

**Management Response: 2014 Resolutions study**

**Name of evaluation:** “What do IUCN Resolutions achieve? A study to develop monitoring for results of IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations”.

(Phase 1 of Objective 4 of 2012 Congress Evaluation)

**Unit/person responsible for managing follow-up:** GPU, Constanza Martinez

**Date created:** 31 March 2014

**Date updated:**

**Actors and units involved in follow up:**

- Global Policy Unit (GPU)
- Union Development Group (UDG)
- Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E)
- Resolutions Task Force of Council (RTF)

- Motions Advisory Group (MAG)
- Resolutions Working Group (RWG)
- Internet Applications Team (IAT)

Recommendation	Response	Intended Result	Completed Actions	Pending Actions (responsibility, timeframe)	Notes																
<b>Motions process as a whole</b>																					
<p>1. <u>Define the purpose of the IUCN Motions process</u> and the principles it should uphold, including commitment to collective action and being results-driven. <u>Establish a theory of change</u> for the Motions process, differentiating if necessary how Resolutions work as a policy mechanism, deliver conservation and shape IUCN governance. <u>Communicate this broadly and use it as a rationale for Motions reform, improved guidance for implementation and changes to monitoring.</u></p>	<p>Agree. Purpose already exists in MAG proposal. Need to address ‘collective action’, ‘results driven’ and how to communicate.</p>	<p>Objective: All constituencies share the same understanding of the purpose of the Motions process, enabling them to use the Motions process accordingly.</p>		<p>1. Use responses of consultation by MAG to respond to this, with modifications:                      1) Incorporate before sending: theory of change for Motions process overall, ‘collective action’/more emphasis on collaboration, ‘results driven’ (all simply explained) (Luc and Connie – mid-April 2014)                      2. Communicate clarified purpose through RCFs (Enrique – throughout 2015)                      3. Communicate clarified purpose through Motions training, and on the Union portal (GPU, PM&amp;E, UDG - from end of MAG consultation through 2016)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Responsibility and impact go beyond GPU and UDG</li> <li>- Outcome should be influenced by portal discussion on participation rates (limited to GCC, MAG, Regional Directors, Membership FPs and some selected Secretariat staff)</li> </ul>																
<b>Planning and preparation</b>																					
<p>2. <u>Overhaul the Motions submission process in a way that supports the decisions taken in response to the first recommendation of this study.</u> The expected <u>factors for success should be established as criteria</u> for accepting Motions. <u>Those that cannot be strict criteria should be encouraged</u> through a communication package that builds Members’ capacity to submit more effective Motions. Motions submission reform is one contribution to delivering Resolutions with clear results that can be monitored – improved implementation is equally important (see the next section).</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Factor for success</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1. Availability of funding</td></tr> <tr><td>2. Specific conditions related to the Resolution context, e.g. diverging views on conservation, political will, cultural differences</td></tr> <tr><td>3. Understanding of responsibility for implementation how to ‘use’ Resolutions</td></tr> <tr><td>4. Political will/engagement of national governments</td></tr> <tr><td>5. Proactive engagement of IUCN Secretariat (HQ and regions) on the issue</td></tr> <tr><td>6. Availability of human resources</td></tr> <tr><td>7. Commission involvement</td></tr> <tr><td>8. Key Members engaging in implementation of Resolutions</td></tr> <tr><td>9. Whether the issue is covered by the IUCN programme</td></tr> <tr><td>10. Frequency of contact between Motion sponsor and focal point</td></tr> <tr><td>11. Coordination and partnerships – internally to the Union and externally</td></tr> <tr><td>12. Clearly articulated results or clearly articulated policy</td></tr> <tr><td>13. Proactive use of the Resolution after it has been adopted</td></tr> <tr><td>14. Sensitivity to context, demonstrated through engaging appropriate stakeholders</td></tr> <tr><td>15. Undertaking a consensus-building process to develop the Motion</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Factor for success	1. Availability of funding	2. Specific conditions related to the Resolution context, e.g. diverging views on conservation, political will, cultural differences	3. Understanding of responsibility for implementation how to ‘use’ Resolutions	4. Political will/engagement of national governments	5. Proactive engagement of IUCN Secretariat (HQ and regions) on the issue	6. Availability of human resources	7. Commission involvement	8. Key Members engaging in implementation of Resolutions	9. Whether the issue is covered by the IUCN programme	10. Frequency of contact between Motion sponsor and focal point	11. Coordination and partnerships – internally to the Union and externally	12. Clearly articulated results or clearly articulated policy	13. Proactive use of the Resolution after it has been adopted	14. Sensitivity to context, demonstrated through engaging appropriate stakeholders	15. Undertaking a consensus-building process to develop the Motion	<p>Agree, but use the Motions Advisory Group’s proposal and the outcomes of the consultation to take a decision on the overhaul of the submission process. .</p>	<p>Objective: Motions that are submitted are developed through collaborative processes, clearly identify an intended result, and lead to collective action.</p>		<p>4. Consider the list of factors for success, and decide which ones can be used – either as criteria for acceptance of Motions or guidance/training for submitting Motions (UDG and MAG - mid April 2014)</p> <p>5. Review the template for Motions submission to make specific suggestions for changes to be included in the consultation documents. Changes may include: giving examples of criteria for admissibility of Motions, and ensuring template makes clear what the intended policy for each Motion should be, or what existing policy the action is supporting. (The template will also be refined by Council by end 2015.) (GPU and PM&amp;E– first comments by <b>8 April 2014 – further refinement through consultation, 2014</b>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The changes to the Motions process will be addressed by MAG proposal and consultation.</li> <li>- How the factors of success are used and/or communicated will happen through criteria/template but also training.</li> <li>- Factors of success may influence both strict criteria and softer guidance – both aiming for better planned Motions that lead to better implementation/more results.</li> </ul>
Factor for success																					
1. Availability of funding																					
2. Specific conditions related to the Resolution context, e.g. diverging views on conservation, political will, cultural differences																					
3. Understanding of responsibility for implementation how to ‘use’ Resolutions																					
4. Political will/engagement of national governments																					
5. Proactive engagement of IUCN Secretariat (HQ and regions) on the issue																					
6. Availability of human resources																					
7. Commission involvement																					
8. Key Members engaging in implementation of Resolutions																					
9. Whether the issue is covered by the IUCN programme																					
10. Frequency of contact between Motion sponsor and focal point																					
11. Coordination and partnerships – internally to the Union and externally																					
12. Clearly articulated results or clearly articulated policy																					
13. Proactive use of the Resolution after it has been adopted																					
14. Sensitivity to context, demonstrated through engaging appropriate stakeholders																					
15. Undertaking a consensus-building process to develop the Motion																					

16. Sound foundation to justify problem being addressed (e.g. independent situation analysis)					
17. Having a focal point who is also an implementer					
18. The individual level of ownership and sense of responsibility of at least one Member (mandated in Resolution text or not)					
19. Within IUCN's sphere of influence					
3. <u>Strengthen the Motions review process</u> in line with the overhaul of the submission process. The Resolutions Working Group should have <u>clear criteria for evaluating compliance</u> of each Motion with the factors for success. The <u>Secretariat should be more strongly involved</u> , for example by appointing focal points earlier in the process that get involved in both Motion review and reporting after eventual adoption ( <u>see recommendation 9 below</u> ).	Agree.	Objective: Only Motions that are developed through collaborative processes, clearly identify an intended result, clearly identify a policy position and are expected to lead to collective action are accepted.  The Resolutions Working Group and Members are aware of the criteria by which Motions will be assessed and reviewed for admission.		6. Resolutions Working Group (RWG) to clarify and communicate how Motions will be reviewed and assessed (RWG - September 2015)	
<b>Implementation</b>					
4. <u>Improve support for implementation</u> of existing body of Resolutions to ensure that more Resolutions are fully implemented and achieve their intended results. For future Resolutions this requires improved planning by supporting the Motions submission process reform. It also requires <u>clarification of roles and responsibilities for implementation</u> in principle. This should <u>be widely communicated, and possibly offered as part of policy capacity building</u> , to all Members, Commissions and Secretariat staff. Implementation guidance should address the issue of communication, including the tools available (e.g. letter by the DG).	Agree	Objective: More Resolutions are fully implemented and achieve conservation results by clarifying roles and responsibilities to increase accountability of various implementers.		7. Define and communicate roles and responsibilities in principle of each constituent group of IUCN for implementation of existing Resolutions (Resolutions Task Force – Nov 2014) 8. Draft modules as part of GPU policy capacity building and deliver training that covers the use of the Motions process and implementation of Resolutions as policy tools (GPU – throughout 2014 and in 2015)	- Guidance for implementation of Resolutions beyond 2016 will depend on the outcome of the MAG's proposal and the new Motions process.
5. <u>Support improved coordination and increased transparency about implementation</u> . The <u>specific people with roles in implementation should be identified and coordination among them supported</u> . Consider including focal points (who traditionally have responsibility for monitoring, not implementing) in this role.	Agree. However this relates to accountability, and is covered by action 1 for recommendation 4 above. The new process proposed by MAG is expected to improve collaboration and as a result make coordination easier.	Objective: More Resolutions are fully implemented; IUCN constituents and other actors involved in implementation of a Resolution can easily get in contact with one another for joint action.		9. See action item 7 above re communicating roles and responsibilities 10. Explore tools that facilitate connecting various actors involved in implementation of the existing Resolutions, for example through the new online Resolutions database, or Commission steering committees, among others (GPU and RTF – 2015) 11. Once the new Motions submission process is approved, consider how pledges or commitments from possible implementers should be followed up, including a role for focal points in supporting coordination among them (RWG with RTF and GPU – mid 2015)	- Several of these actions depend on the exact revisions to the Motions submission process approved by the Members following MAG's consultation.
<b>Monitoring</b>					
6. <u>Define objectives for a monitoring system</u> that meets users' needs and can be maintained at current resource levels. See guiding questions in the section on	Agree	Objectives: The system used to track, monitor and report on the results		12. Apply the tool for monitoring policy that is currently under development to monitoring Resolutions (GPU – by end of 2014)	- For future monitoring, including defining user needs for information about

<p>Monitoring (p.35). This must be done jointly with the discussion to define the purpose of the Motions process and the Motions reform process. Within the monitoring objectives, define user needs for the different elements of Resolutions: IUCN governance, policy, and conservation actions. IUCN governance and conservation will be easier to measure through traditional monitoring. Monitoring policy achievements should be based on the policy tracking tool that GPU and PM&amp;E are currently developing.</p>		<p>achieved through Resolutions responds to the needs of the constituents who will use the information collected.</p>		<p>13. GPU and PM&amp;E to meet and review guiding questions for monitoring of current Resolutions (GPU and PM&amp;E – May 2014)  14. Continue to design and implement the web-based system as required by Res. 4.011 for capturing contributions across the whole Union (GPU, UDG, IAT – by Sept 2014)  15. Explore ways to bring together reporting on programme implementation and Resolutions implementation – for both actions and policy (GPU and PM&amp;E – 2014)</p>	<p>the different elements of Resolutions (governance, policy and action) can only be done after the Members approve a new Motions process</p>
<p>7. In the short term, for the Jeju resolutions being tracked, continue to monitor using the Excel tracking sheet with specific improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shift from tracking “actions” to tracking “results or outcomes”</li> <li>• Clarify instructions that reporting must go beyond the Secretariat</li> <li>• Adjust the status tracking categories, in particular “Ongoing: the resolution will never fully be implemented”</li> <li>• Request focal points to report if an IUCN letter was sent</li> </ul>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>Objective: Improve the current tracking system for Jeju Resolutions.</p>		<p>16. Encourage focal points to report on results or outcomes rather than activities through the reporting template (Oct 2014)  17. Clarify instructions that reporting must go beyond the Secretariat (GPU –Oct 2014)  18. Adjust the status tracking categories, in particular “Ongoing: the resolution will never fully be implemented” (GPU –Oct 2014)  19. Request focal points to report if an IUCN letter was sent (GPU - Oct 2014)</p>	
<p>8. <u>Strengthen the focal point system</u> for monitoring and consider whether focal points should be implementers. <u>Focal points (even if for monitoring only) should be selected during Motion submission process.</u></p>	<p>Agree, but addressed by response to Recommendation 5 to improve coordination among actors involved in implementation.</p>	<p>Objective: ensure continuity of a Secretariat focal point from the drafting stage through implementation.</p>		<p>20. Consider how focal points could be selected earlier in the Motions process to maintain continuity of Secretariat engagement with each Resolution. (GPU, RWG – mid 2015)</p>	
<p>9. <u>Communicate results of past and future monitoring exercises more broadly across the Union.</u> Acknowledge that early results are often enabling results (means to conservation ends).</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Objective: improve communication of the reports</p>		<p>21. Identify the right part of the Union Portal for sharing the Resolutions tracking report and post the reports prepared for Council for all Members to access (GPU with UDG – as soon as possible)  22. Explore roles and responsibilities across the Union for communicating it – e.g. Commission chairs (GPU and RTF – May 2014)</p>	
<p>10. Complete the delivery of the fourth Congress Evaluation objective through <u>follow-up studies with the help of PM&amp;E in 2015, with a view to providing timely guidance for the next Motion submission process and 2016 for a final study of results achieved in the intersessional period.</u> The predicted factors of success in particular should be tracked. Suggested Resolutions to follow for case studies (not necessarily in the sample): 25, 28, 117, 118.</p>	<p>Agree, but note that following approval in 2015 of the new Motions submission process, further changes to criteria based on new findings may be difficult. The aim of the follow up studies should be to complete the Congress Evaluation and report on results achieved by 2016.</p>	<p>Objective: IUCN learns of the results achieved by Jeju Resolutions, the factors that contributed, and the ways that results can be measured in the future.</p>		<p>23. Plan for and complete a follow-up study of the results of the same sample of Jeju Resolutions, and share the report in advance of the 2016 Congress (PM&amp;E – early 2016)</p>	