

# Management response: Independent evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy (2024)

Evaluand identification data	
<b>Evaluand:</b>	IUCN's policy influence work from 2013 to 2023 at regional and international scale
<b>Time scope of evaluation:</b>	2013-2024

Management Response Summary Data	
<b>Evaluation report title:</b>	Independent evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy
<b>Date received:</b>	June 14, 2024
<b>Date Management Response approved:</b>	November 20, 2024
<b>Unit/person responsible for managing/tracking follow-up:</b>	Director General, through Executive Board
<b>Focal points for follow up on individual responses:</b>	Centre for Policy and Law (CPL), Institutional Performance Management and Evaluation Unit (IPME), Strategic Partnerships Unit (SPU), Human Resources (HR), the Membership and Commission Support Unit (MCSU), Regional Offices and the Executive Board.
<b>Last progress update:</b>	
<b>Expected duration required to fully implement the MR:</b>	3 years, with annual progress monitoring

## Introduction to this management response

This management response to the **Independent evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy (2024)** has been prepared by the Secretariat and will be proactively disseminated to all components of the Union to facilitate discussion and engagement on the report's findings and recommendations. The full evaluation report is available on: [Evaluations Database | IUCN](#)

## How to read this document

The full text of each of the 12 recommendations made by the evaluation report are included here, followed by IUCN's intended actions and results in response to each. The responses and intended actions and results are shown in the boxed text throughout the document.

Links to each response are in the summary table below:

Recommendation	Response and link	Focal point for follow-up
Recommendation 1: Update of IUCN policy cycle Recommendation 2: Planning for policy influencing driven off a shared theory of change Recommendation 3: Taking a programmatic approach	<a href="#">Response to Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 on planning for policy influence - accepted</a>	CPL
Recommendation 4: Documenting, sensemaking and learning	<a href="#">Response to Recommendation 4: Documenting, sensemaking and learning - accepted</a>	CPL

Recommendation 5: Revision of project standards	<a href="#">Response to Recommendation 5: Revision of project standards - <b>accepted</b></a>	CPL and IPME
Recommendation 6: Upstream activities to support downstream influencing	<a href="#">Response to Recommendation 6: Upstream activities to support downstream influencing – <b>partially accepted</b></a>	Regional Offices (and Commissions as relevant)
Recommendation 7: Allocation of unrestricted or framework funding for policy influence	<a href="#">Response to Recommendation 7: Allocation of unrestricted or framework funding for policy influence – <b>partially accepted</b></a>	Executive Board
Recommendation 8: Framework Partners’ recognition and support	<a href="#">Response to Recommendation 8: Framework Partners’ recognition and support – <b>partially accepted</b></a>	SPU
Recommendation 9: Developing competency and capacity in policy influencing for the Secretariat	<a href="#">Response to Recommendation 9: Developing competency and capacity in policy influencing for the Secretariat - <b>accepted</b></a>	CPL and HR
Recommendation 10: Managing and coordinating IUCN’s policy work Recommendation 11: IUCN Members’ contributions to policy influencing Recommendation 12: IUCN Commission mandates align to Programme policy objectives	<a href="#">Response to Recommendations 10, 11 and 12 on managing and coordinating across the Union – <b>partially accepted</b></a>	CPL, MCSU and Commission Focal Points

### Synergies with other processes

Around the time that this evaluation was concluding, the Council took a decision (C111/11) requesting the preparation of an intergovernmental policy strategy:

=====

*The IUCN Council agrees to establish a Working Group of Council members and Secretariat to develop a draft IUCN intergovernmental policy strategy, mapping out opportunities, cross-Union leadership/roles, priorities, and key engagements, objectives and outcomes. The draft strategy should both cover the period between now and the 2025 Congress, as well as the 2026-2029 quadrennium, and be designed to deliver on the draft 2026-2029 IUCN Programme as well as the draft 20-year Vision.*

=====

The recommendations from this report are closely linked to the above-mentioned decision and follow-up actions for both will necessarily be implemented in a coordinated manner.

### Understanding a “programmatic approach”

Two planning concepts referred to in this document, and by the evaluators, are clarified below to frame IUCN’s understanding of a “programmatic approach” to policy influencing as recommended in the evaluation:

We define **operational framework** as: A structured set of guidelines that outlines how IUCN works in a specific area, such as policy influencing. An operational framework is a blueprint for how IUCN translates its strategic objectives into practical actions and detailed procedures, processes, roles and responsibilities.

We understand “**policy influencing programmes**” as: the strategy and action plan for each prioritized policy topic or objective that requires a specific programmatic approach. These may encompass “engagement strategies” for key events and meetings. For ease of reference and alignment with IUCN’s own terminology, we favour the use of the term “policy influencing strategies” to avoid confusion with the IUCN Programme.

## Following up on the response

As per IUCN's Evaluation Policy, progress on implementing this management response will be monitored annually by the Executive Board of the Secretariat for the anticipated duration required to implement it (three years).

Any questions about this evaluation may be addressed to [evaluation@iucn.org](mailto:evaluation@iucn.org).

## Recommendations and responses

To ensure clarity and transparency, the full text of each recommendation as written in the evaluation report has been included. IUCN management has responded to each with planned actions and intended results.

### Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 are addressed jointly

#### **Recommendation 1: Update of IUCN policy cycle [Note from MR: this refers to policy cycles in general, not to IUCN's policy cycle for Congress Resolutions and Recommendations]**

**Consider updating the IUCN Policy Cycle, as described in the last evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy (2005) to better represent the role of knowledge (standards, tools, assessments, data, indicators and meta-data and scientific publications) in IUCN's work on agenda setting, policy development, policy implementation, and policy review.**

(For CPL)

- Without IUCN's **knowledge and the contributions of Commission experts**, IUCN's work on policy influencing is not possible in its current form, and this should be recognized as a key part of the IUCN Policy Cycle.
- When planning for policy influence, it is important to also **plan for what knowledge will be required** to support IUCN's policy objectives.
- In using the policy cycle, IUCN should do so in a critical fashion, **taking into account the context** and what is required. What constitutes agenda setting, policy formulation or even policy implementation is highly dependent on the context or policy setting in which IUCN and its boundary partners are operating.

#### **Recommendation 2: Planning for policy influencing driven off a shared theory of change [Note from MR: we will refer to this as IUCN's policy influencing operational framework]**

**Engage in coordinated planning activities to strengthen IUCN's policy influencing interventions, starting with the development of a universal IUCN policy influencing Theory of Change, drawing on the conclusions of this evaluation.**

(For CPL, PPC, Chief Scientist, Chief Economist, Commission Chairs, other relevant thematic or regional leads, IUCN Members and the World Conservation Congress)

Activities include (and these should be treated as sub-recommendations):

- 2.1 Develop a **universal IUCN policy influencing Theory of Change**, drawing on the conclusions of this evaluation. The theory of change should highlight: the Union's unique structural governance; IUCN's policy influencing comparative advantage balancing 'hard' technical skills in conservation science with 'softer' knowledge intermediary skills & trusted partner relationships; and the intermediate outcome nature of meaningful policy influencing results.
- 2.2 Develop a **small set (3 to 4) policy influencing programme theories of change for IUCN's priority policy influencing programmes – see Recommendation 3 below**. We see the Centre for Policy and Law (CPL, previously International Policy Centre) as central to IUCN's policy work and would urge IUCN to bestow some level of authority in the CPL to own, facilitate and coordinate the policy planning and theory of change activities mentioned above.

**Recommendation 3: Taking a programmatic approach [Note from MR: refer to IUCN’s understanding of ‘policy influencing programmes’ above]**

**Policy influencing that is ‘greater than the sum of its project parts’, requires a ‘policy influencing programme’ approach.** Starting with policy objectives, actively assess the project portfolio and pipeline to identify opportunities for a small number of strategic policy influencing programmes. Based on the evaluation conclusions and as a starting point, IUCN policy influencing programmes should be developed for: CBD; UNFCCC; BBNJ/High Seas; and UN Decade on Restoration [and other IUCN engagements with MEAs, such as Ramsar, CITES, CMS, or the plastics treaty.]

- **Each policy influencing programme should have a clear, contextualised and periodically updated overall policy objective and accompanying programme theory of change.** These should be ‘nested’ under the universal theory of change above, and specific, contextualised and periodically updated as guides to the Union’s programmatic policy influencing work.
- **As such they should provide a guide or roadmap** to the relevant and specific Secretariat, Regional Offices, Commissions and Members stakeholders across the sphere of control (strategy, activities and outputs) towards anticipated or expected outcomes in its spheres of influence and interest. (For: policy leads and all programme-level heads)

**Response to Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 on planning for policy influence - accepted**

Response & key actions Focal point for follow-up: CPL	Intended results
<p>The first three recommendations all target improvements to IUCN’s approach to planning policy influencing and relate to how IUCN can better drive a programmatic ambition with clear policy outcomes.</p> <p>These recommendations have strong synergies with Council’s decision C111/11 (May 2024).</p> <p>Numerous improvements have already been made in the last few years to improve the way IUCN plans for, coordinates and organises itself for more impactful policy work. This includes new or updated procedures guiding: 1) requirement for an engagement strategy for every policy event or meeting with expected or proposed policy outcomes, deliverables, tailored delegations, etc, as explained in IUCN Procedures for Engaging in International Policy Meetings: <a href="#">IUCN Procedures 2022</a>, and, 2) IUCN’s common approach to meetings of the Conference of the Parties (COPs) to major conventions. (May 2024 – internal document)</p> <p>IUCN will capitalise on the above-mentioned Council decision to address the recommendations stemming from this evaluation by embedding the following elements in the policy influencing operational framework and strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Definition of IUCN’s programmatic approach to influencing policy, i.e. the policy influencing operational framework<sup>1</sup></li> <li>- Confirmation of definitions and concepts</li> </ul>	<p>A global policy influencing operational framework and strategy exists and is understood and used by all IUCN constituents to steer, manage and monitor the policy influence work of the Union. As a result, IUCN’s approach to policy and advocacy is anchored in clear concepts, definitions, and shared priorities.</p> <p>IUCN has also defined and developed policy influencing strategies (“programmes”), i.e. specific strategies, for priority topics and policy processes, to which Commissions, Members and Secretariat have contributed. These influencing strategies include the desired results, the types of interventions, the rationales and assumptions, the boundary partners, the indicators, tools, etc.</p> <p>In addition, each policy influencing strategy has a clear roadmap and workplan that identifies the expected interventions (including associated and required projects, Commissions’ inputs, etc.).</p> <p>The overarching operational framework informs IUCN’s policy influencing results architecture and the types of activities, outputs and outcome types that should be planned and monitored. This is underpinned by master data management. The framework makes explicit the role of knowledge at each stage of the policy</p>

<sup>1</sup> We define an operational framework as: A structured set of guidelines that outlines how IUCN works in a specific area, such as policy influencing. An operational framework is a blueprint for how IUCN translate its strategic objectives into practical actions and detailed procedures, processes, roles and responsibilities.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update, as appropriate, of conceptual model of the policy cycle</li> <li>- Development of a visual model</li> <li>- Criteria to identify key policy topics that may need specific programmatic approaches that include specific theories of change – referred to as “policy influencing strategies”<sup>2</sup></li> <li>- Roadmap for strategy implementation clarifying expected contributions across the Union (Commissions, Members, Secretariat) as well as potential and agreed funding sources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation 1 (policy cycle): Accepted</b></p> <p>IUCN will ensure that the overarching policy influencing operational framework reflects how knowledge and the Union’s technical and scientific expertise can better inform policy positions and programming.</p> <p><b>Recommendations 2 and 3 (planning based on ToC and programmatic approach): Accepted</b></p> <p>IUCN will progressively develop an overarching policy influencing operational framework to clarify its ‘programmatic approach’ to policy influencing. It will do so in a stepwise manner to ensure that it is optimising coherence in alignment between the delivery of its outcomes and outputs in its 2025-2029 Programme and its policy influencing objectives. This will allow IUCN to systematically consider and identify optimal policy influencing pathways for several of the transformational outcomes in the 20-year Vision (e.g. One Health, Agriculture, Cities, etc).</p> <p>In parallel, IUCN will evidence how it leverages and implements Congress Resolutions and Recommendations (and thus IUCN Members’ policy mandates) to yield greater policy influencing results. As IUCN develops its overall policy strategy and theory of change, it will identify key policy topics for which specific contextualised ‘programmatic approaches’ will be developed.</p> <p>Accordingly, IUCN will adapt Secretariat training material and guidelines to contribute to the implementation of the policy influencing operational framework targeting Commissions and Members, for the Union to work more effectively together.</p>	<p>cycle. The documented framework identifies how systematic and periodic points of reflection, learning and re-adjustment are undertaken across the policy cycle.</p> <p>The operational framework and subsequent policy influencing strategies are documented and supported by relevant tools and guidelines, and by the IUCN project portfolio.</p> <p>Staff are trained and held accountable for implementing and following-up on these operational guidelines.</p> <p>Project funding prioritisation considers the alignment of the project idea with the policy influencing strategy to which it contributes.</p>
---	---

**Recommendation 4: Documenting, sensemaking and learning**

**Led by the Secretariat, encourage and formalise activities (products and processes) that routinely, consistently and collaboratively document, sense-make, and adaptively learn within and between IUCN’s policy influencing programmes.**

(For CPL)

<sup>2</sup> We define “policy influencing strategies” as the strategy and theory of change for each prioritized policy topic or objective. These may encompass “engagement strategies” for key events and meetings.

IUCN has been effective at documenting technical analysis of gaps and problems, but less effective at **documenting policy or political analysis**. While a lot of this is done in tacit and ad hoc ways, documenting at least some of this serves to promote transparency, enable others to give feedback and provides a baseline for monitoring purposes.

What to collect data about? Data can refer to some of the components of the framework we have outlined – i.e. IUCN’s strategy, governance (how it organises itself), the quality and quantity of outputs and activities, immediate responses to them (such as participant attendance and experience at workshops) as well as outcomes, including changes in policy content, policy process, relationships between stakeholders, their perceptions and their practices/behaviours. Annex 6 suggests a monitoring log which might be used to collect such information.

The work undertaken by the Centre for Policy and Law (formerly IPC) over the past ten years to analyse CBD policy, set clear objectives and positions, map supporting and opposing Parties, prepare delegations, plan for and engage in “broad spectrum” activities, document IUCN’s interventions including specific activities at policy events, and document reactions to IUCN’s positions and how IUCN interprets those reactions and to identify future obligations and opportunities, represents an excellent approach. There is a trade-off inherent in this approach - it is rather resource intensive.

Such activities should include:

#### Documenting policy influencing programmes

- Document policy objectives, positions, delegation preparation, meeting and after-action reports, stakeholder analyses, results, implications for IUCN and next steps; manage knowledge (CPL, Regional offices, other thematic teams engaged in policy work, Commissions) – noting that this is already referenced in *Engaging in International Policy Meetings: a step-by-step guide*, but need to be systematically applied.
- There is scope for better capturing learning on how policy influencing works with IUCN Members at regional, national and sub-national levels and exchanging this learning between regions.
- Promote and amplify success!

#### Sensemaking and learning

- Create spaces for discussion – planning, reflection, learning and amplifying what works. Include Commissions in sense-making
- Establish a community of practice that includes Secretariat staff drawn from HQ and Regional Offices, Commission Members and interested Members or Councillors
- Continue to engage in activities that help create a collective identity and continue to emphasize the One Programme approach (this seems to work quite well in IUCN policy delegations)

### Response to Recommendation 4: Documenting, sensemaking and learning - accepted

Response & key actions Focal point for follow-up: CPL	Intended results
<p><b>Recommendation 4: Accepted</b></p> <p>As part of the policy influencing operational framework, IUCN will define its requirements and responsibilities for policy knowledge management and regular learning/sense-making. This should be based, to the extent possible, on regular review of each policy influence strategy, and should involve different component parts of IUCN.</p> <p>IUCN will build on the recommendations and suggested templates presented in Annex II to finalise the tools to be used across the Union.</p>	<p>IUCN implementation of policy influencing strategies is characterised by systematic processes of reflection, learning and operational (re)adjustment, informed by the policy influencing operational framework and ToC, with the intent of optimising immediate and intermediate policy outcomes.</p> <p>IUCN has achieved a balanced and comprehensive approach to documenting both technical and policy analyses of gaps, problems and progress in achieving influence objectives. Roles for documenting and sense-</p>



	<p>making are clear and the knowledge management approach is defined.</p> <p>This enhanced documentation, which should be the responsibility of each stakeholder involved, will be systematic and transparent, fostering an environment where feedback is actively sought and integrated (sense-making). To do this, a set of documentation templates and a knowledge management approach exist (developed as part of the strategy) and is being used as relevant.</p> <p>By establishing clear guidance for documenting and sense-making/learning for policy influence, IUCN promotes greater accountability and ensures continuous improvement in addressing complex issues.</p>
--	--

**Recommendation 5: Revision of project standards**

**We recommend a revision to project guidelines and standards focusing specifically on policy aspects of projects to give assistance, example and guidance, but not prescription to project managers designing projects.**

(For CPL, IPME and Finance)

We take note of the work that IPME is currently engaged in, most notably on developing a qualitative indicator to measure policy influence and upgrades to the Programme and Policy Portal and wholeheartedly support this important work. Guidelines and standards should be helpful, preventing project managers from having to “reinvent the wheel” every time a new project document is written. Any guidelines should also attempt to reflect the diversity of IUCN’s policy influencing work.

This should include:

- Guidelines that help project developers plan for, learn from and measure policy results.
- Guidelines that focus on the roles that IUCN plays in policy influencing and on specific aspects of the policy cycle.
- [with Finance] Clarify guidelines on budgeting for policy influencing work in projects to bring project experts into policy spaces.
- Set some minimum requirements for projects that IUCN implements and executes (not Service Level Agreements).
- Where possible, amplify successful examples documented by evaluations.
- Create and execute a knowledge management plan for the project portfolio, supported by the Programme and Project Portal IT solution.

**Response to Recommendation 5: Revision of project standards - accepted**

<b>Response &amp; key actions</b> <b>Focal point for follow-up: CPL and IPME</b>	<b>Intended Result</b>
<p><i>Recommendation 5: Accepted</i></p> <p>IUCN will ensure that its Programme and portfolio development decision-making and guidelines supports and encourage policy work (aligned with recommendation 1, 2 and 3).</p> <p>This includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alignment with the global policy influencing operational framework and its overall objectives</li> </ul>	<p>IUCN processes, practices and systems adequately identify and support relevant and effective policy influencing work throughout the portfolio.</p> <p>IUCN policy-relevant projects are supported to facilitate outcome-orientated operational adaptations during the policy cycle, as necessary.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre-screening criteria for policy relevance of new project proposals</li> <li>- Proposal and budget guidelines</li> <li>- Monitoring, evaluation, and sense-making/ learning guidance</li> <li>- Policy related capacity strengthening to relevant staff</li> <li>- Revision of IUCN master data management capability to support policy planning and monitoring throughout the portfolio</li> </ul>	<p>IUCN has improved its capacity to steer, plan, manage and monitor its policy work across single projects, countries and portfolios. To do this, IUCN tracks the projects contributing to policy influence and their results through policy-relevant output and outcome indicators.</p> <p>IUCN has enabled its capability to report on policy work in an aggregated fashion (among other important topics).</p>
---	--

**Recommendation 6: Upstream activities to support downstream influencing**

**The IUCN Secretariat should plan for and implement projects and activities aimed at supporting State and government and sub-national Members in planning for and implementing their policy obligations and commitments. This should be documented as clearly as possible to ensure that this service to Members is distributed evenly and leaves no-one behind.**

(For all Regional and National Offices, Commissions)

In addition to other supporting roles that IUCN plays with governments, IUCN can also mobilize resources on behalf of governments to support their implementation of international obligations. The purpose of gaining accreditation under the Global Environment Facility and Green Climate Fund was to position IUCN as an Implementing Agency / Entity so that more resources could be mobilized in support of the IUCN Programme, which is in turn, aligned to umbrella conventions such as CBD and UNFCCC. In addition to mobilizing resources, there are a host of other activities that the IUCN Secretariat and Commissions could engage in to support governments and increase IUCN’s policy influence.

These could include:

- Support the development of national and-sub national planning instruments.
- Providing technical advice.
- Tailoring standards and tools to local context (i.e. translating into local languages).
- Building capacity.
- Supporting legal reform.
- Convening multi-stakeholder, and where appropriate, multi-sector dialogues.
- Supporting the ability of environment-oriented ministries to engage the rest of government.
- Supporting and amplifying the voice of Indigenous Peoples’ Organization Members in national and sub-national processes.
- Mobilizing large scale resources from the Global Environment Facility and Green Climate Fund and then supporting governments in IUCN’s capacity as an Implementing Agency / Entity under those two funds.
- Promoting South-South and triangular sharing of knowledge and experiences.

Planning for and documenting the IUCN Secretariat’s efforts to support all categories of Membership would go a long way to helping IUCN articulate its value proposition to Members.

**Response to Recommendation 6: Upstream activities to support downstream influencing – partially accepted**

Response & key actions Focal point for follow up: Regional Offices (and Commissions as relevant)	Intended results
<p><i>Recommendation 6: Partially accepted</i></p> <p>Acknowledging that i) IUCN priorities are set by IUCN Members themselves through mechanisms such as the Intersessional Programme and the</p>	<p>IUCN’s policy influencing operational framework and subsequent policy influencing</p>



<p>Resolutions and Recommendations adopted at Congress, and that ii) the suggested policy influence activities list provided in the recommendation is not new to IUCN, IUCN’s policy influencing operational framework will further elaborate on how IUCN intends to support States, governments and sub-national authorities in planning and implementing their policy obligations and commitments using the above-listed interventions. This will specify what roles IUCN should play and how IUCN should mobilise its Members.</p> <p>IUCN (Commissions and Secretariat) will structure its data management to capture how it works at national, regional and global levels. This will enable IUCN’s capacity to quantify and qualify at planning and monitoring stages its policy work within projects, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Knowledge generation</li> <li>- Tools, data and standards</li> <li>- Planning instruments</li> <li>- Technical advice</li> <li>- Capacity building and technical assistance</li> <li>- Convening</li> <li>- Resource mobilisation</li> <li>- Gender equality and social inclusion (GESI)</li> </ul>	<p>strategies explicitly outline how IUCN supports IUCN State Members and other government Members to deliver their relevant policy obligations and commitments.</p> <p>IUCN policy actors all contribute to the monitoring and reporting efforts.</p> <p>Members and Commissions receive and recognise benefits of IUCN policy influencing activities delivered through Union collaboration as well as through the portfolio.</p>
--	--

**Recommendation 7: Allocation of unrestricted or framework funding for policy influence**

**Based on planning developed under Recommendation 2, allocate a percentage of unrestricted funding annually to support policy influencing work.** (For the Director General, Chief Financial Officer, with CPL, Regional Offices and other relevant players)

This allocation should be transparent and accountable, supported by:

- Annual work-planning and allocations,
- Annual reporting, and
- Activities under Recommendation 3 for sensemaking, learning and adjust plans for following year based on results and successes.
- Also note that the Centre for Policy and Law (formerly the IPC) should also work to fundraise for policy objectives and policy programmes, and coordinate with regions and centres so that project resources can also have an impact on policy influencing.

**Response to Recommendation 7: Allocation of unrestricted or framework funding for policy influence – partially accepted**

<b>Response &amp; key actions</b> <b>Focal point for follow-up: Executive Board</b>	<b>Intended result</b>
<p><i>Recommendation 7: Partially accepted</i></p> <p>IUCN already allocates unrestricted funding it receives from Framework Partners and from Membership dues directly to policy influencing work. In recent years the allocation has been increased, but more recently this core-funded function has been requested to seek project funding. It is important to note that in in 2021, the International Policy Centre was created and in 2024, became the Centre for Policy and Law (CPL). The Director General is responsible for the implementation of the policy of IUCN as established by the World Congress and the Council. The Centre</p>	<p>The operational framework includes a fundraising strategy, to guide the resourcing by CPL, regions and Centres of IUCN’s policy influencing work (as per responses to Recommendations 1-3).</p> <p>IUCN has strengthened the financial sustainability of its policy</p>

<p>reports directly to the Director General to reflect the role of the DG in policy steering and voice of IUCN's positions. The CPL has the mandate to lead, coordinate and steer IUCN's policy influencing work.</p> <p>Annual allocations are made to support the work of the Centre for Policy and Law, necessary specialised inputs from Region and Centre experts, the representational functions of the Director General and senior management as well as to maintain corporate functions related to the policy cycle and system of IUCN. This support is also directed to IUCN's participation and engagement with key policy influence processes and agendas or directly in support of Commissions.</p> <p>In addition, through other parts of the IUCN Secretariat - Regional Offices, thematic Centres, and the Director General's Office- resources are allocated for policy influence at the regional and country levels. Specific activities that contribute to policy influencing efforts include attending policy meetings (e.g. COPs), providing inputs to IUCN position papers, organising side events, servicing IUCN pavilions, among others.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the ability to fully implement this management response from unrestricted funding is limited by the current resources available to the organisation. Therefore, to secure the necessary funding for policy influencing work, IUCN will continue working towards mobilising more resources from restricted sources, i.e. its project portfolio, as a complement to the allocations it makes already from unrestricted sources. This can be done by aligning with the portfolio more closely with policy influencing, including costed policy activities in projects and programmes, and/or fundraising specifically for policy objectives. To do this, it is critical to demonstrate that policy work yields results and conservation outcomes, and to capitalise on the improvements made in response to the recommendations addressed elsewhere in this management response.</p> <p>As contemplated in the 20-year Strategic Vision, IUCN aims to mobilise greater levels of unrestricted and flexible funding in future. While unrestricted allocations would be one part of the resourcing solution, all funding elements should come together to drive greater focus on IUCN's policy influencing.</p> <p>Finally, as part of the annual cycle (planning and budgeting process), special attention will be given to policy work, not only to maintain current levels of funding, but also in coordination with donors to direct additional resources through improving the alignment of the portfolio deliverables and institutional policy objectives. The IUCN operational framework for policy influencing will address the financial challenges and propose a clear way forward.</p>	<p>influencing work and uses these resources efficiently and effectively.</p> <p>IUCN has strengthened its policy influencing work across the Union, with more resources being brought together to create greater impact.</p>
--	---

**Recommendation 8: Framework Partners' recognition and support**

**The evaluation recommends IUCN's Framework Partners to recognize the strength of IUCN's policy influence at all levels, the tremendous value added of Commission volunteerism in generating policy relevant science and to invest new and additional resources earmarked for IUCN's policy influencing work.**

(For the Framework Partners, Director General and Strategic Partnerships)

This evaluation finds that some of most valuable and sophisticated influence roles that IUCN plays are the most difficult to sustain through project funding and most in need of flexible funding. While we recognize that there are also gains to be made by better aligning the project portfolio to policy objectives, policy influencing is expensive and difficult to resource directly. Generating policy relevant science, extended consultations, convening multi-stakeholder platforms, engaging governments and sub-national entities through technical support and capacity building are some of the areas which are chronically under-funded.

**Response to Recommendation 8: Framework Partners’ recognition and support – partially accepted**

Response & key actions Focal point for follow-up: SPU	Intended result
<p><i>Recommendation 8: Partially accepted</i></p> <p>As part of the operational strategy development process, IUCN will explore different ways to raise funding for policy influencing work beyond project funding (e.g. loosely earmarked, appeals, philanthropy, etc.).</p> <p>IUCN recognises and appreciates the key role that Framework Partners play in supporting IUCN’s policy influencing work through Framework funding (core) without placing restrictions on how those resources are spent.</p> <p>IUCN will continue to work with its Framework Partners to increase their recognition of IUCN policy influencing work through regular policy engagement activities, for example by providing dedicated briefings at biannual meetings, organising webinars to convey IUCN policy positions, among others, all with a view to enhance the engagement with Framework Partners who can then amplify IUCN’s messages.</p> <p>IUCN will also explore options for alignment of funding from its Framework Partners, ensuring consistency with its strategic objectives and policy influencing operational framework.</p>	<p>IUCN’s policy influencing work is understood, highly valued and amplified by Framework Partners and key ministries in Framework Partner countries.</p>

**Recommendation 9: Developing competency and capacity in policy influencing for the Secretariat**

**With CPL, Human Resources should develop a policy competency framework to be used in the recruitment of key policy-oriented positions such as future Directors General, Regional Directors, Country Representatives, thematic leads and policy officers.** (For HR and CPL)

Like any specialized function from project management to financial management, skillsets for engaging in policy influencing are highly specialized. It would be worthwhile to investigate the policy competency frameworks on IUCN Members that are successful in policy influencing (such as the World Wildlife Fund, Wildlife Conservation Society, The Nature Conservancy and Conservation International) and perhaps the competency frameworks of some of the related UN Specialized Agencies (such as UNEP or FAO).

In recent years, the application of competency frameworks has become standard practice in large organizations and this would be a worthwhile exercise for the skills development and recruitment of policy facing positions.

With additional resources, IUCN might also want to consider expanding its cadre of policy officers, probably of higher priority at the Regional level.

While this recommendation is related to individual capacity, capacity can also be grown collectively (see Recommendation 2) through collective sense-making and learning.

**Response to Recommendation 9: Developing competency and capacity in policy influencing for the Secretariat - accepted**

Response & key actions Focal point for follow-up: CPL and HR	Intended results
<p><i>Recommendation 9: Accepted</i></p> <p>Capacity to influence policy requires staff with the appropriate competencies and skills, as well as an enabling environment. The enabling environment is described in the responses to planning and sense-making recommendations.</p> <p>In clarifying its programmatic approach, IUCN will assess its policy work from an organisational development lens. This will be done to identify how skills and competencies should be modeled and built across the Secretariat (for example, it will consider the trade-offs between strengthening the first line of operations and creating a programmatic second line dedicated to policy, among other strategies).</p> <p>For staff competencies, CPL will document the roles and responsibilities for policy influence within the operational strategy document. With HR, roles, responsibilities and competencies for job descriptions will be documented. Depending on the selected model for deploying the function, a standard policy officer job description will be prepared and/or skills and competencies mainstreamed in relevant job descriptions. Recruitment of new policy officers and/or relevant staff will be based on the required competencies.</p>	<p>IUCN can count on skilled staff in policy influencing and advocacy.</p> <p>The selected approach for building and mainstreaming policy skills and competencies has been implemented according to plans.</p> <p>The approach ensures IUCN is well-equipped to effectively influence policy, including through its work in the regions and in coordination with IUCN constituencies.</p>

**Recommendations 10, 11 and 12 are addressed jointly**

**Recommendation 10: Managing and coordinating IUCN’s policy work**

**To aid in coordination within IUCN between Members, Commissions and the Secretariat globally and regionally, use the annual work-planning process to document and compile IUCN’s policy influencing work from all corners of the Union. This information could aid in planning (Recommendations 2 and 3) and sense-making (Recommendation 4).**

(For all “policy teams”)

Recognizing that IUCN has demonstrated some good practice in deploying policy engagement strategies and developing procedures for engaging in international policy meetings, there is still scope to improve upon management and coordination of IUCN’s policy influencing work. It is perhaps telling that there was no single person who could “paint the entire policy picture.” And while this is a characteristic of large, decentralized organizations there is scope for improvement. There is a pretty good understanding of what is happening at the global level and a pretty good understanding of what is happening at the regional level, but we are not convinced that the two levels are completely aware. For example, the feedback the draft report from someone from the global Secretariat suggest that person was unaware that IUCN has applied to become a “Centre of Excellence” under the CBD and KMGBF.

Other mechanisms that IUCN deployed successfully to support coordination include engagement strategies, stakeholder maps (noting Parties in alignment or opposition), delegation briefs, internal strategy notes and delegation/meeting reports. In the context of IUCN’s engagement with the Post-2020 negotiations, there was very complete documentation covering eleven points of contact that allowed the evaluation team to see how IUCN was coordinating itself.

It is important for IUCN to also address the equity dimension, ensuring balanced participation in terms of gender, age, and origin (North and South) with full participation of the Commissions and Regional Offices of the Secretariat.

#### **Recommendation 11: IUCN Members' contributions to policy implementation**

**We urge IUCN Members to work with the IUCN Secretariat and Commissions to support the implementation of the IUCN Programme and work within their governments to support obligations under international agreements, including, but not limited to the Sustainable Development Goals, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in a manner that engages other government departments and sectors.**

(For all categories of Members)

All categories of Membership have roles to play in policy work, but the roles are differentiated.

It is rare for the IUCN Membership to be requested to engage in the implementation of recommendations from IUCN evaluations, however in this case, Members are key to Parties' implementation of international obligations and commitments.

**For State, government agency and subnational governments**, we see that these Members have agency to undertake policy implementation and the potential to influence other departments of government.

Some specific examples of areas where these categories of Membership could help include: promoting uptake of IUCN knowledge, particularly standards and tools, creating awareness in other sectors and departments of government, supporting efforts for revising plans (such as NBSAPs), helping convene multi-stakeholder dialogues and support implementation.

**For non-governmental and Indigenous Peoples' Organizations Members**, there is a slightly different role to be played in support of policy implementation.

To support this recommendation, IUCN may want to engage first in an exercise that maps these two categories of Membership against specific Targets under the aforementioned agreements. For us, one obvious place to start is to map which IGO Members may be in a position to help IUCN and government operationalize Target 3 under the KMGBF.

It would be ideal for IUCN to document this form of Member engagement and feed any learning back into IUCN's planning for policy influence (related to Recommendation 4).

#### **Recommendation 12: IUCN Commission mandates align to Programme policy objectives**

**Ensure that draft Commission mandates are well aligned with the policy objectives named in the draft Programme in terms of (1) generating and supporting knowledge for policy, including horizon scanning, standards, tools, indicators, data and meta-data, scientific publications (2) supporting and participating in policy influencing efforts, and (3) supporting capacity building and implementation of policies and (4) linked to (1) generating data and filling indicator/data gaps required for monitoring (at minimum), the KMGBF and SDGs.**

(For all IUCN Commissions and Commission Chairs)

We recognize that Commission mandates tend to be well aligned with WCC Resolutions and the IUCN Programme, but also take note that some Commissions plan in considerable detail to ensure complete alignment and smooth coordination of Commission experts. We hope, that beyond the mandates approved by WCC, that all Commissions can also workplan against the specifics of the IUCN Programme in a suitable level of detail.

It is worth noting that IUCN is already named as custodian for four of six headline indicators under the KMGBF and several indicators used to monitor the implementation of the SDGs and is named in numerous places as a holder of expertise for future policy monitoring. It is also worth noting that IUCN has developed some useful tools for monitoring, such as Key Biodiversity Areas and the Restoration Barometer, that would provide useful information to sit alongside IUCN's more established monitoring tools that underpin indicators under the KMGBF and SDGs.

Collectively, the IUCN Commissions generate knowledge, without which, IUCN would not have the basis for policy influencing. This needs to be recognized and celebrated collectively by IUCN. Recognizing the contribution of youth in Commissions and experts from the global South is also important. While we did not specifically focus on how recognition could be operationalized, we take note of the World Conservation Congress and the SSC Leaders meeting as two obvious event focused mechanisms. Recognition of the tremendous contribution of Commissions could serve as a means of incentivizing further the participation of individual Commission experts.

**Response to Recommendation 10, 11 and 12 on managing and coordinating across the Union – partially accepted**

<b>Response &amp; key actions</b> <b>Focal point for follow-up: CPL, Membership and Commission Support Unit, Commission Focal Points</b>	<b>Intended results</b>
<p><b>Recommendation 10 (coordination) &amp; 12 (Commission mandates): Partially accepted</b></p> <p>To steer, align and leverage the Union’s contributions towards common and shared priorities for policy influencing work, IUCN will make improvements to its annual work planning process (to the extent possible).</p> <p>This could extend to multiple aspects of Commissions’ and Secretariat’s annual planning and monitoring processes.</p> <p>Through the development of the policy influencing operational framework and associated policy influencing strategies (see combined responses to Recommendations 1, 2 and 3) guidance will be provided to identify and engage Members as “boundary partners<sup>3</sup>” in the delivery of IUCN’s policy work.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 11 (Member contributions): Partially accepted</b></p> <p>The IUCN Secretariat invites IUCN Members to further engage in policy influencing work through various means. An important first step for IUCN Members to shape and influence IUCN’s general policy is to actively engage in the full policy cycle of IUCN – from the discussion and submission of Motions for consideration at World Conservation Congresses to the follow-up and implementation of adopted Resolutions and Recommendations that set IUCN’s general policy.</p> <p>As documented in the annual Resolutions’ implementation reports presented to Council, it seems that a small number of IUCN Members</p>	<p>IUCN’s annual cycle and policy work planning has been adapted to yield greater results through efficient processes and coordination. Annual planning clarifies how IUCN will globally deliver on key policy processes and policy influencing strategies– including clarity on roles and deliverables. As such, all IUCN Constituents have an up-to-date overview of the annual objectives and achievements under each of the prioritised policy processes and understand how they are expected to contribute.</p> <p>Financial aspects are also addressed as part of the annual work planning and budgeting process.</p> <p>IUCN Members are committed and actively engaged in the implementation of IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations (IUCN general policy) alongside the Secretariat and Commissions. Resolution implementation reports are regularly logged in the Resolutions and Recommendations platform.</p> <p>IUCN Members work with the IUCN Secretariat and Commissions to advance on the application of the policy influencing operational framework and implement the policy objectives of the IUCN Programme.</p> <p>In the same way, they work within their governments in a manner that engages other government departments and sectors to support obligations under international agreements, including, but not limited to the Sustainable Development Goals, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.</p>

<sup>3</sup> Boundary partners are: a subset of an initiative's stakeholders. Boundary partners are the people, groups, or organisations that are directly engaged in the initiative, and who can be influenced through the initiative, and who in turn can influence outcomes that are outside the control or influence of the initiative.



<p>engage fully and consistently in IUCN’s policy cycle (although many may engage but not submit reports). As a result, important opportunities might be lost.</p> <p>In addition, the IUCN Secretariat further encourages all IUCN Members to engage in the consultations to define the next quadrennial Programme. Both IUCN’s general policy as set by IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations and the IUCN Programme must be interlinked and Members and Commissions are key to their alignment and implementation.</p> <p>Members are also encouraged to record and make visible their contributions to implement international conservation goals and targets through the IUCN Contributions for Nature Platform.</p> <p>It is important to note that through the application of the IUCN Common Approach to the Conferences of the Parties (COPs) which includes the hosting of IUCN pavilions branded as “Unite for Nature- Home of the Union”, IUCN has not only increased its visibility but has also formalised a space where IUCN constituents – Members, Commissions, Secretariat and partners - gather alongside the COPs to complement and amplify policy positions and key messages.</p>	<p>Non-governmental and Indigenous Peoples’ Organisations Members contribute to operationalizing, implementing, and monitoring the targets under the KMGBF.</p> <p>IUCN Secretariat engages with Members - both directly and through the IUCN Council - when developing and disseminating IUCN positions and key messages relevant to specific multilateral environmental agreements.</p> <p>The Programme and Policy Committee, Council and Members are fully engaged and provide meaningful input and contribute to IUCN’s policy influencing and advocacy work.</p>
---	--