



External Review

IUCN Programme 2021-2024

February 2024

Full report by the independent consultancy © Aleph Strategies Limited





© Aleph Strategies Limited

Address: Bourne House, 475 Godstone Road, Whyteleafe, Surrey, United Kingdom, CR3 0BL

Company Number: 11198794

Authors: Florent Loiseau, Jonathan Rider, Asra Memon, Richard Paley, Saagarika Dadu Brown, Claire Nevache

Contact: Jonathan Rider, Aleph Co-Founder and Director, j.rider@alephstrategies.org

Cover Picture: Mangrove trees in the coastal town of Tanga, Tanzania © IUCN Tanzania



Acronyms

| | |
|----------|---|
| ARO | Asia Regional Office |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |
| BIOPOMA | Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management Action |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| CCVA | Climate Change and Vulnerability Assessment |
| CEC | Commission on Education and Communication |
| CEESP | Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy |
| CBD | Convention on Biological Diversity |
| CITES | Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora |
| OECD-DAC | Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development |
| DG | Director General |
| ESARO | Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office |
| ENACT | Enhancing Nature-based Solutions for an Accelerated Climate Transformation |
| ESMS | Environmental and Social Management System |
| EU | European Union |
| GESI | Gender Equity and Social Inclusion |
| GIZ | Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit |
| GBF | Global Biodiversity Framework |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GPGR | Global Programme on Governance and Rights |
| GSAP | Global Species Action Plan |
| GCF | Green Climate Fund |
| HQ | Headquarters |
| HRCT | Human Rights in Conservation Team |
| ICI | Inclusive Conservation Initiative |
| IPLC | Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities |
| IPO | Indigenous Peoples Organisation |
| IPP | Indigenous Peoples Plan |
| IPPF | Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework |
| IP | Indigenous Peoples |
| ICT | Information and Communications Technology |
| IPME | Institutional Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit |
| IBAT | Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool |
| IMET | Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool |
| INGO | International Non-Government Organisation |
| IUCN | International Union for the Conservation of Nature |
| KNPS | Korea National Parks Service |
| LDN | Land Degradation Neutrality |
| LNGO | Local Non-Government Organisation |
| MEL | Monitoring Evaluation and Learning |
| OECM | Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures |
| PAAS | Project Appraisal and Approval System |
| ORMACC | Regional Office for Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean |
| SDG | Sustainable Development Goal |
| SIDA | Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency |
| UNCCD | United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification |
| UNDRIP | United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples |



| | |
|-------|---------------------------------------|
| VLUAP | Village Land Use Action Plan |
| WCEL | World Commission on Environmental Law |
| WCPA | World Commission on Protected Areas |
| WCC | World Conservation Congress |



Table of Content

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Executive Summary | 8 |
| 1 Introduction..... | 16 |
| 1.1 About this Document..... | 16 |
| 1.2 Background and purpose of the External Review | 16 |
| 1.2.1 About IUCN..... | 16 |
| 1.2.2 About this External Review..... | 16 |
| 1.2.3 Methodological Note..... | 17 |
| 1.2.4 Limitations | 18 |
| 2 Key Findings..... | 19 |
| 2.1 Relevance..... | 19 |
| 2.1.1 Summary..... | 19 |
| 2.1.2 Commission Consultation | 19 |
| 2.1.3 Member Consultation..... | 20 |
| 2.1.4 Needs of Youth and Women..... | 20 |
| 2.1.5 Indigenous Peoples..... | 21 |
| 2.1.6 Private Sector Engagement | 23 |
| 2.2 Coherence..... | 24 |
| 2.2.1 Summary..... | 24 |
| 2.2.2 Alignment with Global Conservation Agenda | 24 |
| 2.2.3 Internal Alignment..... | 25 |
| 2.2.4 Structural Coherence..... | 31 |
| 2.3 Effectiveness | 33 |
| 2.3.1 Summary..... | 34 |
| 2.3.2 Conservation Action | 34 |
| 2.3.3 Knowledge Generation | 39 |



| | | |
|---|--|-----------|
| 2.3.4 | Policy Influence..... | 41 |
| 2.3.5 | Using the three ‘enablers’ | 44 |
| 2.4 | Efficiency..... | 47 |
| 2.4.1 | Summary..... | 47 |
| 2.4.2 | Resource efficiency..... | 47 |
| 2.4.3 | Organisational efficiency | 53 |
| 2.4.4 | Monitoring, evaluation, and accountability:..... | 55 |
| 2.5 | Impact..... | 57 |
| 2.5.1 | Summary..... | 57 |
| 2.5.2 | How can we know IUCN succeeded?..... | 57 |
| 2.5.3 | IUCN’s reliance on projects | 60 |
| 2.6 | Sustainability..... | 64 |
| 2.6.1 | Summary..... | 64 |
| 2.6.2 | Learning capacity..... | 64 |
| 2.6.3 | Services to Members..... | 66 |
| 2.6.4 | Financial sustainability..... | 68 |
| 2.7 | GESI..... | 71 |
| 2.7.1 | Summary..... | 71 |
| 2.7.2 | Gender Equity..... | 72 |
| 2.7.3 | Indigenous Peoples..... | 73 |
| 2.7.4 | Intergenerational Equity..... | 74 |
| 2.7.5 | Disability | 76 |
| 2.7.6 | Human Rights | 76 |
| 3 | Discussion..... | 79 |
| 4 | Recommendations..... | 81 |
| APPENDIX 1: Full Methodology | | 87 |
| | Scope..... | 87 |



| | |
|--|------------|
| Overview of the Methodology..... | 87 |
| Evaluation framework: the Aleph Evaluation Index..... | 87 |
| Project Scorecard | 89 |
| Sampling and Project Selection | 90 |
| Data Collection | 95 |
| Preliminary Findings Workshop..... | 96 |
| Analysis and Reporting | 96 |
| Appendix 2: Evaluation Index and Project Scorecard..... | 97 |
| Evaluation Index | 97 |
| Relevance | 97 |
| Coherence | 99 |
| Effectiveness | 101 |
| Efficiency | 103 |
| Impact | 107 |
| Sustainability | 108 |
| GESI | 110 |
| Project Scorecards..... | 113 |
| Appendix 3: Select Bibliography | 119 |
| Appendix 4: List of Key Informants for remote KIs | 126 |
| Appendix 5: Back to Office Report..... | 136 |
| About this Document | 139 |
| Mission Structure | 139 |
| ESARO..... | 140 |
| ARO | 141 |
| ORMACC..... | 142 |



Executive Summary

Aleph Strategies was commissioned by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) to conduct an evaluation of Nature 2030: A Programme for the Union 2021-2024. This executive summary provides an overview of the key findings and recommendations.

KEY FINDINGS

Relevance - The 2021-2024 Programme (referred to as Nature 2030) was designed in a consultative manner, and can therefore be said to reflect – to the extent possible – the priorities of IUCN’s wide constituency. Interviews with Commissions, Council Members, Members and donors indicate that IUCN undertook the design of the Programme in a collaborative and consultative manner. Feedback from these interviews suggests that there are areas in which the process could have been even more consultative, but there is recognition of how challenging this is for an organisation as large and complex as IUCN. Within the Portfolio, we find that this consultative approach is mirrored in the design of projects, which generally involve strong engagement with local stakeholders, whether in government, academia, civil society, indigenous peoples or local communities.

Coherence - The Nature 2030 is strongly aligned with the global nature conservation agenda. We also find strong alignment between the Secretariat’s work (including the Portfolio) and the work of Commissions. Indeed, given the breadth of priorities reflected in the Nature 2030 Programme, everything can be said to align closely. We also see the One Programme Approach at work, bringing constituents from across the Union together in pursuit of shared goals. The extent to which the Programme impacted the nature or manner in which IUCN – both the Union and Secretariat – designs its interventions is mixed. We find some examples of new strategic priorities contained within the Programme (such as renewables, cities or agriculture), and we recognize that all IUCN projects managed by the Secretariat are required to and do align with the Programme Impact Targets. However, these are so broad that we find that much of IUCN’s work formulated in response to local needs and priorities, rather than in response to specific direction provided by the Programme. In this sense, we view the Programme as being ‘descriptive’ rather than ‘directive’.

Effectiveness - Overall, we find that IUCN has been effective in delivering work aligned with the Programme. While it is not possible to conduct a systematic assessment of the entire project Portfolio, there is plenty of evidence that IUCN is delivering good conservation action. Similarly, we find the IUCN’s work on knowledge generation and policy influence is very strong. We find that the use of



technology is fairly limited. IUCN appears to be somewhat 'behind the curve' on recognising and harnessing emergent technologies to strengthen conservation work. By comparison, IUCN has employed communication, education and public awareness reasonably well in many areas of its work.

Efficiency - Over the review period, IUCN has been very active in improving its efficiency along several dimensions. We find that as regards resource efficiency, the attainment of financial targets is overall moving in the right direction and that resource mobilisation and cost recovery are improving as well, although there is still a margin of progression. IUCN has launched several reviews, studies and reforms of its management structure and tools. This path should certainly be pursued, as the changes will most likely be very positive notably as regards Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning, but attention should be paid to accompany the ongoing changes in order to ensure that they are well understood and serve all their intended beneficiaries.

Impact - IUCN produces impacts at the international level, thanks to its convening power, its technical knowledge and its legitimacy as a long-standing actor of the conservation field. It also generates impact at the project level and changes lives of its beneficiaries. While IUCN's Secretariat's projects are required to align with the Impact Targets of Nature 2030 during their design, once projects are in implementation, the Secretariat is not well equipped to demonstrate strong contributions pathways from its projects or its activities to the Nature 2030 Impact Targets, notably because it lacks systematic reporting tools

Sustainability - As regards sustainability, IUCN is on a trajectory of progress and benefitting from a favourable environment where the demand for conservation knowledge and action is strong and growing. IUCN has taken steps to strengthen lessons learning and sharing, though there is still need for systems strengthening. It has taken several initiatives to improve the services it renders to its Members and is progressing towards stronger financial sustainability, but still can and has to do better, notably as regards its capacity to report on results, the attention to be paid to limiting the risks of generating deficits associated with certain projects and its work with private sector.

GESI - IUCN exhibits a strong commitment to Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) through its policy framework and programmatic initiatives. However, the integration of GESI across IUCN's portfolio varies. The challenges in implementing GESI policies are complex, entailing cultural, structural, logistical, and financial aspects. Cultural norms and attitudes towards gender and marginalised communities often impede the effective implementation of GESI policies. Ambiguities in defining 'local communities' lead to a broad categorisation, sometimes excluding marginalised groups like people with



disabilities, displaced people, and migrants. Implementing GESI policies effectively requires significant resources and expertise, and a lack of robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms impacts the assessment of gender-responsive policy implementation.

DISCUSSION

Three overarching observations emerge from this evaluation:

1. Adequacy of the Programme as an institutional tool

We find on the one hand that the Programme is so broad in nature that the work of all Union Constituencies can align to it. On the other hand, this breadth makes the Programme ‘descriptive’ rather than ‘directive’. In our assessment, we have observed that the current engagement with the Programme – amongst Commissions, Members and the Secretariat – appears to be limited. Interviews with Commissions and Secretariat staff revealed difficulties in operationalising the Programme. While there are examples to illustrate that the Programme has provided new directions and mandates for IUCN’s work (such as agriculture and renewables), in general, the Secretariat’s work (particularly at Regional, National and Project levels) is more guided by pre-defined trajectories or regional strategies. Similarly, the Commissions pre-established priorities, or Members’ own institutional or national policies are more directive than the IUCN Programme. This is not a question of alignment – everything is more or less aligned with the Programme – it is a question of *effect*. We found limited evidence that the Programme effected new thinking or direction.

In this sense, Nature 2030 is a ‘North Star’, providing a high-level vision for what the Union strives to achieve. However, it is missing clear pathways describing intermediate outcomes. **Therefore, the Nature 2030 Programme 2021-2024 document is not an adequate foundation on which to report on results and build an impact narrative for the Union.**

2. Accountability Gap.

The Impact Targets contained within Nature 2030 create an accountability framework for which there is little accountability. In view of our assessment regarding the adequacy of the Nature 2030 Programme document, we perceive an *accountability gap* between the obligations of those who are required to aggregate and report on Programme-wide data, and those who are responsible for contributing data to facilitate such reporting. IUCN HQ (specifically the IPME unit) may be compelled to report against the indicators on behalf of units delivering results, but few within the broader Secretariat or the wider Union feel compelled to do so.



3. Misaligned expectations of the Programme

There is a high expectation amongst donors that the Secretariat is able to provide a clear account of its work, and the progress of the Union towards Programme goals. This is a perfectly rationale expectation. However, on the basis of the Programme, as currently constituted, it is unrealistic to expect that such a narrative can be derived from the data. The Programme simply does not provide an adequate basis for reporting on progress. It is both too vague and too high level. For this reason, we encourage IUCN to develop the next Programme with which reporting expectations can realistically be aligned. Such Programme would provide a deeper elaboration of causal pathways leading to the attainment of higher impacts, and provide a basis for a more critical assessment of progress.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Realign on the purpose and role of the Nature 2030 Programme in directing IUCN's work.

Rationale: There is little sense of ownership of the Nature 2030 Programme document and its content either within the Secretariat or the Union.

Action: IUCN, in application of IUCN Regulations 2 and 2bis should clarify and communicate better on what the Programme is for, who is responsible for delivering it, and how (if at all) progress should be reported. Our view, supported by a number of interviews across the Secretariat and Union, is that the Programme should serve the purpose of a 'North Star' – a high level guiding document that provides a very broad direction of travel. It should not confer a reporting requirement. Results should instead be measured against operational strategies (see below). It should provide clarity on the length and articulation of Programme cycles; and clarity on the respective roles of IUCN components: Members, Council, Commissions, Secretariat and their respective contributions to Programme delivery. This process should be linked to the 20-year strategic vision exercise currently underway at the time of writing.

Recommendation 2: Build a Programme Theory of Change.

Rationale: The Programme currently lacks a Theory of Change.

Action: The Secretariat should lead the process by formulating a draft Theory of Change. The current Union theory of change is inadequate and should be replaced. The Theory of Change should provide a clear description of the causal pathways linking outputs to outcomes and impacts. This would provide



a stronger basis on which to judge whether the Programme is making progress, and create the conditions necessary for a meaningful analysis of performance at the next four-year evaluation. The Theory of Change should clearly describe the roles of the Secretariat and Union in contributing the attainment of the Programme goals (as agreed in the actions recommended above).

Recommendation 3: Recalibrate the Prioritised Programme Areas in the next iteration of Nature 2030.

Rationale: IUCN's work has evolved beyond the priorities articulated in the Nature 2030 Programme, reflecting the ever-evolving nature of the challenges it confronts.

Actions:

- 1. The Union should capitalise on Regional Consultation Forums to initiate an internal consultation across its Constituents to identify new Programme areas.** Commissions must be closely engaged in this exercise to ensure alignment. The first question to ask is whether the current Programme areas: *People, Land, Water, Oceans, Climate*, are the most accurate buckets to describe IUCN's work, and how/whether they can be updated or expanded to include new areas. New Programme areas such as *market development, agriculture, health* or indeed *security* were brought up in a number of interviews, suggesting potential avenues for discussion.
- 2. The Union should streamline the Programme**, removing or reframing superfluous sections of the Programme narrative that would not fit in the new theory of change and ensuring that all components - for instance *enablers* and *transformative pathways* - are really necessary and, if so, that their contribution to the overall impact ambitions is clearly stated.
- 3. The Union may wish to undertake a 'horizon scanning' exercise**, as part of the development of a 20 year strategic vision to better understand the potential threats and opportunities for technology. What are the new technologies that can be leveraged in support of IUCN's mission? A similar exercise could be undertaken to better understand the risks and opportunities around building revenue streams into its business model. We understand a number of options had been considered in the past, such as the IUCN Academy. We encourage IUCN to take stock of these initiatives and to present a clear position within the Programme as to whether these sorts of initiative shall be pursued in the future.

Recommendation 4: IUCN should include a strategy to operationalise the Programme in its next quadriennial Programme document.

Rationale: There is a missing layer of strategic planning in the current Programme architecture.



Action: as part of the next Programme document, include a section to demonstrate how Constituents intend to contribute to the Programme, containing clear implementation modalities and chains of results for the Secretariat, Commissions and contributions from Members. It should also contain specific strategies for non-portfolio activities: e.g. internal and external communication strategies; fundraising strategy etc. The section would then provide the basis for results reporting and impact measurement. The results would be restricted to the level of outcomes, derived from the overarching Programme. Measuring IUCN's performance against the strategy would therefore provide a strong evidence base for IUCN's progress (Secretariat and Union) towards achieving the overarching Programme goals.

Action: Align the budget with the next iteration of the Programme. IUCN should ensure that the next Programme document includes a financial strategy designed to serve the attainment of the Programme outcomes.

Recommendation 5: Strengthen results monitoring and reporting practices.

Rationale: Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning practices across IUCN are weak.

Actions:

- 1. Continue to build an aggregated reporting system for the Secretariat.** Having had a preliminary view of the proposed new project portal, we fully endorse both the scope and design of the system. GESI indicators should also be included in the portal, facilitating the analysis of both impacts and the implementation of IUCN's ESMS standards. We encourage leadership within the Secretariat to promote and uphold the use of the new portal once it is live.
- 2. Continue to encourage usage / uptake of the Contributions for Nature Platform amongst Members.** Conduct a Membership survey to test utility of the platform. This platform needs to reach a critical mass in order to start providing value to Members. If uptake is slow, even those who have already started uploading data may decide the effort is not warranted.
- 3. Continue to build an aggregated reporting system for Commissions.** Revise Annexe 2 of the Council Handbook and build a stronger and integrated reporting framework that includes the work of Commissions and helps capture the impact of Commissions' work.



Recommendation 6: Reflect on the scope and purpose of the next Programme evaluation.

Rationale: In the absence of an aggregated MEL framework with up-to-date data it is not possible to evaluate either the effectiveness or the impact of the Programme.

Actions:

1. **We strongly encourage IUCN to conduct an internal evaluability assessment** of the Programme prior to engaging an external firm for the next evaluation. Such an assessment would ascertain the volume and nature of data available for the review, and propose alternative approaches should a standard OECD-DAC evaluation methodology be deemed unsuitable. This review is the second consecutive external evaluation based on monitoring and data that are incomplete and with no clear projects contribution pathways to high-level results or impact . The development and rollout of the new project portal should significantly improve that situation. Should that not be the case, we question the utility of conducting a third evaluation under similar circumstances given the appetite amongst Donors for a clear impact narrative.
2. **Undertake an on-going learning review of the Programme.** Assuming that IUCN does not shift from Programme-level evaluation to strategy-level evaluation (as proposed in Recommendation 4 above, IUCN may wish to consider a modular cycle of smaller evaluations focussed on Programmatic subsets, such as *Land* impacts for example, or specific thematic priorities, such as *integration of IP priorities within the Programme*, or indeed non-portfolio work, such as *communications, membership engagement or policy influence*. These exercises could be conducted over the lifecycle of the Programme, providing timely, nuanced insight and actionable recommendations to help strengthen approaches. Taken together, the findings of these smaller evaluations would provide the basis for a meta-synthesis at the end of the Programme period.

Recommendation 7: Strengthen GESI practices across the Union

Rationale: Our review highlights a number of areas in which IUCN can strengthen its work on GESI.

Actions:

1. **Strengthen Gender Empowerment and Inclusion with M&E System:** IUCN should develop a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, focusing on gender equality and social inclusion. This could be integrated into the current draft project portal. This system should include standardised indicators that capture the varied impacts on different gender groups, considering intersectionality. Consistent data collection and analysis will inform policy



adaptation, resource allocation, and identify participation gaps in decision-making. A robust M&E framework will enhance the visibility and impact of gender initiatives, promoting trust and collaboration.

2. **Better mainstream GESI across the programme.** One way to do this would be to include GESI topics, explicitly and specifically into the new programme as horizontal cross-cutting themes rather than vertical lines so that every project and initiative undertaken within the programme has clear and strong GESI component that is consistently monitored.
3. **Continue to empower Indigenous Leadership:** IUCN needs to deepen Indigenous Peoples' (IPs) participation and leadership in conservation, respecting their cultural, social, and economic rights. Consistent integration of indigenous knowledge across regions and sectors is essential. IUCN should address this through resources and expertise, balancing Indigenous interests with other stakeholders, and developing tools like handbooks for better Indigenous knowledge integration.
4. **Develop an inclusivity policy for Marginalised Groups:** IUCN should implement an inclusivity policy addressing the needs of marginalised groups such as people with disabilities, the elderly, and displaced individuals. The policy should ensure representation, participation, and accessibility in conservation areas and decision-making processes. It should also include research and disaggregated data collection to develop responsive and equitable conservation policies that encompass all societal members.
5. **Develop a comprehensive Human Rights Framework:** IUCN should establish a Human Rights Framework integrated into all programme aspects. This framework should set clear guidelines for incorporating human rights in project planning, implementation, and evaluation, focusing on marginalised groups' rights. It should mandate human rights impact assessments, community engagement, and a grievance redressal system, especially in areas with governance challenges.



1 Introduction

1.1 About this Document

Aleph Strategies (Aleph) has been commissioned by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) to conduct an External Review of its 2021-2024 Programme, Nature 2030. The evaluation began in August 2023 and concluded in December 2023. This is the final evaluation report, containing the main findings of the exercise.

1.2 Background and purpose of the External Review

1.2.1 About IUCN

Since 1948, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has been at the forefront of the mission of safeguarding nature, drawing on its unique global reach and large membership comprising of States, sub-national governments, government agencies, national and international NGOs and indigenous peoples' organisations and representatives. In order to deliver its programme as mandated by its Members, the IUCN manages a wide portfolio of conservation projects aimed at mitigating environmental challenges of habitat loss, restoring ecosystems and improving people's well-being sustainably.

To achieve their mission, the IUCN membership collaboratively approves the IUCN Programme (or Programme as referred to hereafter), which is the overarching strategic document through which IUCN pursue its objectives for the quadrennial period between each World Conservation Congress. The Programme provides a framework that includes and invites contributions from the IUCN Members, Commissions and Secretariat. It outlines the broad areas of work and defines targets and indicators to measure success.

1.2.2 About this External Review

This External Review is jointly commissioned by the IUCN's Director General and Framework partners, as part of the framework agreements signed by both parties. This type of External Review has been conducted every four years since 1991 and focuses on the implementation of the IUCN Programme, it is typically undertaken prior to the World Conservation Congress and the final report is presented to the IUCN Members at the Congress.



The objective of the review is to evaluate the overall performance of the IUCN Intersessional Programme considering relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact to ensure the accountability of IUCN towards its Council, framework partners, constituents, donors, and other stakeholders, to provide lessons learnt that will generate actionable recommendations for further implementation of the Programme. Reported to the next IUCN World Conservation Congress, the external review will also be used in the design of the next IUCN intersessional programme.

This evaluation covered the work of the Union as a whole, with a greater emphasis on the Secretariat's work. It would be impossible to assess the performance of all 1400 Members of the Union within the constraints of this exercise, and given the limited availability of data on Member contributions to the Programme targets. The review of IUCN Commissions was not in the scope of this external review as it falls under the remit of the IUCN's Governance review¹. The evaluation covered the Secretariat's portfolio and non-portfolio work.

1.2.3 Methodological Note

A full methodology is contained in the appendices at the end of this report. In brief, Aleph employed a range of data collection tools, serving to gather data on seven evaluation pillars: *relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact and gender, equity and social inclusion*.

Aleph undertook an extensive, albeit non-exhaustive, **literature review** of IUCN's strategic and operational documentation, including monitoring data, external evaluations, strategies and workplans, policies and standards, and relevant online platforms, such as Contributions for Nature. In conjunction with this, we also conducted a deeper reading of project-level documentation from within the Portfolio. **28 projects were sampled** to provide an indicative insight into how the Programme is reflected in IUCN's activities on the ground. A total of **59 qualitative interviews** were conducted with staff within the IUCN Secretariat (Centres, Corporate Units, Regional Offices, National Offices, project teams), and the Union (Framework partners, donors, Commissions, Council and Members).

Three field missions were undertaken to the Asia Regional Office (ARO), the Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO) and the Regional Office for Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean

¹ Council Handbook Feb 21:6. "To enhance its oversight, the Council will: [...]iii. commission an external review of IUCN's governance at least every four years, to be delivered in time to inform a Council 'strategy session' at mid-term. The Terms of Reference and scope of the external review shall be established by Council and include the review of the IUCN Commissions. The latter will have the purpose of ensuring the necessary renewal of existing Commissions and broader renewal of Commissions or other network mechanisms to meet the knowledge generation, expert and Programme delivery needs of the Union. This review will anyway have to be done well before the date fixed for filing nominations for Commission Chairs.



(ORMACC). This entailed country visits to Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, Kenya, Tanzania, Costa Rica and Guatemala. During these missions, the evaluation team conducted meetings and interviews with Secretariat staff, government officials, local / national NGOs, civil society groups, local communities and indigenous peoples organisations.

Data from these sources is presented throughout our analysis in the subsequent sections of the report. We endeavour where possible to present evidence at a global level, substantiating our claims with observations derived from our assessment of Portfolio projects.

1.2.4 Limitations

A full description of limitations is provided in the appendices at the end of this report. There were three overriding challenges for this evaluation:

1. **The lack of a centralised MEL platform with aggregated Programme data.** IUCN does not track results against Programme targets. This precluded an objective assessment of *effectiveness* and *impact*.
2. **Varying levels of data completeness at project level.** Some projects contained a wealth of data, others did not. This precluded both a comparative assessment and an aggregated analysis of project performance.
3. **The balancing of time and resource allocated for this evaluation with the breadth of material and the wide range of subject matter to cover.** The Programme spans an exceptionally broad range of activities, delivered by a range of stakeholders across the Secretariat and within the wider Union.



2 Key Findings

2.1 Relevance

We assess *Relevance* as the extent to which the Programme was developed in a **consultative manner**, reflecting the priorities of the Union and the needs and priorities of indigenous peoples, local communities, women and youths.

2.1.1 Summary

The Nature 2030 Programme was designed in a consultative manner, and can therefore be said to reflect – to the extent possible – the priorities of IUCN’s wide constituency. Interviews with Commissions, Council Members, Members and donors indicate that IUCN undertook the design of the Programme in a collaborative and consultative manner. Feedback from these interviews suggests that there are areas in which the process could have been even more consultative, but there is recognition of how challenging this is for an organisation as large and complex as IUCN. Within the Portfolio itself, we find that this consultative approach is mirrored in the design of projects, which generally involve strong engagement with local stakeholders, whether in government, academia, civil society, indigenous peoples or local communities.

2.1.2 Commission Consultation

All seven IUCN Commissions were consulted during the design of the IUCN 2021-2024 Nature 2030 Programme. The Commissions, like other IUCN constituents, were invited to provide inputs on the Programme draft before it was finalised at the 2020 Marseille World Conservation Congress. Commissions were invited to Gland in 2019 to engage with and consult on the development of the Programme. The extent to which this level of engagement was deemed adequate is mixed. Some Commission Members report that they were heavily involved in the process, leading discussions on key elements of the Programme, such as the development of the '5 Rs' for example. Others simply describe their engagement as adequate. However, one Commission Member reported that the timeframe for consultation was limited, and that consultation took place too close to the Congress in Marseille, offering limited opportunities for Members to engage in the process, thereby creating the impression of a 'top down' process.



2.1.3 Member Consultation

IUCN Members were consulted during the development of the Programme. Members include States and government agencies, NGOs, indigenous people's organisations, scientific and academic institutions and business associations. Between May and November 2019, IUCN facilitated a series of Regional Conservation Forums in all operational regions to solicit the views of its membership.² Their final approval was solicited through an online vote in early 2021.³ However, an online Membership survey conducted in 2023 found that a little over one fifth of respondents took part in the design of the Programme. While the sample size (262) is not statistically representative of the entire Membership, the findings are nonetheless instructive.⁴

Interviews with Members highlighted some of the difficulties they experienced with the process. One described the practical challenges of soliciting inputs within the tight and often crowded confines of the five-day Congress. In spite of this, there seems to be an appreciation amongst some Members of the challenge of building consensus across the Union's broad, and growing constituencies. According to one Member: *'You have to balance inclusiveness with speed. There's a nervousness about sharing things before they're perfect. To be really inclusive you have to be more open about bringing people in even before the thing is finished.'* According to another: *'If I put myself in the shoes of IUCN, they have a lot of members.'* *You can't create a strategy by crowdsourcing views. You could perhaps do some early consultations with certain groups, but I don't believe you can develop a document through crowdsourcing'.*

Despite the difficulties soliciting views from Members in an inclusive manner, it is encouraging to see that a further 13% of respondents would like to be engaged in this process in the future.⁵

2.1.4 Needs of Youth and Women

Women and youths are well represented in the Nature 2030 Programme, which explicitly outlines IUCN's mandate of placing gender-informed and gender-responsive action at the core of the project portfolio and policy influence work. This theme is particularly relevant to the Programme area and impact targets concerning *People* wherein it states the following - *IUCN will work to achieve gender equality as a fundamental right and a driving force for effective, equitable and sustainable*

² IUCN (2021): Nature 2030, p.2

³ Ibid, pp.2-3

⁴ IUCN (2023): Membership Survey

⁵ Ibid



environmental solutions.⁶ IUCN also prioritises integration of youth as catalysts of change and promises to *actively engage with and invest in youth and intergenerational partnerships to foster the new generations of conservation leaders.*⁷ The Programme Impact Framework⁸ also contains specific indicators under the *People Programme Area*, requiring sex and age disaggregated data. While the Framework contains many flaws, as we discuss later in the report, it is notable that IUCN intended to pursue these targets and indicators.

At the strategic level, IUCN has set in place guidelines to operationalise its commitment to engaging women and youth. These guidelines include the *IUCN Gender Equality and Women Empowerment Policy (2018)* and *IUCN Youth Strategy 2022-2023*, which are overseen by the Human Rights in Conservation Team⁹. The youth strategy in particular is guided by the *Nature 2030 2021-2024 Programme*. The youth strategy entails a Union-wide action framework, covering the period 2022-2030 along with specific short-term priority actions of IUCN Members, Commissions and the Secretariat, covering the period until the next IUCN World Conservation Congress in 2025.¹⁰ Later in the report, we assess the extent to which these strategic ambitions translated into operational approaches and practices (see GESI section).

2.1.5 Indigenous Peoples

The Nature 2030 Programme mandates inclusive partnerships with indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) for effective and impactful portfolio delivery, knowledge generation and policy influence work. In this, the Programme responds to Resolution 002 from the World Conservation Congress in 2020, which calls for strengthened institutional inclusion concerning indigenous peoples.¹¹ About 25 Indigenous People's Organisations (IPOs) are a part of IUCN Membership.¹² Since 2016, IUCN remains the only global intergovernmental membership organisation to include a specific category for Indigenous People's Organisation (IPO).¹³ In their capacity as Members, their vote was sought for the approval of the Programme.¹⁴ It is unclear what proportion of IPOs actually engaged in the design of the Programme.

⁶ IUCN (2021): *Nature 2030*, p.10

⁷ *Ibid*, p.11

⁸ *Ibid*, p.22

⁹ IUCN (2022): *IUCN Youth Strategy 2022-2030*

¹⁰ *Ibid*, p.4

¹¹ WCC-2020-Res-002-EN

¹² https://www.iucn.org/our-union/members/iucn-members?mbr_cgry=1566&rgn=All&stat=All&page=2

¹³ IUCN: *Becoming an Indigenous peoples' organisation Member: A convening platform for collective action and influence*

¹⁴ IUCN (2021): *Nature 2030*, p. 2-3



Nevertheless, we find clear evidence that IUCN is enacting a strategic commitment to incorporating the needs and priorities of Indigenous Peoples throughout its programming. At the strategic level, IUCN has developed the Standard for Indigenous Peoples as part of their Environmental & Social Management System (ESMS). The standard's applicability is determined through a case-by-case examination as part of the ESMS screening. The screening is a preliminary desk assessment of potential project impacts for Indigenous Peoples.¹⁵ The ESMS principles mandate regional and national offices to consult with the Indigenous Peoples in a culturally appropriate way so that they remain active and effective participants in decision-making processes relevant to them in the context of IUCN projects.¹⁶ Following these consultations, project planners are required to develop an explicit risk mitigation plan integrated within the ESMS or to employ IUCN's templates - the Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) or the Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) - to ensure accountability to these measures.

Additionally, similar to their work on gender and youth, the Human Rights in Conservation group within Centre for Society and Governance works on a range of individual projects such as the Inclusive Conservation Initiative (ICI) - a Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded programme implemented in partnership with Conservation International. We learned from an interview with a Secretariat team member that the programme is composed of 10 sub-projects around the globe with indigenous organisations as partners. At the heart of it is the provision of support (technical and financial) to these organisations to design and implement their own impact strategies around issues related management of their territories, land rights, management of natural resources and governance.

We also note that IUCN has developed the *Indigenous Peoples Self-Determined Strategy: Supporting effective participation of indigenous peoples in IUCN and conservation*. The development and implementation process of this strategy was led by IPOs and supported by IUCN's Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) and the IUCN Global Programme on Governance and Rights (GPGR). As a living document, it provides a basis for IPOs to engage with the development and implementation of IUCN's work and to advance indigenous rights and priorities within conservation. Among other areas, the Strategy stipulates for the inclusion of IPOs at all levels of IUCN governance from Council, National and Regional Committees to IUCN Commissions and projects. IUCN has also continued to deliver *Indigenous Insights - Stewarding the Earth* a campaign to support IUCN's Member IPOs in sharing messages on the role of indigenous communities in conserving nature.¹⁷ While

¹⁵ IUCN Standard on Indigenous People, p. 6

¹⁶ Ibid, p.4

¹⁷ <https://www.stewardingthe.earth>



the initial campaign was drawn to a close in December 2021, it has been brought back again in 2023 in order to ensure that IPOs continue to have a platform for sharing insights on nature stewardship.

IUCN applies recognised definitions for Indigenous Peoples, aligned with the International Labour Organization's Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, and the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Furthermore, recognising the limitations of these definitions, IUCN provides further nuance to help project planners and implementers¹⁸:

- peoples who identify themselves as 'indigenous';
- tribal peoples whose social, cultural, and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations;
- traditional peoples not necessarily called indigenous or tribal but who share the same characteristics of social, cultural, and economic conditions that distinguish them from other sections of the national community, whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions, and whose livelihoods are closely connected to ecosystems and their goods and services.

2.1.6 Private Sector Engagement

IUCN considers the private sector to be an important source of finance, and recognises that businesses can play a transformative role in nature conservation.¹⁹ The extent to which the private sector was engaged in the design of the Programme is unclear.

Nevertheless, developing private sector relationships and exploring the potential for private finance remain a priority for IUCN, as evidenced both by the development of a *Business Engagement Strategy* in 2022, and by the creation of a Business Engagement Unit. The approach appears to be yielding some results. At the strategic level, IUCN has invested in various business engagement projects over the course of the Programme duration - some of which focus on renewable energy, private sector support for species conservation and wetland preservation, biodiversity management plans for large-scale infrastructure projects, and regenerative agriculture in food supply chains. One notable initiative is the Blue Carbon Accelerator Fund, which started in 2022 and selected four projects in Benin, Peru, Madagascar, and the Philippines for funding to prepare for implementation and attract private sector financing.

¹⁸ IUCN ESMS Standard on Indigenous Peoples

¹⁹ IUCN (2021): Nature 2030, 7



2.2 Coherence

We assess *Coherence* as the extent to which the Programme aligns with **the global conservation agenda**, the extent to which there is **internal alignment** between the Programme and the workstreams of the Secretariat and the Union, and the extent to which there is **structural coherence** underpinning the rationale for Programme design.

2.2.1 Summary

The Nature 2030 is strongly aligned with the global nature conservation agenda. We also find strong alignment between the Secretariat's work (including the Portfolio) and the work of Commissions. Indeed, given the breadth of priorities reflected in the Nature 2030 Programme, everything can be said to align closely. We also see the One Programme Approach at work, bringing constituents from across the Union together in pursuit of shared goals.

However, on the basis of our interviews and our reading of IUCN's literature, we find the Programme to be *descriptive* rather than *directive*. While there are some areas in which the Programme signals new direction and priorities, there is a strong sense in which the Programme is seen by many of the those we spoke to as 'business as usual'.

2.2.2 Alignment with Global Conservation Agenda

We find strong alignment between the Programme and global conservation and development priorities.²⁰ For example, we find strong alignment between Nature 2030 Programme and the **Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF)**. Though Nature 2030 was finalised before the GBF targets were finalised, biodiversity conservation remains at the core of IUCN's agenda, cross-cutting all work streams of action, knowledge and policy. Nature 2030 explicitly makes provision for deeper alignment in the next Programme cycle of 2024-2028²¹, and situates the vision of the GBF of *living in harmony with nature by 2050' at the centre of the Programme.*²²

²⁰ IUCN (2023): Contributing to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework: Nature 2030, IUCN Resolutions and Conservation Tools.

²¹ IUCN (2021): Nature 2030, p2

²² Ibid, p.3



IUCN's Standards are reflected in the now-finalised GBF, which is a good reflection of IUCN's capacity to shape global policy frameworks. Four of the 10 headline indicators adopted by the GBF were taken directly from IUCN, including Red List of Ecosystems, extent of natural ecosystems, and Red List Index.²³

Operationally, we see that much of IUCN's work is aligned with the GBF. For instance, IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas, develops knowledge-based policy, advice and guidance on the full range of issues related to protected areas. The Commission brings together experts to develop global protected area standards and best practice guidelines, supporting governments, NGOs, Indigenous peoples and local communities, and other stakeholders in the implementation of the GBF, and especially its Target 3 on area-based conservation.²⁴ Another example is that IUCN's Red List of Ecosystems which is listed as a headline indicator for monitoring Goal A of the GBF agreed at COP15.²⁵

IUCN intended to link Impact Targets contained within the Nature 2030 Programme with global conservation frameworks. Though the indicators in the Nature 2030 Programme Impact Framework were never operationalised (see our analysis on MEL under the efficiency section of the report), it is commendable that such efforts at alignment were undertaken. The link between IUCN's Nature 2030 Programme and **UN Framework Convention for Climate Change (UNFCCC)** is exemplified through the Impact Targets C1 and C2 which are based on UNFCCC indicators. C1 is based on *UNFCCC: Proposed additional indicator of number of UNFCCC Parties submitting National Adaptation Plans*, and C2 is based on *UNFCCC: Number of Parties submitting updated Nationally Determined Contributions*.²⁶ Within the Land Programme area, the Nature 2030 Programme focuses on Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) - an initiative under the **UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)**. There is an explicit alignment between this SDG 15.3, LDN targets, and IUCN's Nature 2030 Impact Target L2.²⁷ With regards to **United Nations SDG targets**, 10 out of 15 impact targets of the Nature 2030 Programme have SDG-aligned indicators.²⁸

2.2.3 Internal Alignment

2.2.3.1 Realisation of the One Programme Charter

The delivery of the Nature 2030 Programme is underpinned by the One Programme Charter. The Charter speaks to the potential for siloed approaches common to any large, complex, multi-national

²³ IUCN (2022): Quarterly Report 2022-Q4, p.8

²⁴ IUCN (2022): Annual Report, 2022, p. 14

²⁵ Ibid, p.30

²⁶ Ibid, p. 23

²⁷ Ibid, p. 23

²⁸ Ibid, pp.22-23



organisation such as IUCN. The approach is intended to provide a strategic framework wherein the strengths and unique roles of its Members, Commissions, Committees, and Secretariat are leveraged to further the conservation agenda and achieve the impact targets.²⁹ Interviews with stakeholders and staff across the Union demonstrate a general awareness of the guiding principles laid out by the Charter at a strategic level. To the extent that the majority of IUCN staff we interviewed – whether at HQ, the regional and national offices, and within the Commissions - understood the value of the Union, and the benefits that accrue from shared resources and knowledge, **it is clear that the Charter is a well-recognised concept.**

IUCN appears to have pursued the One Programme Charter in a number of formats. There is evidence that highlights efforts at collaboration between different IUCN units on different levels. For example, at the regional level, the quarterly reports show how opportunities for synergies were leveraged. For example, IUCN ARO recently met with the CEESP, WCPA, WCEL and CCC Commission Chairs and Regional Vice Chairs to strengthen collaboration and synergies within the Oceania region.³⁰ The collaboration is also manifested in the form of exchange of knowledge involving different IUCN Members. For example, in Guinea Bissau in IUCN West and Central Africa region, IUCN Members were trained on the IUCN Green List and Red List standards, as well as on the monitoring and evaluation of environmental projects in order to address environment drivers.³¹ Another example comes from the IUCN ORMACC region involving multiple IUCN constituents. At CBD COP15, IUCN ORMACC hosted a discussion forum entitled “Defending the Defenders: Environmental Justice Beyond the Implementation of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework” with the close collaboration of CEESP, the IUCN Counsellor for Indigenous Peoples, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the Network of Indigenous Women and Biodiversity, and the Abyala Indigenous Forum.³² It is also encouraging to see the efforts to strengthen coherence between the Secretariat and the Union through reinforcing alignment between the Secretariat's and Commissions' workplans.³³

However, interviews with Secretariat Staff, Members and Commissions highlight an underlying tension between IUCN's growing project portfolio and the competition this is perceived to engender with some members. As IUCN's project portfolio has grown over the last few years, some feel that this has placed IUCN in direct competition for resources with its Members. According to one Member: ‘When IUCN

²⁹ Ibid, p. 7

³⁰ IUCN (2023): Report of the Regional Offices - April-June 2023, p. 18

³¹ IUCN (2022): IUCN Regional Offices Report - October-December 2022, p.8

³² Ibid, p.15

³³IUCN (2022): Proposed Process to Align the Commissions Planning Cycle to that of the Secretariat



operates in countries, we see that IUCN is sometimes competing with members, instead of sometimes operating with them. I saw that in China and in other countries. I know that in certain countries, it works very well, but in others it does not.’ A Commission Member reported: ‘one of the core principles is that IUCN cannot compete with its members on implementation. If I look at the regional and national offices of IUCN, the only way they raise funds is through projects. IUCN needs to be working at the policy level with governments around the world. It seems to be working at the field level, knocking heads with IUCN members. I question whether this is valuable.’

However, this view is far from universal, as we find evidence showing that IUCN is creating new opportunities for its members. According to one interview with IUCN staff at country level: *‘I think the idea that we squeeze out Members is nonsense. We bring in a lot of opportunity for members and smaller organisations.’* Our own observations of IUCN’s projects on the ground certainly indicate a high degree of participation of small, local NGOs (some of whom are Members), particularly through the awarding of small and medium-sized grants. IUCN’s Annual Report from 2022 illustrates that over 30 projects contain a small grants facility, serving 549 grantees, 12% of whom are members.³⁴

Grant recipients that we interviewed in Cambodia and Vietnam, for example, were highly positive about the support they received from IUCN. IUCN is to be applauded for launching the Open Project Portal in 2021 in order to provide more transparency and accountability regarding the Secretariat’s project portfolio and the extent to which Members are engaged.³⁵ We also note the GEF and GCF supported projects – which constitute a significant proportion of the growing portfolio - enable IUCN to grant funds to members who are not accredited entities with either fund, thereby creating funding opportunities that would not exist were it not for IUCN. Moreover, around 50% of Members report that they have benefitted from involvement in IUCN’s field projects.³⁶

2.2.3.2 Alignment between the project portfolio and the Programme

In one sense, all of the projects reviewed for this evaluation are aligned with the Programme. On the one hand, it is commendable that the Programme is so broad, as it enables IUCN to capitalise on the momentum it has built on existing projects, and enables IUCN to pursue new or emergent priorities. On the other, it is descriptive rather than directive. One IUCN HQ Staff member stated: *The broadness of the programme is such that everything would fit in it. But nothing is specific. There are no impact*

³⁴ IUCN (2022): Annual Report, p.36

³⁵ IUCN (2022): Director General Report to Council and Strategic Objectives 2022, p.14

³⁶ IUCN (2022): Annual Membership Satisfaction Survey – Presentation to the Executive Board, p.5



targets. Therefore, we do not know where we are and I cannot tell stories about that. Another said: *It is more of a visionary document than a specific programme of work.* As we illustrate later in this report, it is possible to extract results from almost every project that correspond to one or more of the Impact Targets within the Programme Impact Framework.

According to one interview with a senior leader within the Secretariat, the generality of the Programme allows the pursuit of project funding, regardless of whether it is explicitly aligned with the Programme or not. We learn from our interviews that the project portfolio has grown, not as a result of the strategic direction provided by the Programme, but in pursuit of funding, or in pursuit of highly localised conservation needs. One interviewee at an IUCN Regional Office stated: *At the moment, we just scramble to create a project in response to a call for proposal. What we should be doing is looking at the Programme theory of change.*

From our own observations of IUCN's projects at regional and national levels, the Programme appears to confer little urgency or direction on how programmes or projects are developed. We encountered a range of views towards the Programme amongst interviews with IUCN regional teams. In one of the regional offices, Nature 2030 is seen a helpful frame of reference for strategic planning, even if it is considered to be somewhat 'top down'. In the other offices we visited, it is clear that the Programme plays a far less central role. According to one senior staff member in an IUCN Regional office: *'the problem was that it [Nature 2030] did not provide enough guidance for me on how to operationalise my work.'*

Regardless of these views, it is clear that the projects themselves, in each of the regions we visited – quite rightly - tend to follow their own rationale born out of highly contextualised priorities. Viewed from the perspective of regional, national and project level work, the Programme sometimes feels very 'far away'. Indeed There are projects within the portfolio, such as the *Community-Based Marine Turtle Conservation Project*, that have been running for many years, generating their own momentum and pursuing their own goals. IUCN's work in the Mekong Delta is informed not by the Programme, but by a deep understanding of the localised needs and context in which it operates. One Regional Director stated: *'operating in the region is rather complex, but it is really driven by the demands of countries. The demands are conveyed to us via our contacts with the Ministries.'* Another interviewee explained that the priorities of regional and subregional economic unions were far more influential than the IUCN Programme on the definition and shaping of their own programme of work.



To be clear, this does not imply that projects or regional programmes of work are misaligned or nonaligned with the Programme, rather that their reporting frameworks are often not explicitly aligned with the Programme nor does the Programme itself generally appear to direct decisions or significantly influence the design of regional work plans. Looking at regional planning literature and project planning documentation, there is rarely an explicit mention of Nature 2030, nor of the specific targets they seek to attain. In this sense, we see little explicit alignment between the Programme and national and regional projects. We acknowledge that project managers are required to report the financial contribution of their projects to each of the 15 Programme Impact Targets, but as interviews revealed, the decision to select which Impact Target to select is made challenging by the fact that the Programme Area and Impact Targets construct has overlaps and forces staff to link the same action to multiple targets. According to one interviewee within the Secretariat: *'this is a difficult task – it is effectively a bit random when we assign to each target, because our work corresponds to multiple things.'*

2.2.3.3 Alignment between Thematic Centres and the Programme

We find alignment between the work of the Centres and the Programme. As for the Regions, the Centres are compelled to demonstrate alignment with the Programme Prioritised Programme Areas of *People, Land, Water, Oceans and Climate* in the annual consolidated workplans.³⁷ No other strategic planning literature was forthcoming over the course of the review period to assess further alignment with the Programme, however interviews with Centre Directors illustrate that alignment is indeed strong. According to one: *Everything we do at the Centre is tightly organised and relevant to the Programme.*

IUCN underwent a significant restructuring process over the Programme period, responding in part, to a perception within the Secretariat that workstreams could be better integrated and streamlined through a new set of thematic programme teams. According to one interview with a senior staff member at HQ: *'There were something like 14 teams that didn't speak to each other. The structure didn't allow for synergies to develop on cross cutting agenda like Nature-based Solutions (NBS). So we restructured to break these silos. The teams within each Centre are supposed to be more fluid than before, allowing for more collaboration.'* The 2021-2024 Operational Plan explicitly states an intent to 'optimise organisational programmatic and corporate directorate structures, in response to 'potentially top-heavy management structures in terms of the number and scope of programmatic (global and regional) and corporate directorates.'³⁸

³⁷ 2023-centres and regions workplan-consolidated

³⁸ IUCN (2021): Operational Plan 2021-2024, p.15



The previous structure was consolidated under five new thematic Centres. *The Centre for Economy and Finance* oversees resource redirection and mobilisation to meet the global targets on biodiversity and climate change. *The Centre for Society and Governance* is responsible for 'institutional, legal and collaborative efforts aimed at empowering and protecting the rights of a wide range of stakeholders'. *The Centre for Conservation Action* delivers work on biomes, including efforts on land, oceans and species. *The Centre for Science and Data* leads on the conservation science and knowledge, curating key products such as the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems, the IUCN Green List of Protected Areas and IUCN Standard for Nature-based Solutions. The *International Policy Centre* works with the IUCN Director General to enhance the Union's policy work and impact, guiding engagement in multilateral processes and international environmental forums to ensure the provision of sound policy and technical advice to negotiators and key stakeholders.

It is still too early to judge the effects of the new structure. The shift is acknowledged to have been a highly disruptive period both by the Secretariat³⁹ and within the Union more widely. According to one donor: *There was a turnover in personnel that was forced and disruptive. A lot of good people went. I understand the need for reform. The HQ structure was overhauled with no conversations. There should have been better communication with Council.* Nevertheless, some within the Secretariat see the shift in positive terms, citing the improvements that stem from integrated workstreams across previously-separate units.

We note from interviews with senior staff at the Secretariat that the Programme created a new mandate for IUCN to expand and mainstream areas that had been piloted under the previous Programme period. For example, the addition of Impact Target 2, under Land (*Thriving production landscapes are sustainable, and nature's value and benefits are safeguarded in the long term*) created momentum to build a dedicated Agriculture team within the Secretariat. The inclusion of *cities* within Impact Target 3 under Land, provided impetus for new thinking.

2.2.3.4 Alignment between the Commissions and the Programme

Though the Commissions' work is beyond the scope of this evaluation, it is important to reflect that our observations about the distance between the Programme and much of the Secretariat's work (notwithstanding the Centres), is seen also in the distance between the Commissions and the

³⁹ IUCN (2022): Thematic Centres Quarterly Report Q4 2022, p.1



Programme. The observations below are based on a small number of interviews, but are nevertheless instructive.

Alignment between the Commissions' work and the Programme is mixed. Just as we see with the Secretariat's work, all of the Commissions' work feeds into the Prioritised Programme Areas because they are so encompassing. According to one Commission member: *at the Commission we use Nature 2030 as a source. It's fairly easy to do this because Nature 2030 is so broad.* However, according to others, Commission workplans often derived from an alternative set of priorities than those explicitly contained in the Programme. For example, one Commission member noted that Resolutions were passed by Congress, after the approval of the Programme.⁴⁰ These Resolutions, they said, conferred greater operational urgency than the Programme itself, and resulted in workstreams that are not prescribed within the Programme.

Representatives from the IUCN Commissions tend not to rely on the Programme for guidance, pursuing instead longer-standing agenda that precede the Programme. One Commission member tried to map the Programme onto their own strategy and found that the Programme reporting framework did not account for much of the Commission's work. According to one Commission Member: *We struggle with the division of Land, Water, Climate etc. because they are often connected. We have to break these siloes. Internally within our Commission, some groups were highly critical of this siloed approach.* Another Commission member stated: *Nature 2030 doesn't drive what we do. It's important. It's an umbrella document [...] We struggled to link some of our flagship activities within the framework of Nature 2030.*

2.2.4 Structural Coherence

2.2.4.1 Clarity of Programme Goals

There is little clarity of Programme targets across the Union. Interviews with Secretariat staff at Regional, National and Project level, and many within HQ at Gland itself, found low awareness of the overall Programme Impact Targets in Nature 2030. Interviews with Commissions and Council members found similarly low levels of awareness. Those who are aware of the objectives or targets (albeit in a general sense), are often critical. According to a senior Regional staff member: *Firstly, I don't agree that they are impact targets. Impacts by when? 2030? A four-year cycle? They are too broad and hard to measure. Part of the problem is the terminology. People are confused about when this needs to be*

⁴⁰ IUCN (2021) Statutes and Regulations, 2021 p. 24



completed. The second problem is the impact pathways. This doesn't tell us what we will achieve on the way to the impact targets. As noted previously the construction of Programme Areas and Impact Targets contained within the Nature 2030 document creates difficulties for reporting and alignment.

2.2.4.2 Theory of Change

The Programme is built on a weak theory of change. The Nature 2030 Theory of Change defines high-level long-term goals for People, Land, Water, Oceans, and Climate. However, it does not specify IUCN's milestones for achieving these policy goals nor the barriers that will be addressed, nor the underlying assumptions that guide the intervention logic. Causal linkages between general workstreams, outcomes and impacts are not clear. Nor does the theory of change diagram provide a clear articulation of change.⁴¹

One of the problems this engenders is an over-reliance on anecdotal reporting in support of goal attainment. One example is the impact reporting contained within the Director General's reports to Council, which in addition to providing an update on the DG's own objectives, entail a collection of examples pertaining to each of the Programme's indicators. This is also true of the previous external Programme review in 2021⁴², which similarly provided a selection of examples that illustrate a contribution to the overall impact targets. This is not a criticism of either report (indeed, this evaluation follows in the same tradition), but a reflection of the fact that without a well-articulated theory of change, it is difficult to indicate a direction of travel. Is IUCN making progress towards these goals? What proportion has been achieved? How far/close is attainment? What are the interim milestones (outcomes) that signal progress towards the attainment of the greater goal? A stronger theory of change that articulates the contributions of the Secretariat and the Union, respectively, to the attainment of goals, coupled with outcome-level indicators would create a stronger basis for impact reporting. The previous Strategic review recommended that the Theory of Change be reviewed, this recommendation is still valid. The revision should be part of the strategic reflection and strategic planning exercise we recommend to conduct.

2.2.4.3 Results Framework

The overarching Programme Impact Framework for Nature 2030 was considered to be ineffectual by the majority of people interviewed in this review. The targets were considered too general, and there was no system for reporting impacts against the indicators. As a result, the Framework was not

⁴¹ IUCN (2021): Nature 2030, p. 9

⁴² Baastel (2020): External Review of the IUCN Programme 2017-2020



employed throughout the duration of the Programme period. One Commission member stated: *I spent a frustrating few weeks thinking through how we could map the entirety of our work to Nature 2030 and the indicators. It was a difficult, challenging and frustrating exercise.*

One of the difficulties with the Framework is that it corresponds to the work of the whole Union, but only the Secretariat – and HQ more specifically is accountable for aggregating the results.⁴³ Only HQ staff at Gland is preoccupied with reporting at aggregate level. Project teams, for example, are typically compelled to report against individual donor frameworks and accountability requirements. There are currently few incentives for IUCN's wider constituents, whether at regional, programmatic, national or project levels to report against common institutional indicators, which are typically viewed as either irrelevant or burdensome. At project level, in particular, many of the IUCN staff we spoke to, feel that the Project Portal reporting requirements are cumbersome and unhelpful. The limited uptake of the Contributions for Nature Platform illustrates the difficulty in mobilising interest from partners to input data. We acknowledge data is being uploaded, but the review team found insufficient data on the platform to facilitate our analysis. The weaknesses of the current MEL system are well recognised by the entire Secretariat, including Regions and Centres, which has already undertaken a significant programme of work to develop a new system. The review team was given a detailed demonstration of the new system, which provides a much more robust methodology for mapping contributions of the Secretariat's work towards the attainment of the Programme goals.

We further our assessment of the MEL system under the 'efficiency section' of the report, where we explore the impact of the weak MEL framework on Programme performance.

2.3 Effectiveness

We assess *Effectiveness* as the extent to which the Portfolio is delivering **conservation action**, the extent to which the Secretariat and the Union are delivering **knowledge generation** and **policy influence**, the extent to which '**enablers**' within the Programme were integrated into Programme implementation (technology, communication and sustainable finance).

⁴³ The Council Handbook does not provide clarity on roles and responsibilities for reporting. It is unclear, for example, how Commissions and Members are meant to report on Impact Targets. Similarly, it is unclear who within the Secretariat is responsible for reporting project contributions to the overarching Impact Targets. IUCN (2021): Council Handbook, p.36.



2.3.1 Summary

Overall, we find that IUCN has been fairly effective in delivering work aligned with the Programme. While it is not possible to conduct a systematic assessment of the entire project Portfolio, there is plenty of evidence that IUCN is delivering good conservation action. Similarly, we find that IUCN's work on knowledge generation and policy influence is strong. We find that the use of technology is limited. IUCN appears to be somewhat 'behind the curve' on recognising and harnessing emergent technologies to strengthen conservation work. By comparison, we find that IUCN has employed communication, education and public awareness reasonably well in many areas of its work.

2.3.2 Conservation Action

While the majority of IUCN projects meet their donor specific accountability requirements, IUCN does not systematically track the performance of projects within the Portfolio in terms of their contribution to Programme Impact Targets. Nor is it possible to state what proportion of projects within the Portfolio are on track to meet their own targets, nor how they performed with regards to financial management or other operational/managerial measures of efficiency. In the absence of such data, we sampled 28 projects to conduct a high-level literature review of available documentation. The exercise was not intended to generate quantitative data, nor to provide a detailed evaluation of each project. Rather the goal was to provide a snapshot of projects across a range of areas, enabling a qualitative assessment of general trends of project delivery.⁴⁴ On this basis, **we find that IUCN's projects are executed with a high degree of proficiency.**

Our assessment indicates strong stakeholder engagement at government and community levels from project design to delivery. We find each of the projects to be highly relevant to the local contexts in which they operate, corresponding to specific needs. The systematic application of ESMS standards during project design stages, combined with strong levels of community and stakeholder consultation in many of the projects we looked at, is indicative of a robust approach to project design. Some examples to illustrate this point are provided below:

- **Mekong WET project** in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Viet Nam - IUCN worked with local partners to conduct detailed Climate Change and Vulnerability Assessments (CCVAs) as the first step of a participatory adaptation planning process, which combined scientific assessments with extensive community-level consultations and dialogue with local authorities and site

⁴⁴ For a full methodology of the project scorecard methodology, please see the appendices of this report.



managers. The CCVA reports contained clear data on communities living in and around wetlands, describing demographic data such as ethnicity, number of households, number of people and gender. A local stakeholder analysis was also conducted, ensuring a strong contextualised understanding of how project activities can be delivered in a manner that adapts to local conditions and serves local needs.⁴⁵

- **Save Our Mangroves Now (SOMN) 2.0 project** in Tanzania, Madagascar and Kenya – Building on the success and lessons from SOMN phase 1, phase 2 nevertheless began with a detailed stakeholder mapping exercise to recalibrate and to enhance partnership building.⁴⁶
- **Building River Dialogue and Governance (BRIDGE) Phase 5** - working across five transboundary river basins in Africa – Four phases of the BRIDGE Programme were delivered prior to this one, over a period 12 years during which a multitude of different forms of engagement have taken place with a range of stakeholders. The experience and knowledge gained from these interactions helped shape the priorities for the current phase. In the first quarter of Phase 5 the project made connections with more than 70 partners from previous phases to engage them in the current phase and actions were taken to mobilise new partnerships. These partners included CSOs, government agencies, donor organisations and academic institutions.⁴⁷

We also find that the majority of projects we looked at were making progress towards delivering their targets - of the 26 projects for which there was some reporting data, 25 evidenced good progress towards / achievement of results. For example:

- **Coke Flood Retention Strategy** - The project can be deemed successful, as it achieved, or made a significant advance towards its annual targets for flood retention capacity for each year of implementation. In year one, 105 hectares of farming land was planted with diversified lotus farming systems, representing 1.575 million m³ of flood-retention capacity, against a target of 1.5 million m³. In year two, the project fell just short of its target, achieving 2.1 million m³. compared to a target of 2.3 million m³. In the final year, the project supported 241 hectares, thereby securing 4.1 million m³ of flood-retention capacity compared to a target of 2.9 million.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ IUCN (2019): Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment U Minh Thuong, Viet Nam

⁴⁶ WWF Germany (2019): SOMN 2.0 Project Proposal, pp.9 & 10, Annexes 2a & 2b

⁴⁷ IUCN (2023) BRIDGE - Building River Dialogue and Governance (Phase 5) Progress report (September 2022-August 2023)

⁴⁸ IUCN (2021): Final Grant Report. UG-2019-47695-Piloting Flood-Based Livelihoods in Support of a Water Retention Strategy for the Mekong Delta, Vietnam.p.3



- **BC Barometer Programme** - The project interim report indicates that it has achieved or exceeded the targets for its outcome indicators (*Barometer framework allows for report and progress tracking by all Bonn Challenge pledgers and number of hectares of land under restoration*). A third outcome (*Barometer strengthened through integration of 3rd party products*) is due to be achieved after project end date.⁴⁹
- **World Heritage Leadership Programme** – A mid-term evaluation reported good progress towards results, including: at site level, site managers have reported changes in World Heritage site management and conservation practice such as integration of nature-culture components in management plans and a more people-centred approach which promotes the broader involvement of communities and ethnic communities in site management and greater cooperation with local stakeholders. Further results can be found in the report.⁵⁰
- **SOS Lemurs** - At project level the outcomes appear to be fairly satisfactory. A final evaluation was conducted in 2022, which reported that 71.6% of objectives/activities set by grantees had been achieved and 26.8% had been partially achieved or were in progress.⁵¹

Mapping project achievements against the Nature 2030 impact indicators is challenging. As noted at multiple points in this report, IUCN does not systematically track portfolio results against the Nature 2030 indicators. Project literature demonstrates that many of the projects' results could be linked in one form or another to some of the indicators within Nature 2030. Mapping these contributions in detail – even for the 28 projects sampled in this evaluation – would be a considerable undertaking in its own right and is not attempted here. Examples of project contributions to impacts include:

- **Mekong Peatland Project** – The project will contribute to the Land Impact Target 1. *Ecosystems are retained and restored, species are conserved and recovered, and key biodiversity areas are safeguarded.* The latest Project Implementation Report states that the project has achieved to date 77% of its target to map peatlands in Myanmar, Cambodia and Lao PDR, in spite of significant delays at inception due in part to Covid-19. It has also contributed to People Impact Target 2. *Equitable and effective governance of natural resources at all levels to benefit people and nature.* It has done so by strengthening legal and policy frameworks for sustainable peatland management. IUCN exceeded 'the target of 2 policy/legal frameworks per country by strengthening a total of 8 laws, plans, policies, guidelines or strategies. The Lao PDR has

⁴⁹ IKI (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 & 2023) The Bonn Challenge Barometer of Progress - Interim Reports, p.5

⁵⁰ E.C.O Institute for Ecology (2020) Mid-term Programme Evaluation: World Heritage Leadership (Final Report), pp.10-11.

⁵¹ ONF International (2022): SOS Lemurs Initiative 2017-2022 - Final Evaluation Report, p.42



strengthened 3 legal/regulatory documents: one strategy; one management plan; and one policy. Cambodia has strengthened 5 legal/regulatory documents: one law; two policies, and two plans.⁵²

- **Landscape and Integrated Water Resources Management and Restoration in Sebeya and other Catchments, Rwanda** – This project aligns with the People impact target 2: *Equitable and effective governance of natural resources at all levels to benefit people and nature*. The project implemented Village Land Use Action Plans (VLUAPs) in 117 communities, with close involvement of local community members. The project also contributed to Land impact target 1: *Ecosystems are retained and restored, species are conserved and recovered, and key biodiversity areas are safeguarded* because it placed 3,500 ha under restoration, including measures such as terracing, and stream bank rehabilitation.⁵³
- **Regional Coastal Biodiversity Project (RCBP)** - The project has made a contribution to the Oceans impact target 1: *The loss of marine species and decline of marine ecosystem integrity is halted, and restoration initiated*, and impact target 2: *Uses of marine natural resources generate overall positive biodiversity outcomes and sustain livelihood benefits for coastal communities*. It has done so by increasing awareness amongst communities of the benefits received for healthy coastal ecosystems, indirectly benefitting 30,133 individuals in the project area. Under the project, a total of 75,110 hectares are yielding greater catch sizes due to improved management of closures and fishing gear, in addition to improved governance mechanisms.⁵⁴
- **Enlazando el Paisaje Centroamericano project** – The latest technical monitoring report for this project records that over 80 tree species have been identified within a proposed 4,000ha restoration area. This contributes to Land impact target 1. *Ecosystems are retained and restored, species are conserved and recovered, and key biodiversity areas are safeguarded*. Results from this project can also be said to contribute to People impact target 2: *Equitable and effective governance of natural resources at all levels to benefit people and nature*. For example, local conservation governance structures, such as the Joint Management Committee of the Cayos Miskitos Marine Biological Reserve (RBMCM) in Nicaragua and the Governance System of the Karataska Lagoon System (SLK) in Honduras, are now better able to implement

⁵² IUCN (2023): Project Implementation Report, p.4

⁵³ IUCN (2020): *Embedding Integrated Water Resource Management in Rwanda (EWMR): 2020 Annual Report*, p.7

⁵⁴ IUCN (2022). Regional Coastal Biodiversity Project. 5th Annual report, p.12



coordination mechanisms for the development of a Comprehensive Landscape Management Plan as a result of support provided by the project.⁵⁵

However, in our reading of project literature we detect potentially powerful impact narratives that are lost in the current formulation of Nature 2030 Impact Targets. For example, there are a number of Impact Targets that correspond (in some cases rather tangentially) to *livelihoods*. We find some great examples of how IUCN has improved livelihoods at project level, but these impacts could be reported against a number of different Impact Target indicators, thereby diluting a potentially positive impact story at an aggregated level. Knowing that some donors are interested in the linkages between nature conservation and development, creating a single ‘livelihoods’ Impact Target could enhance IUCN’s impact reporting. We provide two examples of project-level livelihoods impacts.

- **The Regional Coastal Biodiversity Project (RCBP)** has a strong focus on livelihoods, resulting in an estimated \$424,383 income thanks in part to training and support provided by IUCN to 18 small business groups.⁵⁶ This could correspond to the Oceans’ Impact Target 2: *Uses of marine natural resources generate overall positive biodiversity outcomes and sustain livelihood benefits for coastal communities.*
- **The Resilience for People and Landscapes Programme (REPLAP)** aimed to support climate adaptive livelihoods systems in order to improve household livelihoods through the promotion of climate resilient initiatives. At the end of the project, it facilitated the diversification of livelihoods in 66% of households within the project area (against a target of 60%). It also reduced the number of households living below the poverty line by 17.5%.⁵⁷ This could correspond to Climate Impact Target 1: *Countries use Nature-based Solutions to scale up effective adaptation to the impacts of climate change.*

The fact that there is no natural ‘home’ for these sorts of impact within the current Programme results architecture means that stories like these, and potentially others too, risk becoming lost in future Programme-level reports unless there is specific provision made for them. We return to this theme in the recommendation section of the report below.

⁵⁵ IUCN (2023): Enlazando el Paisaje Centroamericano: Informe de Avance Enero-Junio 2023, p.16

⁵⁶ IUCN (2022). Regional Coastal Biodiversity Project. 5th Annual report, p.10

⁵⁷ IUCN (2022): Final Evaluation of the Resilience for People and Landscapes Programme (RELAP), p.ii



Overall, taken individually, it is difficult to fault IUCN's projects at first glance. However, given the absence of aggregated project performance data, it is impossible to provide an overarching assessment about the extent to which they have contributed to conservation action.

2.3.3 Knowledge Generation

2.3.3.1 Familiarity with Knowledge Products

There is a high degree of familiarity with many of IUCN's knowledge products - notably the flagship products such as the Red List of Threatened Species. Interviewees praised the quality of IUCN's work, citing the importance of the Commissions in generating technically strong products. There is a sense from the interviews that much of IUCN's credibility derives from the quality of its knowledge products and standard setting. According to one interview with a donor: *what they are the most known for, of course, is the Red List*. Another stated: *The standard setting work is what IUCN does best*.

IUCN hosts an impressive online library of public resources,⁵⁸ ensuring wide access to materials produced by the Union. The resource library is well curated, with user-friendly search functions. At the end of 2021, IUCN reported that almost two million documents were downloaded from the online library, achieving 8,889 online mentions.⁵⁹ This figure rose to 12,841 online mentions in 2022.⁶⁰ That year, the most downloaded publication was Primary Microplastics in the Ocean (28,312 downloads), followed by Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories (20,041 downloads). Helpfully, IUCN employs the Altmetric Attention Score to gauge interest/uptake of its publications. The Altmetric is useful because it provides a view of non-traditional sources, including mainstream and social media, public policy document and online reference managers, enabling IUCN to assess the uptake of knowledge products beyond just academic circles. The most recent IUCN Annual Report from 2022 highlights five reports that received the most online attention that year. These include two reports produced by the Species Survival Commission: Situation analysis on the roles and risks of wildlife in the emergence of human infectious diseases (score 81), and Selecting species and populations for monitoring of genetic diversity (score 52).⁶¹

⁵⁸ https://www.iucn.org/resources?resource_type=All#resources

⁵⁹ IUCN (2021): IUCN Annual Report 2021, p.29

⁶⁰ IUCN (2022): IUCN Annual Report 2022, p.29

⁶¹ Ibid, p.28



2.3.3.2 Utility of Knowledge Products

IUCN publications, Standards-based knowledge products and tools are held in extremely high regard by all stakeholders interviewed. According to the Membership Satisfaction Survey, more than 80% of IUCN Members agree that their organisation has benefitted from IUCN knowledge products.⁶² One donor stated: *Everything they do is the gold standard. They are the gold standard. We hope this continues to expand. Without them, we cannot achieve anything.*

IUCN produces a number of Standards-based knowledge products and tools. These include, the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems, the IUCN Global Invasive Species Database, the World Database of Key Biodiversity Areas, and Protected Planet. It also produces a number of other standards, including: the Global Standard for Nature-Based Solutions, and the Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas Standard. Finally, it produces a range of decision support tools, such as the IUCN Contributions for Nature Platform, PANORAMA, the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT), the Restoration Barometer and World Heritage Outlook.

An external review conducted in 2021, documented the utility of data products based on IUCN's Standards, which contributed significantly to improved decision-making and positive outcomes for biodiversity.⁶³ We find a number of specific examples to further illustrate this point throughout IUCN's reporting literature.

At the CBD COP15, PANORAMA is explicitly referenced in Decision 15/16 as a key initiative 'which supports implementation through knowledge generation, management and sharing for effective biodiversity planning, policy development, decision-making, implementation, transparency and responsibility' (CBD 15/16).⁶⁴ The Red List of Ecosystems was listed as a key indicator for monitoring Goal A of the Global Biodiversity Framework. Similarly, the Protected Planet databases were cited as sources for monitoring indicators.⁶⁵ At the CITES COP 19, IUCN's report on the conservation status and trade in African and Asian rhinos reportedly informed decisions adopted at the meeting.⁶⁶ At a more granular level, we find use cases in more specific contexts. For example, the Côte d'Ivoire Office of Protected Areas employed the IUCN Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool (IMET) as a basis for planning eco-tourism projects.⁶⁷ In Costa Rica, the IUCN Restoration Barometer is used as a national

⁶² IUCN (2023): Annual Membership Satisfaction Survey. Presentation to the Executive Board, p. 2

⁶³ The Biodiversity Consultancy (2021): IUCN: Strategic Review of Data Products based on IUCN Standards, p.5

⁶⁴ IUCN (2022): Centres Quarterly Report, Q4 2022, p. 10

⁶⁵ IUCN Annual Report 2022, p.31

⁶⁶ IUCN (2022): Quarterly Report 2022 Q-4, p.7

⁶⁷ IUCN (2023): IUCN Regional Offices, Apr-June 2023, Quarterly Report, p. 20



tracking system for the implementation of restoration projects, with support from government institutions, NGOs, trade associations, and public companies.⁶⁸

2.3.4 Policy Influence

2.3.4.1 Policy Leadership

IUCN is engaged in a wide range of policy work across the Union, aimed primarily at setting conservation priorities and informing and influencing international agreements.⁶⁹ The impact of IUCN's policy work will be assessed in a separate evaluation being conducted concurrently. Nevertheless, a summary view of policy work is warranted in this evaluation as it forms a key part of the Programme. It is clear from our interviews with IUCN's donors and Members, and from our reading of IUCN's literature that IUCN is highly influential. More than 60% of IUCN's members trust and have benefitted from IUCN's advice on policy-related issues. Close to 80% also value IUCN's conservation policy work.⁷⁰ As one Member stated: *'It is the single greatest lobbyist for nature. The policy influence and leveraging of state support is where IUCN's core value lies.'* Commenting on the manner in which IUCN achieves policy influence, one stakeholder noted: *'they did it with quiet, science-based advocacy. They were on the ground; they could answer questions and provide scenarios. I do think their constant presence and their ability to do this is very important. They deserve a lot of credit'*. It was reported several times that IUCN had a unique identity in the conservation world as a being a non-partisan or non-militant organisation, while being the "voice of nature".

IUCN's Quarterly Reports highlight a number of tangible ways in which IUCN is leading the nature conservation agenda, and influencing policy. For example, the IUCN delegation at the Ramsar COP14 in November 2022 influenced Resolution 18.20 about recognising the potential of wetlands as a Nature-based Solution for climate mitigation and adaptation.⁷¹ At the CBD COP 15, many of IUCN's indicators were adopted as part of the Global Biodiversity Framework's headline indicators.⁷² Further examples can be found in IUCN's role in preparation for the UN High Seas Treaty and negotiations towards a Plastics Treaty, and the development of a Global Species Action Plan (GSAP).⁷³ IUCN's Annual Report from 2022 contains many further examples of policy influence. For example, at the Intergovernmental

⁶⁸ IUCN (2020): Application of the Restoration Barometer in Costa Rica

⁶⁹ <https://www.iucn.org/policy>

⁷⁰ IUCN (2023): Annual Membership Satisfaction Survey. Presentation to the Executive Board, p. 2

⁷¹ IUCN (2022): Quarterly report 2022-Q4, p.4

⁷² Ibid, p.9

⁷³ IUCN (2023) Workshop 1- Centre for Conservation Action



Conference on Marine Biodiversity of Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction, IUCN provided briefings for negotiators and textual proposals for parts of the proposed Treaty.

IUCN is well-positioned to launch and lead new global initiatives. At the COP 27 for UNFCCC, IUCN co-launched the Mangrove Breakthrough, a set of targets for non-state actors and governments to halt the loss of mangroves. This is now part of the Sharm El-Sheikh Adaptation Agenda, which provides a global agenda for building global resilience by 2030. It was also instrumental in the launch of the Enhancing Nature-based Solutions for an Accelerated Climate Transformation (ENACT) initiative.⁷⁴

IUCN was instrumental in developing the definition of Nature Based Solutions⁷⁵ - a statement we heard from a number of sources. The term is now widely accepted and appears in the targets for the Global Biodiversity Framework - Targets 8 and 11⁷⁶. We also learned from interviews with IUCN staff that IUCN was instrumental in ensuring that the concept of other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) was integrated into Target 3 of the Global Biodiversity Framework - the so-called 30x30 target.

IUCN is able to exert significant policy leverage through its various roles within global conservation frameworks, notably within the World Heritage Convention, where it fulfils the statutory role of Advisory Body. An external review of IUCN's engagement with the World Heritage Convention concluded that IUCN had significant influence within the Convention, where it has full visibility at the Committee sessions, a place on the speakers' podium and speaking rights above non-Committee Member States Parties, and where it drafts decisions for nomination dossiers to the World Heritage List.⁷⁷ IUCN has a seat on the Advisory Committee of the UN Ocean Conference, in which role it provided inputs to the Lisbon Declaration. IUCN's engagement with the Conference led to the West Indian Ocean region's commitment to the 30x30 goals in marine areas, and statements calling for a deep-sea mining moratorium.⁷⁸

At a more operational level, we find plenty of examples where IUCN has been critical in influencing national government policies. For example, in Vietnam, we learned from interviews with team in Ho Chi Minh City that IUCN lobbied hard for the eventual banning of turtle meat from markets, through its ongoing advocacy work as part of the *Community-Based Marine Turtle Conservation Project*. We also

⁷⁴ IUCN (2022): Quarterly Report 2022-Q4, p.4

⁷⁵ <https://iucn.org/our-work/nature-based-solutions>

⁷⁶ <https://www.cbd.int/gbf/targets/>

⁷⁷ Aleph Strategies (2022): Strategic Review of IUCN's Future Engagement with the World Heritage Convention, p.33

⁷⁸ IUCN (2022): IUCN Annual report 2022, p.25



learned from interviews with local government officials and IUCN project teams in Vietnam that IUCN's work was instrumental in precipitating the National Government's Decision 120, which provided official recognition for the dangers of a third rice crop harvest, thereby paving the way for a reintroduction of flood-friendly crops such as floating rice and lotus. The main thrust of the *Save Our Mangroves Now (SOMN) 2.0* project was to facilitate the development of new policy relating to mangrove conservation and to ensure that mangroves were included in the broader policy documents on biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation and adaptation. This was achieved with at a global level with important documents such as the UNFCCC Glasgow PACT, the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework, the Blue Carbon Policy Framework and the UNFCCC Global Stock Take options paper.⁷⁹ Through the *Regional Coastal Biodiversity Project*, IUCN worked together with local communities to propose 20 new regulations for fisheries management and legal frameworks. IUCN reports that five of these proposals have been approved by the government, and a further 9 have been implemented to date.⁸⁰ Other examples can be found throughout the project reporting literature.

2.3.4.2 Networking and Convening

This is seen as IUCN's key strength by the majority of stakeholders we interviewed throughout the Secretariat, and within the wider Union. More than half of IUCN Members that took part in a recent poll are of a view that they have benefitted from the neutral convening platform provided by IUCN.⁸¹ There are examples of IUCN's networking capacity to be found across the organisation. At a global level, in 2022 alone, IUCN hosted a number of high-level convening events, bringing together thousands of stakeholders across government, the private sector, indigenous peoples' organisations, academia and nature conservation. These include the World Conservation Congresses, which are amongst the largest conservation forums in the world. The last Congress in 2021 was held in Marseille, and attracted over 9,200 participants online and in person (over 2,300 of whom were under 35 years of age). It included an exhibition of over 100 stands and 500 events.⁸²

During the Programme period, IUCN held the Second Asia Parks Congress (1200 participants from 49 countries), and the Inaugural African Protected Areas Congress (more than 2400 participants from 80 countries).⁸³ IUCN also held the first Leaders Forum in Jeju, Republic of Korea in October 2022, which included more than 350 representatives from over 50 countries.⁸⁴ An external evaluation of the Leaders

⁷⁹ Futureval (2023) External final evaluation - final report, p.13

⁸⁰ IUCN (2022). *Regional Coastal Biodiversity Project*. 5th Annual report, p.11

⁸¹ IUCN (2023): Annual Membership Satisfaction Survey. Presentation to the Executive Board, p. 3

⁸² IUCN (2021): Annual Report 2021, p12

⁸³ IUCN (2022): Annual Report 2022, p20

⁸⁴ Ibid, p.19



Forum concluded that IUCN had strong international standing and a power to convene a wide range of stakeholders, and reported high levels of participant satisfaction.⁸⁵

At a regional level, we find similar examples of IUCN's ability mobilise stakeholders. In Asia, IUCN ARO collaborated with the Ministry of the Environment of Japan (MoEJ), Korea National Parks Services (KNPS) and the WCPA to provide guidance on the implementation of Other Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs).⁸⁶ Similarly, in Africa, IUCN ESARO collaborated with UNEP-WCMC, WCPA and other partners to provide training to government and civil society in Kenya and Namibia.⁸⁷ IUCN ECARO facilitated a regional dialogue Scaling-up Nature-based Solutions for Resilient Landscapes in Central Asia, with the World Bank and the Ministry of Ecology, Environmental Protection and Climate Change of Uzbekistan. This provided policy makers and practitioners across the Central Asia region with a platform for discussing Nature-based Solutions for tackling climate induced natural disasters.⁸⁸ IUCN PACO fostered collaboration in Ghana and DRC with 30 conservation experts, human and animal health experts to introduce the One Health Approach to key stakeholders at national and local levels.⁸⁹

We also saw first-hand IUCN's capacity to convene conservation stakeholders at country level. Each of our field missions to ARO, ORMACC and ESARO entailed extensive meetings with national and sub-national government, conservation organisations, civil society, NGOs and local community groups. Many of IUCN's projects are specifically designed to create platforms for collaboration and dialogue. For example, the project Advancing towards rights-based conservation and territorial management in Latin America funded by Sida, promotes 'spaces of reflection, dialogue and collective action to foster environmental justice beyond implementation of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.'⁹⁰

2.3.5 Using the three 'enablers'

The Programme contained three enablers: i) technology, data and innovation; ii) communication, education and public awareness; and iii) investments and financial sustainability. Here we look at the use of technology and the deployment of communication, education and public awareness. Investments and financial sustainability are addressed in the *sustainability* section of the report.

⁸⁵ Baastel (2022): IUCN Leaders Forum Evaluation 2022

⁸⁶ IUCN (2022): Asia Regional Office Annual Report 2022

⁸⁷ IUCN (2021): ESARO Annual Report 2021, p.15

⁸⁸ IUCN (2023): Regions Quarterly Report, Apr-Jun, 2023, p. 6

⁸⁹ Ibid, p. 20

⁹⁰ IUCN (2022): ORMACC Biennial Report, p.26



2.3.5.1 Technology, Data and Innovation

As articulated in the Nature 2030 Programme, IUCN views technology as an enabler, running across all areas of IUCN's work. **However, there is no natural 'home' for strategic thinking about technology**, and according to one interviewee at the Secretariat: *'there are a great many number of opportunities for tech, but we don't have an organisational vision for how tech can be used.'* Within IUCN's deep repository of online resources, there are no reports on the use or potential uses of technology in enhancing conservation work. There are no feasibility studies or threat assessments focussing solely on technology. Given the rate of technological development, said one Council Member, whether in materials science, AI or gene-editing - it seems striking that IUCN appears not to have undertaken a strategic assessment of the situation. Indeed, we find very little evidence of strategic thinking or action regarding technology in any of the Secretariat's annual reporting instruments, whether the Director General's reports to Council; the Annual Report 2022; the Regional Annual Reports; or the quarterly progress reports from the Corporate Units, the Centres and the Regions.

There is one exception. The ARO Annual Report from 2022, highlights the Tech4Nature programme in collaboration with Huawei. This is IUCN's flagship technology programme, which seeks innovative solutions for protected area management for Green List sites in the region.⁹¹ This is a significant project because it specifically seeks to identify and implement technological solutions to help scale nature conservation. It aims to provide guidance on how digital technology can enhance area-based conservation with direct involvement of the ICT sector. According to one interview with Secretariat staff, it is hoped that this project will be the catalyst for further such projects.

2.3.5.2 Communication, Education and Public Awareness

We find good examples throughout IUCN's work that illustrate an industrious approach to communication, education and public awareness. The IUCN Global Communications Unit has been active over the evaluation period, achieving good media exposure: over 32,386 media articles referencing IUCN in the first quarter of 2023 alone.⁹² During this period IUCN has secured media coverage in major outlets including The Economist, BBC, The Guardian, New Scientist, The Washington Post, CNN, National Geographic, Reuters, Le Monde and many others. Reviewing each of the quarterly progress reports from the Secretariat's Corporate Units from 2021 to present reveals a broadly consistent picture of activity, achieving comparable levels of media exposure with prominent outlets. The Quarterly Progress Report from Q3 2022 showcases one press release in particular (the IUCN Red

⁹¹ IUCN (2022): Asia Regional Office Annual Report 2022, 9

⁹² IUCN (2023): Corporate Quarterly Progress Report January – March 2023, p.4



List update) that generated around 3,831 media articles in 126 countries, which, it states is amongst the highest ever figures of any press release.⁹³

These achievements appear to have been attained with only a limited budget, and without strategic direction or guidance. Interviews with IUCN HQ staff suggest that communications output is driven by events rather than pursuit of a coherent communication strategy. Communications work reportedly receives only limited funding, preventing a more strategic approach to outreach and engagement.

At project level, we find examples of how IUCN has leveraged communication, education and public awareness to strengthen nature conservation. A good example of this can be found in the *Community-Based Marine Turtle Conservation project* in Vietnam, which has diligently pursued a campaign for the last 20 years to raise awareness and mobilise local communities in support of the turtle conservation. The increasing number of people from local communities who now volunteer to support conservation activities is testament to the success of this approach.

Other examples include: the *Bahari Mali* project in Tanzania which employed public broadcast radio for diffusing knowledge of the project; similarly, the *ASWA2* project in Uganda employed radio to reach local communities. It also employed community drama groups for the same purpose. The *Building Livelihood Resilience to Climate Change in the Upper Basins of Guatemala's Highlands* project is currently undertaking a media study to identify suitable communications channels for future community engagement work.

We also note that IUCN launched the IUCN Academy, which provides a range of training products and professional certificates. While an evaluation of the Academy is beyond the scope of this work, the creation of the Academy itself illustrates a strong commitment to education in particular.

⁹³ IUCN (2022): Corporate Quarterly Progress Report - Q3 2022



2.4 Efficiency

We assess *Efficiency* as the extent to which the mechanisms supporting the delivery of the Programme and, more widely, the work of the Union are in place and performing well, including the generation and management of financial resources (**resource efficiency**), some internal tools and processes key to **organisational efficiency**, the **monitoring and accountability** tools and practices, and **internal and external communication**'s role in supporting programme delivery.

2.4.1 Summary

Over the review period, IUCN has been very active in improving its efficiency along several dimensions. We find that, as regards resource efficiency, the attainment of financial targets is overall moving in the right direction and that resource mobilisation and cost recovery are improving as well.. IUCN has launched several reviews, studies and reforms of its management structure and tools. This path is likely to be pursued, and the changes will most likely be very positive notably as regards Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning. Clear communication on the ongoing changes is however critical to ensure that they are well understood and serve all their intended beneficiaries.

2.4.2 Resource efficiency

2.4.2.1 Attainment of financial targets

Overall, IUCN is on its way to attaining most of its financial objectives and the financial situation is improving while still not exempt from risk (See below section 2.6). The reference document against which the attainment of the financial targets is to be measured is the *IUCN Financial plan 2021-2024*, which lays out nine growth and sustainability targets⁹⁴. However, it should be noticed that this plan is only loosely coupled with *Nature 2030*: it displays income targets and projected expenditure for each programme area over the four-year period but does not go further into details. A closer link between the two documents could only be made if the Secretariat's contribution to the delivery of the programme were better defined.

For the specific purpose of this review, we asked the Chief Financial Officer for a report on the attainment of the nine targets covering the period from 2021 to October 2023. It should be noted that pre-existing reports covered either 6 months or one-year periods and do not contain specific reference to the Financial Plan 2021-2024. **The results are in the below table, which shows that most targets are either met or close to be met**, with a particularly good performance as regards the increase of

⁹⁴ IUCN [2021] IUCN Financial Plan 2021-2024, p. 11-12



framework income, the growth in income generation from private sector, foundations and philanthropy is the area where the targets may be missed. It has however been reported that those targets may not be fully owned and pursued by all components of the Union. There were questions at the Council meetings about whether increasing membership income, or diversifying income sources were real objectives of the Union or not.

Progress on implementation of the Financial Plan 2021-24

| Target | Baseline (2020) | Target value | Period | Status taking into consideration the 2024 budget |
|---|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Increase membership dues | CHF 12.7m | 10% of total value | 2021–2024 | 2021-24 increase of 9% compared to 2020 |
| Maintain current level of framework income | CHF 12.1m | 0% | 2021–2024 | 2021-24 increase of 19% compared to 2020 |
| Increase value of project portfolio: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF/GCF • Other | CHF 522m (total) | 15% 5% | Year-on-year | 2021-24 increase of 48% compared to 2020 (total portfolio) |
| Increase annual level of restricted income and expenditure | CHF 77.6m | 10% | Year-on-year | 2021-24 increase of 96% compared to 2020. |
| Increase level of operational costs funded by cost recovery | 54% | From 63% to 70% | 2021–2024 | 2024 budget: 62% 2023 forecast: 61% 2022 actual: 61% 2021 actual: 56% 2020 actual: 54% (The baseline and target values in the Financial Plan were erroneously calculated. Baseline should read 54%, not 63%) |
| Non-staff operating costs not to exceed 20% of total operating costs | 16% | 20% | 2021–2024 | 2024 budget: 19% 2023 forecast: 16% 2022 actual: 17% 2021 actual: 15% |
| Grow income from foundations and philanthropy | 8% | From 9% to 12% of total income | 2021–2024 | 2024 budget: 8% 2023 forecast: 6% 2022 actual: 9% 2021 actual: 6% |
| Grow income from private sector | 4% | From 3% to 5% of total income | 2021–2024 | 2024 budget: 2.0% 2023 forecast: 2.4% 2022 actual: 2.5% 2021 actual: 2.7% |
| Increase reserves | CHF 17.6m | CHF 3m | 2021–2024 | 2024 budget: CHF 2.0m 2023 forecast: CHF 1.3m 2022 actual: CHF (0.6m) 2021 actual: CHF 5.5m If the forecast for 2023 and the budget for 2024 are achieved the total increase for the period 2021-24 would be CHF 8.2m. |

Based on the most recent IUCN management results from 2022, Membership dues made up to 8% of the total funding. Although this does not match the anticipated increase, there has been an overall increase in the membership as evidenced in the 2022 results. The report states that CHF 13.5 million



were invoiced⁹⁵ in 2022, compared to CHF 12.6 million in 2021. 62 new Members joined IUCN in 2022, including one new State Member, The Maldives. At the end of 2022, there were 1,452 Members across 165 countries. The number of members has been steadily increasing - with 12 new members in Q1 and 11 new members in Q2 of 2023⁹⁶.

Framework income increased from CHF 13.6m to CHF 15.2m (11% increase).

The level of reserves (unrestricted and designated) at the end of 2022 was CHF 23M compared to a Financial Plan level of CHF 20m⁹⁷.

The project portfolio has seen incremental growth. At the end of 2022, the value of the project portfolio stood at CHF 927 million, comprising 556 projects in 166 countries. The European Commission was IUCN's largest donor, followed by the Global Environment Fund (GEF), the German Government and the Green Climate Fund (GCF)⁹⁸. Levels of restricted income and expenditure have also risen. Project income and expenditure reached CHF 127 million compared to CHF 104 million in 2021.⁹⁹

In terms of operational costs funded by cost recovery, the healthy operating surplus reflects IUCN's continued drive to increase operational efficiency and to increase the funding of operational costs from the project portfolio thereby reducing the pressure on unrestricted funds to cover operational costs.¹⁰⁰

By the end of 2022, while income from private sector has decreased from 3% (2017-2020 period) to 2%, IUCN managed to increase its income from foundations and philanthropy from 8% (2017-2020 period) to 9% of the total funding.¹⁰¹

2.4.2.2 Resource mobilisation and cost recovery

IUCN is aware of the challenges pertaining to resource mobilisation and cost recovery and it is addressing them, there is however more to be done, notably as regards communication on those topics.

⁹⁵ Income is recognised based on the value of invoices raised. However, some Members do not pay their dues. The provision for non-payment is shown as an expense in the financial statements.

⁹⁶ IUCN [2023] Regions quarterly reports, 2023

⁹⁷ IUCN: C 109 Results on DG Strategic Objectives for 2022, p.2

⁹⁸ UCN Management Results 2022, p. 3.

⁹⁹ Ibid, p.1

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, p.1

¹⁰¹ Ibid, p.2



IUCN set up a *Resource Mobilisation Strategy* that contains five core objectives and a monitoring framework. This was done to ensure a balance between unrestricted and Programme funding in a way that covers all Programme delivery and institutional needs¹⁰². The goal of this strategy is to secure adequate, predictable and flexible funding to deliver the IUCN Programme, service the Union, invest in organisational development and reduce risks¹⁰³. A short report on progress was expected to be provided to the Board each year and a review of the strategy's five objectives¹⁰⁴ and effectiveness was to be conducted in 2023 in order to extract lessons learnt and inform the planning and resource mobilisation approach for the next quadrennial cycle. We saw few and very short mentions of the mobilisation strategy in the several reports consulted for this strategic review and **we certainly encourage the Secretariat to take stock of and report on the implementation and results of the strategy.**

The *Operational Plan 2021-2024* recognises that historically the Secretariat and its component units have been over-dependant on unrestricted sources and have failed to optimise legitimate cost recovery from the project Portfolio. Not only does this increase financial risk exposure but it also limits strategic and innovative investment necessary for longer-term financial stability and sustainability¹⁰⁵. Over the course of 2022, IUCN developed a new overhead Policy shared with Framework Partners and other key institutional donors and progress was made in achieving compliance with the Policy. Nevertheless, some donors (e.g. EU, GEF, GCF, UN agencies) impose their own rates (sometimes 7 or 8%) , which barely cover the costs borne by IUCN for project implementation (while IUCN policy asks for overheads rates of 12%). A two-fold approach to addressing this has been adopted: 1) launch of a project costing framework that supports, amongst other, improved budgeting and inclusion of corporate costs as direct costs; and 2) discussion with donors at the institutional level led by the Strategic Partnerships Unit with the support of the DG through high level meetings¹⁰⁶.

From the interviews conducted for this review, we noted that there is a widely shared understanding of the need to increase cost recovery. It has been reported¹⁰⁷ that IUCN makes a deficit of 4.5% on the Portfolio and Membership which needs to be funded from unrestricted funds, this being particularly true with the GEF and GCF projects that carry a lower level of Indirect Costs Recovery than projects

¹⁰² IUCN Operational Plan 2021-2024, p. 9

¹⁰³ IUCN Resource Mobilization Strategy 2021-2024, August 2021.

¹⁰⁴ 1. Mobilise more flexible, multi-year resources, 2. Diversify and de-risk the Union's donor base, 3. Fully finance the programme and its Strategic Initiatives, 4. Enhance the visibility of IUCN and its donors (results), 5. Strengthen internal coordination.

¹⁰⁵ IUCN Operational Plan 2021-2024, p. 9

¹⁰⁶ IUCN: C 109 Results on DG Strategic Objectives for 2022, p.14

¹⁰⁷ Moore Kensington Smith, IUCN Finance Strategy and Financial Governance Review, March 2023



where IUCN plays an executing role. Interviews also lead to the conclusion that there might be a lack of understanding of IUCN operating modalities (notably of the need for hiring and retaining staff in the field, even though they are not permanent staff members) which results in GCF and GEF being somewhat reluctant to support higher overhead costs. Although they have agency fee policies for all accredited agencies and may not be able to depart from them, it remains that better understanding of the structure of costs of IUCN could be desirable. Several donors have stated their willingness to increase the portfolio of their projects with IUCN, where IUCN is not always ready to conduct projects that are not financially balanced. **There is certainly a need for IUCN to communicate better and explain more clearly the Union’s strategy, as well as its financial constraints and situation to its donors, which may allow for increasing the level of charged overheads.**

2.4.2.3 Quality of financial monitoring systems

Overall, IUCN’s quality of financial monitoring systems is improving and investments leading to that improvement also allow for better reporting and risk prevention.

The commissioning, by IUCN of a Finance Strategy and Financial Governance Review¹⁰⁸ demonstrates a good level of attention to the quality of the Union’s financial monitoring. This topic has been a matter of attention for the Secretariat during the last years and, according to interviews conducted, the situation has been improving: in addition to the institutional mechanisms of reporting to Council, and to audits of financial statements released each year, IUCN has developed and rolled out tools for ensuring a better monitoring of its financial situation. Although the complexity of the structure and of its funding mechanisms remains a challenge (more than 50 offices, 36 installations of the finance system over the world) processes are being streamlined and standardised.

At the project level, IUCN has also developed a series of tools, notably:

- A Budget Architecture and Overhead Policy, in March 2022;
- A Project Costing Framework – Guidelines for project managers for costing support units and services, in January 2023, which provides a clear set of guiding standards for costing project activities, including when and how to charge for support costs and services, distinguishing mandatory and project specific cost;
- A Budget Review Checklist, in February 2023.

At the Programme level, the CFO and finance units contribute to the development of the annual financial report, consolidating inputs from all relevant units and finance team. This report includes inputs from quarterly/annual progress reports submitted by Centres, Regions and Corporate units

¹⁰⁸ Moore Kensington Smith, IUCN Finance Strategy and Financial Governance Review, March 2023



within the Secretariat. It is presented to the Director General as an integral part of IUCN's annual planning and monitoring process and is also shared with the Council and donors¹⁰⁹. The reports from Centres and Regions contain information on the size of the project Portfolio, budget per thematic area, and Portfolio by donor type. More largely, several improvements are being made to IUCN's tools and processes, notably to the ERP suite (Programme and Project Portal, Grant Portal, NAV, HR, CRM) which could feed into a more complete and easier to access financial reporting on projects.

2.4.2.4 Value for money

There is no doubt as regards the unique value of IUCN, but it is not clear whether and how the Union could raise more funds to do more.

Value for money is always difficult to assess when it comes to services and to products that are largely not physical (e.g. technical knowledge) and in a sector in which there is a limited number of producers, and a lack of structured competition. However, it is possible to give a few elements of appreciation.

Interviews and project reviews show that IUCN has a unique value proposition, thanks to its long history, its legitimacy in the field of conservation, its capacity to bring expertise, its convening power, its positioning as being “the voice of nature” or the provider of “nature-based solutions”. The relevance and quality of IUCN products is also widely acknowledged and the project reviews we have conducted confirmed this perception.

One specific characteristic of IUCN is its capacity to create indirect impact through its Commissions. Commissions raise their own money and this cash is indirectly generated through IUCN's participation and work. It further generates around CHF300m volunteer time, according to the last estimate available from 2017¹¹⁰.

During interviews conducted for this review, interrogations were expressed about value for money. The recent addition of the Business Engagement Unit fee (13% in addition of the 12% overhead costs) has been described by a few interviewees as a taxation imposed on their work. They seem to be unaware of the details of the 2022 policy and notably that, when the 13% is applied, 3% are retained by the units responsible for the executing the project. One framework donor stated that they would like to see more reporting about how core funding is used by IUCN to deliver impact as they want to know better what is achieved through their financial contributions.

¹⁰⁹ Monitoring IUCN's health and strategic directions, PPT document

¹¹⁰ Moore Kensington Smith, IUCN Finance Strategy and Financial Governance Review, March 2023; p.74



We also heard different, and somewhat divergent opinions from donors and from IUCN staff outside HQ as regards the cost of working with IUCN: some saying that “IUCN is not greedy”; others that IUCN is fairly expensive, and another highlighting that the procedures are quite bureaucratic (slow, heavy and difficult to understand) which suggests that transaction costs are high and that efficiency could be improved.

2.4.3 Organisational efficiency

Overall, IUCN has been launching several management reforms over a short period of time that has been described as creating disturbance although addressing important issues. If New management tools and practices appear necessary and useful, their readability, acceptance, and utility for all are not always clear to all parts of the Secretariat.

IUCN’s complexity (the number and variety of its Members, the fact that the Union is composed of Members, Commissions and a Secretariat tasked with supporting them and delivering the project Portfolio) poses challenges to organisational efficiency. This is evident both from our document review and our interviews. Several interviewees noticed that IUCN used to be a a very bureaucratic organisation and have noted progress in this regard. This change in perception is certainly positive.

This change in perception may reflect a range of improvements initiated during the Programme period: notably by setting up multiple management tools and systems, and ensuring that they fit together to monitor the Secretariat’s organisational health and strategic direction¹¹¹. These include the major revamping of Project Guidelines and Standards (PGS), Project Appraisal and Approval Systems (PAAS), Contributions for Nature Platform, PANORAMA, and Management Dashboard as evidenced in the quarterly reports of different units. These tools and systems are intended for standardisation and enhancement of operational efficiency for Programme delivery. For instance, the revision of the PAAS is aiming at improving IUCN’s capacity to steer its project pipeline and thereby the alignment of programme and engagement with members. Indeed, the decision of launching a project is crucially important given the cost-recovery imperatives, the financial situation and the level of risk that the organisation can face. It has been reported that the development and roll out of those revised tools is ongoing but somewhat slowed down by limited investment capacity. In addition to those project

¹¹¹ IUCN: Institutionalizing the continuous checking of IUCN’s organizational health and strategic direction – Powerpoint presentation



management tools improvements, a new HR process called “performance development programme”, was rolled out in 2022¹¹².

One example of these management tools is the set of dashboards and scorecards. In 2022, the Secretariat launched the first of its kind Management Dashboard and an updated, fit-for-purpose Managers Scorecard linked to the new performance development programme. The Management Dashboard aims to provide up-to-date quantitative data around five areas: people, finance, portfolio, partners and Members. Its intended users are managers across the global Secretariat. With growing positive feedback from staff across offices, the aim is to extend access to the platform to all staff (subject to licence costs). The Managers Scorecard contains indicators on a range of topics – including people (overall average score in the snapshot survey of Unit managers, turnover rate, absences, gender ratio), financial situation, number of Members involved in portfolio and data stewardship amongst others. There are also individual Unit-level indicators developed by the respective Unit Head and Chief HR Officer.

These tools are of value as they articulate people and project management and provide senior management with a detailed view of the annual planning and reporting. However, feedback from regional offices shows that those tools are not yet fully used, and that their utility for field work is not clearly perceived. One area that has been described as particularly challenging by several IUCN staff members in different regions is the one of human resources management: in the context of an expanding portfolio, staffing capacity struggles to keep up with project development, project implementation and reporting requirements. Regional offices and Centres are facing conflicting priorities: they have to invest time in project development in order to ensure that they will be able to keep their staff – with recruitment being a slow process - and also to dedicate considerable efforts to institutional requirements in terms of planning, monitoring and reporting.

The restructuring of the Secretariat architecture, with the creation of the Centres, is certainly an important change that happened during the period under review. It is however very difficult and too early to measure its effects on organisational efficiency. We have collected different perceptions from different kinds of interviewees. It has been said that a limited number of Centres is preferable to a very large number of units, but the identity of those Centres is not always easy to perceive and to communicate, with certain well-known IUCN programmes being now difficult to locate and identify by

¹¹² IUCN: C 109 Results on DG Strategic Objectives for 2022



external stakeholders (such as the World Heritage Convention work, for example). This reform has also created concern or even discontent within staff.

2.4.4 Monitoring, evaluation, and accountability:

This is an area in which IUCN was performing poorly and has been significantly invested and improved. Critical systems and resources are now in place and should play their role in the Union’s Programme management.

An external review of IUCN's MEL practices¹¹³, and accompanying management response in 2021 illustrate many of the shortcomings of the MEL system under the previous Programme period, and demonstrate IUCN's readiness to make improvements to MEL systems and practice. The key problem highlighted with the previous Programme was the lack of continuity and connectivity between the overarching Programme ambitions and individual projects. While there was broad strategic alignment, reporting instruments were not allowing an aggregated assessment of project performance against overarching Programme objectives. As the review concludes: there are thousands of narratives about successful project interventions, but the big storyline is missing. The review summarises the challenge neatly: the Secretariat is in a somewhat delicate situation: Members set the agenda but do not have the finances to implement it – the Secretariat acquires the finance through projects that follow an agenda as agreed with the funding organisations. **This paradox at the highest strategic level of the organisation leads to a fragmented and complex planning system.** The situation is actually even more complex: some Members are actually implementing with their own resources projects and programmes linked to IUCN’s field of actions, and some members partner with IUCN Commissions, but without all components of the Union being aware of it. The Contribution for Nature platform is expected to contribute to a better view of the entire panorama of IUCN’s activities, as part of the One Programme approach.

Our own observations re-affirm this assessment, notably the in-depth review of project documents shows that not all of them are subject to mid-term review or final evaluations and that, when those final evaluation reports exist, they do not follow the same structure or guidelines that would allow for an aggregation of findings, recommendations or lessons learnt. In this regard the situation has not changed yet since 2021¹¹⁴.

¹¹³ E.C.O. Institut für Ökologie : IUCN Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Analysis, may 2021

¹¹⁴ “There is an enormous amount of data and information at project level, but few standards, guidelines and framework to compile data and generate information from it.” IUCN Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Analysis, p.7



IUCN has not been inactive and has developed an Evaluation Policy¹¹⁵ that is fully aligned with the best practices existing in other international organisations, notably as regards the governance, standards and types of evaluations, and the specific lines of inquiry established to test the key assumptions in IUCN's institutional theory of change and addressing: the One Programme Approach; Gender, indigenous people and youth; Science / policy / action interface and Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS). Should this be implemented during the 2024-2029 period, the IUCN would be well equipped for reporting on the implementation of Nature 2030.

IUCN's IPME Unit has been working hard to develop a new system, which appears to offer a solution to the problems identified, or at least to contribute to their solution. It will allow for more detailed planning, and, above all, for a much more detailed qualitative and quantitative monitoring and reporting on project results. According to the latest Director General's Strategic Objectives Report (2023), a results management module will be integrated into the online Project Portal in order to align project-level logical frameworks with 'reference results' linked to a list of prescribed IUCN indicators. The intention is to provide the ability to map project outputs and outcomes to standardised IUCN results indicators, thereby generating an aggregated results and impact narrative. The intention is to roll out the new system by 2024.

Furthermore, it is commendable that, thanks to unrestricted funding received from the Switzerland Development Cooperation, the IPME Unit has hired four new full time Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Coordinators for four regional offices, helping to strengthen MEL practices across the organisation. The project costing framework and the arrival of these MEL Coordinators has allowed for recruiting and launching the recruitment of additional MEL staff at project level. We also note that IUCN has conducted an organisation-wide assessment of MEL training and recruitment needs¹¹⁶.

Most importantly, we see that considerable work has been undertaken to develop a new results-framework with clear standard indicators that can account for the work of the Secretariat. We note that IUCN does not intend to create a single framework that captures the entire work of the Union (i.e. the Secretariat, the Commissions and its Membership). The framework under development will correspond to the Secretariat only, while the Contributions for Nature platform will correspond to the work on the wider Union¹¹⁷.

¹¹⁵ IUCN [2023] Evaluation Policy

¹¹⁶ IUCN [2023] Results on DG strategic objectives for 2022, p.18.

¹¹⁷ IUCN PPME&MEL Strategy and Roadmap



As regards accountability, there is a well-established system in place for the Secretariat (the DG) to report to Council. This has not been criticised by interviewees, one of them expressing however his wish that Regional Directors present their results during Council meetings. However the Strategic Planning and Reporting Framework presented in the Annex 2 of the Council Handbook displays a big number and complex system of monitoring and reporting vehicles, which implies a heavy reporting burden and may lead to less than more accountability¹¹⁸.

We would like to invite IUCN to spare no efforts in pursuing its work of strengthening the monitoring and evaluation functions and tools. It should also continue to implement the recommendations of the 2017-21 strategic review that are still open.

2.5 Impact

We assess *Impact* as the extent to which the **Union contributed to the impact targets** in all five Programme areas – People, Land, Water, Ocean, Climate as detailed in IUCN Nature 2030 Programme. We also provide an analysis on the factors hindering a clear, complete and fully reliable reporting on impact above the project level.

2.5.1 Summary

IUCN undoubtedly produces impacts at the international level, thanks to its convening power, its technical knowledge and its legitimacy as a long-standing actor of the conservation field. It also generates impact at the project level and changes lives of its beneficiaries. However, it is not equipped to demonstrate contributions pathways from its projects or its activities to the *Nature 2030* impact targets, and **we find the absence of aggregated data an impediment to an impartial assessment of impact.**

2.5.2 How can we know IUCN succeeded?

2.5.2.1 Specific challenges for reporting on IUCN results

The extent and complexity of IUCN, notably the number and variety of its Members has already been mentioned and is an obvious challenge for reporting on the Union's results. Members are not linked by an accountability framework and are in different situations as regards their reporting on conservation

¹¹⁸ IUCN Council Handbook v1.2, February 2021, Annex 2, p.36-37.



actions, not to mention Nature 2030 impact targets. For instance, Commissions are very independent in defining their programme of work, while the Secretariat is accountable for the implementation of the IUCN Programme. In addition, IUCN produces numerous intangible and very diverse products: technical assistance, guidelines, lists, actual preservation or restoration of natural sites. If this is common among large international organisations, specific products and delivery mechanisms call for specific monitoring approaches and results measurements, which are missing in the case of IUCN.

The structure of the Programme is also challenging: specific topics, areas of intervention or projects could fall under different Programme areas. For instance, projects on wetlands, mangroves or land management affected by climate change could be contributing to the programme areas of *Land*, *Oceans* and *Climate*. Similarly, “nature-based solutions” is a technical term and a strategy of intervention which, for several years, has been defining IUCN’s main approach to conservation: the idea being that IUCN addresses human problems and looks for solutions that reconfigure the relationship between human beings and their living environment. This approach is captured in the IUCN 2020 *Global Standard for Nature-based Solutions*. In *Nature 2030*, nature-based solutions are primarily mentioned about climate change (Programme Area 5), where it could be applicable across the entire Programme.

2.5.2.2 *Nature 2030 not specific enough as regards reporting on impacts*

Section 8 of *Nature 2030* is entitled “How will we know IUCN succeeded?” and dedicated to the obligation to “critically assess progress against [the] Impact Targets”. In that section, IUCN commits to create a digital platform where all parts of the Union can “voluntarily share their planned and realised contributions to meeting the Impact Targets as well as towards global policy targets such as the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change”. A few other mechanisms are listed for ensuring reporting on results and identification of lessons learnt:

- The comparison of results achieved by diverse components of the Union;
- The results of systematic evaluations;
- The use of Panorama, IUCN’s repository of narratives on successful approaches and their underlying success factors;
- The adoption, by the Secretariat of an “operational plan that will commit to a set of well-defined objectives and performance measures against which it will report with a clear line of sight to the Targets”.

From a professional monitoring and evaluation viewpoint, this set up is insufficient for structuring a good quality accountability and reporting system. Indeed, it has several weaknesses:



- The tools listed -except the operational plan – are to be used on a voluntary basis only, therefore there is a strong risk of a bias of under-reporting of projects or actions that did not achieve their intended objectives;
- The publication or sharing of systematic evaluations, although specified in the Evaluation policy¹¹⁹ is not yet full implemented;
- Panorama cannot give a balanced view of the Union’s results.

The Programme impact framework included in *Nature 2030* as its Annex 1 is structured around five Programme Areas, each of them associated with three impact targets that are, for most of them, expected to contribute to SDG indicators. The main value of this Framework is that it is fairly simple and high-level. However, such a brief overview of the impacts expected from a Union as wide and as complex as IUCN cannot be self-sufficient as a strategic document or as a reporting framework. **The impact targets are more of the “north star” type than precise and well-defined objectives.** There is a need for a far more detailed and well-structured Programme framework that would detail for instance how each Centre and Regional Office is expected to contribute to impact targets. Ideally, expected results of each project or unit should be specific, supported by data and adequate performance and accountability approaches, and clearly linked to higher-level objectives and impact.

2.5.2.3 Existing tools for showcasing and reporting on results

Although not to be assimilated to institutional reporting tools and mechanisms – the multiplicity and diversity of which as described in Council Handbook we signalled above - *Panorama, Solutions for a healthy planet* mentioned in *Nature 2030* is a web-platform launched in 2016 initiated by IUCN and GIZ, presenting more than 1400 “solutions”, or good practices, for nature and people, identified by IUCN Members and partners. Those are indeed success stories of specific projects presented as replicable and published on the site only after a review. However, not all solutions presented are the results of IUCN projects.

The *Contributions for Nature* web-based platform, which went live in June 2022, documents contributions for nature from the Union. It displays details and data on conservation and restoration actions that IUCN Members are undertaking or planning to undertake. Contributors to the platform are non-governmental organisations and indigenous peoples’ organisations, Government Agencies and Subnational Governments, State Members, IUCN National and Regional Committees, IUCN Commissions and the IUCN Secretariat. The tool offers detailed information on specific projects and

¹¹⁹ IUCN Evaluation Policy version 3.0, p.11



quantitative data on three types of contributions: conservation contribution to biodiversity, restoration contribution to biodiversity and restoration contribution to climate change mitigation. The platform has the potential to disseminate some of Union’s achievements but it presents expected contributions, which do not necessarily materialised. It is not a place for systematic reporting on results or contributions to impact targets, and is not structured according to the Nature 2030 programme framework, and also because publications take place on a voluntary basis and are not very detailed.

Institutional reporting from the DG to the Council is a well-established practice in IUCN. Several times a year the DG reports on its strategic objectives, and annual reports present results of the Union along several axes. In the 2022 Annual report, the section dedicated to the Portfolio is structured along the 5 Programme areas. In such a short format, it would be impossible to report on the entirety of the Portfolio and for each Programme area the report presents a selection of “highlights”, which are success stories. Such reporting is not systematic, does not mention projects that underachieved or failed, does not draw lessons, and does not detail how specific projects contribute to Programme impacts or direction of travel.

2.5.3 IUCN’s reliance on projects

2.5.3.1 *Impossibility to report on the Programme impact in a structured and rigorous manner*

The previous external Programme evaluation conducted in 2021 found that results could not be aggregated at Programme level, obfuscating an assessment of effectiveness. It also concluded that IUCN did not have an adequate system in place to measure progress towards intended impacts¹²⁰. The situation remains the same today, and in some regards has deteriorated since no aggregated data of any kind is captured at Programme level.

As noted previously, we find a weak MEL framework at Programme level, coupled with an absence of aggregated output, outcome or impact data. Interviews with IUCN staff at all levels, from HQ to project level, and with Commission Members more broadly, find consensus that the current MEL framework, as articulated in the *Nature 2030* document, is impractical. As a result, we understand that no one reports results against these targets. Instead, project managers are compelled to report budget allocation against the Prioritised Programme Areas (People, Land, Water, Oceans, Climate), though this tool is not considered to be useful, as project activities often correspond to multiple Programme Areas, as already noted, thereby creating an inaccurate picture of how funds are distributed. Furthermore,

¹²⁰ Baastel : External Review of the IUCN Programme 2017-2020, p.iii



project managers have often as their first priority to report to donors rather than to IUCN. Nor do the Centres within the Secretariat itself report against the Programme Indicators. Quarterly reports published by the Centres and regions reviewed for this evaluation make no reference to the *Nature 2030* indicators.

Interviews with IUCN staff in the three Regional Offices visited for this review confirmed that the lack of structured regional strategies programmes with a set of indicators prevent them from reporting on IUCN impact targets. Regional Offices have initiated the development of specific theories of changes and / or strategies and work plans.

It has also been reported that the difficulty to present a report on a limited set of impacts is an obstacle to fundraising and that, in parallel, donors – notably from the private sector – were too interested in outcomes and not enough in impact.

We therefore observe that Recommendations 1 and 2 of the *2021 External Review of the IUCN Programme 2017-2020*¹²¹ remain valid at the end of 2023. Several actions have been taken and are still being rolled out according to the management response¹²², notably as regards the development of the new Project Portal and the strengthening of the MEL function that we already highlighted. However, we still share the view of our predecessors who led the last strategic review that the structure of the Programme needs to be rethought and redesigned. This could involve introducing a more operational or *intermediate* layer of reporting connected to the overarching Programme impact targets, or the introduction of “contribution claims”¹²³. This would imply establishing criteria according to which given projects could claim their contribution to the attainment of higher or global programme expected impact.

This approach would allow responding to the perception of several interviewees, with one of them stating: “IUCN has a lot written on impact targets, how to monitor those, etc... On paper, there is a lot and there are reports during the Congress. But on the ground, do we actually see the change? Changes

¹²¹ R1: Build a results-based 2021-2024 Programme.

R2. Transform IUCN into a learning organization.

¹²² IUCN External Review of the IUCN Programme 2017-2020 – Management Response

¹²³ On contribution claims, one can consult:

John Mayne *A brief on contribution analysis: Principles and concepts*, 05 oct 2020, available on evaluatingadvocacy.org for a theoretical and methodological approach, and for a case study:

Delahais, T., & Toulemonde, J. (2017). Making rigorous causal claims in a real-life context: Has research contributed to sustainable forest management? *Evaluation*, 23(4), 370-388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389017733211>



happen, but how can that be attributed to IUCN? We do not have grips on that. IUCN could do a better job in reporting on its results”.

2.5.3.2 Reporting on Impact

Reviewing IUCN’s reporting literature, and external evaluations, there is a tendency to report impact based on isolated anecdotes packaged under impact targets or Prioritised Programme Areas from Nature 2030. We have demonstrated in the *Effectiveness* section above, how the Portfolio is delivering conservation action through contributions to Nature 2030 targets; we have also reported on some signal impacts from policy work and knowledge generation. However, when it comes to providing an overall assessment of impact, we abstain from providing examples against each of the indicators in Nature 2030.

- The first obstacle is that such an exercise would require a significant investment of time in order to gather an adequate volume of anecdotes to carry any analytical meaning;
- The second (more significant) obstacle would be the necessity to determine precisely what volume of anecdotal evidence would construe an adequate basis for an evaluation of impact;
- The final (most significant of all) obstacle would be the need to develop a set of balanced criteria for weighing the value, or analytical, weight of one anecdote against another – in other words, choosing which anecdotes are important, and which are not.

Unless these three obstacles are overcome, collecting evidence in such a manner does not constitute an evaluation, nor does it provide an adequate basis for accountability. Furthermore, we fear this would reinforce a positive reporting bias, as this form of reporting only favours good results. It also distracts from a deeper understanding of ‘big picture’ impacts achieved over longer timeframes. Reporting against the Nature 2030 indicators risks fragmenting impacts that are better understood within a narrower geographic scope over a longer timeframe.

IUCN’s core value, in our view, is its **capacity to generate and sustain momentum**. The cumulative effect of IUCN’s policy work, knowledge creation, networking, convening and project-based activity is momentum. Taken together, IUCN’s value proposition is its capacity to scientifically identify a problem, to identify, test, refine and pilot solutions, and – most importantly – to scale them, whether through executing the initiative directly, or by creating a conducive legal and/or policy framework, or by generating replicable tools and models for others to replicate.

Just one example can be seen in the Mekong River Basin in Vietnam, where over a number of years IUCN has piloted a course of action involving a number of interconnected projects and sustained policy



advocacy. This process began with the discovery that intensive rice cropping had diminished the water retention capacity of the floodplains, leading to loss of biodiversity and downstream flooding in built-up, high-population density areas. IUCN's work at highlighting this issue and piloting alternative crops resulted in a significant about turn in the Government of Vietnam's position on intensive rice cropping (Decision 120). Having successfully demonstrated the ecological and economic advantages of alternative crops, IUCN is now in the process of identifying scale pathways to support a transition away from intensive rice cropping, thereby ensuring high volumes of water are retained in the floodplains during the rain season.

From ESARO, there are other examples. The *Blue Tanga Pemba Project* was a pilot and feasibility study, which took place in a regional plan for developing the blue economy (the Blue Future Project) and followed on the 12-year Tanga Coastal Zone Conservation and Development Programme in a country that had its first marine reserves in 1970. The project addressed people (half a million people highly dependent from fishing, with a focus on fishermen, land, water (mangrove conservation), and oceans (fisheries, conservation of coral reefs, coastal management). The project built on long term commitment, brought knowledge produced by a long-term partner which is also a IUCN Member (the Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association). It demonstrated the potential of the Blue Future Project and defined which approaches (community-level management and nature-based solutions) should be followed to achieve expected outcomes. The *Bahari Mali project*, which followed the Blue tanga Pemba, was funded from the same source (Irish Aid, managing funds allocated by the European Union) and followed the way indicated by the pilot study. Although it is still early to identify specific impacts attributable to the project, we have seen during field visits that the activities supported by the project have already led to conservation results and social changes. There is no doubt that impacts will be generated thanks to: the fact that the projects takes place in a long series of similar activities, in a context of sub-regional international cooperation and because it has a transformational effect on the people-nature relationships. The project, although still in its early age, has already been identified by local and national public authorities as a success deserving wider audience. It was recommended by local government representative to be included in the Uhuru Torch project, a prize that highlights projects that making a difference.

In ORMACC, IUCN a good example can be seen in the *Building Livelihood Resilience to Climate Change in the Upper Basins of Guatemala's Highlands* project. Over the course of seven years, the project has generated good momentum, building on the experiences of previous projects like the USAID-funded *Tacaná and Mi Cuenca* projects (2013-2017), which piloted successful early-warning systems for



highland farmers. Mobilising a wide range of national and regional stakeholders – including a private university, local and national NGOs and local communities, the current project aims to address climate change impacts on the hydrological cycle in target watersheds through improved land practices. The project utilises a suite of tools, including research, monitoring and modelling of weather and climate change, and providing real-time data and advice to local farmers. As a result of this work, farmers have adopted new practices and techniques in pilot farms, tripling production capacity, instilling more efficient water management practices, preventing erosion, and restoring forest cover.

In future, we encourage IUCN to consider an impact reporting system that accommodates narrative reporting on this scale, in addition to reporting individual project contributions to overarching impact targets. This, in many ways, would provide a more robust accountability mechanism, as it would essentially provide an assessment of whether IUCN's model of working is actually achieving results.

2.6 Sustainability

We assess *Sustainability* as the extent to which the IUCN is equipped to ensure the continuity of its operations and of its capacity to deliver impacts. For so doing, we review the Union's **capacity to learn lessons** from its work, to **provide satisfactory services to its Members**, and its **financial sustainability**.

2.6.1 Summary

As regards sustainability, IUCN is on a trajectory of progress and benefitting from a favourable environment where the demand for conservation knowledge and action is strong and growing. IUCN has taken steps to strengthen lessons learning and sharing, though there is still need for systems strengthening. It has taken several initiatives to improve the services it renders to its Members and is progressing towards stronger financial sustainability, but still can and has to do better.

2.6.2 Learning capacity

Overall, we acknowledge that IUCN has undertaken a number of initiatives to strengthen the culture and practice of knowledge sharing, though there are still avenues for improvement. Recommendation #2 of the last strategic review¹²⁴ invited IUCN to transform into a learning organisation and indicated three ways in that direction:

- Strengthen the IUCN M&E and reporting system for the 2021-2024 Programme.

¹²⁴ Baastel : External Review of the IUCN Programme 2017-2020, p.iii



- Develop a Programme-level sustainability-for-result strategy.
- Develop a mechanism to systematically capture lessons learned at the project, regional, programme, unit, and IUCN Global Programme level.

In the management response, IUCN agreed with the recommendation and said that addressing the shortfalls in the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) system was a priority. However, it agreed only partially with the proposed development of a Programme-level sustainability-for-result strategy, which was said to be relevant yet impractical.

Several positive actions were taken in response to recommendation #2. One of them was the commissioning of a MEL analysis, which confirmed that “evidence is rarely used to make adjustments to the IUCN project portfolio and associated management processes”¹²⁵. Our observations lead us to concur with the view that **IUCN is not yet able to systematically record, think upon and disseminate through the entire Programme the lessons learnt from project implementation, and even if there are signs of progress, efforts are still needed.**

Evidence of lesson-learning at regional level does exist. For instance, the IUCN European Regional Office organised, as part of the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) Action Component and Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in Territories of European Overseas (BEST) programmes, a workshop in Nairobi that gathered over 55 grantees from the Africa, Caribbean and Pacific regions, and the European Overseas Countries and Territories. Through interactive sessions, participants shared their experiences with grant making and good practices and lessons learned. This innovative pilot initiative was an inspiring experience for knowledge sharing and sets the ground for future exchanges¹²⁶. The same activity, “Knowledge Sharing Journey”, is also reported by IUCN ORMACC mentioning that eight Caribbean grantees systematised inspiring replicable initiatives during the workshop.

Another example of initiative for sharing lessons is reported by IUCN SUR¹²⁷ which supported the revision and uploading of more than 30 Panorama solutions on Protected and Conserved areas in Spanish (seven in Portuguese in progress), displaying the importance this learning platform has in the region and the potential for a consistent growth as a tool to exchange knowledge and experiences in the region. This shows that Panorama, as noted previously, could indeed be used as platform for

¹²⁵ E.C.O. Institut für Ökologie : IUCN Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Analysis, p.9

¹²⁶ IUCN [2023] Report of the IUCN Regional Offices, April – June 2023, p.9 and 16, and , and

<https://iucn.org/story/202307/biopama-and-best-20-grantees-share-knowledge-conservation-practice>

¹²⁷ IUCN [2022] Report of the IUCN Regional Offices, Oct-Dec, 2022, p. 22.



publishing lessons. The same is true for the Quarterly regional reports which, if disseminated, could serve that purpose.

During a meeting we attended in ESARO where project managers were presenting their work, they underlined that IUCN being a knowledge-based organisation, brings scientific knowledge to projects, but also transfers lessons learned during implementation to other sites or countries when a project is extended from one country to another. The specific case of the Project Catchment restoration measures – ASWA 2¹²⁸, was mentioned as one in which several technical and project management lessons were learned.

At the Committee level - A virtual platform launched in March 2022, the *Asia Nature Forum* aims to strengthen engagement and interaction between IUCN constituents in the Asia region. Six webinars on topics related to nature conservation and sustainable development allowed Members, Commissions, Councillors and Secretariat staff to learn and share experience with each other¹²⁹.

2.6.3 Services to Members

Members' support and interest in IUCN's work is critical to the long term financial sustainability and relevance of IUCN. The action of IUCN towards its Membership over the review period has been heavily focused on the **implementation of the 2020 Membership strategy**. The Strategy called for the recruitment of 240 new Members between 2022 and 2025 with a focus on State and Subnational Government categories. IUCN had "over 1300" member organisations in 2020¹³⁰, at the end of 2022, it has 1457 plus 12 waiting for Council's approval¹³¹. Thus, the objective is likely to be attained. Figures show that new members join before the organisation of World Conservation Congress (WCC) and some of them are leaving afterwards. Data show that the main reasons for taking part in WCC are: networking and exchange and to learn about best practices.

Following a Council decision of 2021, IUCN expanded its membership base to subnational governments (regions and cities) in 2022 which allowed for further numerical expansion of the Membership. Interviews returned mixed views on the continued growth of Membership: while several interviewees welcome this trend as a sign of the Union's attractiveness and vitality, others underline that recruitment should focus on states (which contribute 70% of the Membership income), and that a too high number

¹²⁸ Project P03807

¹²⁹ IUCN Annual Report 2022, p. 11.

¹³⁰ IUCN: 2019 Annual report p. 6

¹³¹ Member Strategy Implementation, Update for GCC Task Force on Membership Value Proposition, May 2023



of Members would pose a challenge to the Union's governance and to the Congress decision-making capacity.

In application of the Membership strategy, several actions were taken, notably:

- A new member value proposition was defined around the three pillars of
 - o Inform: give to Member access to data;
 - o Influence: Members are heard on a global stage;
 - o Implement: Members can take part in projects implementation on the ground;
- New Member onboarding procedure and recruitment materials were developed and rolled out;
- Key Performance Indicators on "monitoring the health of membership were developed and are being monitored;
- A modernised Union newsletter was launched in 2023;
- Two issues of *Unite for Nature* are published every year.

One of the main new products developed under the review period is *Engage* (<http://engage.iucn.org>), the digital community platform open to the 22,443 IUCN constituents and gives access to seminars, digital mobilisation campaigns, notably to achieve the Global Diversity Framework. Follow-up of WCC resolutions will also be available on the digital Member zone to be developed.

The IUCN *Contributions for Nature Platform* can also be used for Membership engagement. One example of that is ORMACC together with the Mesoamerican and Caribbean Regional Committees organising a bilingual, Spanish-English seminar for presenting the Platform as a tool for identifying capacities and geographical presence, generating more synergies among the IUCN Members, putting Commissions and Secretariat under the banner of One Programme, with more than 130 contributions validated on the Platform¹³².

The latest release of the Annual Membership Satisfaction Survey¹³³ from May 2023 shows (despite a relatively limited number of 262 respondents – 18% of IUCN membership) **an overall high level of satisfaction among Members**. In addition, 207 respondents found that their Membership to IUCN is adding value to their organisation's work. The other items of the survey show that Members value and benefit from IUCN knowledge projects and access to conservation network.

¹³² IUCN [2022] ORMACC Biennial Report 2021/2022 p.12

¹³³ IUCN [2023] Annual Membership Satisfaction Survey, Presentation to the Executive Board.



There was a limited number of cases where Members which were also high-income contributors and/or technical partners left the Union because of dissatisfaction with the level of fees they had to pay, or with budgeting decisions. IUCN is now investigating the reasons that led to Members leaving the Union.

2.6.4 Financial sustainability

IUCN has three major sources of income: *Membership dues*, which provide unrestricted funding, *framework income*, which is almost fully unrestricted, and *cost recovery* which is mostly restricted funding (with the exception of the indirect cost recovery element that is unrestricted funding). Other sources of income come from philanthropy, foundations and private sector, which is for the main part restricted funding.

In order to ensure financial sustainability, expenditure should not exceed income over a long period. A temporary imbalance could be compensated from reserve, which has happened to IUCN in the recent past. As reported earlier in this report, financial management is improving, however, the Union is still facing a rather challenging situation as regards its financial sustainability. The challenges result from three factors:

- The low level of flexible unrestricted income and of reserve;
- The dependence from framework funding, since the recovery of programme costs from the project portfolio is insufficient;
- The growth of the portfolio, which increases the imbalance between restricted and unrestricted income. It also increases risk and potential losses, which, if they materialised, would need to be funded by reserves.

IUCN is well aware of that situation exposed in both its *2021-2024 Financial Strategy* and in the *2023 Finance Strategy and Financial Governance Review*. The most important financial risks IUCN is facing are the following ones:

- With a low level of reserves, there is a limited capacity to invest in fundraising activities and in up-to-date management tools, including those necessary for improving financial management;
- The low level of reserves also limits the capacity of IUCN to enter into large financial agreements with donors if such agreements imply significant risks that IUCN would have to cover with its reserve;
- The dependence on framework funding is as risky situation, considering that one or several framework partners could decide to decrease or put an end to their funding, or to turn it into



restricted funding. In this regard, the recent addition of Luxemburg amongst framework funders is a positive development¹³⁴.

In addition, the relative lack of unrestricted funds has operational consequences, incentivising IUCN to increasingly rely on projects. **As a result, the attention and efforts of programme and project managers, facing heavy workload and time constraints, are focused on projects whereas tasks pertaining to corporate functions (notably strategic thinking, programme planning, monitoring, reporting, evaluation and learning) appear less urgent or less important and are left aside.** This point has been made by several interviewees at HQ and Regional levels within the Secretariat.

Latest financial reports¹³⁵ show that cost recovery is above budget for 2023 and the level of reserve is increasing. Several interviewees expressed satisfaction with the attainment of (or the progress towards) the improvement of the financial situation. However, there are different views as regards the desirable path for reconstituting the reserve: it is said that this should be a priority, but we also heard that going too fast in that direction leads to a reduction of the speed of Programme delivery. This is certainly a topic on which the Council Finance and Audit Committee will have to make choices.

All things considered, the key to financial sustainability is certainly **to ensure that in the medium to long term, the Portfolio does not create a deficit.** In view of the increasing part of the projects funded by GCF or GEF and of the fact that implementing and executing them is likely to create a deficit, IUCN is somewhat reluctant to increase its cooperation with those funds. Here again, there is a balance to be found, or **the overhead costs applied to those funds could be renegotiated**, as it is proposed in the *Finance Strategy and Financial Governance Review*. In advocating for a revision of the GCF and GEC corporate policies may, IUCN could seek support from other agencies that would also benefit from a change.

Another important aspect of financial sustainability is the capacity of IUCN to maintain or enter into long-term bilateral agreements and partnerships with other conservation actors or stakeholders, despite the fact that some of them can appear as competitors for IUCN. In 2022, IUCN signed 138 new contracts for a total value of CHF164 million and bilateral engagements represented over 60% of income with the largest new partnerships signed with framework partners. 17 new agreements were signed with the Private sector¹³⁶; which is an additional source of income. In this regard, the creation in

¹³⁴ IUCN [2023] Director General Annual Report p.13

¹³⁵ Notably the table reproduced in section 2.4.2 of this report and the Financial results for January – October 2023 presented by the Chief Financial Officer to the Executive Board.

¹³⁶ IUCN [2023] Director General Annual Report p.2-3



2023 of a Business Engagement Unit is certainly a promising initiative that would allow for increasing income from the private sector while sensitising it to the issues of nature conservation at a time when social and environmental responsibility of firms is high on their agenda¹³⁷. However, other organisations similar to IUCN and competing with it for private sector funding are better equipped (and have more staff). **IUCN still has to catch up on delays and most likely to change parts of its working culture if it wants to significantly increase the income generated from cooperation with private sector.** We notice that in our review of a sample of 28 projects there were very few examples of mobilising private sector funding.

Finally, there would be another way of IUCN to increase its level of unrestricted income: by doing more income generating activities or by monetising more effectively the knowledge and data it generates. This avenue was explored by the last Director General but his initiatives in this domain were not supported. The IUCN Academy was created in that context and could possibly serve that purpose. This would be a subject Council may wish to continue to to address.

¹³⁷ IUCN [2022] IUCN Business Engagement Strategy – Direction and Framework for ExBo discussion, June 2022



2.7 GESI

We assess *Gender Equity and Social Inclusion* as the extent to which **gender, indigenous peoples, intergenerational equity, disability** and **human rights** are reflected in IUCN's policies, practices and projects.

2.7.1 Summary

IUCN exhibits a strong commitment to Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) through its policy framework and programmatic initiatives. However, the integration of GESI across IUCN's portfolio varies. The challenges in implementing GESI policies are complex, entailing cultural, structural, logistical, and financial aspects. Cultural norms and attitudes towards gender and marginalised communities often impede the effective implementation of GESI policies. Ambiguities in defining 'local communities' lead to a broad categorisation, sometimes excluding marginalised groups like people with disabilities, displaced people, and migrants. **Implementing GESI policies effectively requires significant resources and expertise, and a lack of robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms impacts the assessment of gender-responsive policy implementation.** Further structural issues make the implementation of GESI policies across the Programme with consistent depth and breadth challenging. The primary issue is that GESI policies do not have an owner at IUCN. While the Human Rights in Conservation team based in Washington DC has the expertise, they deliver on their own portfolio of projects. Without a clear focal point for GESI, the interpretation, application and accountability of the policy across the programmes is left to the country offices. These offices too, often do not have dedicated GESI focal points, unless the project has a clear GESI component to it. The implication of this is that the application of the policy is not consistent or made relevant to the context in which it is being applied. Furthermore, no monitoring system currently exists that assesses the extent to which projects are compliant with GESI policies. While work on gender is the most advanced, other categories such as indigenous peoples, youth, people with disabilities and other marginalised groups of people are still nascent in the extent to which they are consistently mainstreamed across IUCN's programme. Policies and discussions around some categories like people with disabilities currently do not feature anywhere at an institutional level and are limited to specific projects.



2.7.2 Gender Equity

2.7.2.1 Integration of IUCN's Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment Policy

The IUCN Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Policy is a key element of IUCN's programmatic efforts, emphasising the organisation's commitment to gender equality and women's rights. This policy mandates a gender-responsive approach across its programs and projects. Some Regional Offices and Centers implement this policy and include gender actions in their projects.

The Human Rights in Conservation Team (HRCT), under IUCN's Centre for Society and Governance, spearheads gender-responsive efforts. The team's responsibilities include knowledge generation, policy and technical support to projects, and capacity building. However, interviews highlight that challenges such as the team's broad mandate and the need for better coordination and cultural sensitivity in non-Western societies persist.

Gender-responsive action and mainstreaming are integral to IUCN's Programme. The HRCT collaborates with other teams and partners to support gender mainstreaming, developing tools and methodologies. For example, the use of a gender tracking tool in the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) III project in the Indo-Burma Biodiversity Hotspot exemplifies this effort.¹³⁸ Another example can be found in the *Catalysing local climate action and strengthening climate resilience in the Guatemalan Highlands* project implemented through IUCN ORMACC, where IUCN delivered grants to ten small and medium-sized community organisations in the western highlands of Guatemala. These organisations will implement Ecosystem-based Adaptation projects to strengthen the participation of local community members, women, and indigenous peoples' organisations¹³⁹.

Despite strong policy commitments, IUCN faces challenges in implementing gender equity and women's empowerment policies consistently across different cultural and regional contexts. Interviews with Secretariat staff reveal there is a need for enhanced monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, more significant participation of women and gender minorities in decision-making, and adequate resource allocation.

¹³⁸ <https://www.iucn.org/our-work/region/asia/our-work/regional-projects/critical-ecosystem-partnership-fund-cepf-indo-burma-biodiversity-hotspot>

¹³⁹ Regions quarterly report, Jan-Mar 2023, p. 16.



2.7.2.2 Consideration in Scientific Knowledge, Policy Advocacy, Networking, and Capacity-Building

IUCN actively generates gender-responsive environmental knowledge, emphasising gender perspectives in research and the importance of gender-disaggregated data. Projects like the *Resilient, Inclusive and Sustainable Environments* (RISE) grants challenge address gender-based violence in relation to natural resource use. In policy advocacy, IUCN promotes gender equity in environmental policies, advocating for gender considerations in international agreements and frameworks. IUCN's influence is evident in the implementation of Gender Action Plans across the Rio Conventions and in other key environmental processes.

Networking and partnerships are another area where IUCN promotes gender equity. The *Advancing Gender in the Environment* (AGENT) Initiative, a collaboration with USAID, aims to enhance environmental programming effectiveness through gender integration.¹⁴⁰ IUCN addresses knowledge gaps, builds capacities, and provides technical support on gender integration in various environmental sectors. IUCN also integrates gender perspectives in its training and capacity-building initiatives, training conservation professionals and community leaders on gender-sensitive environmental management and developing resources and tools for gender-responsive conservation practices.

2.7.3 Indigenous Peoples

2.7.3.1 Integration of IUCN Standards of Indigenous Peoples

IUCN integrates the Standards on Indigenous Peoples (IPs) into its programmes and projects through policy endorsement, practical collaboration, and promoting indigenous rights. Notably, IUCN endorsed the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in 2008, emphasising Indigenous rights to land, resources, and full participation in conservation initiatives.

Indigenous Peoples' Organisation Members within IUCN have developed a self-determined strategy, focusing on increasing Indigenous participation in governance, policy engagement, rights recognition, creation of Indigenous protected areas, and supporting Indigenous organisations. This strategy highlights the need for effective participation and leadership roles of Indigenous peoples in conservation, addressing their cultural, social, and economic rights.

¹⁴⁰ <https://genderandenvironment.org/agent/>



Key projects like *Amazonia 2.0* illustrate the integration of indigenous voices and engagement.¹⁴¹ This project monitored large areas using satellite imagery and indigenous participation, established governance structures, and provided tailored training to communities. The project's success, recognised through awards and a regional knowledge-sharing platform, demonstrates IUCN's commitment to multi-stakeholder collaboration and grassroots-level work.

However, the effectiveness of indigenous integration varies by region and project nature. Interviews with regional office staff indicate a need for deeper, more meaningful engagement and recognition of the diverse needs and contributions of indigenous communities. Consistently integrating indigenous knowledge and practices remains a challenge, with ongoing efforts like the development of a handbook by the Commission on Ecosystem Management aiming to address this gap.

2.7.3.2 Consideration of Standards in Scientific Knowledge, Policy Advocacy, and Networking

IUCN's integration of Indigenous Standards extends to scientific knowledge production, policy advocacy, and networking. In scientific research, IUCN recognises traditional ecological knowledge as crucial, leading to culturally enriched scientific outcomes. Collaborative research ensures indigenous perspectives shape research agendas, reflected in IUCN's publications. In policy advocacy, IUCN champions indigenous rights in global forums, advocating for inclusive environmental policies and supporting indigenous-led initiatives. For example, the 2nd Asia Parks Congress highlighted the need for indigenous participation in policy-making. IUCN's efforts in these forums emphasise the role of indigenous peoples in managing their lands and resources.

Networking efforts by IUCN enhance the visibility and influence of indigenous peoples in conservation dialogues. Partnerships and collaborations focus on elevating indigenous voices and ensuring their participation in environmental conservation. These efforts are crucial in advocating for indigenous rights and integrating their perspectives into global environmental policies.

2.7.4 Intergenerational Equity

2.7.4.1 Integration of IUCN Youth Strategy

IUCN's Youth Strategy, developed in 2022, reflects a commitment to engaging young people in environmental conservation and sustainability. This strategy, part of a Union-wide action framework for 2022-2030, aims to implement actions for and with young people, setting specific priorities up to

¹⁴¹ <https://www.iucn.org/our-work/projects/amazonia-20>



the next World Conservation Congress in 2025. While IUCN has focused primarily on gender and Indigenous Peoples, the Youth Strategy signifies an increased emphasis on involving youth in conservation efforts.

The Commission on Education and Communication (CEC) features a Youth Engagement and Intergenerational Partnerships Specialist Group, tasked with connecting and mobilising diverse youth globally. This group leads CEC Networks to create educational and communicational initiatives catering to local needs.

Youth participation in IUCN activities is substantial, with 25% youth representation in the IUCN CEC Steering Committee in 2022. Programmes like *#NatureForAll* foster intergenerational dialogues, and global events such as the *IUCN Leaders Forum* and the *Africa Protected and Conserved Areas Congress (APAC)* have showcased significant youth engagement. These forums have provided platforms for young leaders to interact with global conservation leaders and represent diverse youth perspectives.

Despite these efforts, challenges persist in ensuring youth involvement extends beyond symbolic participation to tangible influence in decision-making and policy. IUCN aims to develop more inclusive strategies addressing the needs of youth, people with disabilities, and human rights concerns. Continuous assessment and the implementation of robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are crucial for enhancing the impact of youth engagement.

2.7.4.2 Integration in Non-Portfolio Activities

In scientific knowledge production, IUCN's engagement of youth is less explicitly documented. While the organisation encourages youth participation in commissions and working groups, significant youth-led research initiatives or contributions to scientific outputs are not prominently featured. In networking, IUCN utilises its global reach to connect with youth organisations. Collaborations like the *#NatureForAll* initiative and the CEC Youth Engagement and *Intergenerational Partnerships Specialist Group* illustrate efforts to include youth perspectives in conservation discussions and to mobilise them globally. Capacity building and empowerment of youth are evident in initiatives like the *IUCN Global Youth Summit*, where young people engage in conservation discussions and workshops. The *Young Professionals Network* within IUCN offers mentorship and skill development opportunities, highlighting the organisation's commitment to empowering young conservation professionals.



While IUCN demonstrates a dedication to integrating youth into its broader mission, transforming this into a core aspect of its institutional culture is an ongoing challenge. The extent of youth influence on IUCN's strategic planning and decision-making remains an area for further development.

2.7.5 Disability

2.7.5.1 Incorporation of disability principles within the IUCN Programme

The interviews and documentation review did not present a concerted effort to include people with disabilities within IUCN's Programme. The projects at the country and regional levels do not include a strong disability inclusion component and therefore no indicators exist in project results frameworks to monitor the extent to which the views and interests of this group are consistently included across the projects delivered under the Programme. However, in some projects, 'people with disabilities' fall under the more general category of 'vulnerable and marginalised communities'¹⁴². Similarly, while not directly mentioning 'disability,' IUCN's Nature 2030 Programme emphasises the equitable sharing of nature's contributions to all people, suggesting an inclusive approach that could encompass people with disabilities.

2.7.6 Human Rights

2.7.6.1 Incorporation of Human Rights Principles in the IUCN Programme

Since 2020, IUCN's Human Rights in Conservation Team has actively integrated human rights considerations, particularly gender equality, into environmental conservation practices. However, IUCN's work in mainstreaming human rights suffers from the same issues as other GESI areas. There is inconsistent integration of human rights supported by a strong monitoring system. The *IUCN World Conservation Congress in 2020* highlighted the need for a rights-based approach to biodiversity conservation and climate change, emphasising the respect and protection of rights for Indigenous Peoples, local communities, women, and youth.

The work of the IUCN World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL) continues to advance the integration of human rights in conservation, co-hosting, for example, an international conference

¹⁴² For example - IUCN is involved in a project titled "Regenerative Seascapes for People, Climate, and Nature," in coastal and marine regions of the West Indian Ocean, including Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, Madagascar, and the Comoros. This project aims to directly benefit 350,000 people, including 225,000 women and 12,500 people in vulnerable and marginalised situations. Among these, people with disabilities are included as a part of the broader group encompassed under 'vulnerable and marginalised situations'¹⁴². Another project-based example where an IUCN project includes people with disabilities is the Women in Recycling Foundation (WORF), an initiative led by young women, aims to promote a healthy environment for women, young women, and women with disabilities by strengthening the waste management system and empowering them through circular economy solutions



entitled: *inclusive conservation: indigenous peoples and local communities at the forefront of the forest protection*, which explored the complementarities and synergies with environmental law and human rights law.¹⁴³

IUCN supports the establishment of a Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and Climate Change, acknowledging the impact of environmental degradation on human rights. This stance is reflected in resolutions calling for the recognition of Indigenous Peoples' rights as outlined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), including respect for indigenous knowledge systems and consent principles.

The United Nations Human Rights Council's recognition of a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment as a human right aligns with IUCN's approach to environmental governance. IUCN's commitment extends to gender equality and women's empowerment, integral to its human rights and environmental sustainability agenda. For instance, the *Plastic Waste Free Islands* project involves a study analysing human rights issues arising from plastic pollution and its differentiated impact on men and women in the Caribbean and Pacific.¹⁴⁴

IUCN's efforts to protect environmental and human rights defenders, especially in regions where risks are high, demonstrate its awareness of the challenges in defending these rights. However, interviews with Secretariat staff highlighted there is a need for more systematic incorporation of human rights principles across IUCN's programmes and projects. This expansion should encompass the rights of children, people with disabilities, and other marginalised groups, ensuring a comprehensive approach to human rights.

Engagement and participation of local communities in decision-making and rights protection require enhancement. While some projects show effective community engagement strategies, it is unclear whether this is practised consistently across all projects. Robust mechanisms to monitor human rights impacts within conservation projects are necessary, as well as managing risks related to human rights violations in areas with weak governance or conflict. Initiatives like the *Whakatane Mechanism*¹⁴⁵ are

¹⁴³ <https://www.iucn.org/story/202311/iucn-wcel-co-hosts-first-fci-conference-inclusive-conservation-indigenous-peoples-and>

¹⁴⁴ Regions Annual Report, Jan-Mar 2023, p. 18

¹⁴⁵ <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwjY7bH8iJyDAXVyRkEAHREhAtkQFnoECBQQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwhakatane-mechanism.org%2F&usg=AOvVaw2JbGb0ZcYNWXeNW9EXfuur&opi=89978449>



steps towards addressing these issues, but a more focused approach, including policy influence and grievance redressal, is essential for comprehensive human rights integration.



3 Discussion

There are three overarching themes that emerge from our assessment of Programme performance that warrant summary here.

1. Adequacy of the programme as an institutional tool

As noted previously, we find the Programme to be ‘descriptive’ rather than ‘directive’. In our assessment, we have observed that the current engagement with the Programme – amongst Commissions, Members and the Secretariat – appears to be limited. Interviews with Commissions and Secretariat staff revealed difficulties in operationalising the Programme. The Commissions typically work on their own, pre-established priorities. Members pursue their own institutional or national policies. The Secretariat, particularly at Regional, National and Project levels, similarly pursues pre-defined trajectories. This is not a question of alignment – everything is more or less aligned with the Programme – it is a question of *effect*. We found limited evidence that the Programme effected new thinking or direction.

Indeed, familiarity with the impact targets contained within Nature 2030 is generally low within the Secretariat and the Union. No one we interviewed uses the current Programme Impact Framework contained within Nature 2030. The indicators are generally considered to be either too vague, or not relevant. One Commission member we interviewed attempted to map the Commission’s work against the Nature 2030 indicators, but abandoned the exercise after several months due to the complexity. Interviews with Secretariat staff found that the Project Portal is generally considered to be both ineffectual and burdensome. It is considered a compliance function, rather than something that aids adaptive management, performance management and evidence-based decision making. The Contributions for Nature platform is still in its infancy, and does not currently provide an adequate basis for reporting contributions to the Programme from Members.

In this sense, Nature 2030 is not really a programme; it is a ‘North Star’, providing a high-level vision for what the Union strives to achieve. As one Council member put it: *From the start, it lacked sass. It was not an innovative document. It did not put forward any recommendations or innovations. It did not galvanise anyone. So it was designed to keep everyone working as they were. It was designed to be business as usual position.*



Therefore, the Nature 2030 Programme 2021-2024 document is not an adequate foundation on which to build an impact narrative for the Union.

2. Accountability Gap.

The impact targets contained within Nature 2030 create an accountability framework for which there is little accountability. In view of our assessment above, we perceive an *accountability gap* between the obligations of those who are required to aggregate and report on Programme-wide data, and those who are responsible for contributing data to facilitate such reporting. IUCN HQ (specifically the IPME unit) may be compelled to report against the indicators on behalf of units delivering the results, but few within the broader Secretariat or the wider Union feel compelled to do so. Part of the problem here, as noted throughout this report, is the absence of a strong reporting framework, and a lack of clarity in the Council Handbook on roles and responsibilities for reporting contributions to the Programme's impact targets; a topic we return to in the recommendations below.

3. Misaligned expectations of the Programme

There is a high expectation amongst donors that the Secretariat be able to provide a clear account of its work, and the progress of the Union towards Programme goals. This is a perfectly rational expectation. However, on the basis of the Programme, as currently constituted, it is unrealistic to expect that such a narrative can be derived from the data. Though many people we interviewed describe the Programme as a 'North Star' there is still an expectation that the Secretariat should be able to measure the results of its work against the overarching targets. The Programme simply does not – and should not – provide an adequate basis for reporting on progress. It is both too vague and too high level. For this reason, as we elaborate in the recommendations below, we encourage IUCN to develop a four-year Programme with which reporting expectations can realistically be aligned. Such a Programme would provide a deeper elaboration of causal pathways leading to the attainment of higher impacts, and provide a basis for a more critical assessment of progress.



4 Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Realign on the purpose and role of the Nature 2030 Programme in directing IUCN's work.

Rationale: There is little ownership of the Nature 2030 document and its content either within the Secretariat or the Union. Reporting against Programme indicators has proven to be a consistent challenge (over this and the previous Programme period). In effect, the Programme currently provides limited strategic direction, few people use it, and yet it nevertheless creates a significant volume of work for the Secretariat and Union once every three-four years as a new Programme is created and the previous one evaluated. It also creates a considerable operational strain throughout the implementation period because it requires continual monitoring and reporting. Key questions to ask during this reflection include: *whose needs specifically within IUCN does the Programme serve? Does the Programme materially enhance, undermine or obfuscate IUCN's work at Project, National, Regional, Centre or Commission level? Is the Programme intended simply to describe what IUCN does, (which is currently the case) or should it seek to provide explicit direction?*

Action: The Union, in application of IUCN Regulations 2 and 2bis should clarify and communicate better on what the Programme is for, who is responsible for delivering it, and how (if at all) progress should be reported. Our view, supported by a number of interviews across the Secretariat and Union, is that the Programme should serve the purpose of a 'North Star' – a high level guiding document that provides a very broad direction of travel. It should not confer a reporting requirement. Results should instead be measured against operational strategies (see below). It should provide clarity on the length and articulation of Programme cycles; and clarity on the respective roles of IUCN components: Members, Council, Commissions, Secretariat and their respective contributions to Programme delivery. This process should be linked to the 20-year strategic vision exercise currently underway at the time of writing.

Recommendation 2: Build a Programme Theory of Change.

Rationale: The Programme currently lacks a Theory of Change. It is therefore impossible to demonstrate how IUCN's actions are contributing to the attainment of the Programme goals. Nor is it clear from the current Programme how the Secretariat and the Union, respectively, contribute to the Programme. As a result, IUCN has struggled to present a clear impact narrative either within the Secretariat or to its



framework partners, donors and Members. To date, Programme level reporting is piecemeal, relying on anecdotes, rather than demonstrating *direction of travel* towards intended goals.

Action: The Secretariat should lead the process by formulating a draft Theory of Change. The current theory of change within the Nature 2030 Programme document is inadequate and should be replaced. The Theory of Change should provide a clear description of the causal pathways linking outputs to outcomes and impacts. This would provide a stronger basis on which to judge whether the Programme is making progress, and create the conditions necessary for a meaningful analysis of performance at the next four-year evaluation. The Theory of Change should clearly describe the role of the Secretariat and Union in contributing to the attainment of the Programme goals (as agreed in the actions recommended above).

Recommendation 3: Recalibrate the Prioritised Programme Areas in the next iteration of Nature 2030.

Rationale: IUCN's work has evolved beyond the priorities articulated in the Nature 2030 Programme, reflecting the ever-evolving nature of the challenges it confronts. The Secretariat's Portfolio of projects address a range of issues not reflected in the current formulation of the Programme. Similarly, interviews with Commissions found cause to redefine the Programme in line with current priorities. For example, the 'People' programme area in Nature 2030 is a heavily rights-orientated narrative, focussing on the importance of rights-based approaches to tackling inequality, in justice and the unsustainable use of nature. While this is still a priority, IUCN is now working increasingly on projects that seek to harness markets and economic behaviours in support of Nature Based Solutions, for example. Nature 2030 also contains a lot of 'strategic noise' – the three enablers, the '5 R's' etc. – these were found to be either a distraction or an irrelevance to most people we interviewed. Though we understand the original intent of these elements (which was laudable), it is clear that they did not influence the way in which IUCN plans or executes its work.

Actions:

- 1. The Union capitalise on Regional Consultation Forums to initiate an internal consultation across its Constituents to identify new Programme areas.** Commissions must be closely engaged in this exercise to ensure alignment. The first question to ask is whether the current Programme areas: *People, Land, Water, Oceans, Climate*, are the most accurate buckets to describe IUCN's work, and how/whether they can be updated or expanded to include new areas. New Programme areas such as *market development, agriculture, health* or indeed *security* were brought up in a number of interviews, suggesting potential avenues for discussion.



2. **IUCN should streamline the Programme**, removing or reframing superfluous sections of the Programme narrative that would not fit in the new theory of change and ensuring that all components - for instance enablers and transformative pathways - are really necessary and, if so, how they contribute to the attainment of the overarching impact ambitions.
3. **IUCN may wish to undertake a ‘horizon scanning’ exercise**, as part of the development of a 20 year strategic vision, to better understand the potential threats and opportunities for technology. What are the new technologies that can be leveraged in support of IUCN’s mission? A similar exercise could be undertaken to better understand the risks and opportunities around building revenue streams into its business model. We understand a number of options had been considered in the past, such as the IUCN Academy. We encourage IUCN to take stock of these initiatives and to present a clear position within the Programme as to whether these sorts of initiative shall be pursued in the future.

Recommendation 4: IUCN should include a strategy to operationalise the Programme in its next quadriennial Programme document.

Rationale: There is a missing layer of strategic planning in the current Programme architecture. While the Programme itself ostensibly provides an overarching direction for IUCN, the next ‘level’ of planning architecture is currently developed on an annual basis, divorced from the priorities outlined in the Programme. Operational workplans we reviewed within the Secretariat and the Commissions demonstrate little alignment with the Programme. We encourage IUCN to consider the possibility of creating a results hierarchy that links Constituents’, global, regional and project level indicators in a clear accountability framework. We acknowledge that the breadth and complexity of IUCN’s structures make this a difficult undertaking, but it would significantly improve the quality of reporting by creating stronger accountability for results at all levels of the organisation.

Action: as part of the next Programme document, include a section to demonstrate how Constituents intend to contribute to the Programme, containing clear implementation modalities and chains of results for the Secretariat, Commissions and contributions from Members. It should also contain specific strategies for non-portfolio activities: e.g. internal and external communication strategies; fundraising strategy etc. The four-year strategy would then provide the basis for results reporting and impact measurement. The results would be restricted to the level of outcomes, derived from the overarching Programme. Measuring IUCN’s performance against the strategy would therefore provide a strong evidence base for IUCN’s progress towards achieving the overarching Programme goals.



Action: Align the budget with the next iteration of the Programme. The Secretariat should ensure that the next Programme includes a financial strategy designed to ensure the sustainability of the Union and to serve the attainment of the Programme outcomes.

Recommendation 5: Strengthen results monitoring and reporting practices.

Rationale: Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning practices across IUCN are weak. There are no aggregated reporting instruments to capture the Secretariat’s non-portfolio work (such as communications, knowledge creation or policy influence). The Project Portal is inadequate in its current format. The Contributions for Nature platform is still in its infancy. The problem is well recognised, well acknowledged and well understood within the Secretariat and the Union. It is extremely encouraging to see that significant work has already been undertaken to address these issues – notably the development of a much-improved project reporting portal, which will enable aggregated results reporting across the Portfolio.

Actions:

- 1. Continue to build an aggregated reporting system for the Secretariat.** Having had a preliminary view of the proposed new project portal, we fully endorse both the scope and design of the system. GESI indicators should also be included in the portal, facilitating the analysis of both impacts and the implementation of IUCN’s ESMS standards. We encourage leadership within the Secretariat to promote and uphold the use of the new portal once it is live.
- 2. Continue to encourage usage / uptake of the Contributions for Nature Platform amongst Members.** Conduct a Membership survey to test utility of the platform. This platform needs to reach a critical mass in order to start providing value to Members. If uptake is slow, even those who have already started uploading data may decide the effort is not warranted.
- 3. Continue to build an aggregated reporting system for Commissions.** Revise Annexe 2 of the Council Handbook and build a stronger and integrated reporting framework that includes the work of Commissions and helps capture the impact of Commissions’ work.

Recommendation 6: Reflect on the scope and purpose of the next Programme evaluation.

Rationale: In the absence of an aggregated MEL framework with up-to-date data it is not possible to evaluate either the effectiveness or the impact of the Programme. We are aligned with the previous external review findings from 2020, which concluded the same. This evaluation has therefore by necessity covered a wide range of topics, providing a high-level view of IUCN’s work over the last three



years. We understand this evaluation serves as an important accountability mechanism. However, given the breadth of the Programme, and therefore the breadth of potential subject matter that could theoretically fall within this evaluation, we raise the possibility that IUCN's needs may be better served by a series of more targeted evaluations conducted over the course of the Programme period that provide deeper insights into a narrower range of topics.

Actions:

1. **We strongly encourage IUCN to conduct an internal evaluability assessment** of the Programme prior to engaging an external firm for the next evaluation. Such an assessment would ascertain the volume and nature of data available for the review, and propose alternative approaches should a standard OECD-DAC evaluation methodology be deemed unsuitable. This review is the second consecutive external evaluation based on monitoring and data that are incomplete and with no clear projects contribution pathways to high-level results or impact. The development and rollout of the new project portal should significantly improve that situation. Should that not be the case, we question the utility of conducting a third evaluation under similar circumstances given the appetite amongst Donors for a clear impact narrative.
2. **Undertake an on-going learning review of the Programme.** Assuming that IUCN does not shift from Programme-level evaluation to strategy-level evaluation (as proposed in Recommendation 4 above, IUCN may wish to consider a modular cycle of smaller evaluations focussed on Programmatic subsets, such as *Land* impacts for example, or specific thematic priorities, such as *integration of IP priorities within the Programme*, or indeed non-portfolio work, such as *communications, membership engagement or policy influence*. These exercises could be conducted over the lifecycle of the Programme, providing timely, nuanced insight and actionable recommendations to help strengthen approaches. Taken together, the findings of these smaller evaluations would provide the basis for a meta-synthesis at the end of the Programme period.

Recommendation 7: Strengthen GESI practices across the Union

Rationale: Our review highlights a number of areas in which IUCN can strengthen its work on GESI. Though we find many good examples of a positive approach to GESI – from the creation of the Human Rights in Conservation Team (HRCT) to the Indigenous Peoples' Planning Framework (IPPF) – we identify a number of gaps where further improvements could be made.

Actions:



1. **Strengthen Gender Empowerment and Inclusion with M&E System:** IUCN should develop a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, focusing on gender equality and social inclusion. This could be integrated into the current draft project portal. This system should include standardised indicators that capture the varied impacts on different gender groups, considering intersectionality. Consistent data collection and analysis will inform policy adaptation, resource allocation, and identify participation gaps in decision-making. A robust M&E framework will enhance the visibility and impact of gender initiatives, promoting trust and collaboration.
2. **Continue to empower Indigenous Leadership:** IUCN needs to deepen Indigenous Peoples' (IPs) participation and leadership in conservation, respecting their cultural, social, and economic rights. Consistent integration of indigenous knowledge across regions and sectors is essential. IUCN should address this through resources and expertise, balancing Indigenous interests with other stakeholders, and developing tools like handbooks for better Indigenous knowledge integration.
3. **Better mainstream GESI across the Programme.** One way to do this would be to include GESI topics, explicitly and specifically into the new programme as horizontal cross-cutting themes rather than vertical lines so that every project and initiative undertaken within the programme has clear and strong GESI component that is consistently monitored.
4. **Develop an inclusivity policy for Marginalised Groups:** IUCN should implement an inclusivity policy addressing the needs of marginalised groups such as people with disabilities, the elderly, and displaced individuals. The policy should ensure representation, participation, and accessibility in conservation areas and decision-making processes. It should also include research and disaggregated data collection to develop responsive and equitable conservation policies that encompass all societal members.
5. **Develop a comprehensive Human Rights Framework:** IUCN should establish a Human Rights Framework integrated into all programme aspects. This framework should set clear guidelines for incorporating human rights in project planning, implementation, and evaluation, focusing on marginalised groups' rights. It should mandate human rights impact assessments, community engagement, and a grievance redressal system, especially in areas with governance challenges.



APPENDIX 1: Full Methodology

Scope

This evaluation covered the work of the Union as a whole, with a greater emphasis on the Secretariat's work. It would be impossible to assess the performance of all 1400 Members of the Union within the constraints of this exercise, and given the limited availability of data on Member contributions to the Programme targets. The review of IUCN Commissions was not in the scope of this external review as it falls under the remit of the IUCN's Governance review¹⁴⁶. The evaluation covered the Secretariat's portfolio and non-portfolio work.

The evaluation was grounded primarily in a deep review of strategic and programmatic literature at global and regional levels. Qualitative interviews with IUCN Council and Members, IUCN Commissions, donors, staff members and projects stakeholders and beneficiaries enriched our analysis of the literature. The insights generated through these methods were supplemented by a high-level review of 28 projects within the Secretariat's Portfolio.

Overview of the Methodology

Evaluation framework: the Aleph Evaluation Index

The evaluation framework for the IUCN Nature 2030 2021-2024 Programme was based on the six OECD-DAC criteria for measuring the impact of development programmes - *relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact* and *sustainability*. Additionally, the Programme performance was analysed on *gender equality and social inclusion* (GESI) principles, with the aim to pay specific attention to the impact of IUCN Programme on women, youth and indigenous populations.

Based on an extensive documentation review and preliminary consultations over the inception period, the review team ensured that all relevant definitions, standards and indicators within the scope of this evaluation were integrated into the framework for this exercise. The Index covers the key concepts, strategic priorities and principles of IUCN and the Nature 2030 Programme. These include - but are not limited to – the three enablers (technology, communication, and investments), five pathways of change

¹⁴⁶ Council Handbook Feb 21:6. "To enhance its oversight, the Council will: [...]iii. commission an external review of IUCN's governance at least every four years, to be delivered in time to inform a Council 'strategy session' at mid-term. The Terms of Reference and scope of the external review shall be established by Council and include the review of the IUCN Commissions. The latter will have the purpose of ensuring the necessary renewal of existing Commissions and broader renewal of Commissions or other network mechanisms to meet the knowledge generation, expert and Programme delivery needs of the Union. This review will anyway have to be done well before the date fixed for filing nominations for Commission Chairs.



(recognise, retain, restore, resource, and reconnect), leadership and partnership, One Programme approach, financial management and sustainability, and risk management.

Each pillar within the Index is broken into specific ‘areas.’ Each area is further divided into specific evaluation criteria, which connote performance. A ‘desired state’ accompanies each of the evaluation criteria. The extent to which IUCN can be said to have achieved the desired state forms the basis of our analysis. A simple scoring system is applied for each of the evaluation criteria. 1= IUCN is either off-track or not making progress towards this goal; 2 = IUCN has made progress, but there is still work to do; and 3 = IUCN has achieved or exceeded the goal. A ‘traffic light’ colour scheme is applied to the scores, providing a quick visual cue of performance. The colour scheme is graded, passing from red for a score of 1, to green for a score of 3.

The average scores for each criteria provide a score for each area, and the average score for each area in turn provides an overall score for each of the evaluation pillars in the Index. The use of average scores precludes the danger of ‘washout’ where all scores are potentially the same number. Average scores facilitate a more nuanced summary of performance.

The scores are not intended to fulfil a quantitative analytical function. Instead, they are designed to facilitate our analysis, providing a general sense of performance across every element of the programme, and enabling rapid navigation of large volumes of text and data. For this reason, the scores themselves are not presented in this report, as they are for internal purposes only.

- **Relevance** – This pillar explored the basic premise and rationale for the design of the Programme. Here, we looked at the extent of stakeholder consultation as part of Programme design, and the Programme’s capacity to adapt in the face of external circumstances/context.
- **Coherence** – This pillar provided an assessment of whether IUCN 2021-2024 Nature 2030 Programme was aligned with IUCN’s internal priorities and objectives and the extent to which it was aligned with wider global frameworks.
- **Effectiveness** – This pillar considered how well IUCN delivered against its ambitions for knowledge creation and policy work. It also provided a view on the extent to which projects within the Secretariat’s Portfolio were contributing to conservation action. Additionally, the pillar looked at the extent to which the three enablers were leveraged to support the



Programme delivery by focusing on concrete examples from different national, regional or global projects.

- **Efficiency** – Under this pillar, we focussed on the manner in which the Programme was delivered, looking at key elements including attainment of financial targets, organisational efficiency, and MEL.
- **Sustainability** – Notwithstanding that this evaluation is primarily an accountability exercise, we used the sustainability criterion to assess if IUCN has successfully captured and integrated best practices in project delivery – an important consideration to guide the design of the next intercessional IUCN Programme. We also explored the presence of any capacity-building efforts and/or organisational infrastructures that facilitated local ownership. In addition to that, the pillar also looked at aspects related to financial sustainability at the strategic level.
- **Impact** – This pillar looked at whether the IUCN Nature 2030 Programme contributed to its impact targets in all five Programme areas – People, Land, Water, Ocean, Climate. It provides a collection of examples from across IUCN’s work that showcase work aligned with the Programme targets contained within the Nature 2030 document.
- **GESI** – While this is not an OECD-DAC criterion, we recognise GESI as an equally important pillar. Under this pillar, we explored the extent to which the Programme adequately recognised and integrated principles and policies related to gender equity, indigenous peoples’ rights, intergenerational equity, disability and human rights.

Project Scorecard

A simple scorecard was designed over the course of the Inception Phase to provide a standardised data-collection framework for each of the 28 sampled projects. The scorecard was designed to mirror the structure of the overarching evaluation Index. The scorecards enabled the review team to gather project/programme-level data across a consistent range of topics, facilitating analysis of wider trends and patterns across the sample. They were not intended to provide an evaluation of each project. Data from the scorecards was been filtered directly into the overarching evaluation Index, providing tangible examples of Programme performance in conjunction with our wider interviews and desk review. The completed scorecards are not presented as a separate deliverable to IUCN – they served an internal



purpose to facilitate data collection and analysis. It is not possible, for example, to provide a summary dashboard of project performance, as the level of data contained within in each scorecard varies significantly.

With the time available for this review, our analysis at project-level was necessarily brief, presenting only the most salient points to generate insight for our overall assessment of Programme performance. The scorecard itself was drafted in Excel and accompanies this report as an appendix (see appendices).

Sampling and Project Selection

Aleph conducted a total of 28 case studies, using the scorecard as the basis for our analysis. Data was collected through a combination of field missions, remote interviews and desk review. We developed a sampling strategy for selecting projects to review. The sampling strategy was designed to provide a selection of IUCN Secretariat projects that are *indicative* of the range of projects within the IUCN portfolio. The sample is not designed to be representative. The process of identifying suitable criteria for building the sample included a detailed review of the IUCN Secretariat portfolio, close reading of the previous Programme external review, and consultations with IUCN staff at HQ. We identified eight primary criteria to provide an initial basis for selection.

- i) **Availability of final reporting data** – we elected to sample only those projects for which reporting data is available. In order to facilitate a meaningful analysis of overall Programme performance, we required data to illustrate achievement/non-achievement of targets at project level. In the end, a number of projects in the sample did not have complete monitoring data or evaluations, providing instead quarterly or annual reports.
- ii) **Geography** – The sample focuses on the three statutory regions where field visits took place. Although it does not cover all statutory regions, the review provided good insight into IUCN’s work in three radically different operational contexts. Field mission locations were pre-determined by IUCN based on the need to visit regional offices in Thailand, Costa Rica and Kenya.
- iii) **Programme theme** – the sample reflects the distribution of projects by thematic area – People, Land, Water, Oceans and Climate.
- iv) **Project typology** – we selected projects to reflect the different implementation modalities: *implementing role* and *executing role*.
- v) **Donor** – we selected projects that reflect the range of donors that fund IUCN programmes including multilateral and bilateral funders.



- vi) **Timeframe** – we selected projects with either start or end dates within the Programme timeframe of 2021-2024, ensuring that we are able to demonstrate contribution to impact targets that could be attributed to the 2021-2024 Programme.
- vii) **Budget** – we selected projects with a minimum budget size of CHF 350,000 to ensure the likelihood of incorporating a range of delivery modalities, implementation activities, and involvement of multiple stakeholders.
- viii) **Centres** – the sample adequately integrates projects implemented by all four Centres.

The selection of field visit locations was further determined through consultation with IUCN Regional staff, who advised on the feasibility of field missions, project status, and site accessibility. Each project listed below was assessed against the evaluation criteria contained in the scorecard, using available secondary data combined with remote interviews conducted on a needs basis. Projects were assessed at the highest managerial level. Global projects were assessed at a global level; regional programmes at a regional level; national projects at a national level. Given the range of different projects within the portfolio, we did not expect to collect data against every criterion in the scorecard for each project. Data was therefore collected on a best-effort basis according to information that was readily available during the data collection period.



Table 1: Selection of Projects for Scorecard Assessment

| Project ID | Short Title | Start Date | End Date | Unit Name | Contract Amount | Centre/Region |
|------------|--|------------|------------|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| P01600 | Mekong WET | 01/01/2017 | 30/09/2022 | Asia - Science and Strategy Group (TH) | 2,894,279.00 | ARO |
| P01730 | Mekong Peatlands Project | 01/01/2016 | 30/06/2023 | Asia - Science and Strategy Group (TH) | 2,924,648.00 | ARO |
| P02677 | Coke - Flood Retention Strategy | 01/09/2017 | 31/10/2021 | Vietnam Programme Coordination (VN) | 178,639.00 | ARO |
| P03776 | CEPF Phase III Indo-Burma - RIT | 01/12/2020 | 30/09/2025 | Asia - Science and Strategy Group (TH) | 1,235,869.00 | ARO |
| P03885 | Protection and Conservation of Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in Asia | 01/03/2021 | 31/03/2026 | Asia - Science and Strategy Group (TH) | 1,398,336.00 | ARO |
| P03924 | Community Based Marine Turtle Conservation in Vietnam | 01/06/2021 | 30/09/2026 | Vietnam Programme Coordination (VN) | 89,587.00 | ARO |
| P02256 | SOS Lemurs | 01/09/2016 | 30/04/2023 | Species Conservation Action (HQ) | 8,160,000.00 | Centre for Conservation Action |
| P02337 | BC Barometer | 25/09/2016 | 30/06/2023 | Forest and Grassland (US) | 4,858,948.00 | Centre for Conservation Action |
| P02639 | SIDA marine plastic | 01/10/2017 | 30/06/2022 | Ocean Team (HQ) | 5,270,141.00 | Centre for Conservation Action |
| P03386 | SOMN 2.0 | 01/01/2020 | 31/03/2023 | Ocean Team (HQ) | 1,632,320.00 | Centre for Conservation Action |
| P03719 | Black Mountain Phase2 | 01/07/2021 | 30/06/2025 | Climate Change (HQ) | 900,649.00 | Centre for Economy and Finance |
| P03048 | Humane management of IAS | 07/10/2019 | 06/10/2022 | Biodiversity assessment and knowledge (BE) | 569,410.00 | Centre for Science and Data |



| | | | | | | |
|--------|--|------------|------------|--|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| P02312 | World Heritage Leadership 2016-22 | 01/10/2016 | 31/12/2022 | Heritage, Culture and Youth Team (HQ) | 3,110,888.00 | Centre for Society and Governance |
| P03944 | BRIDGE 5 | 01/09/2022 | 31/08/2026 | Water and land management | 7,820,000.00 | Centre for Society and Governance |
| P03950 | SUSTAIN Pro | 08/12/2021 | 31/12/2024 | Water and land management | 4,611,386.00 | Centre for Society and Governance |
| P04108 | VWI Youth Journey | 01/06/2022 | 30/06/2023 | Water and land management | 663,729.00 | Centre for Society and Governance |
| P02917 | Resilience for People and Landscapes Programme (REPLAP) | 01/09/2019 | 31/08/2022 | ESARO -Drylands Resilience (DRP) (KE) | 1,427,492.00 | ESARO |
| P03151 | Landscape and Integrated Water Resources Management and Restoration in Sebeya and other Catchments, Rwanda. | 01/05/2019 | 30/06/2023 | Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR), RW (RW) | 6,862,815.00 | ESARO |
| P03473 | Restoring Ecosystems to Reduce Drought Risk and Increase Resilience | 01/06/2020 | 31/08/2023 | Forest and Grassland (KE) | 1,083,203.00 | ESARO |
| P03807 | Catchment Restoration Measures Aswa 2 | 01/11/2021 | 31/12/2023 | Uganda - Programme (UG) | 1,651,898.00 | ESARO |
| P02886 | TWENDE Towards Ending Drought Emergencies: Ecosystem Based Adaptation in Kenya's Arid and Semi-Arid Rangelands | 01/01/2020 | 31/12/2024 | ESARO | ...17,260,000.00 | ESARO |
| P03948 | Blue Tanga-Pemba Seascape | 01/09/2021 | 31/08/2022 | ESARO (TZ) | 429,816.00 | ESARO |
| P04384 | Bahari Mali | 01/09/2022 | 31/08/2025 | ESARO (TZ) | 587,306.00 | ESARO |
| P02912 | GIRH Acuífero del Valle de Guatemala | 01/01/2019 | 24/08/2023 | ORMACC - Livelihoods and Climate Change (OR) | 708,808.00 | ORMACC |



| | | | | | | |
|--------|---|------------|------------|--|---------------|--------|
| P02510 | RCBP | 29/11/2017 | 28/11/2024 | ORMACC - Forest Governance and Economy Unit (OR) | 13,374,349.00 | ORMACC |
| P02625 | Building livelihood resilience to climate change in the upper basins of Guatemala's highlands | 08/04/2020 | 07/04/2027 | ORMACC - Livelihoods and Climate Change (OR) | 23,358,642.00 | ORMACC |
| P02693 | Landscape Standard | 01/10/2017 | 31/12/2021 | ORMACC - Forest Governance and Economy Unit (OR) | 487,095.00 | ORMACC |
| P02866 | EbA LAC | 31/03/2021 | 30/08/2025 | ORMACC - Livelihoods and Climate Change (OR) | 8,798,417.00 | ORMACC |
| P03237 | Enlazando el Paisaje Centroamericano | 13/01/2020 | 31/12/2025 | ORMACC - Biodiversity and Rights (OR) | 20,533,957.00 | ORMACC |

Data Collection

Key informant interviews. We conducted a range of mainly online in-depth interviews with IUCN Council members, Commission chairs, IUCN Members, IUCN Secretariat staff, Donors and technical partners. Semi-structured interviews lasted approximately one-hour and covered a variety of topics linked to the relevant research topics contained in the Evaluation Framework. Snowball sampling was employed to allow the review team to pursue lines of enquiry as they emerged over the course of the interviews. A full list of interviewees is contained in the appendices at the end of this report. A total of 59 interviews was conducted.

Case study field visits.

Field missions were carried out in three IUCN operational regions (ARO, ORMACC, ESARO) comprising seven countries in total.

1. ORMACC – Costa Rica and Guatemala
2. ESARO – Kenya and Tanzania
3. ARO – Thailand, Vietnam and Cambodia

In each country, we engaged with as wide range of project stakeholders as possible, including IUCN management staff, IUCN Members, government counterparts, local partners (I/LNGOs, CSOs etc.) and where feasible, local beneficiary communities impacted by the project. In total, we engaged with over 140 individuals over the course of the fieldwork. The full list of interviewees is provided in a separate *Back to Office Report*, attached as an annex below.

Table 2: Case study field visits – locations and projects

| Project ID | Short Title | Centre/Region |
|------------|---|---------------|
| P01600 | Mekong WET | ARO |
| P02677 | Coke - Flood Retention Strategy | ARO |
| P03776 | CEPF Phase III Indo-Burma - RIT | ARO |
| P02917 | Resilience for People and Landscapes Programme (REPLAP) | ESARO |



| | | |
|--------|---|--------|
| P03948 | Blue Tanga-Pemba Seascape | ESARO |
| P04384 | Bahari Mali | ESARO |
| P02625 | Building livelihood resilience to climate change in the upper basins of Guatemala's highlands | ORMACC |

Documentation review. Aleph undertook an extensive, albeit non-exhaustive, review of IUCN's Programme-level literature. We reviewed documents shared by IUCN and those publicly available in IUCN's extensive online repository of resources including policy briefs, position papers, conservation tools, Commission statements and datasets. We also explored project-level documentation for each of the selected remote case studies. A selected bibliography is contained in these annexes.

Preliminary Findings Workshop

A preliminary findings workshop was held following the completion of the fieldwork and data collection. The workshop took place on 13th December 2023, and provided an opportunity to present some early thoughts and reflections to the Evaluation Steering Committee.

Analysis and Reporting

The evaluation covered a significant volume of data, generating a wealth of information. In presenting our findings, we have endeavoured where possible and relevant to substantiate our claims with evidence at a global, regional and project level, combined with insights and quotations from our interviews. Given the breadth of subject matter covered in this review, our analysis is often out of necessity highly strategic in nature. Data from the project scorecards was consolidated to provide a qualitative basis for statements of achievement. We intentionally avoid statistical claims based on our limited dataset of 29 projects, favouring instead statements such as 'most of the projects' or 'some of the projects' where the weight of evidence allows. Similarly, given the somewhat patchy availability of project level data with which to complete each project scorecard, it was not possible to fully complete every indicator on each scorecard. Since we had anticipated this to be the case at the inception of this evaluation, this is not to the detriment of the methodology.

Appendix 2: Evaluation Index and Project Scorecard

Evaluation Index

The Index provided an internal tool to facilitate analysis. It contained a range of criteria, which we endeavoured to cover through our interviews and reading. Given the breadth of the review it was not possible to fully explore each area to the same level of detail.

Relevance

| Area | Indicators | | Desired State | Evaluation Questions | Methods | Source |
|--|------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Area 1: Stakeholder Consultation | 1.1 | Commission Consultation | IUCN Secretariat engaged with thematic and technical experts and Commissions during the development of the Programme, in order to ensure both relevance and attainability of the goals and objectives. | Did IUCN undertake consultations with stakeholders working in the conservation sector? Did it engage with the IUCN Commissions? Is there alignment between the IUCN 2021-2024 Programme and the Commissions' mandates? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review | Commission Members Nature 2030 Document |
| | 1.2 | Member consultation | The IUCN Programme targets are well aligned with IUCN's Members priorities. Members were consulted on the design of the Programme. | Were Members given an opportunity to engage with the Programme design? To what extent does the Programme integrate/reflect Members' needs? | 1. Key informant interviews | IUCN members DDG Programme IPME Unit Regional offices National offices Centres Commissions |



| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|--|---|--|---|
| | 1.3 | Needs of women and youth | The Programme adequately incorporated the context and needs of women and youth in the design and implementation. The Programme aligns with well-recognised GESI standards and priorities. | Did IUCN engage with representative organisations of women and youth to ensure continued relevance to their needs? To what extent does the Programme align with their needs? To what extent does the Programme reflect priorities pursued by other organisations working in this space (UNWOMEN, for example)? To what extent do women participate in activities? Does IUCN measure gender disaggregated results? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review | Programme document DDG Programme IPME Members ESMS Standards documents - Gender Equality and Women Empowerment policy Project narrative documents/reports Beneficiaries Programme and Policy Committee of Council Human Rights in Conservation Team |
| | 1.4 | Needs of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities | The Programme adequately incorporated the context and needs of the IPLC in the design and implementation of the activities and projects carried out under the Programme. | To what extent did IUCN engage with representative bodies for IPLCs during the design of the Programme? What mechanisms exist for ensuring continual engagement throughout the Programme implementation period? Did IUCN engage with the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities to ensure continued relevance to their needs? To what extent does the Programme align with their needs? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Field visits | ESMS Standards for Indigenous Peoples document Technical / thematic experts - indigenous peoples IUCN Members particularly IPOs Regional offices National offices IPME Unit IUCN members Commission chairs Beneficiaries Project managers/MEL representatives |
| | 1.5 | Private sector engagement | The Programme has integrated a solid business engagement strategy within its implementation. IUCN has streamlined and put in place rules and processes for private sector engagement which all regions, centres and corporate services can apply. IUCN has ensured its relevance by having clear value proposition and set of services and products that can be offered to the private sector. | How has IUCN engaged with the private sector? How is that done on different levels - HQ, regional, national? What is the value that IUCN provides to the private sector through its 2021-2024 Programme? What are the enablers and bottlenecks in IUCN processes of private sector engagement? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review | Programme document IUCN members Regional offices National offices Business Engagement Unit - Head DDG Programme IPME Unit Business Engagement strategy 2021-2024 Operational and Financial Plan Private sector partners Programme and Policy Committee of Council |



Coherence

| Area | Indicators | | Desired State | Evaluation Questions | Methods | Source |
|---|------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| Area 1: External Alignment | 1.1 | Alignment with global conservation agenda | The Programme is well aligned with global conservation conventions and frameworks (UNCCD, UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement, post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and UN SDGs). The Programme is designed in a way that it addresses the conservation and development targets from the global frameworks. | To what extent did the Programme remain relevant to the global conservation frameworks? Which targets did the Programme address? | 1. Documentation Review 2. Key informant interviews | Programme document IUCN position papers on conservation conventions Acting DG DDG Programme IPME Unit IUCN members Commissions Centres Regional offices |
| Area 2: Internal Alignment | 2.1 | Realisation the One Programme Charter | IUCN's work is well aligned with and reflective of the IUCN One Programme Charter. The four Charter principles are integrated into IUCN's working approaches. | How does IUCN reflect the implementation of the IUCN One Programme Charter in its working approaches? How can it be improved? To what extent were the four principles of the Charter integrated into IUCN's working approaches? | 1. Documentation Review 2. Key informant interviews | Programme document Acting DG DDG Programme IPME Unit IUCN members Commissions Centres Regional offices |
| | 2.2 | Alignment of national and regional projects with the Programme | The project/programme objectives and targets are well aligned with the Programme. | To what extent are the projects' objectives and targets aligned with the Programme? Is the connection implicit/explicit? Are the projects reporting based on the targets identified in the Programme? | 1. Documentation Review 2. Key informant interviews 3. Field visits | Programme document Project reports/narratives/MEL reports Project ToC Regional offices National offices Project managers/MEL units |
| | 2.3 | Alignment between Thematic Centres and Programme | There is a clear alignment between the Centres' strategic objectives and the overarching impact objectives in Nature 2030 | Do the Centre pursue clearly documented and clearly defined strategies? Are the objectives clear? Are they explicitly linked to the impact objectives in Nature 2030? | 1. Documentation Review 2. Key informant interviews | Programme document IPME Unit Centres |



| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|--|--|---|--|
| | 2.4 | Alignment between the Programme and the Commissions | The Commissions' priorities and workplans are aligned with the Programme | Are the workplans and Programme aligned? Are the objectives clear? Are they explicitly linked to the impact objectives in Nature 2030? | 1. Documentation Review 2. Key informant interviews | Programme document Acting DG DDG Programme IPME Unit IUCN members Commissions Centres |
| Area 3: Structural Coherence | 3.1 | Clarity of Programme goals | Programme objectives and targets are clearly defined, realistic and feasible given the resources and timeframe for the work. | To what extent are the Programme objectives and targets adequately defined, realistic and feasible, and to what extent are results verifiable? | 1. Documentation Review 2. Key informant interviews 3. Field visits | Programme document IPME Unit Regional offices National offices Project managers Commissions Regions Centres |
| | 3.2 | Theory of Change | The Programme had a clear theory of change, linking Programme activities, outputs, outcomes and goals along rational causal pathways. | Does it have a ToC? Are the causal pathways clearly described? To what extent is the Programme's theory of change coherent, valid, and relevant? Are the fundamental conservation context and problems well understood and well articulated? Does it set a realistic timeframe for change? | 1. Documentation Review 2. Key informant interviews | Programme document IPME Unit Regional offices National offices Project managers Commissions Regions Centres |
| | 3.3 | Results Framework | The Programme has a centralised logframe/resultsframe, containing up-to-date aggregated data for each indicator. Programme target indicators exist, and were linked to the theory of change. Impact targets are quantifiable and relevant to the overall programme goal. | Does the Programme have a results framework? Does it contain well defined and realistic indicators? Do the indicators capture the potential impact of the programme? | 1. Documentation Review 2. Key informant interviews | Programme document IPME Unit Regional offices National offices Project managers Commissions Regions Centres |



Effectiveness

| Area | Indicators | | Desired State | Evaluation Questions | Methods | Source |
|-------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Area 1: Conservation Action | 1.1 | Project performance | IUCN's portfolio projects are generally on track to deliver their intended results. | To what extent are projects sampled within the portfolio on/off track to deliver against intended outcome indicators? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key informant interviews 2. Field visits 3. Documentation review | Programme document Regional offices National offices IUCN Members Commissions Centres External stakeholders |
| Area 2: Knowledge generation | 2.1 | Familiarity with knowledge products | Stakeholders are familiar with IUCN's scientific and knowledge products | How familiar are stakeholders with IUCN's knowledge and scientific outputs? Are they aware of products such as Green List, Red List, Contributions for Nature, World Heritage Outlook etc? Where did they come across these products? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key informant interviews 2. Field visits 3. Documentation review | Programme document DG and DDGs Regional offices National offices IUCN Members Commissions Centres External stakeholders |
| | 2.2 | Utility of knowledge products | Stakeholders consider IUCN's knowledge products to be useful and informative. | What do stakeholders think about IUCN's knowledge and scientific products? To what extent are the products considered to be useful? Do stakeholders use these tools/products to support/inform their own work? How could they be improved? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key informant interviews 2. Field visits 3. Documentation review | Programme document DG and DDGs Regional offices National offices IUCN Members Commissions Centres External stakeholders |
| Area 3: Policy Influencing | 3.1 | Policy leadership | IUCN is considered by external stakeholders to be a thought leader - spearheading cutting-edge research and shaping global, regional and national policy discussions. | How has IUCN contributed to policy influence? What are some concrete examples? What are some enablers and resources that IUCN successfully used to contribute to impact in policy influence? What are some barriers? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key informant interviews 2. Field visits 3. Documentation review | Programme document DG and DDGs Regional offices National offices IUCN Members Commissions Centres External stakeholders |



| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|--|--|--|---|--|
| | 3.2 | Networking and convening | IUCN is seen as a powerful convenor in the conservation sector. It has the capacity to mobilise diverse interest groups, governments, organisations and businesses, convening decision makers and policy influencers. | To what extent is IUCN considered to be good at convening organisations to coordinate/collaborate on conservation initiatives? What opportunities does IUCN create for networking and convening? Are these opportunities considered to adequate? How could IUCN improve its capacity to network and convene? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key informant interviews 2. Field visits 3. Documentation review | Programme document DG and DDGs Regional offices National offices IUCN Members Commissions Centres External stakeholders |
| Area 4: Technology, data and innovation | 4.1 | Use of technology, data and innovation as an enabler across all Programme areas | IUCN has leveraged technology, data and innovation in big data and AI to enhance conservation outcomes across the five Programme areas (People, Land, Water, Oceans and Climate) and increase accountability and transparency through ICT. ICT systems have been improved/updated across the Union to strengthen Programme delivery. | Has IUCN engaged any new ICT systems or tools to strengthen Programme delivery? What challenge/issue did the new technology seek to address? To what extent has this been addressed? Has IUCN leveraged innovative technology and data collection and analysis methods like data sensing, big data and AI, machine learning and blockchain to enhance conservation outcomes? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Documentation Review 2. Key informant interviews 3. Field visits | Programme document Project narratives/MEL reports Project managers/MEL units PPME Unit Regional directors IUCN members External stakeholders |
| Area 5: Communication, education and public awareness | 5.1 | Increased communication, education and public awareness as an enabler across all Programme areas | IUCN has raised awareness and inspired conservation action through effective communication strategies, awareness campaigns, and capacity-building. IUCN has contributed to cross-sectoral partnerships and increased citizen action for issues across all five Programme areas (People, Land, Water, Ocean, and Climate). | Has IUCN engaged different communication and awareness-raising strategies to increase public information and mobilise action on conservation issues? Were there any challenges faced? How have the messages been received by different IUCN audiences? Has IUCN been able to mobilise greater action through communication and awareness? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Documentation Review 2. Key informant interviews 3. Field visits | Programme document Project narratives/MEL reports Project managers/MEL units PPME Unit |



Efficiency

| Area | Indicators | Desired State | Questions | Methods | Sources |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Area 1: Resource efficiency | 1.1 Attainment of financial targets | IUCN has achieved all of its 2021-2024 Programme financial targets - increase in membership dues, maintaining current level of framework income, increase in value of project portfolio, increase annual levels of restricted income and expenditure, non-staff operating costs remaining under 20% of the total operating costs, increase in income from foundations/philanthropy and private sector, and increase in reserves. | Has IUCN achieved its 2021-2024 Programme financial targets? If not, what affected the non-achievement of these targets? To what extent did the Programme meet its financial goal of adopting a full cost recovery approach? Did the restricted funding increase over the four-year period? What are some bottlenecks faced by the Secretariat? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews | Programme document 2021-2024 Financial and Operational Plan Annual work plans Annual reporting Financial Audit Committee CFO Financial reports Framework partners IUCN members |
| | 1.2 Quality of financial monitoring systems project/programme and Programme levels | Strong systems were in place to ensure rigorous financial monitoring and reporting at a global Programme level. | What systems were in place at Programme level? What systems were in place at project/programme level? Were these systems upheld and implemented correctly throughout the Programme period? Were problems with the system identified and corrected? To what extent were Programme stakeholders satisfied with the quality of the financial reporting system? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews | 2021-2024 Financial and Operational Plan Annual work plans CFO IPME Unit |
| | 1.3 Cost recovery approach | IUCN has successfully optimised the roll out and integration of a “full cost recovery approach” into its project development procedures. | Has IUCN successfully integrated a “full cost recovery approach” into its project development procedures? How has that been achieved? Has that been achieved through increase in restricted funds or unrestricted reserves? If the cost recovery has not been achieved, what are the bottlenecks? How have the changing donor priorities impacted this? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews | 2021-2024 Financial and Operational Plan Annual work plans CFO Financial Strategy and Governance Review (2023) |
| | 1.4 Value for money | The Programme is generally considered to be good value for money by IUCN stakeholders and external funders/stakeholders. IUCN maintains a high leveraging ratio on unrestricted funding. IUCN continues to make in-kind contributions to deliver the Programme. | Is the Programme generally considered to be good value for money by internal and external stakeholders? Are there specific examples to illustrate value for money? Are these examples well communicated internally and externally? Does IUCN successfully leverage unrestricted funds to secure additional resource? Does IUCN continue to provide in-kind resource to support Programme delivery? Are both the | 1. Key informant interviews | DDG - Programme CFO IPME Unit Regional offices National offices Centres IUCN members Framework partners |



| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | | leverage ratio and the in-kind support systematically calculated and monitored? | | |
| | 1.5 | Resource mobilisation and adaption | The Programme contained a clear, structured, institution-wide, and corporate-driven resource mobilisation strategy. Resource mobilisation targets were achieved. The Programme was adequately flexible in terms of adapting the resource allocation in the face of COVID-19 and other external risks. | What was the nature and amount of funding that the Programme raised? Did the Programme have a clear strategic resource mobilisation strategy? If so, were targets met, both in terms of volume and in terms of target funder-category? Were the resources redirected as needs changed during the COVID-19 pandemic? Were risks managed? Were decisions taken which helped to enhance resource efficiency in response to new information? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews 3. Field visits | Resource Mobilisation Strategy 2021-2024 Financial and Operational Plan Director Strategic Partnerships Unit DDG - Programme CFO IPME Unit Regional offices National offices Centres IUCN members |
| Area 2: Organisational efficiency | 2.1 | Internal tools | IUCN developed, streamlined, and utilised internal tools including Project Guidelines and Standards, Project Appraisal and Approval System, Information Systems Strategy etc. to strengthen Programme delivery. | Did IUCN develop internal tools to facilitate Programme delivery? What were those? How has IUCN adapted those over the Programme duration? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews | IUCN Project Guidelines and Standards Regional offices National offices DDG - Programme Centres Commissions DDG - Corporate Services IPME Unit |
| | 2.2 | Work plan delivery and oversight | IUCN implemented all strategic initiatives and the Programme priorities on time/within the planned timeframe. IUCN has established systems/processes that allow monitoring and oversight for consistent project delivery. | Were IUCN strategic initiatives / Programme related priorities delivered on time? If not, what were the obstacles? What contingency measures were taken? Are there systems/processes that allow oversight of project delivery? | 1. Documentation review (operational workplans) 2. Key informant interviews | DDG - Programme CFO IPME Unit Regional offices National offices Centres IUCN members Framework partners |
| | 2.3 | Policies | IUCN has strong policies in place to support the Programme delivery. These policies are thoroughly implemented. There is an accountability mechanism that oversees the implementation of these policies. | Has IUCN strengthened its internal policies? Which policies are these? Who is responsible for oversight of the policy implementation? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews | IUCN policies DDG - Programme Regional offices National offices Centres |



| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2.4 | Human resources and business capabilities | IUCN has adequate human resources to deliver all its activities and functions. It has invested in staff development, strengthened quality assurance and accountability mechanisms with respect to staff performance, and enhanced its business capabilities to strengthen portfolio delivery and other IUCN operations. | Does IUCN have adequate human resources for all its activities? Is the staff turnover high or low? Does IUCN optimise and invest in its human resources/performance management for the smooth delivery of the 2021-2024 Programme? How was that done? How has IUCN invested in its business capabilities? What impact has that created? | 1. Key informant interviews | Acting DG DDG - Corporate Services DDG - Programme Regional offices National offices Centres |
| Area 3: Monitoring and accountability | 3.1 | Monitoring and evaluation | There was a strong M&E system in place, including logframe, monitoring workplan, and dedicated M&E staff. The Programme was underpinned by a sound theory of change, which corresponded to a logical framework, replete with indicators from output to outcome levels. | Did the Programme Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning system support accountability, decision-making and learning aspects of the Programme? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews | IUCN Evaluation Policy Project Guidelines and Standards IPME Unit Regional offices National offices Project reports/theory of change narratives |
| | 3.2 | Availability of M&E data | Up to date, accurate M&E data was collected, quality assured and made available to relevant departments across IUCN, including Corporate Services (Communications Strategic Partnerships Unit, Programme, Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation, Membership etc.), Programme, and Regions and Outposted Offices. | Was up to date data maintained throughout the Programme implementation period? If not, what were the key constraints? Was IUCN able to overcome these constraints? Was data generally submitted on time from individual programmes/projects? What were the bottlenecks? How can Programme monitoring be strengthened in the future? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews 3. Field visits | Project reports Annual Programme reporting Evaluations/External Reviews database Communications Unit Strategic Partnerships Unit Programme Unit Regions and Outposted Offices Unit IPME unit |
| | 3.3 | Utility of monitoring data | Data collected at Programme and programme/project levels was considered to be useful by IUCN stakeholders. It helped to guide implementation, strengthened management and oversight, and equipped wider teams (within Corporate Services, for example) with useful data. | To what extent was data considered to be useful by IUCN stakeholders? Are there any examples that illustrate data utility at programme/project levels? Are there any examples of wider data utility - for example in strengthening policy/advocacy work, or improving Member engagement? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews 3. Field visits | M&E reports (global/regional/national) IUCN members Framework partners Project teams Centres Regional offices National offices IPME unit External stakeholders |



| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | 3.4 | Evaluations | Evaluations were systematically conducted for project/programmes executed under the Programme mandate based on the IUCN Evaluation policy. Evaluations were conducted to a high standard by external parties, using recognised methodologies. Management responses were provided by IUCN to each evaluation. | Were evaluations regularly undertaken at the programme/project level, when defined as mandatory by the evaluation policy? Were they conducted in alignment with industry recognised evaluation standards? Did the evaluations generally encourage learning and reflection by IUCN delivery teams? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews 3. Field visits | IUCN Evaluation policy Annual reports Evaluations/external reviews database IPME Unit Project MEL units Regional offices National offices DDG - Programme |
| Area 4: Internal and External Communication | 4.1 | Technical support | The Headquarter (HQ) office was able to provide adequate technical support to the national and regional offices. There was frequent communication between the HQ and regional offices and national offices to ensure that project standards, guidelines and objectives are upheld in line with the wider Programme. | Was HQ responsive in providing technical support to national and regional offices? How frequent was the communication between the HQ and regional and national offices? What were the bottlenecks? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Field visits | Strategic Advisor, Head of DG Office Acting DG / DDG - Regions and Outposed Offices DDG - Programme Regional directors/offices National offices Global Communications Unit |
| | 4.2 | Membership engagement | IUCN developed a Union-wide portal to track the 2021-2024 Programme as a form of membership engagement and monitoring contributions from different IUCN constituents. | Was the platform developed? How was it received by the IUCN Members and Commissions? Is it being utilised effectively to capture the contributions made by different IUCN components? What are some challenges? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews | Programme document Membership Survey 2021-2024 Financial and Operational Plan Head - Members and Commissions Support IUCN members Commissions Centres Regional offices National offices DDG - Programme IPME Unit |



Impact

| Area | Indicators | | Desired State | Questions | Methods | Sources |
|-------------------------------------|------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| Area 1: Reporting on Impacts | 1.1 | Challenges for reporting on IUCN results | Results reporting is possible. The challenges associated with results reporting across such a large organisation as IUCN are mitigated/reduced through strong reporting mechanisms. | What challenges exist for reporting on results? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews | Programme document Annual work plans Annual reporting Project Portal Contributions for Nature IPME Unit Project Teams Regional Teams Centres |
| | 1.2 | Adequacy of existing tools and reporting structures | Nature 2030 provides a robust framework for assessing the Union's impact and progress. | Wdoes Nature 2030 provide an adequate basis for measuring impact? | 1. Documentation review 2. Key informant interviews | Programme document Annual work plans Annual reporting Project Portal Contributions for Nature IPME Unit Project Teams Regional Teams Centres |



Sustainability

| Area | Indicators | | Desired State | Questions | Methods | Sources |
|---|------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Area 1: Learning | 1.1 | Learning and best practices | IUCN has put in place a mechanism to capture lessons learned at Programmatic, regional and local levels. There are opportunities for knowledge and lessons sharing at Programmatic, regional and local levels. | Does IUCN capture and integrate lessons and best practices to promote learning at different places? If so, how is that done? What can be improved? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key informant interviews 2. Field visits 3. Documentation review | Project teams Project report/learning documents Regional offices National offices |
| Area 2: Financial Sustainability | 2.1 | Membership strategy | IUCN has implemented the objectives and targets under its Membership strategy - developing an engagement funnel and ensuring strategic engagement, improving communication, and streamlining delivery of quality services to existing members. | How was the Membership strategy implemented to increase restricted funding? Were the financial targets for restricted income (25% increase over four-year period) met? Were the targets met? What is the rate/nature of member satisfaction? What impact does that have on the development of the next IUCN Programme? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review | IUCN Membership Engagement Strategy Programme document 2021-2024 Financial and Operational Plan CFO DDG - Programme Strategic Partnerships Unit Head - Members and Commissions Support IUCN Members |
| | 2.2 | Revenue streams | IUCN has diversified its funding base to ensure efficient and effective implementation of future Programmes. | How have the IUCN's financial/business models/funding mechanisms changed? Are these sustainable? Has IUCN increased its revenue from sources like private sector, foundations and philanthropy, etc? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review | Programme document 2021-2024 Financial and Operational Plan CFO DDG - Programme Strategic Partnerships Unit |
| | 2.3 | Indirect costs | IUCN has a financial strategy in place to reduce overheads and infrastructural costs alongside the Portfolio growth to ensure future sustainability. | Does IUCN have a financial strategy in place that specifically addresses reduction of overheads for financial sustainability? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review | Programme document 2021-2024 Financial and Operational Plan CFO DDG - Programme Strategic Partnerships Unit |



| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | 2.4 | Unrestricted income | IUCN has been able to increase its unrestricted funds over the Programme duration as a means to full cost recovery and future investments in new initiatives. | Has IUCN been able to increase its unrestricted funds? How? If not, what are some challenges faced by IUCN? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review | IUCN Financial Strategy and Financial Governance reviews 2021-2024 Financial Plan and Operational Plan CFO DDG - Programme |
| | 2.5 | Strategic partnerships | IUCN has invested in establishing partnerships to mitigate the shortfall in unrestricted income, decrease infrastructure costs and/or diversify the funding base? | Has IUCN invested in establishing partnerships to balance out IUCN costs and income? In what ways has that been achieved? If not, why? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review | IUCN Financial Strategy and Financial Governance reviews 2021-2024 Financial Plan and Operational Plan Strategic Partnerships Unit CFO |



GESI

| Area | Indicators | Desired State | Questions | Methods | Source | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| Area 1: Gender Equity | 1.1 | Integration of IUCN Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment policy within the Programme and projects | The Programme sufficiently integrated the IUCN Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment policy. The projects at country and regional levels included a strong gender equity component in both design and implementation. | To what extent did the Programme integrate the IUCN Gender Equity and Women's empowerment policy in design and implementation? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review 3. Field visits | Environmental and Social management system (ESMS) IUCN Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment Policy Programme document DDG - Programme Regional offices National offices Centres Commissions IUCN Members Project teams |
| | 1.2 | Consideration of the policy within generation of scientific knowledge, policy advocacy, networking and capacity-building | Gender equity and women's empowerment policy remained an important part of IUCN's work in development of scientific knowledge, policy advocacy and networking. | To what extent did IUCN integrate its Gender Equity and Women's empowerment policy in its non-portfolio work of scientific knowledge production, policy advocacy and networking? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review 3. Field visits | Environmental and Social management system (ESMS) IUCN Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment Policy Programme document DDG - Programme Regional offices National offices Centres Commissions IUCN Members Project teams |
| Area 2: Indigenous Peoples | 2.1 | Integration of IUCN Standards of Indigenous Peoples policy with the Programme and projects | The Programme sufficiently integrated the IUCN Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment policy. The projects at country and regional levels included a consistent involvement of indigenous peoples in both design and implementation. | To what extent did the Programme integrate the IUCN Standards on Indigenous Peoples in design and implementation? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review 3. Field visits | Environmental and Social management system (ESMS) Standards of Indigenous People DDG - Programme Regional offices National offices Centres Commissions IUCN Members Project teams |



| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|--|---|--|
| | 2.2 | Consideration of the Standards within generation of scientific knowledge policy advocacy, networking and capacity-building | The Standards on Indigenous Peoples remained an important part of IUCN's work in development of scientific knowledge, policy advocacy and networking. | To what extent did IUCN integrate the IUCN Standards on Indigenous Peoples in its non-portfolio work of scientific knowledge production, policy advocacy and networking? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review 3. Field visits | Environmental and Social management system (ESMS) Standards of Indigenous People DDG - Programme Regional offices National offices Centres Commissions IUCN Members Project teams |
| Area 3: Intergenerational Equity | 3.1 | Launch and integration of IUCN Youth strategy within the Programme and projects | The Programme sufficiently integrated the IUCN Youth Strategy. The projects at country and regional levels included a consistent involvement of young people in both design and implementation. | To what extent did the Programme integrate the IUCN Youth Strategy in design and implementation? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review 3. Field visits | Environmental and Social management system (ESMS) IUCN Youth Strategy Programme document DDG - Programme Regional offices National offices Centres Commissions IUCN Members Project teams |
| | 3.2 | Consideration of the IUCN Youth strategy within generation of scientific knowledge, policy advocacy, networking and capacity-building | IUCN Youth strategy remained an important part of IUCN's work in development of scientific knowledge, policy advocacy and networking. | To what extent did IUCN integrate the IUCN Youth strategy in its non-portfolio work of scientific knowledge production, policy advocacy and networking? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review 3. Field visits | Environmental and Social management system (ESMS) IUCN Youth Strategy Programme document DDG - Programme Regional offices National offices Centres Commissions IUCN Members Project teams |
| Area 4: Disability | 4.1 | Incorporation of disability principles within the IUCN Programme | The Programme sufficiently integrated the disability principles. The projects at country and regional levels included a strong gender equity component in both design and implementation at all levels. | To what extent was the IUCN Programme attuned to disability at all levels of design and implementation? | 1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review 3. Field visits | Environmental and Social management system (ESMS) Programme document DDG - Programme Regional offices National offices Centres Commissions IUCN Members Project teams |



| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Area 5: Human Rights</p> | <p>5.1</p> | <p>Incorporation of human rights principles within the IUCN Programme in line with UN frameworks</p> | <p>The Programme sufficiently integrated the human rights principles with the IUCN Programme in design and its implementation at global, regional and local levels.</p> | <p>To what extent was the IUCN Programme attuned to human rights at all levels of design and implementation?</p> | <p>1. Key informant interviews 2. Documentation review 3. Field visits</p> | <p>Environmental and Social management system (ESMS) Programme document DDG - Programme Regional offices National offices Centres Commissions IUCN Members Project teams</p> |
|------------------------------------|------------|--|---|--|--|--|



Project Scorecards

| Area | Indicator | Desired State | Questions |
|------------------|--|---|---|
| RELEVANCE | Effective targeting of issues relating to conservation and sustainable development | The project is designed to fill the gaps in coverage or add value in addressing conservation and/or sustainable development priorities. | Does the project seek to address a conservation or development gap? To what extent does it add value to previous or existing initiatives with similar objectives? |
| | Addressing stakeholders' and beneficiaries' needs | Stakeholder and beneficiary needs are reflected in project objectives. | Was a stakeholder/beneficiary analysis conducted as part of the project design? Were the stakeholders/beneficiaries consulted during project development? How do project objectives align with the needs identified through those consultations? |
| COHERENCE | Addressing the Prioritised Programme Areas identified in IUCN's 'Nature 2030: A programme for the Union 2021-2024' | One or more of the five Prioritised Programme Areas (People, Land, Water, Oceans & Climate) are actively addressed by the project. | Which of the five programme areas does this project address? Are project objectives directed towards achieving IUCN the Impact Targets listed under each programme area? Is the project employing any of the approaches described under each impact target? To what extent is the project using, promoting and scaling up nature-based solutions to conservation challenges? |
| | Compliance with IUCN Project Guidelines and Standards (PGS) and Project Appraisal and Approval System (PAAS) | The project complies with all modules of the IUCN Project Standards and Guidelines. | Are project staff familiar with IUCN's concept of the project cycle? Have Gender, Youth, Indigenous Peoples considerations been mainstreamed into project design and implementation? Have financial and risk analyses been conducted? Are project processes and procedures consistent with the IUCN's Environmental and Social Safeguard Framework? |



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|---|
| | Adherence to the Five delivery pathways described in 'Nature 2030' | The project follows the five pathways to transformative change, namely Recognise, Retain, Restore, Resource, Reconnect. | Does the project promote: A shared understanding of challenges, urgency of action, potential solutions and respective roles? The safeguarding, maintaining and sustainable use of the biodiversity and natural and cultural heritage? The rehabilitation of lost or degraded species and ecosystems and the full suite of benefits they provide? Mobilising funding and investment in nature and the people working to conserve it? re-establishing the link between people and nature to build a culture of conservation? |
| | Adoption of IUCN's One Programme approach | The project is implemented in accordance with the 'One Programme Charter'. | What has the project done to leverage the respective roles, capacities and unique features of the constituent parts of IUCN? |
| | Interaction with other related initiatives | Where appropriate, the project has established synergies with other projects or programmes with a similar geographical and/or thematic focus. | Has the project identified other initiatives that share a similar thematic and/or geographical focus and explored potential synergies? Has the project interacted with these other initiatives to strengthen impact by sharing knowledge, lessons learned or resources? |
| EFFECTIVENES | Activity implementation and output delivery | The project has implemented its planned activities and delivered its intended outputs. | What major implementation challenges did the project face, and how were they overcome? Were any actions not implemented or outputs not delivered, and if so what were the reasons? |
| | Achievement of project objectives and outcomes | The project has achieved / or is on track to achieve its principal objectives and outcomes. | To what extent has the project achieved its intended objectives and outcomes? What were the factors that allowed those achievements ? What were the factors that prevented any objectives or outcomes being achieved? |
| | Use of enablers as levers for economic and social change | The project effectively used the three enabling themes presented in 'Nature 2030' to promote economic and social change. | How did the project use the following enablers in relation to each Programme Area: - Technology, data and innovation? - Communication, education and public awareness? - investments and financial sustainability? What were the outcomes? |



| | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| | Engagement with a comprehensive range of stakeholders | The project regularly engages with a broad range of stakeholders (especially women, youth and indigenous peoples), through consultation, information sharing, and involvement in decision making processes where appropriate. | What types of stakeholder has the project targeted as partners and beneficiaries - do they include women & girls, youth and, where applicable, indigenous peoples? How frequently are they consulted during project implementation? Are they regularly kept informed about project developments? Which project partners and beneficiaries have a role in decision making and through what mechanisms? |
| | Mobilisation of the private sector for conservation financing | The project involved collaborative partnership with and investment from private sector organisation(s) to address conservation and/or development challenges. | Were private sector organisations involved in financing the project? In what ways is the private sector involved? |
| EFFICIENCY | Timely project implementation | Project activities were delivered on time to a high standard. | Were there delays in delivering project activities? If so, what were the causes of these delays? Were mitigation measures taken to address the delays? If so, were they successful? |
| | Appropriate budgeting and sound financial management | Project activities were delivered within budget and funds were properly managed. | Was budget appropriately allocated between project components? Were activities delivered within budget? If not, what were the reasons? What were the actual expenditure rates against budget? How often was the project audited and what were the findings? |
| | Maintenance of the flow of funds | The project received disbursements of funds from donors according to the agreed schedule. | Were disbursements made as per schedule? If not, how long were the delays and what were their causes? |
| | Management and mitigation of risk relating to context, delivery, operations, finance, reputation and safeguarding | The risks identified and analysed during project development were closely monitored and effectively managed or mitigated. | What means were used to monitor risks during implementation? How were emerging threats managed or mitigated? Did any risks substantively affect the quality or timeliness of delivery and if so how? |



| | | | |
|---------------|---|--|--|
| | Functioning monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework | The project has a functioning and effective M&E framework, which is aligned with IUCN policies and generates data which measure its contribution to IUCN impact targets. | <p>Did the project have a Theory of Change and Results framework with clear objectives, targets and indicators and which showed the causal pathways leading from activities and outcomes to results and impacts?</p> <p>Was there a mechanism for accurate and timely monitoring of implementation progress and output delivery and was it applied consistently across the project?</p> <p>How were project deliverables measured against results and impact targets?</p> <p>Was the IUCN digital platform used to record and share success?</p> <p>Did the project practice adaptive management in response to changes in implementation status or context as revealed through the M&E processes?</p> <p>Did a periodic reporting take place, in line with what had been planned?</p> <p>Was the project independently evaluated and if so, how frequently?</p> |
| IMPACT | Contribution to impact targets | The project has made a clear contribution to IUCN's impact targets relevant to its programme area(s) as defined in Annex 1 of the 'Nature 2030' document. | <p>Is the project familiar with the impact targets outlined in Annex 1 to 'Nature 2030'?</p> <p>To which impact targets has the project contributed and in what way?</p> |
| | Contribution to generation of new knowledge relating to conservation and/or sustainable development | The project has generated new knowledge relating to conservation an/or sustainable development that has utility beyond the scope of the project itself. | <p>What contribution has the project made to increasing relevant knowledge?</p> <p>Has that knowledge been properly managed and curated?</p> <p>Is the knowledge being disseminated to the wider conservation/development community?</p> |
| | Contribution to policy influence relating to conservation | The project has contributed to conservation policy influence and/or implementation. | How has the project contributed to policy influence? What are its impacts on nature and people including different stakeholders? |
| | Contribution to conservation action | The project has contributed to conservation action. | How has the project contributed to conservation action? How was that materialised? What are some examples of the implications of this contribution on nature and people? |
| | Development of innovative approaches and methodologies for conservation and sustainable development | The project has developed innovative approaches and methodologies for interventions relating to conservation an/or sustainable development. | <p>What new approaches/methodologies have been developed by the project?</p> <p>How have these approaches/methodologies been made available to the wider conservation community?</p> |



| | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| SUSTAINABILITY | Financial sustainability | Finance is being or has been mobilised to continue conservation and/or sustainable development activities after the project ends. Alternatively, the achievement of project objectives has rendered continuation financing unnecessary. | Is additional finance required to continue the project's activities beyond the lifetime of the project? Have the funds been mobilised or are they being mobilised and if so, from what sources? |
| | Human capacity development | The project's investment in local human capacity has created a solid foundation for the implementation future conservation and sustainable development interventions. | What did the project do to build local capacity conservation and sustainable development? Will that capacity be sufficient to deliver similar initiatives in the future? |
| | Knowledge products and lessons learnt | The project has created a repository of knowledge products and lessons learnt. These lessons have been disseminated to the project team and made accessible to the wider conservation/development community. | Were lessons learned captured and recorded throughout project implementation? How have these lessons been disseminated within the project team and made accessible to a wider audience? |
| | Sustained outcomes | The project outcomes are likely to remain valid and continue to contribute to IUCN impact targets after the project ends. | Which project outcomes are likely to remain valid and continue to contribute to achieving impact beyond the lifetime of the project, and why? |
| GESI | Crosscutting (Programme Level) | The Programme has sufficiently integrated the principles and standards outlined in the ESMS across its projects and has established a strong operational mechanism to undertake, monitor and review the ESMS mechanism in its projects that fall within its scope | How many projects in the Programme have gone through the ESMS screening? Of them, how many were required to do the ESMS Impact Assessment, and successfully completed the ESMS Impact Assessment? How effectively are these projects able to monitor, report on and mitigate the risks identified in their ESMS Impact Assessment? |
| | | Adequate GESI considerations are factored into projects that do not fall within the scope of the ESMS | Projects falling in the category of non-area based projects, service agreement projects, and projects where IUCN is not the lead agency, adequately factor in GESI considerations |



| | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|---|
| | Gender Equity | The project includes a strong gender equity component in both design and implementation. | Does the project have a gender analysis and has it applied the key issues and recommendations identified to inform gender-responsive and gender-inclusive project design, budgeting, staffing, implementation, monitoring and evaluation? How often is the gender analysis reviewed and refreshed? Does the project have inclusive and gender-sensitive project teams that demonstrate appropriate capacities and technical expertise to support gender-responsive action? Does the project collect, analyse and apply sex-disaggregated data and using gender indicators to inform gender-responsive monitoring, evaluation, reporting and learning on IUCN programmatic activities? |
| | Indigenous Peoples | The project adequately caters for the representation and consideration of the rights, interests and engagement of indigenous peoples in its project in both design and implementation. | Does the project's ESMS Screening require the preparation of an Indigenous Persons Planning Framework and if so, has this IPPF developed to include IUCN's standards and guidance on IPPF? Has the project ensured that indigenous people have appropriate opportunities in terms of representation, participation, decision-making and benefits, throughout the identification, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of activities? |
| | Human Rights | The project adequately protects the fundamental and secure rights of all those who are likely to be directly and indirectly impacted by the project's activities (including people with disabilities, elderly, children and youth, sectarian and ethnic minorities and any others who are likely to be impacted by the project's activities) and where these are deemed at risk, has taken adequate mitigation measures in project design and delivery | Does the project's design and delivery plan adequately reflect its impact on the fundamental and secure rights of people likely to be affected by the project's activities? Does the project have a functioning and effective grievance, complaints and redressal mechanism? Does the project ensure that no fundamental rights are violated in the delivery of its activities? |

Appendix 3: Select Bibliography

Programme Reading

- Aleph Strategies (2022): Strategic Review of IUCN's Future Engagement with the World Heritage Convention
- Baastel (2020): External Review of the IUCN Programme 2017-2020
- Baastel (2022): IUCN Leaders Forum Evaluation 2022
- Baastel (2022): IUCN's Engagement with the GEF as a GEF Agency
- Convention on Biological Diversity (2022): Decision 15/16 - Knowledge Management and the Clearing-House Mechanism
- Denmark Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2022): Inception Review Report: Danish Support to IUCN 2021-24
- ECO (2021): IUCN Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Analysis
- IUCN (1948): Statutes and Regulations. Revised 2021
- IUCN (2011): Working as a Union to Deliver IUCN's One Programme (One Programme Charter)
- IUCN (2017): ESMS - Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP)
- IUCN (2018): ESMS - Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF)
- IUCN (2020): 2021-2024 Portfolio Results Framework - Full Draft 2020
- IUCN (2020): 2021-2024 Portfolio Results Framework Cover Note
- IUCN (2020): Application of the Restoration Barometer in Costa Rica
- IUCN (2021): Congress Resolution 147 WCC-2020-DEC-147-EN
- IUCN (2021): ESARO Annual Report 2021
- IUCN (2021): Management Response - IUCN Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Analysis
- IUCN (2021): Nature 2030 - A Programme for the Union 2021-2024
- IUCN (2022): Annual Report
- IUCN (2022): Asia Regional Office Annual Report 2022
- IUCN (2022): Centre and Regional Workplan-Consolidated
- IUCN (2022): Corporate Quarterly Report - Q3 2022
- IUCN (2022): *IUCN Africa Protected Areas Congress: Kigali Call to Action for People and Nature.*
- IUCN (2022): IUCN position paper for the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) COP 15
- IUCN (2022): *IUCN position paper for the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) COP 27*
- IUCN (2022): IUCN Regional Offices Report - October-December 2022
- IUCN (2022): IUCN Youth Strategy 2022-2030
- IUCN (2022): ORMACC Biennial Report
- IUCN (2022): Proposed Process to Align the Commissions Planning Cycle to that of the Secretariat
- IUCN (2022): Solutions in Focus: Tech4Nature. PANORAMA
- IUCN (2022): *Thematic Centres Report - Q4 2022*
- IUCN (2023) Workshop 1- Centre for Conservation Action
- IUCN (2023): *Annual Membership Satisfaction Survey. Presentation to the Executive Board*
- IUCN (2023): Centre and Regional Workplan-Consolidated
- IUCN (2023): Contributing to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework: Nature 2030, IUCN Resolutions and Conservation Tools.
- IUCN (2023): Corporate Quarterly Report - Q1 2023
- IUCN (2023): *Project Costing Framework Section 1: Guidelines for project managers for costing support units and services*
- IUCN (2023): Report of the Regional Offices - April-June 2023



IUCN (2023): Request for Proposals – External Review of the IUCN Programme 2021-2024,
IUCN (2023): *Results on DG Strategic Objectives for 2022*
IUCN (2023): *Roadmap of the PPME/MEL Strategy for IUCN Secretariat*
IUCN Resolutions: *WCC-2020-Res-002-EN*
IUCN: *An IUCN Indigenous Peoples Self-Determined Strategy: Supporting effective participation of indigenous peoples in IUCN and conservation*
IUCN: *Becoming an Indigenous peoples' organisation Member: A convening platform for collective action and influence*
The Biodiversity Consultancy (2021): IUCN: Strategic Review of Data Products based on IUCN Standards

Project Reading

IUCN (2018). Programme proposal. Scaling-up Ecosystem based adaptation (EbA) Measures in rural Latin America.
EbA LAC (no date). Estrategia de Género Costa Rica
P02886 IUCN (2023) Interim report. 20_II_176_G_EbA Rural Areas
Eba LaAC (2023). Rutas para cumplir indicadores
BDO (2022). Financial audit of "scaling-up Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) Measures in rural Latin America"
IUCN: Donor contract
P03807 IUCN (2023): INCOME GENERATING ACTIVITIES (IGAs) PROGRESS REPORT - July 2023
IUCN (2023): TREE NURSERIES ESTABLISHMENT PROGRESS REPORT - July 2023
IUCN (2023): SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DEMONSTRATION ESTABLISHMENT REPORT _ July 2023
IUCN: Bahari Mali (Sustainable Blue Livelihoods in the Tanga-Pemba Seascape), Tanzania, project proposal submitted by ESAO to Embassy of Ireland in Tanzania
IUCN (2023): Baseline survey report for the Bahari Mali Project in the Tanga-Pemba Seascape Area (Final Report), 18 May 2023
P04383 IUCN: Terms of Reference for a consultancy for Design of Project Communication strategy and A Knowledge Management plan
<https://www.iucn.org/story/202305/community-members-tanzanias-tanga-pemba-seascape-set-benefit-new-blue-economy-project>
<https://www.iucn.org/news/eastern-and-southern-africa/202110/great-blue-wall-initiative-accelerate-blue-economy-region>
IUCN (2016): Bonn Challenge Barometer - proposal
IUCN-BMU (2016): Grant Agreement
National authorities of 11 countries (2019-2021) Individual letters of Interest in working with IUCN on Forest Landscape Restoration
P02337 IUCN (2020?) Extension Budget
BMU-IKI (2020) Vertragsänderung (letter confirming cost extension - October)
IUCN (2022) Amendment Request - February
BMU (2022) Amendment Letter - April
BMU (2022) Amendment Email - December
BMU (2023) Amendment Email - June



- IKI (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 & 2023) The Bonn Challenge Barometer of Progress - Interim Reports
- IKI (2023) The Bonn Challenge Barometer of Progress - Biennial Report
- BMM-IUCN (2016): Action Plan - April 2016 to March 2017.
- BMM-IUCN (2018): Action Plan - March 2018 to February 2019.
- BMM-IUCN (2018): Brief and feedback to CEO at Strategic Biodiversity Planning Workshop - 10 July 2019
- P03719 BMM-IUCN (2020) Black Mountain Mining Collaborative Agreement 2013-2020: Review of phase 1
- BMM-IUCN (2022) Collaboration Logframe.
- BMM-IUCN (2021): Action Plan - September 2021 to August 2022.
- BMM-IUCN (2023): Action Plan - September 2023 to December 2024.
- IUCN: TOWARDS A BLUE FUTURE IN THE TANGA – PEMBA SEASCAPE - Project document
- IUCN: “Towards a Blue Future in the Tanga-Pemba Seascape Initiative”; MANAGEMENT LETTER For the Year ended 31 August 2022
- P03948 IUCN: Detailed budget
- IUCN: Financial Statements of the Projects - Year Ended 31 August 2022
- <https://www.dfa.ie/irish-embassy/tanzania/news-and-events/latestnews/launching-the-tanga-pemba-seascape-programme-to-advance-the-embassys-blue-economy-efforts.html>
- https://hrms.iucn.org/iresy/index.cfm?event=vac.offline.download&offline_vacancy_id=5102
- IUCN (2022): BRIDGE Phase 5: Proposal for a Programme 2022-2025
- IUCN (2023) Building River Dialogue and Governance: BRIDGE 4 2019-2022 - report
- IUCN (2023) BRIDGE - Building River Dialogue and Governance (Phase 5) Progress report (September 2022-August 2023)
- P03944 IUCN (2023) BRIDGE 5 Final Budget (attached to contract).
- IUCN (2023) Financial Statement Sep22-Feb23
- IUCN (2023) Financial Statement Mar-Aug23
- IUCN (2020): Full Proposal_CEPF Phase III
- IUCN (2023): Progress Report Jan-Jun 2023
- IUCN (2023): Supervision Mission to the Indo-Burma Hotspot
- P03776 IUCN (2023): Mid-term Assessment
- VCV Auditing Service (2022): Audited Consolidated Statement of Sources and Uses of Funds January 2021-December 2022
- <https://www.cepf.net/our-work/ecosystem-profile-defined>
- IUCN (2021): Final Grant Report. UG-2019-47695-Piloting Flood-Based Livelihoods in Support of a Water Retention Strategy for the Mekong Delta, Vietnam
- P02677 IUCN (2023): Monitoring Report - Piloting Flood-Based Livelihoods in Support of a Water Retention Strategy for the Mekong Delta
- IUCN (2020): Flood Based Livelihoods in the Mekong Delta
- IUCN (2021): Funding Proposal - Support for Community Based Marine Turtle Nesting Beach Conservation and Bycatch Reduction in Viet Nam (2021-2026)
- P03924 IUCN (2023): Progress Performance Report. Year 2. Support for Community-Based Marine Turtle Nesting Beach Conservation and Bycatch Reduction in Viet Nam
- IUCN (2023): Volunteers and turtle conservation in Viet Nam: what’s been achieved (online)
- IUCN: IUCN Vietnam Sea Turtle Volunteer Facebook page (online)
- P03237 IUCN, CCAD, KFW, Cooperación alemana (2022). Plan Operativo General 2021-2025. Programa de Biodiversidad: Enlazando el Paisaje Centroamericano



- IUCN, KFW, Cooperación alemana (2023). Manual Operativo. PROGRAMA DE BIODIVERSIDAD: ENLAZANDO EL PAISAJE CENTROAMERICANO
- KFW (2020) Acuerdo separado al contrato de aporte financiero del 17 de diciembre de 2019
- CCAD, German cooperation, KFW, IUCN (2022) II Informe Anual - Año 2022
- Enlazando el paisaje centroamericano (2023). Informe de avance enero-junio 2023
- Carvajal & LEA (2022) Informe sobre el trabajo para asegurar razonablemente sobre los fondos desembolsados en el marco del procedimiento del Fondo de Disposición
- IUCN, SICA, KFW (2022). Ayuda memoria de misión de evaluación.
- GITEC - Consult GMBH (219) Estudio de factibilidad. Enlazando el Paisaje centroamericano
- IUCN (2020). Identification, Assessment, Sharing & Dissemination of Best Practices for Humane Management of Invasive Alien Species. First Progress Report
- IUCN (2022). Identification, Assessment, Sharing & Dissemination of Best Practices for Humane Management of Invasive Alien Species. Second Progress Report
- P03048 IUCN (2022). Identification, Assessment, Sharing & Dissemination of Best Practices for Humane Management of Invasive Alien Species. Final Progress Report
- European Commission (2022) An introduction to the invasive alien species of Union concern - Brochure
- IUCN Website: <https://www.iucn.org/our-work/projects/identification-assessment-sharing-and-dissemination-best-practices-humane> - project webpage
- IUCN (2021) Project Closure Report: Landscape Standard
- Verified Carbon Standard (2016) Project proposal. Addressing REDD+ through Landscape-Scale Sustainable Commodity Production Models
- Verra, Rainforest Alliance, The Climate Community & Biodiversity Alliance, IUCN, NCSC, Proforest, Solidaridad (2018). Landscape Standard. Terms of Reference
- P02993 IUCN and Agua Tica/FUNDECOR (2021). LandScale Evaluación inicial holística de las Subcuencas Norte de San José, Costa Rica.
- Landscape (no date) Aplicación y uso de Landscape in Costa Rica, Descubra y comunique información fiable sobre la sostenibilidad a nivel de paisaje.
- Landscape (2020). Directrices para la evaluación
- Landscape (2018) Terms of Reference
- IUCN (2018): GEF Mekong Peatlands Project Document
- IUCN (2022): Agency Notification of Suspension - Myanmar
- P01730 IUCN (2020): Project Implementation Manual
- IUCN (2022): Aide Memoire
- IUCN (2023): Project Implementation Report
- IUCN (2016): Mekong WET: Building Resilience of Wetlands in the Lower Mekong Region through a Ramsar Regional Initiative. Proposal.
- IKI (2022): Mekong WET Final Technical Report
- IUCN (2019): Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment U Minh Thuong, Viet Nam
- IUCN (2019): Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment Phu My Species and Habitat
- P01600 Conservation Area, Viet Nam
- IUCN (2019): Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment Bang Pakong River Wetland, Thailand
- IUCN (2019): Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment Beung Kiat Ngong Ramsar Site, Lao PDR
- IUCN (2022): A Regional Synthesis of Results and Lessons from Mekong WET Small Grants 2021-2022



- IUCN (2022): Indo-Burma Wetland Outlook 2022: Towards Wise Use of Indo-Burma's Wetlands.
- AECID & IUCN (2019). Convenio de financiación. Anexo I. Información básica del programa
- IUCN (2020) Plan Operativo General. Seguridad hídrica RMG.
- P02912 PROSEHIGUA (2023) Informe Semestral POA4
- Grupo Madre Sierra (2022). Evaluación técnica intermedia
- PROSEHIGUA (2020). Informe Anual Plan Operativo Anual1
- IUCN (2022) Evaluation Management Response Template
- IUCN (2023): Coastal and Marine Ecosystems Conservation and Management Project: Year 2
- P03885 Final Technical Progress Report and Financial Report
- USAID, IUCN (2022) Regional Coastal Biodiversity Project. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plan FY2017-FY2024
- IUCN (2018) Regional Coastal Biodiversity Project. Revised Technical Application for cooperative agreement
- P02510 IUCN (2022). Regional Coastal Biodiversity Project. 5th Annual report
- Venegas Nexia (2021) RCBP. Financial report and independent auditor's opinion
- IUCN (2022). Regional Coastal Biodiversity Project. Sistematización de buenas prácticas 2018-2022
- IUCN: Project proposal
- IUCN: GENDER AND YOUTH ENGAGEMENT GUIDELINES FOR UGANDA Resilience for People and Landscapes Programme (REPLAP)
- IUCN: Gender and Youth Engagement Guidelines for Kenya
- P02917 IUCN: Establishing Environmental, Social and Economic Baselines and Developing an Interactive M&E Framework for the Resilience for People and Landscape Programme (REPLAP)
- IUCN (2022): Final audit report August 2022
- IUCN (2022): Final Project Narrative Report (August 2022)
- IUCN (2022): Final evaluation report (December 2022)
- GCF & IUCN (2019) Funded activity agreement
- IUCN (2018) Funding proposal
- P02625 IUCN (2022) Informe consolidado misión de supervisión proyecto "Construyendo resiliencia de los medios de vida ante el cambio climático en las cuencas altas del altiplano de Guatemala"
- DFK (2022) FINANCIAL AUDIT OF THE PROJECT "BUILDING LIVELIHOOD RESILIENCE TO CLIMATE CHANGE IN THE UPPER BASINS OF GUATEMALA'S HIGHLANDS"
- IUCN: Project document with annexes
- IUCN (2020): Inception report
- IUCN: Meeting report on Nature based Solutions -Drought Project Inception Meeting and framing of policy reviewKenya.
- P03473 IUCN: 2021 Progress reports
- IUCN: 2022 Progress reports
- IUCN (2022): Audit report
- IUCN: TA proposal
- P03151 IUCN: 2019 Annual report
- IUCN: 2020 Annual report



- IUCN: 2023 Completion report
IUCN: 2023 Evaluation report
IUCN/SIDA (2017): Framework Agreement 2017-2020.
IUCN/SIDA (2017): Framework Agreement 2017-2020 - Amendment No.3
IUCN (2017)Marine plastics & Coastal Communities: A 4-year IUCN initiative in the Indian Ocean and Asia Pacific regions 2017-2020 - Concept for Sida.
IUCN (?) MARPLASTICCs: Theory of Change.
IUCN(2018 & 2019-20): Internal Agreement Marine Plastics Project - ARO
P02639 IUCN(2018 & 2019-20): Internal Agreement Marine Plastics Project - ESARO
IUCN (2021) MARPLASTICCs Extension Proposal
IUCN (2022) MARPLASTICCs Final Project Report
IUCN (2022) Progress against indicators (as at March 2022) - table
Cynosure (2022) Final Project Evaluation for the Marine Plastics & Coastal Communities (MARPLASTICCs) - Report
IUCN (2022) MARPLASTICCs: Progress Against Indicators Updated March 2022
WWF Germany (2019): SOMN 2.0 Project Proposal
WWF Germany (2021, 2022 & 2023) SOMN 2.0 Interim Technical Reports to BMZ
WWF Germany (2023) SOMN 2.0 Final Technical Report to BMZ
P03386 WWF Germany (2022) SOMN Flagship synthesis report
Futureval (2021) External mid-term evaluation 1 - final report
Futureval (2023) External mid-term evaluation 2 - final report
Futureval (2023) External final evaluation - final report
IUCN (2015): SOS Lemur Special Initiative - Concept.
IUCN (2016): SOS Lemur Project Proposal - Appraisal & Approval.
IUCN (2023): SOS Lemurs Initiative - Final Report
P02256 IUCN (2023): SOS Lemurs Initiative 2017-2023 - Impact Report
ONF International (2022): SOS Lemurs Initiative 2017-2022 - Final Evaluation Report
ONF International (2022): SOS Lemurs Initiative 2017-2022 - Final Evaluation (Summary)
ONF International (2022): SOS Lemurs Initiative 2017-2022: Final Evaluation (Presentation)
IUCN (2023): Management Response (to Final Evaluation recommendations)
IUCN (2021): Productive landscapes for inclusive growth in Tanzania and Mozambique: SUSTAIN Pro - proposal.
IUCN (2021): SUSTAIN Pro Budget Annual Budget.
P03950 IUCN (2023) SUSTAIN Financial Report Dec 2021 - Dec 2022.
PWC (2023) Independent auditor's report to the Management on the financial report 9 Dec 2021 to 31 Dec 2022) of the project SUSTAIN Pro.
IUCN (2023): SUSTAIN Pro: Annual Report 2022.
IUCN (2022): Valuing Water Youth Journey - proposal
P04108 IUCN (2022): Valuing Water Youth Journey - budget
IUCN (2023): Valuing Water Youth Journey - Mid-term Report
IUCN (2023): Valuing Water Youth Journey - Financial Report 1 June 2022 to 31 March 2023.
P02312 IUCN-ICCROM-Norwegian MoCE (2016): World Heritage Leadership Programme - Cooperation Agreement (Phase 1)



IUCN-ICCROM-Norwegian MoCE (2016): World Heritage Leadership Programme - Annex I to Phase 1 Cooperation Agreement (Modules, Results & Outputs)

IUCN-ICCROM-Norwegian MoCE (2022): World Heritage Leadership Programme - Cooperation Agreement (Phase 2)

IUCN-ICCROM-Norwegian MoCE (2022): World Heritage Leadership Programme - Annex I to Phase 2 Cooperation Agreement (Modules, Results & Outputs)

E.C.O Institute for Ecology (2020) Mid-term Programme Evaluation: World Heritage Leadership (Final Report)

Websites

IUCN Open Project Portal. Available at: <https://open.iucn.org/>

IUCN Contributions for Nature Platform. Available at: <https://www.iucncontributionsfornature.org/>

IUCN Environmental and Social Management System. Available at: <https://www.iucn.org/about-iucn/accountability-and-reporting/project-accountability/environmental-and-social-management-system>

IUCN project guidelines and standards v2.2. Available at: <https://www.iucn.org/about-iucn/accountability-and-reporting/project-accountability>



Appendix 4: List of Key Informants for remote KIIs

| Name | First Name | Function | Org/Unit / Dept / Office |
|-------------------|------------|--|---|
| AGUILAR ROJAS | Grethel | Acting DG, DDG Regions and Outposted Offices | IUCN |
| ANDRADE | Angela | Commission on Ecosystem Management | IUCN Commissions |
| BJØRKTO BADE | Heidi | Senior Advisor | NORAD |
| BROOKS | Thomas | Chief Scientist | IUCN |
| BRUNNER | Jake | Head, Lower Mekong Subregion (M1) | IUCN |
| CAMPILAN | Dindo | Regional Director, Asia; Task manager GEF/GCF | ARO |
| COLCHESTER | Marcus | Senior Policy Advisor | Forest Peoples Project |
| DAVIS | Michael | Chief Financial Officer, Global Finance Group | IUCN |
| DAWSON | Christine | US State Department Representative at IUCN | US government |
| DEBOISSON | Lucille | Performance and Accountability Specialist | IUCN |
| DELGAO ROSA | Humberto | Director for Biodiversity | European Commission, DG Environment |
| DEONG | Lai Jean | Head, Financial services | IUCN |
| DERAM | Lucinda | Director, Strategic Partnership Unit, Chair of the evaluation steering committee | ICUN |
| DISKO | Stefan | Consultant | International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) |
| GONZALES | Mayte | Head of human rights in conservation | IUCN |
| IBRAHIM | Faridah | Head, Business Engagement Unit | IUCN |
| JASIMUDDIN MOUDUD | Hasna | IUCN Council Member - Bangladesh | IUCN Council |
| JENKINS | Richard | Head Biodiversity assessment and knowledge | IUCN |
| KAKA | Ali | IUCN Council Member -Kenya | IUCN Council |
| KARANGWA | Charles | Global Head, Nature Based Solutions | IUCN |
| KENRICK | Justin | Coordinator | Forest Peoples Project |



| | | | |
|--------------------|----------|--|-------------------------------------|
| KLEITZ | Gilles | Directeur Exécutif - Développement Durable | AFD |
| LANJOUW | Annette | CEO | Arcus Foundation |
| LEE | Aileen | Chief of Programs | Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation |
| LEE | SungAh | DDG Corporate Services | IUCN |
| LI | Lin | Senior Director, Global Policy and advocacy | WWF |
| LIEBERMAN | Sue | Vice President, International Policy | Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) |
| MAGIN | Georgina | Senior Programme Manager | Flora and Fauna International |
| MAGINNIS | Stewart | DDG programme | IUCN |
| MARTROU | Eric | Risk Management Officer | IUCN |
| McBREEN | James | Senior Programme Officer | IUCN Centre for Conservation Action |
| MCWILLIAM | Alex | SPO Species / Programme Coordinator Science and Strategy Group (SSG), Asia Asia Regional Office | ARO |
| MEYER | Nils | Senior Project Manager | KFW |
| MIHAYLOVA | Antonia | Special Adviser to the Director General | IUCN |
| MURTI | Radika | Director, IUCN Centre for Society and Governance | IUCN |
| MUSAU | Francis | Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Manager (SP) | ESARO |
| OBERLE | Bruno | Former IUCN DG | IUCN |
| OLUCHINA | Charles | Regional programme coordinator | ESARO |
| OUELLET-DROUIN | Antoine | Head, Institutional Performance Management and Evaluation unit | IUCN |
| PARILLA ARTIUGUINA | Ursula | Regional Director - Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean (D) | ORMAC |
| PENIA MORENO | Sonia | Director of international policy centre | IUCN |
| RAO | Madhu | World Commission on Protected Areas | IUCN Commissions |
| REYBET-DEGAT | Patrick | Head, Global Programme, Operations Unit | IUCN |
| RODRIGUEZ | Jon-Paul | Species Survival Commission | IUCN Commissions |
| RUBIO | Jose | Senior Technical Specialist | Flora and Fauna International |
| SANBDROOK | Libby | Director, Corporate Sustainability | Flora and Fauna International |



| | | | |
|------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| SANDWITH | Trevor | Director, IUCN Centre for Conservation Action | IUCN |
| SOUTHEY | Sean | Chair of the Commission on Education and Communication | IUCN Commissions |
| STEINMETZ | Elke | Head of Division for International Cooperation on Biodiversity | BMUV BMUV is a IUCN Member and a donor |
| STEWART | Iain | Head, Membership and Commission Support | IUCN |
| TEJADA | Ricardo | Director Global Communications | IUCN |
| TUDA | Arhtur | Executive Director | West Indian Ocean Marine Science Association |
| TUGENDHAT | Helen | Coordinator | Forest Peoples Project |
| VELASQUEZ | Jerry German | Director, Division of Mitigation and Adaptation | Green Climate Fund (GCF) |
| VINICIO CEREZO BLANDON | Marco | IUCN Council Member Guatemala | IUCN Council |
| VOIGT | Christina | World Commission on Environmental Law | IUCN Commissions |
| VON BERLEKOM | Maria | Head, Unit for Global Cooperation on Environment Department for International Organisations and Policy Support | Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) |
| VON KROSIGK | Lydia | Sector Economist for Biodiversity | KFW |
| WALKER PAINEMILLA | Kristen | Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy | IUCN Commissions |

Field Level Interviews

| Country | Interview | Organisation | Title | Project / Topic | Date |
|------------|------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------|
| ARO | | | | | |
| Thailand | Satrio Adi Wicaksono | IUCN | Senior Programme Officer for Forest (Programme) | General | 13/11/2023 |
| | Mohammad Khalid Sayeed Pasha | IUCN | Senior Programme Officer - Protected and Conserved Areas | General | 13/11/2023 |
| | Eric Martrou | IUCN | HQ Staff – Risk Management Officer – Programming Side (Online) | General | 13/11/2023 |
| | Dr. Niladri Gupta | Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre | Senior Water Resources Management Specialist (Online) | General | 14/11/2023 |
| | Dr. Sheila Wertz | FAO | Senior Forestry Officer | General | 14/11/2023 |
| | Ruwan Fernando | IUCN | Regional Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Coordinator (SP) | General | 14/11/2023 |
| | Anshuman Saikia | IUCN | Portfolio Manager Asia and Oceania Multilateral finance | Mekong Peatlands | 15/11/2023 |
| | Raphael Glemet | IUCN | Water and Wetlands Senior Programme Officer | Mekong WET | 15/11/2023 |
| | Kathryn Bimson | IUCN | Water and Wetlands Programme Officer | Mekong WET | 15/11/2023 |
| | Raquibul Amin | IUCN | Head of Science and Strategy Team | General | 15/11/2023 |
| | Warankana Rattanarat | RECOFTC | Country Program Director | General | 15/11/2023 |
| | Thanapol Kheolamai | RECOFTC | Program Management Coordinator | General | 15/11/2023 |
| | Maeve Nightingale | IUCN | Marine and Ocean Project Officer (Coastal Protection) | Protection and Conservation of Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in Asia | 15/11/2023 |
| Cambodia | Yorth Bunny | Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust | Country Manager | Mekong WET | 16/11/2023 |
| | Srun Bunthary | Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust | Officer | Mekong WET | 16/11/2023 |
| | Or Channy | Cambodian Rural Development Tours | Director | CEPF III | 17/11/2023 |
| | Vanessa Munoz | Fishing Cat Ecological Enterprise | Chief Executive Officer | CEPF III | 17/11/2023 |
| | Rasmey Luy | Culture and Environment Preservation Association | Executive Director | CEPF III | 17/11/2023 |
| | Vannak | Culture and Environment Preservation Association | Deputy Executive Director | CEPF III | 17/11/2023 |
| | Kong Kimsreng | Ministry of Environment | Director, Department of Northern Tonle Sap Terrestrial Protected Areas Conservation | General | 17/11/2023 |
| | Pheadkey Sorn | IUCN | Water and Wetlands Coordinator | General | 16-17/11/2023 |
| Vietnam | Trần Chế Linh | Department of Agriculture & Rural Development, An Giang Province | Head of Planning Office | Mekong WET | 20/11/2023 |



| | | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|------------|
| Phạm Hồng Quyền | Department of Agriculture & Rural Development, An Giang Province | Officer - Planning Office | Mekong WET | 20/11/2023 |
| Lương Huy Khanh | Department of Agriculture & Rural Development, An Giang Province | Head of Sub-Dept of Irrigation | Mekong WET | 20/11/2023 |
| Nguyễn Thị Lê | Department of Agriculture & Rural Development, An Giang Province | Vice Head of Sub-Dept of Plants Protection | Mekong WET | 20/11/2023 |
| Nguyễn Phước Thành | Department of Agriculture & Rural Development, An Giang Province | Vice Manager - Centre of Agricultural Services | Mekong WET | 20/11/2023 |
| Men Mon Đy | Department of Foreign Affairs, An Giang Province | Officer | Mekong WET | 20/11/2023 |
| Ms Thu | Department of Natural Resources & Environment, An Giang Province | Officer - Environmental Protection Unit | Mekong WET | 20/11/2023 |
| Lê Quang Trường | Manager of Tan Thanh Cooperative | Tan Thanh Cooperative | Coke Flood Retention | 20/11/2023 |
| Farmer | Member of Tan Thanh Cooperative | Tan Thanh Cooperative | Coke Flood Retention | 20/11/2023 |
| Lý Văn Lợi | Can Tho University | Wetland Researcher | Mekong WET | 21/11/2023 |
| Nguyễn Thanh Giao | Can Tho University | Lecturer – Faculty of Environmental Studies | Mekong WET | 21/11/2023 |
| Huỳnh Thị Hồng Nhiên | Can Tho University | Researcher – Faculty of Env. Studies | Mekong WET | 21/11/2023 |
| Trần Bé Em | Lung Ngoc Hoang wetland reserve | Head of Conservation Unit | Mekong WET | 21/11/2023 |
| Châu Thị Tố Liên | Farmer | Lotus and Rice Farmer, Vinh Dai Commune | Mekong WET | 22/11/2023 |
| Lê Thành Yên | Tan Hung district people's committee | Chairman | Mekong WET | 22/11/2023 |
| Đàng Điền Trung | Tan Hung district people's committee | Officer | Mekong WET | 22/11/2023 |
| Nguyễn Lương Tuấn | Vinh Dai CPC (commune people's committee) | Vice Chairman | Mekong WET | 22/11/2023 |
| Trương Văn Phú | Vinh Dai CPC | Manager of floating rice cooperative | Mekong WET | 22/11/2023 |
| Bùi Văn Bé | Vinh Dai CPC | Officer | Mekong WET | 22/11/2023 |
| Nguyễn Công Toại | Lang Sen wetland reserve | Vice Manager | Mekong WET | 22/11/2023 |
| Nguyễn Văn Can | Lang Sen wetland reserve | Community Engagement Officer | Mekong WET | 22/11/2023 |
| Nguyễn Tuấn Anh | Lang Sen wetland reserve | Ranger | Mekong WET | 22/11/2023 |
| Dr. Nguyen Thanh Phong | IUCN Vietnam | Coordinator of Agriculture and Nature Based Solutions | General | 23/11/2023 |
| Chu The Chuong | IUCN Vietnam | Project Manager - Mekong Delta Coastal Habitat Conservation Project | Marine Turtle Conservation in Vietnam | 23/11/2023 |



| | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | Dr. Huong Le Thi Thu Huong | SNV | Value Chain Expert | Mekong WET | 23/11/2023 |
| | Gian Tangphuong | IUCN Vietnam | Mekong Delta Field Program Officer | General | 20-24/11/23 |
| | Tien Trinh | IUCN Vietnam | Mekong Delta Program Assistant | General | 20-24/11/23 |
| | Dr. Nguyen Thi Kim Dung | VNUHCM – University of Science | Head of Department of Ecology, Evolutionary Biology | Mekong WET | 24/11/2023 |
| | Bui Thi Thu Hien | IUCN Vietnam | Marine and Coastal Programme Coordinator | Marine Turtle Conservation in Vietnam | 24/11/2023 |
| | Andrew Wyatt | IUCN Vietnam | Deputy Head, IUCN Lower Mekong Sub-Region | Mekong WET, Coke Flood Retention | 24/11/2023 |
| ESARO | | | | | |
| Kenya | Luther ANKURU | IUCN | ESARO Director | ESARO management | 26/10/2023 |
| | Moses EGARU | IUCN | Senior Program officer Water and Biodiversity | REPLAP | 28/10/2023 |
| | Francis MUSAU | IUCN | Regional M&E manager | General | 25/10/2023 - 1/11/2023 |
| | Collins CHERUIYOT | IUCN | Chief of Party | REPLAP | 26/10/2023 |
| | Innocent KABENGA | IUCN | IUCN Regional Head, Land Systems/Country Representative, Kenya | REPLAP | 26/10/2023 |
| | Mauricio XERINDA | IUCN | IUCN Country Representative in Mozambique | Regional coordination | 26/10/2023 |
| | Roopa KARIA | USAID | Director, Environment Office at USAID/Kenya & East Africa | USAID - IUCN Cooperation | 24/10/2023 |
| | Beatrice WAMALWA | USAID | Environment Office Deputy Director, USAID Kenya/East Africa | USAID - IUCN Cooperation | 24/10/2023 |
| | Charles OLUCHINA | IUCN | Regional programme coordinator | General | 03/11/2023 |
| | Kaori YASUDA | IUCN | IUCN Rwanda Country Representative | Regional coordination | 24/10/2023 |
| Tanzania | Arthur TUDA | WIOMSA | Executive Director | Bahari Mali | 06/11/2023 |
| | Innocent EDWARD | IUCN | IUCN Tanzania Field Officer | Bahari Mali | 29/10/2023 |
| | Joseph OLILA | IUCN | IUCN COR Tanzania Manager | Bahari Mali | 29/10/2023 |
| | Maria DAGOBERT | Tanzania Government | District Fisheries Officer Mkinga DC | Bahari Mali | 29/10/2023 |
| | Joel BENJAMIN | Tanzania Government | District Fisheries Officer Pangani DC | Bahari Mali | 30/10/2023 |
| | Timothy SOSIYA | Tanzania Government | Tanga Regional Natural Resources Advisor | Bahari Mali | 31/10/2023 |
| | Monga ELINASI | IUCN | IUCN COR Regional Programme Manager | Bahari Mali | 31/10/2023 |



| ORMACC | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Costa Rica | Tania Ammour | IUCN | Senior Advisor to the Regional Director | General/Linking Landscape/EbA LAC | 20/11/2023 |
| | Ana Estrada | IUCN | Constituency and Official Relations Coordinator | General | 20/11/2023 |
| | Andrea Matarrita | IUCN | Regional Manager Finance and Corporate Services (F&CS) (M1) | General | 20/11/2023 |
| | Theresia Keding | IUCN | Regional Portfolio Coordinator | General/EbALAC/RCBP | 20-21/11/2023 |
| | Ahmid Daccarett | IUCN | Regional MEL Coordinator | General | 20-21/11/2023 |
| | Adalberto Padilla | IUCN | IUCN Country Representative in Honduras | General | 20/11/2023 |
| | Raquel Sigüenza | IUCN | IUCN Country Representative in Guatemala | General | 20/11/2023 |
| | Nadia Mujica Rosero | IUCN | Portfolio Manager Latin America and the Caribbean - (GEF, GCF) (M1) | General | 20/11/2023 |
| | Rebeca Alvarado | IUCN | Regional Coordinator of finance | General | 20/11/2023 |
| | Mariela Madrigal | IUCN | Regional Coordinator of Administration | General | 20/11/2023 |
| | Giulia Clerici | IUCN | Regional Coordinator Strategic Communication | General | 20/11/2023 |
| | Melinka Nájera | IUCN | Regional Project Coordinator | Linking Landscape | 11/20/2023 |
| | Diana Bernaola | IUCN | ESMS Specialist | Linking Landscape | 20/11/2023 |
| | José Courreau | IUCN | Protected Areas Expert | Linking Landscape | 20/11/2023 |
| | Milena Berrocal | IUCN | Technical expert | Linking Landscape | 20/11/2023 |
| | María Belén Moncayo | IUCN | Former Regional Project Coordinator | EbA LAC | 20/11/2023 |
| | Carlos Barrantes | Ministry of Environment and Energy | Director of Natural Resources | EbA LAC | 21/11/2023 |
| | Astrid Michels | GIZ Costa Rica | GIZ Costa Rica | EbA LAC | 21/11/2023 |
| | Rafael Ávila | IUCN | Regional Project Coordinator | EbA LAC | 21/11/2023 |
| | Padel Rivera | IUCN | Technical officer | EbA LAC | 21/11/2023 |
| Alejandro Santizo | IUCN | National Project Coordinator (Costa Rica) | EbA LAC | 21/11/2023 | |
| Elizabeth Cardona | IUCN | Governance Technical Officer | EbA LAC | 21/11/2023 | |
| Zulma Mendoza | IUCN | Project coordinator | RCBP | 21/11/2023 | |
| Claudia Urritia | IUCN | MEL specialist | RCBP | 21/11/2023 | |



| | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|--|--|--|------------|
| | Karla Evangelista | IUCN | Site coordinator in La Paz, Guatemala | RCBP | 21/11/2023 |
| | Blanca García | IUCN | Site coordinator in Puerto Barrios, Guatemala | RCBP | 21/11/2023 |
| | Zelma Larios | IUCN | Deputy coordinator | RCBP | 21/11/2023 |
| | Lucrecia Rodríguez | Central American Integration System | Executive secretary of the Central American Agricultural Council | General | 22/11/2023 |
| | Tony Nello | IUCN | Former coordinator | Landscape | 11/22/2023 |
| | Randall Jiménez | IUCN | Conservation Scientist | Landscape | 11/22/2023 |
| | Luis Gámez Hernández | Public Utilities Company of Heredia /Agua Tica | Agua Tica | Landscape | 11/22/2023 |
| | Arlene López | Tropical Agronomic Research and Teaching Centre | Project Coordinator | Eba LAC | 11/29/2023 |
| | José de Jesús Infante | Central American Integration System (SICA) | Director of Regional Directorate for Fisheries and Aquaculture | RCBP | 12/05/2023 |
| Guatemala | Pedro Rosado | Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food | Vice Minister for rural economic development | Resilient Highlands | 11/23/2023 |
| | Horacio Jiménez | Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food | Advisor to the Vice Minister for rural economic development | Resilient Highlands | 11/23/2023 |
| | Mariano Cap | National Institute of Seismology, Volcanology, Meteorology and Hydrology | Head of the Meteorological Research and Services Department | Resilient Highlands | 11/23/2023 |
| | Mártir Vásquez | National Institute of Forestry | Deputy manager | Resilient Highlands | 11/23/2023 |
| | Raquel Sigüenza | IUCN | IUCN Country Representative in Guatemala | General/Resilient Highlands/PROSEHIGUA | 24/11/2023 |
| | Alejandro Santizo | IUCN | National Project Coordinator | General | 24/11/2023 |
| | Otoniel Monterroso | IUCN | National Project Coordinator | General/Resilient Highlands | 24/11/2023 |
| | Marco Antonio Fuentes | IUCN | Financial/administrative officer | General | 24/11/2023 |
| | Guillermo Putzeys | IUCN | Specialist in geographic information systems | General/Resilient Highlands/PROSEHIGUA | 24/11/2023 |
| | Evelyn Vargas | IUCN | Communication specialist | General | 11/24/2023 |
| | Vanessa Franco | IUCN | Small/Medium Grants coordinator | General/Resilient Highlands | 11/24/2023 |
| | Rafael Ávila | IUCN | Regional Project Coordinator | General | 11/24/2023 |
| | Dafne Domínguez | IUCN | MEL specialist | Resilient Highlands | 11/24/2023 |
| | Orsibal Ramírez | IUCN | Technical integrated watershed management specialist | Resilient Highlands | 11/24/2023 |
| | Yun Yongseok | IUCN | Data Management | Resilient Highlands | 11/24/2023 |



| | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|---------------------|------------|
| Lourdes Coy | IUCN | Gender specialist | Resilient Highlands | 11/24/2023 |
| Oscar Calvo | IUCN | Climatology specialist | Resilient Highlands | 11/24/2023 |
| Heidi Fernandes | IUCN | Finance officer | Resilient Highlands | 11/24/2023 |
| Lucía García | IUCN | Former coordinator | PROSEHIGUA | 11/24/2023 |
| María José Pérez | National Institute of Seismology, Volcanology, Meteorology and Hydrology | Technical services in the technical-administrative unit of Quetzaltenango | Resilient Highlands | 11/25/2023 |
| Ángel José Robas | National Institute of Seismology, Volcanology, Meteorology and Hydrology | Meteorological observer in the technical-administrative unit of Quetzaltenango | Resilient Highlands | 11/25/2023 |
| María Cristina Carrillo | Beneficiaries | Beneficiaries | Resilient Highlands | 11/27/2023 |
| Santa Cac Osorio | Beneficiaries | Beneficiaries | Resilient Highlands | 11/27/2023 |
| Juan Elazar Joj | IUCN | Technical staff | Resilient Highlands | 11/27/2023 |
| María Corazón Hernández | Western Rural Development Association | Project facilitator | Resilient Highlands | 11/27/2023 |
| Mauro Hernández | Western Rural Development Association | Forestry technician | Resilient Highlands | 11/27/2023 |
| Bardaqueo Ordóñez | Western Rural Development Association | Forestry technician | Resilient Highlands | 11/27/2023 |
| Antonia Chumuc | Western Rural Development Cooperation Association | Western Rural Development Cooperation Association Coordinator | Resilient Highlands | 11/27/2023 |
| Marta Iach | Western Rural Development Cooperation Association | Forestry technician | Resilient Highlands | 11/27/2023 |
| Kenneth Loarca | Foundation for conservation in Guatemala | Technical staff | Resilient Highlands | 11/27/2023 |
| Yvonne Ramírez | Foundation for conservation in Guatemala | Director of Natural Resources | Resilient Highlands | 11/28/2023 |
| Reynaldo Reyes | Foundation for conservation in Guatemala | Technical coordinator | Resilient Highlands | 11/28/2023 |
| Juan Pablo Castañeda | University Rafael Landívar | Director of the Natural Sciences and Technology Research Institute | Resilient Highlands | 11/28/2023 |
| Pedro Pineda | University Rafael Landívar | Researcher at the Natural Sciences and Technology Research Institute | Resilient Highlands | 11/28/2023 |
| Elvis Caballero | University Rafael Landívar | Researcher at the Natural Sciences and Technology Research Institute | Resilient Highlands | 11/28/2023 |
| Hendryc Obed | National Council of Protected Areas | Regional Officer | Linking Landscape | 11/29/2023 |
| Nadia Recinos | Municipal Water Company of Guatemala | Deputy manager | PROSEHIGUA | 11/29/2023 |
| Roberto Hernández | Beneficiaries | | EBA LAC | 11/29/2023 |



| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---|---------------------------------|------------|
| | María Silvestre | Beneficiaries | | EbA LAC | 11/29/2023 |
| | Héctor Espinoza | Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources | Former viceminister | PROSEHIGUA/Altiplano Resiliente | 11/30/2023 |
| | Obdulio Cotuc | Project Manager | Greater Southern City Community of Municipalities | PROSEHIGUA | 12/01/2023 |

Appendix 5: Back to Office Report



External Review of the IUCN Programme 2021-2024

[Back to Office Report](#)

[December 2023](#)





© Aleph Strategies Limited

Address: Bourne House, 475 Godstone Road, Whyteleafe, Surrey, United Kingdom, CR3 0BL

Company Number: 11198794

Authors: Florent Loiseau, Jonathan Rider, Claire Nevache

Contact: Jonathan Rider, Aleph Co-Founder and Director, j.rider@alephstrategies.org



Acronyms

| | |
|--------|---|
| Aleph | Aleph Strategies |
| ARO | Asia Regional Office |
| ESARO | Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office |
| IUCN | International Union for the Conservation of Nature |
| ORMACC | Regional Office for Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean |



Introduction

About this Document

Aleph Strategies has been engaged to conduct an evaluation of IUCN's Programme 2021-2024. As part of this evaluation, Aleph undertook three field missions to ARO, ORMACC and ESARO. The purpose of these missions was:

- To develop a deeper understanding of IUCN's operations at a regional level;

- To gather further data on individual projects, which were selected from the portfolio to illustrate IUCN's work on the ground.

This 'back to office' report provides a short summary of the work undertaken during these field missions. It is not intended to provide insight or analysis, which we reserve for the final evaluation report. We are indebted to IUCN colleagues in Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, Kenya, Tanzania, Costa Rica and Guatemala for their strong support and facilitation throughout the planning and delivery of the field missions.

Mission Structure

The agenda for each field mission were created in close consultation with the relevant project teams in each country. They combined a mix of in-person and remote interviews with regional, national and project-level stakeholders, group meetings and project site visits.

Meetings and interviews were conducted with project stakeholders at all levels, from local community members, to local and national government. Project partners were also interviewed. For the most part, interviews were generally conducted independently of IUCN staff, though there were cases – notably with key government partners or when translation was required – where this was not possible. We do not feel this compromised the quality of our engagement with these groups, nor undermined the independence of the exercise.



Field Missions

ESARO

The ESARO mission took place between 24th October and 6th November. During the ESARO field mission, Aleph visited Kenya and Tanzania. In Kenya, several meetings were held with IUCN staff working at national and regional level. On the first day, a 2.5 hour long meeting was organised with participants from the entire region, who were either physically present or who joined online, for exchanging on the activities implemented in the different countries covered by ESARO.

We took part in the visits to the following project sites:

Kenya:

- Tana river basin (Tana River county): We met with villagers and members of local Somali communities who, thanks to IUCN, are contributing to a activities of a sub-catchment management plan. We had extensive exchanges with:
 - o the IUCN project managers;
 - o the responsible project officer for the Kenyan implementation partner;
 - o the official representative of the county
 - o the villagers themselves, including women (members of the association created as part of the project for managing the sub-catchment)
- Bangal, Tana river county. We met with villagers governing an association created by IUCN and the Kenyan Water Authority for the managing of a “water pan”, which is an artificial lake used for keeping rain water. The association is responsible for ruling access to and use of water. We had the same type of exchanges (with project managers and villagers, including women) and could address a very wide series of topics. We visited the site of the water pan.

Those activities were part of the project *Resilience for People and Landscapes Programme (REPLAP)*.

Tanzania:

- Pangani: Visit of 2 sites where local communities conduct activities of crab fattening, mangrove tree nursing, and are setting up beekeeping activities: we had extensive exchanges with the villagers. We met with the community members involved in those activities and with representative of the local association supporting the execution of the project as well as with local antenna of the national authority in charge of nature conservation (BMU)
- Visit of a fishing and seed growing site managed by the Ulezi Kazi group. A group mainly composed of women. We had a visit of the site and free exchanges with them.



- Visit of the site to the King fish group, a group of women supervising fishing, conditioning and selling (including abroad) of king fish in a ecologically responsible manner. We had free exchanges with the President and the Treasurer of the group on their business success and on the way it benefits to the village as a whole.
- Those activities are part of the *Bahari Mali* project, which was a follow-up of *the Blue Tanga-Pemba Seascape*.

It must be noted that the ESARO staff took the opportunity of the evaluation visits for visiting the projects. The Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer guided and accompanied the external evaluator to both countries, the IUCN representative in Kenya came along with us to the Tana River county and the IUCN project staff came with us to Pangani.

ARO

The ARO field mission took place between 12th – 25th November. During the ARO field mission Aleph visited Thailand, Cambodia and Vietnam. In Thailand and Cambodia, meetings were held in Bangkok and Phnom Penh only. No visits were undertaken to project sites. In Vietnam, Aleph was able to view the following activities, linked to both the *Mekong WET* and *Coke Flood Retention Projects*:

- Lotus farm in Ta Danh commune, Tri Ton district – we viewed the lotus farming model, speaking to a local farmer who took us out onto the water to show how the lotus is grown and harvested. We also viewed adjacent flooded fields which were not cultivated, illustrating the richness and variety of useful plants (such as lily) found in abundance in areas not taken over by the third rice crop cycle. We were accompanied by local government authorities on this trip.
- Lung Ngoc Hoang wetland reserve, Hau Giang province. We engaged with the local park authority, who provided a tour of the reserve, showing new melaleuca plantation areas, and explaining the importance of the climate change vulnerability assessment conducted by one of the project grantees (who also accompanied us on the tour).
- Floating rice model in Vinh Dai commune, Long An Province. A brief visit to a floating rice farm, to speak with a local farmer and view his crop, and to discuss the relative merits of the floating rice model over regular rice harvesting.



ORMACC

The ORMACC field mission took place from 20th-30th November. Aleph visited Costa Rica and Guatemala. In Costa Rica, Aleph held meetings in San José, with regional office colleagues, projects colleagues, partners, public and private stakeholders as well as regional integration organisation. In Guatemala, additional to meetings with colleagues and stakeholders in Guatemala City, Aleph visited EbA LAC and Resilient Highlands projects:

Meteorological station in Los Altos, Quetzaltenango.

- Pilot farm with integrated soil and water management using keyline approach, Santa María Chiquimula, Totonicapán province.
- Restoration site in San Martin Jilotepeque, Chimaltenango province.

Two grassroots organisations were visited that didn't include project site visits:

- ADIRO, grassroots organisation that implements a small grant, Totonicapán.
- CDRO, second-floor organisation that implements a medium grant, Totonicapán.