structure and vice-versa.</p>		

B. Organizational Model – Structural Adjustment (note: more specific recommendations in Sections C and D)

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
B.1 Adapt recommended model (see diagram)	Partially agree, we are working with HRMG to produce a suitable organizational model.			
B.2 In attempting to draw what we believe to be the best structure for SP, we have [recommended] created positions such as “Species Senior Scientist”, have grouped some activities under “Special Technical Projects”, have allocated scientific and managerial “Focal Point” roles and put forward the idea of a cross-cutting coordinating role for support staff	covered below			
B.3 Given that the suggested [recommended] “Focal Point” roles create an intermediate level of management within the Programme, the original role of Deputy Coordinator has been redefined in the proposed structure as part of this management tier	covered below			
B.4 We recommend that very clear terms-of-reference be drawn up for the proposed new positions, should they be adopted	covered below			
<p>B.5 Estimate capacity requirements are given in Full Time Equivalent posts (FTE). For the sake of continuity, the FTE figures given would include the current mix of staff on permanent contracts, employed interns, a consultant on retainer and a part-time extra-budgetary position (staff “on loan” from a donor)</p> <p>The calculation of the total number of FTE posts may not be exactly what was provisioned for in the current budget, which may mean phasing some of the positions in over the next 18 months if they are deemed to be appropriate</p>	covered below			

C. Organizational Model – Structural Adjustment: Detailed Recommendations

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>C.1 (1). Approve suggested structural adjustments</p> <p>To meet the dual challenge of managing the programme while continuing to deliver scientific analyses, we recommend a matrix structure, as presented on the preceding page. The feasibility and cost of implementing such an adjustment must be considered. Sponsorship for the changes must be obtained from IUCN Senior Management.</p>	<p>Agreed, we will develop a matrix structure to cover management issues in each main location as well as technical issues across the programme. We request that senior management fully comprehend and support the proposed changes.</p> <p>We will rename the Deputy Co-Coordinator Deputy Head; he will have a major role in supporting the Finance Assistant.</p> <p>The Head will be the Unit Manager in Gland.</p> <p>Role and TORs of the Species Senior Scientist will be clearly defined.</p> <p>We will create the post instead of Support Staff Coordinator, reporting to the Head to help coordinate the Support Staff in Gland, Cambridge and Washington.</p> <p>SSC Network Support officer(s) and Communications will report to the Head; the Finance Assistant will report to the Deputy Head.</p> <p>We will review and adjust TORs of all posts accordingly and clarify delegations of authority.</p>	<p>It will be necessary to recruit a new manager in Washington and manage risk from departure of the SSS.</p> <p>The term 'focal point' is unhelpful and should be avoided.</p> <p>Some network support is carried out by the HQ Support post (on line registration and more).</p>	<p>By end 2006 to refine/change TORs</p>	<p>Depends on scenario.</p> <p>Potential costs include: (a) New post in Washington and (b) Creation of one part time support post in Cambridge</p>

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Time Frame	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>C.2 (2). Create Task Force</p> <p>The re-allocation of responsibilities and tasks, revision of individual terms-of-reference and restructuring of certain positions, should be the object and focus of a task force comprising SP management and IUCN Human Resources specialists. This may involve potential further input from an external partner with specific expertise in organizational redesign.</p>	<p>Agreed. Task Force has met twice and had a major input into this response; it has been helpful to engage staff from outside the SP.</p> <p>It will meet once more in the autumn of 06 to review progress in implementation of response.</p>	<p>The Task Force will be a limited term body to assist the Head in responding to this review and implementing a change management process.</p> <p>Currently, the Task Force is comprised of Jane Smart, Jean-Christophe Vie, Jean-Yves Pirot, Christian Laufenberg, Lucy Deram-Rollason, Diego Ruiz and Alex Moiseev</p>	<p>Underway</p>	<p>No cost, except staff time to meet</p>
<p>C.3 (3). Consolidate overall management responsibility</p> <p>Strong leadership is a prerequisite for organizational performance, even more so during transformation. We recommend a clear dual leadership model which reflects the 2 dimensions of the matrix model, and would require the creation of a “Species Senior Scientist” role.</p>	<p>Disagree. A dual leadership model is a flawed idea. The “Species Senior Scientist” (SSS) would provide technical leadership only</p> <p>The SSS will play a technical role in relation to all the work; the Head and Deputy Head will share out the technical oversight as per the diagram recommended (Head = Focal Point A, Deputy Head = Focal Point B)</p> <p>In practice, the SSS will have to continue to manage the Washington operation for the time being, as no further funding is available. There is a need to maintain our close and important relationship between the CI and the SP.</p>	<p>Note this has been subsequently clarified with PWC as what was intended.</p> <p>Focal point has a different meaning in IUCN so we need an alternative word here.</p>	<p>During reorganization</p>	<p>New post in Washington</p>

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>C.4 (4). Create intermediate management level</p> <p>Managerial skills are not lacking. What must be decided and instituted is the middle-management layer of the suggested model, referred to as “Focal Points”. This must take both the scientific and organizational dimensions into account, including the need to delegate operational management of the 2 remote locations.</p>	<p>Agree: a senior management tier will be developed within the programme: The Head, Deputy Head, the SSS and the Red List Programme Officer will become that team. The RLP Officer is the senior manager in the UK. In the UK the senior manager will take on HR role too (as per former responsibilities of Head of Publications – already discussed with HR)</p> <p>These become (in addition to their technical roles) the operational line managers in the UK and DC (despite the remote location of SSS). This team will take on strategic responsibility for a range of other functions such as fundraising</p>	<p>Links with Rec. 6 – raising a position in Cambridge and would not be possible without a support staff (also links with changes in the Publications Unit, increasing burden; supports admin / signing authority for Publication Unit)</p> <p>Focal point is probably not the right word – will work with HRMG on this – perhaps “coordinator” instead?</p>	<p>By mid-year</p>	<p>May entail regrading one post in Cambridge at a higher level (Discuss with Diego who is familiar with grades in UK team)</p>
<p>C.5 (5). Create support staff coordinator role</p> <p>Redistributed support staff capacity (see below) will only be sustained by implementing a coordinator role which must be attributed to a respected and dedicated support staff member, reporting directly to the head of Programme. This role must be designed to ensure fair and adequate prioritization of administrative and support tasks.</p>	<p>Partially agree. Head of the SP needs an executive assistant who should coordinate support staff in Gland, Cambridge and Washington</p> <p>Support staff will report to their local Unit managers.</p>	<p>Support staff in different locations will need to interact with each other from time to time, with some overall co-ordination needed.</p>	<p>By autumn</p>	
<p>C.6 (6). Redistribute support staff capacity</p> <p>Better use of support staff capacity where it is most needed can be obtained by re-allocating responsibilities and tasks and restructuring certain support positions to properly reflect the geographical spread of SP activities (e.g. publications position in Gland, whereas the IUCN publications unit is in Cambridge). We recommend that there be a local support staff position in each of the 3 locations, coordinated out of Gland.</p>	<p>A support staff member will be employed from end August 2006 in the UK. The post should take on some HR and office management role; HR to advise and square against former responsibilities in UK based publications Unit, and clarify funding available.</p>	<p>HRMG to assist with creation of new post.</p>	<p>By-August 2006 with agreement of Senior Management</p>	

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>C.7 (7). Strengthen network support function</p> <p>The SP gives support to the wider network, which is the triple helix of members, regions and commissions, specifically the Species Survival Commission, in a number of areas. The functions which provide this support should be labeled as such, and this should include a dedicated communications role (“Network Support and Communications.”)</p>	<p>On the assumption that this recommendation is about support to the SSC network</p> <p>Network support to the SSC will be strengthened. There are currently two network support posts, both of which are vacant. These positions will be filled.</p> <p>The recommendation here (not spelt out) is supported: the current Communications job share should be split into 2: one part concentrating on external media and the other to be reoriented (0.4 FTE) toward network support (communications between the programme and SSC network), internal communications and knowledge management.</p> <p>Good links with Global Communications Dept should be further optimised.</p> <p>We will review the support to SSC provided by communications staff, including products such as <i>Species</i>, and give the staff a clear operating environment.</p> <p>We will clarify who has authority over production – and agree with the Chair. Delegation of authority needs to be defined and clear sign off lines.</p>	<p>With the WWF funding cut (CHF 150K per year from 2005) it will only be possible to employ one network support position in the first instance, and not even this until the end of 2006 because of the budget cuts.</p> <p>Securing project funds for network support is difficult. Ideally IUCN should provide an additional CHF 150K core funding</p> <p>Note: the admin support position in HQ provides network support e.g. on line registration, as well as contact information, and all technical and non technical; staff already provide a significant measure of support to the Commission.</p>	<p>Clarify by end-year roles and responsibilities for network support</p>	<p>Should be minimal;</p>

Recommendation	Management response	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>C. 8 (8). Strengthen innovative capacity</p> <p>In order to remain relevant and to maximize its contribution to the “paradigm shift” within the conservation movement, SP must continue to allocate resources to innovative projects in areas which have been identified as aligned with medium to long term strategy. The Species Information System is an existing example, but further examples such as Climate Change, Invasive Species and Indicators were also put forward and deserve full attention. We recommend the creation of a “Special Technical Projects” portfolio, and that this responsibility is allocated to one of the scientific “Focal Points”.</p>	<p>Agree: We will aim to mainstream species work into other parts of IUCN.</p> <p>SP will explore entry points for using RL Data collection / products (e.g. data on livelihoods and use) to support work of regions and other thematic programmes.</p> <p>SIS underpins everything and will stay under the management of the Head of the SP.</p> <p>Other technical projects as listed should come under the responsibility of the Deputy Head. Newly emerging ones will be assigned as appropriate</p>	<p>This will likely include, but not be limited to, links with the 3I-C Fund, Chief Scientist, leverage portfolios</p> <p>Space for ideas is important here - new thinking is needed and new ways of doing things</p> <p>Focal point is the wrong name for the technical oversight role provided by the Head and Deputy Head</p> <p>SSS has a role here too</p>	<p>Mid-2007</p> <p>Use of Red List data on trade and livelihoods is already underway</p>	
<p>C.9 (9). Strengthen financial management capacity</p> <p>A clear need exists for the SP to better manage its financial planning and reporting. This can be achieved in part by creating a middle-management “Financial Focal Point” role (see # 4 above), but this role must be supported by the dedicated finance assistant, who in turn has the necessary support from IUCN Global Operations. In some Not-for-Profit organizations, the finance assistance can be very effectively provided by a retiree with a finance administration background.</p>	<p>TORs and recruitment will henceforth ensure that both support staff and technical staff have “reasonable” financial acumen.</p> <p>The Finance Assistant (we do not recommend any re-grading) will be supported by the Deputy Head in his role as Finance Co-ordinator. This will be reviewed after an agreed time period.</p> <p>We will develop guidelines to optimise communications between HQ Finance dept and the SP.</p> <p>SP will work with GPT and Finance to rationalize systems.</p>	<p>Most programmes are capable of managing finances with a finance assistant or programme officer, provided there is reasonable guidance from the Head and reasonable financial acumen amongst the technical staff.</p> <p>Support staff should be able to offer some financial administrative support. This should be included in the TORs, and recruited for in the position in the UK.</p>	<p>By end year, reassessed by mid-2007</p>	<p>Possible regrading of Finance Assistant post in 2007</p>

D. Recommendations independent from the Organizational Model – Structural Adjustment

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>D.1 (10). Define fundraising strategy</p> <p>This recommendation includes both the clear allocation of overall responsibility for fundraising within the SP, as well as a strengthening of communications and coordination between Conservation Finance & Donor Relations and the SP. It also requires the registration of the Cambridge office to be undertaken as soon as possible, and refers to the training requirements identified elsewhere.</p>	<p>Agree: Will define a practical strategy that outlines (a) how SP, GPT and CFDR will coordinate fundraising efforts (b) how to package projects for different donors (c) how to budget to ensure that costs are covered (d) SP participation in wider project portfolio; (to include roles and responsibilities of SP, GPT, CFDR).</p> <p>A strengthening of communications and coordination between Conservation Finance & Donor Relations is currently being implemented.</p> <p>The registration of the Cambridge office as a legal entity in the United Kingdom is essential and will be undertaken as soon as possible.</p> <p>New management tier will take collective responsibility for fundraising.</p> <p>Fundraising objectives will be included in all relevant revised TORs.</p>	<p>Fundraising: SP needs to identify priorities – globally and regionally for fundraising and the different needs of Cambridge, Washington and Gland offices; needs assistance in packaging projects either on their own or as part of global fundraising efforts (with GPT) and a mechanism for joint fundraising with regions</p> <p>A more imaginative and strategic fundraising approach is needed going beyond the current model.</p> <p>Development of more partnerships around shared programmatic objectives will be part of a successful fundraising strategy as they develop.</p>	<p>By end-year</p>	<p>Staff time inputs from GPT, Finance and CFDR</p>

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>D.2 (11). Ensure continued access to technology</p> <p>As SP continues to enhance the technological underpinnings of the programme (Red List database, SIS), there must be stronger assurance that the required technology will continue to be available, either on offer by 3rd parties or internally to the IUCN. This requires a technology plan which identifies current and future needs, sources which can service those needs and potential funding to pay for them.</p>	<p>Agree, SP is coordinating with Director Global Operations, with the engagement of senior management and others in IUCN as appropriate, to define a plan for the development of SIS versions 2.0 and then 3.0</p> <p>IUCN as a whole needs to decide what to do with the Oracle donation (which was to IUCN – including support for SIS – see recommendations for senior management in A)</p> <p>Ongoing capacity needs of the SP (e.g. longer term funding for GIS and SIS) will be assess and addressed, resources permitting</p>	<p>SIS should link to other IUCN ‘flagship knowledge products’ and a high level plan needs to be developed for their interoperability led by senior management, that SP contributes to.</p> <p>Profile of SIS needs to be raised in IUCN</p> <p>RLDB: This is the most successful and most frequently visited website in the conservation sector. Currently IUCN depends on CI for the provision of server space and user support for the main Red List Database (a Service level Agreement is to be developed with CI). In the longer term IUCN should take a view on the optimal way to host this website.</p> <p>This recommendation has implications for GPT, PBIA and resolution monitoring, amongst others.</p> <p>WCMC “remarriage” plan: the SP should be fully involved in these negotiations.</p>	<p>By end-year</p>	<p>TBD</p>
<p>D.3 (12). Strengthen skills sets</p> <p>Areas in which we recommend that SP concentrate its efforts in terms of capacity building are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Language skills ▪ Information technology skills ▪ Project management skills ▪ Finance management skills ▪ Fundraising-related skills (proposal writing, presentations, negotiation) 	<p>Agree and in part addressed above.</p> <p>SP will prioritize training needs, undertake a skills audit, revise TORs to reflect necessary skills</p>	<p>Language and information technology already have training programmes in place</p> <p>Recruitment is a key to upgrading information technology skills (GIS, SIS, database, etc)</p> <p>GIS expert is in place; SIS expert is in place</p> <p>Translation budget would assist</p>	<p>By March 2007</p>	<p>Staff time</p>

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>D.4 (13). Strengthen communications</p> <p>Given that it is recommended to maintain three distinct locations for strategic reasons, it is very important that the SP makes a concerted effort to create a sense of common belonging and purpose through informal knowledge sharing and a formal communication framework. This may take the form of regular, structured conference calls around a specific subject (e.g. budget review, resource allocation, fundraising opportunities, technical briefs), but should also include documented communication other than e-mail (e.g. progress reports, mid-term staff reviews, upward and/or 360° feedback, etc.)</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>New tier of management will define internal communications strategy:</p> <p>SP will contribute four CNGs per year to facilitate external communications between SP and the rest of IUCN</p>	<p>Overall, there is a need to “mainstream” the SP in the thinking of the rest of IUCN</p> <p>Communication will flow better once organizational structure agreed finalized.</p> <p>Strategy to include succinct trip reports / meetings/ structured conference calls</p>	<p>By end-year</p>	<p>Should be minimal</p>
<p>D.5 (14). Improve resource allocation and task prioritization</p> <p>The SP should examine ways in which staff utilization and workloads could be tracked in order to assess whether tasks being accomplished are in accordance with objectives, whether they are being distributed ad-hoc, and how this is impacting effectiveness and morale. This should be a combination of a staffing tool and a process whereby tasks are allocated. Such a mechanism can also be used in driving improved communications (see communications, above)</p>	<p>Agree but we expect that this will improve after restructuring and revision of TORs</p> <p>GPT will provide assistance to show, in budget terms, the differences between core and activity money in supporting items like the RL and CITES work</p>	<p>There is a workflow issue – Red List and CITES-Trade Analyses (highest profile products produced by IUCN) creates a time crunch – 400,000 SFR could help alleviate (it may be possible to manage the Red List process on a longer timeline, but for the CITES-Trade Analyses this would be challenging)</p> <p>This is a ‘good management’ recommendation which should flow from fixing the rest.</p> <p>Staff already have performance appraisals, individual work plans, and regular monitoring of performance</p> <p>PWCs are to send through an example tool</p>	<p>By end year</p>	<p>No additional cost</p>

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>D.6 (15). Effectively manage partnerships</p> <p>As SP has chosen to engage in a number of strategic partnerships, these need to be clearly governed by the appropriate, binding memoranda of understanding and service level agreements. Responsibility within SP for maintaining and monitoring the relationships with each partner must be established and communicated. Particular attention must be paid to potential confusion in reporting lines where partnerships include seconded staff positions.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>New MOUs are being negotiated with RL partners following internal discussions re data ownership/use/brand issues following from the recommendations of the review of the RL Consortium</p>	<p>Note that: IUCN Legal Adviser and Director of Operations want further thought on the policy and strategic implications of the potential new agreements which go beyond the technical aspects (to lay groundwork for sound arrangements with third parties that will protect IUCN's interests (legal and otherwise) in the Red List).</p> <p>Implications of increasing number of RL Partners, especially in terms of staff time, need to be addressed.</p>	<p>By end 2006 finalise a series of MOUs with Red List Partners</p>	<p>Staff time primarily with implications for 'services' provided by RL Unit and other parts of Programme</p>
<p>D.7 (16). Undertake wider stakeholder survey</p> <p>In order to optimize engagement between SP and its wider stakeholder community (SSC, other IUCN Programmes and Commissions, Regional Offices), we recommend that a full, detailed survey be conducted.</p>	<p>Disagree, at this point in time</p>	<p>Survey fatigue</p>		
<p>D. (17). Ensure common identity and image of SP</p> <p>In order to avoid confusion regarding staff responsibilities and allegiances, we recommend that clear directives be given regarding the printing of business cards and the use of e-mail footers.</p>	<p>Agree, SP will implement a common identity based on usage of programme names and job titles, common visual identity (email footers, business cards). Will seek assistance of Communications in this task. Will seek assistance of HRMG on job titles</p>		<p>By end of year</p>	<p>Minimal but significant!</p>