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Context and Rationale

As part of the evaluation system set out in the IUCN Evaluation Policy, IUCN undertakes a series of strategic reviews organizational units and thematic programmes on a regular basis. These reviews typically assess a range of key performance criteria, including relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of an IUCN organizational unit (Global Thematic Programme, Regional, Outposted or Country Office) and cover the unit’s Programme, Strategies and Operations.

The IUCN Environmental Law Programme and Centre has been included in the 2006 strategic review cycle at the request of the Director-General and the Head of the Environmental Law Programme for the broad purpose of investigating and clarifying the Environmental Law Programme and Centre’s mandate, programmatic niche and operations to improve its performance and financial viability. This review will also examine the role of the Environmental Law Library, ECOLEX and the Partner Centres.

The IUCN Environmental Law Programme and Law Centre

The IUCN Environmental Law Centre (ELC) is located in Bonn, Germany and was established in 1970.

The Centre houses two extensive libraries, on Legislation, Treaties and Case Law, and Literature and Soft Law and is the headquarters for the UNEP, FAO, IUCN Management Unit for the joint initiative known as ECOLEX - the vehicle through which the three organizations provide web based access to their comprehensive holdings of environmental law information.

The ELC is a part of the network of environmental law expertise that comprises the IUCN Environmental Law Programme (ELP) and it works in collaboration with the whole of the IUCN family, together with many other partners from across the globe, in advancing environmental law, including:

- IUCN Commission on Environmental Law members
- IUCN staff and focal points in IUCN Headquarters and Regional and Country Offices in 42 offices around the world
- Thirteen regional 'partner centers' and the other institutional partners with whom the ELP has memoranda of understanding
The Environmental Law Programme is an integrated programme of activities that assists decision makers with information, legal analysis, advisory services, legislative drafting, mentoring and capacity building at national, regional and global levels. The Programme also provides the opportunity and the forum for governments, non-government organizations and others to network and to share information and discuss ideas.

The mission of the IUCN Environmental Law Programme (the ELP) is: *To advance sustainability through the development of legal and policy concepts and instruments, and through building the capacity of societies to develop and implement environmental law and policy, in furtherance of the IUCN Mission.*

Priority Areas

The priority areas for the ELP are reflected in the IUCN Programme, the ELC Strategic Workplan and through the ELP Strategic Plan.

IUCN has a long history of involvement with the negotiation and implementation of international treaties. The following treaties are regarded as ‘priority IUCN treaties:’

- Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)
- Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention)
- World Heritage Convention (WHC)
- Convention on Migratory Species (CMS)
- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

The ELP is regarded as the principal body of legal expertise in relation to these treaties (and the protocols developed under them) and it links their implementation to other conventions, events and processes.

Many other treaties are also of key significance to the IUCN. They include:

- Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD)
- Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC)

ELP also works to identify and address cross cutting issues. There is an emphasis placed on environment impact assessment (EIA), strategic impact assessment (SIA) and on taking an active role in engaging with social and economic issues. Other cross cutting issues include: compliance and enforcement, liability and procedural rights.

Purpose and Objectives of the Review

The overall purpose of this review is to provide analysis, recommendations and options for the MedWet Committee to support organizational restructuring.

The specific objectives of the review are:

- Assess the current programmatic focus and niche (relevance); modes of delivery (effectiveness, efficiency) and suggest where programmatic focus and modes of delivery should change;
• Assess the organizational model and operational systems, including office location, that underpin the programme;
• Assess the business model or strategies of the Environmental Law Programme;
• Assess the role of the Law Library-ECOLEX, and the Partner Centers in delivering the Environmental Law Programme;
• Develop options and scenarios based on the above to guide the future development of the Environmental Law Programme.

Intended Audience and Uses of the Review

This external review is commissioned by the Director General at his request for the purpose of assessing options for organizational renewal and programmatic reorientation. The review will be managed by the Director Global Programme.

The intended users of the review include IUCN Senior Management, the Head of the Environmental Law Programme in collaboration with key stakeholders.

Qualifications of the Review Team

The review team will be comprised of one senior evaluation specialist and one young professional from either IUCN.

The senior evaluation specialist is expected to possess sufficient independence from the Environmental Law Programme and the following:
• At least ten years experience leading and conducting evaluations;
• The demonstrated ability to review programme focus, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, organizational structures and management, and financial viability;
• Experience in reviewing
• The ability to lead and mentor a young professional through the evaluation process;
• Ability to communicate orally and in writing in English.

The young professional (35 years and younger) should possess the following:
• A professional position within IUCN;
• Experience in social survey design, administration and analysis;
• Experience in preparing interview protocols, conducting interviews and qualitative data analysis;
• Ability to communicate orally and in writing in English.

Both candidates will be required to file a CV and example of written work with the Ramsar Convention Secretariat (and/or Global Programme Team, IUCN). The example of written work of the senior evaluation specialist should be an example of a recently conducted evaluation which the senior evaluation specialist led.

Methodology

To address the key objectives and answer the major questions of the external review, the review team will collect quantitative and qualitative data from key stakeholders of the Environmental Law Programme, including IUCN HQ and Regional staff, the Commission
on Environmental Law, ECOLEX partners FAO and UNEP, Partner Centers and other external stakeholders.

Data collection instruments will include documentation analysis, semi-structured interviews with stakeholders listed above, to reach a representative sample of all stakeholder groups. It is the responsibility of the external review team to design data collection instruments.

Schedule

The review is expected to take place in the third quarter of 2006. Exact dates are still to be confirmed.

Outputs and Deliverables

The Review process will deliver the following outputs:

1. An evaluation workplan, including a final evaluation matrix of questions, indicators, data sources and methods, a schedule of activities and all interview protocols or questionnaires (responsibility – review team).

2. Detailed Review report containing evidence based findings and recommendations addressing each of the objectives and questions of the review, with analysis to support findings and recommendations (responsibility – review team).

3. Management Response and Action Plan to implement the (agreed) recommendations of the review (responsibility – Environmental Law Programme)

Dates are to be negotiated for deliverables, but ideally according to the Schedule (above).

Review Budget

A detailed budget will be developed in consultation with Global Programme Team and will depend on the composition of the review team and requirements for level of effort and travel.
## ANNEX 2  ELP Review Evaluation Matrix (revised 25 July)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Issues</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources and analysis methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Relevance (organizational performance)</td>
<td>To what extent is the Environmental Law Programme relevant?</td>
<td>To what extent is the Environmental Law Programme relevant to IUCN (Programme, global thematic programmes and regional programmes)?&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; To what extent are the products and services delivered by the Environmental Law Programme relevant to the intended users? To what extent is the Environmental Law Programme Relevant to the external environment? Who are Environmental Law Programme’s competitors?</td>
<td>Evidence of environmental law in other component programmes; perception of relevance from component programmes High degree of satisfaction of ELP’s products and services by</td>
<td>Analysis and inventory of environmental law work based on Intersessional plans, interviews with component programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Based on the above, what else should be included in the ELP’s programme? What is currently included in the ELP’s programme that is not relevant or not a priority to its stakeholders?</td>
<td>Perception of relevance from external stakeholders, including donors Convergence of ELP’s environmental law work with others; absence of clear niche for ELP based on that convergence</td>
<td>Analysis based on interviews with external stakeholders Analysis of external environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> Assumes that the ELP is relevant to the ELC because they have a shared programme (we may want to challenge this assumption)

<sup>2</sup> Component programme is a generic term describing both global thematic programmes and regional programmes
<p>| Effectiveness of Programmatic Delivery (organizational performance) | To what extent is the Environmental Law Programme delivered effectively? | How does ELP develop its intersessional and annual programme and workplans? Is this an effective mode of programme planning? Who participates in the ELP programme planning process? Is this an appropriate mix of stakeholders? Who else should be involved? Whose participation inhibits programme planning? How clear are the intersessional programme and annual workplans of ELP? Is there a clear relationship between programme delivery, reporting and planning? What products and services does the ELP deliver? To whom? To what degree are key stakeholders satisfied with the ELP’s products and services? | Identifiable and effective programme planning processes | methods | Analysis based on document review and interviews with ELP staff | Analysis based on document review and interviews with ELP staff | Analysis based on document review and interviews with ELP stakeholders |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Issues</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources and analysis methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness, continued</td>
<td>To what extent does the ELP help other component programmes effectively deliver (effectively incorporate environmental law?) their Programmes? Is this effectiveness (value-added, ability to help programmes incorporate environmental law) different for global thematic programmes and regions? If so, why? Based on the analysis above, what mechanisms or approaches should the ELP incorporate into its programme delivery to increase effectiveness? What is required of component programmes with which the ELP works to increase programme delivery of both or either ELP or other component programmes? What, specifically, should ELP be doing to increase its interaction, including programme delivery, with regions?</td>
<td>Evidence of joint programming or activities; high degree of satisfaction of partners (regions and globally)</td>
<td>Analysis based on document review and interviews with regional and global thematic staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Issues</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Sub-questions</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources and analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational model</td>
<td>What is the organizational model of the ELP?</td>
<td>What is the history and development of the ELP?</td>
<td>What is the optimal structure for the ELP?</td>
<td>Interviews with historically relevant staff (current and ex-staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has the current organizational model of the ELP? In terms of IUCN Secretariat? In terms of operational relations with the ELC? In terms of operational relations with other affiliated partner organizations?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis based on documentation, including organizational structure diagram, delegations of authority and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does the organizational model of the ELP facilitate delivery of its programme?</td>
<td>To what extent does the outposted nature of the Law Centre facilitate or inhibit delivery?</td>
<td>Analysis weighing pros and cons from a variety of sources, including interviews (ELP and HQ), historical analysis, financial viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational capacity</td>
<td>To what extent is the strategic leadership of the ELP sound?</td>
<td>Strong positive perception; e.g. evidence of suitable management culture, proper direction setting, resource development, ensuring tasks are done, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis based on interviews, and possibly extract from Global Staff Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Issues</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Sub-questions</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources and analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational capacity, continued</td>
<td>How efficient and effective is the management of the ELP?</td>
<td>Are the roles and responsibilities of all staff well-defined and implemented?</td>
<td>Written and anecdotal evidence of typical management functions, particularly internal communications, policies and procedures, etc (note: leadership, external network management, finance and human resources covered elsewhere in this performance area)</td>
<td>Analysis based on document review of management policies (finance, HR, delegations of authority, etc) and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the ELP manage its networks effectively and efficiently?</td>
<td>To what extent does the ELP manage its relationship with and obligations to the Environmental Law Commission effectively and efficiently? To what extent does the ELP manage its relationship with the Partner Centres effectively and efficiently? What benefits and costs are associated with managing interaction with ELC and Partner Centres</td>
<td>Strong evidence of high return on investment (benefits vs. costs) in managing these networks; strong positive perception from staff and partners (ELC, partner centres)</td>
<td>Analysis based on interviews with stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are staff satisfied and motivated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is the financial management of the ELP sound?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive perception of staff working in the ELP</td>
<td>Extract from Global Staff Survey</td>
<td>Analysis based on document review and interviews (including audit and HQ Finance staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Issues</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Sub-questions</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources and analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational capacity, continued</td>
<td>Is human resource management of ELP sound?</td>
<td>To what extent is the ELP business model or plan of the ELP sound?</td>
<td>Sound policies, effective mechanisms for implementation, strong positive perception from staff Evidence of a sound business model or strategy; evidence that staff and management work within that business model</td>
<td>Analysis based on document review and interviews, particularly on issues raised by the Global Staff Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial viability</td>
<td>To what extent is the ELP financially viable?</td>
<td>What is the effect of the outposted ELP in Bonn on the financial viability of the ELP?</td>
<td>Evidence of a sound business model or strategy; evidence that staff and management work within that business model Cost analysis</td>
<td>Analysis based on document review, interviews with staff both within and outside of the ELC (e.g. at HQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of costs and benefits and scenarios based on (a) outposted office in Bonn separate from UN complex (b) outposted office in Bonn within UN complex and (c) repatriation of ELP to HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the effect of the Environmental Law Library and ECOLEX on the financial viability of the ELP?</td>
<td>Clear evidence (from, for example, the ABC List) of a donor engagement strategy and frequent contact</td>
<td>Analysis based on document review and interviews to assess changes in donor support in recent history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How does the ELP interact with its donors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Issues</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Sub-questions</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources and analysis methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Law Library and ECOLEX</td>
<td>To what extent are the Environmental Law Library and ECOLEX relevant to the practice of environmental law in its own right?</td>
<td>Is the purpose of the Environmental Law Library and ECOLEX clear and sound? Do stakeholders see the Environmental Law Library and ECOLEX as relevant to their work?</td>
<td>Strong perception that the Law Library and ECOLEX is an essential resource for environmental lawyers</td>
<td>Analysis based on interviews (particularly external stakeholders where possible; could be ELC members in this case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is the Environmental Law Library and ECOLEX effective in supporting the practice of environmental law and delivery of the IUCN Environmental Law Programme?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong perception that the Law Library and ECOLEX is an essential resource for environmental lawyers</td>
<td>Analysis based on interviews (particularly external stakeholders where possible; could be ELC members in this case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does the tripartite partnership between UNEP, FAO and IUCN adequately support the effectiveness of the Environmental Law Library and ECOLEX?</td>
<td>TBD further</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis based on document review and interviews with IUCN, FAO and UNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the organization of the Environmental Law Library and ECOLEX effective and efficient?</td>
<td>TBD further</td>
<td></td>
<td>This analysis should adapt the principles identified in the Red List Consortium Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3  STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED

IUCN

Office of the Director General

Ibrahim Thiaw  Acting Director General and Regional Director, West Africa
Jane Garneau  Special Assistant to Director General

Global Programme

Bill Jackson  Director
Sue Mainka  Senior Programme Coordinator
Jeff McNeely  Chief Scientist
David Sheppard  Head, Programme on Protected Areas
Ger Bergkamp  Coordinator, Water and Nature Initiative
Carl Gustav Lundin  Head, Marine Programme
Stewart Maginnis  Coordinator, Forest Conservation Programme
Martha Chouchena Rojas  Head, Policy, Biodiversity and International Agreements, Unit
Joshua Bishop  Special Advisor, Economics
Alex Moiseev  Advisor, Planning and Evaluation

Global Strategies

Gabriel Lopez  Director
Hans Friederich  Head, Conservation Finance and Donor Relations
Lucy Deram  Bilateral Relations
Alicia Held  Librarian
Global Operations

Alison Rowles-Anobile  Director
Silvio Olivieri  Senior Technical Advisor for Conservation Information Systems
Diego Ruiz  Head, Human Resources
James Muchira  Internal Auditor

Regional Offices

Maria Fernanda Espinoza  Regional Director, SUR
James Murumbedzi  Regional Director, ROSA
Grethel Aguilar Rojas  Regional Director, ORMA
Aban Kabraji  Regional Director, Asia
Odeh Al-Jayousi  Regional Director, WESCANA
Tamas Marghescu  Regional Director, Europe
Bihini Won Wa Musiti  Acting Regional Director, Central Africa
Geoffrey Howard  Regional Programme Coordinator, Eastern Africa
Patricia Moore  Head, Regional Environmental Law Programme – Asia
Laurent Granier  Senegal Country Office and Legal Advisor, West Africa Region

Commission on Environmental Law

Sheila Abed  Chair
Michel Prieur  Vice-Chair
John Scanlon  Steering Committee member, and former Director, ELC
Jorge Caillaud  Honorary Member
Wolfgang Burhenne  Steering Committee member
Lee Paddock  Co-Chair, CEL Specialist Group on Enforcement and Compliance
Richard Ottinger  Co-Chair, Specialist Group on Energy, Law and Climate Change
Nilufer Oral  Co-Chair, Specialist Group on Oceans, Coastal and Coral Reefs

Eugenia Wo Ching Sancho  Co-Chair, Specialist Group on Implementation of CBD

Barbara Lausche  Member, and author of history of ELP

Environmental Law Centre

Alejandro Iza  Head Environmental Law Program, and Director, Environmental Law Centre
Charles Di Leva  Former Director Environmental Law Centre
Francoise Burhenne-Guilmin  Senior Counsel and former Director, ELC
Thomas Greiber  Legal Officer
Sharelle Hart  Legal Officer
Daniel Klein  Legal Officer
Maria Socorro Manguiat  Former Legal Officer
Tomme Young  Former Legal Officer
Daniella Montag  Finance, Human Resources and Protocol
Anni Lukacs  Senior Information and Documentation Officer
Andrea Lesemann  Documentation Officer
Monica Pacheco-Fabig  Documentation Assistant
Ann DeVoy  Projects Assistant
Jill Self  Programme Assistant

Donor Organizations

Erik Skoglund  Swedish International Development Agency (Sida)
Francois Droz  Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC)
Felix Hoogveld  Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands (DGIS)
Han Olav Ibrekk  Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)
Marita Steinke  Head, Division of Environment and Sustainable Resources Management, Ministry for Development Cooperation, Germany (BMZ)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization and Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Breier</td>
<td>Nature Protection Division, Ministry of the Environment, Germany (BMU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Academy of Environmental Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Robinson</td>
<td>Chair of IUCN Academy of Environmental Law, and former Chair, CEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Boer</td>
<td>Co-Director of IUCN Academy of Environmental Law and Vice-Chair, Joint Task Force on Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Benidickson</td>
<td>Co-Director, IUCN Academy of Environmental Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achim Steiner</td>
<td>Executive Director, UNEP and Former Director General, IUCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwona Rummel Bulska</td>
<td>Chief, Environmental Law Branch, Division of Policy Development and Law (DPDL), UNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Mekouar</td>
<td>Director of Conference Council and Protocol and former Chief, Development Law Service, FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry ten Kate</td>
<td>Director, Business and Biodiversity Offsets Program, Forest Trends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 4 MAIN DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

The following list shows documents that were made available to the reviewers or were downloaded from relevant websites. The list is not exhaustive of all the documentation reviewed.

Websites of the following organizations, programmes or units were visited:
- IUCN Knowledge Network
- ELP, CEL and ELC
- ECOLEX
- IUCN Academy of Environmental Law
- UNEP and FAO
- The Foundation for International Environmental Law and Development

General IUCN
1. The IUCN Programme 2005-2008 – Many Voices, One Earth, IUCN, November 2005
2. The Future of Sustainability – IUCN Renowned Thinkers Meeting, Zurich, 29-31 January 2006 – Presentation
3. Minutes of meetings of the IUCN Council at which were presented reports from the CEL Chair (49th, 53rd-57th and 60th meetings)

Environmental Law Programme
1. Weaving a Web of Environmental Law – Contributions of the IUCN Environmental Law Programme, Barbara J. Lausche, 2005 (Manuscript)
3. IUCN Environmental Law Programme – Quadrennial Programme 2001-2004, draft, 1 June 2000
4. IUCN Environmental Law Programme – Strategic Plan 2002-2003
5. IUCN Environmental Law Centre – 2006 Strategic Workplan

Commission on Environmental Law
1. Commission on Environmental Law – Report 2001-2004 by the Chair, Nicolas A. Robinson
2. IUCN Commission on Environmental Law (CEL) – Mandate: 2005-2008
3. CEL Steering Committee Meeting, 13-15 June 2005, Cape Town, South Africa, Minutes of the Meeting
4. CEL Steering Committee Meeting, 4-5 April 2006, Bonn, Germany, Minutes of the Meeting
5. CEL Specialist Groups Meeting, 1-2 June 2006, Foz do Iguaçu, Brazil, Minutes of the Meeting
6. Development of CEL Strategic Plan 2006-2012 (Draft for discussion) – text and presentation

Environmental Law Centre
1. IUCN Environmental Law Centre (ELC) – Project Management, Guidelines for Project Managers
2. 2006-2007-2008 Income and Expenditure Forecast (1 December 2006 update)
3. ABC List Review as of 1 December 2006
4. Financial Status as of 30 November 2006
7. IUCN Webtrends statistics

ECOLEX
2. Memorandum of Understanding between IUCN/ELC and UNEP for developing a common search engine of ECOLEX/FAOLEX etc. of July 2003
3. Memorandum of Understanding between IUCN/ELC and UNEP relating to the maintenance of the ECOLEX database computer system and improving on the ECOLEX database of June 2004
4. 13th Meeting of the ECOLEX Steering Committee, Bonn, Germany, 8-9 March 2006, Minutes of the Meeting
5. ECOLEX – A gateway to environmental law – information sheets

IUCN Academy of Environmental Law
1. IUCN Academy of Environmental Law – Paper for IUCN Council from the Commission on Environmental Law (for the 57th meeting of IUCN Council, 9-11 December 2002)
2. Minutes of the 57th Meeting of the IUCN Council, 9-11 December 2002
3. License Agreement between IUCN – the World Conservation Union, and Jamie Benidickson, on behalf of a non-profit Canadian corporation to be incorporated as the IUCN Academy of Environmental Law of 22 and 29 May 2006
4. IUCN Academy of Environmental Law Secretariat – Report to Governing Council (of the Academy), October 2006, University of Ottawa, Canada
5. 4th IUCN Academy of Environmental Law Colloquium, October 16-20, 2006, Pace University School of Law – Colloquium Program

IUCN Presence in Germany
1. Letter from Dr Gallas, for the BMU Minister to DG David McDowell of 6 October 1998
2. Agreement between the Federal Republic of Germany and IUCN concerning the Occupancy and Use of Premises by IUCN in Bonn of 7 December 1998
3. Agreement between the IUCN and KSSF of January 1999
4. 7 December 1999 letter from Dr. Edmonds from BMU to IUCN regarding BMU’s lump sum payment
5. 26 February 2002 letter from Sparkasse Bonn
6. 12 May 2002 letter from Thomas Krummel to John Scanlon

ELP Publications

IUCN Environmental Law Programme Publications 2001-2004, CD-ROM

No. 65 Les conventions locales de gestion des ressources naturelles et de l'environnement : Légalité et cohérence en droit sénégalais  
Laurent Granier, 2006

No. 60 Judges and the Rule of Law - Creating the Links: Environment, Human Rights and Poverty  
Thomas Greiber (Ed.), 2006

No. 59 Legal Aspects in the Implementation of CDM Forestry Projects; Maria Socorro Z. Manguiat, Roda Verheyen, Jens Mackensen and Gerald Scholz, 2005

No. 57 Explanatory Guide to the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture; Gerald Moore and Witold Tymowski, 2005

No. 56 An Introduction to the African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources; IUCN ELP, 2004


No. 54 Accessing Biodiversity and Sharing the Benefits: Lessons from Implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity edited by Santiago Carrizosa, Stephen B. Brush, Brian D. Wright, Patrick E. McGuire, 2004
No. 52 Drafting Legislation for Sustainable Soils: A Guide; Ian Hannam and Ben Boer, 2004

No. 51 Water as a Human Right? John Scanlon, Angela Cassar, Noémi Nemes, 2004

No. 31 Draft International Covenant on Environment and Development; Third Edition: Second Revised Text, 2004

No. 49 International Environmental Governance - An International Regime for Protected Areas; edited by John Scanlon and Françoise Burhenne-Guilmin, 2004

No. 47 Energy Law and Sustainable Development; Adrian J. Bradbrook, Richard L. Ottinger, 2003


No. 45 Legal and Institutional Frameworks for Sustainable Soils; Ian Hannam with Ben Boer, 2002

No. 44 Arctic Legal Regime for Environmental Protection; Linda Nowlan, 2002

No. 43 (2) Environmental Law in Developing Countries - Selected Issues Vol. II Marianela Cedeño Bonilla, Edgar Fernández Fernández, Sondes Jemaiel, Rose Mwebaza and Dana Zhandayeva (coordinated by Françoise Burhenne-Guilmin), 2004

No. 43 (1) Environmental Law in Developing Countries - Selected Issues; Nazrul Islam, Isabel Martinez, Ikechi Mgbeoji, Wang Xi (coordinated by Francoise Burhenne-Guilmin), 2001

No. 41 The TRIPS Agreement, Sustainable Development and the Public Interest Discussion Paper; Simon Walker, 2001

No. 40 A Guide to Designing Legal and Institutional Frameworks on Alien Invasive Species; Clare Shine, Nattley Williams and Lothar Gündling, 2000

No. 39 Landscape Conservation Law - Present Trends and Perspectives in International and Comparative Law; IUCN ELP/PA, Societe Francaise pour le Droit de l'Environnement, 2000

No. 32 Biodiversity in the Seas: Implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity in Marine and Coastal Habitats, Fontaubert de, A. C., Downes, D.R., Agardy, T.S, 1996


No. 29 Biological Diversity Conservation and the Law: Legal Mechanisms for Conserving Species and Ecosystems; Klemm, C.de; Shine, C., 1993

Other IUCN Publications

Transboundary Protected Areas for Peace and Protection, Sandwith T., Shine C., Hamilton L., Sheppard D., 2003


Disclosure Requirements: Ensuring mutual supportiveness between the WTO TRIPS Agreement and the CBD, IUCN and other organizations, 2005

Genetically Modified Organisms and Biosafety – A background paper for decision-makers and others to assist in consideration of GMO issues, Young T. 2004 (IUCN Policy and Global Change Series No 1)


Change – Adaptation of Water Resources Management to Climate Change, Bergkamp G., Orlando B., and Burton I., 2003

Value – Counting Ecosystems as Water Infrastructure, Emerton L., and Bos E., 2004

Pay - Establishing payments for water-shed services, Smith M., de Groot D., Bergkamp G., 2006

Governance of the Mediterranean Sea – Outlook for the Legal Regime, Chevalier C., 2005