

IUCN Strategic Review:

**Regional Office for South America
(SUR)**

Final Report

January 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	2
1.1 Background – Origin of the Review.....	2
1.2 Mandate – Purpose of the Strategic Review.....	2
1.3 Methods and Approach.....	3
1.4 Limitations and Constraints of the Study.....	4
1.5 Outline of the Report.....	4
2. Factors Related to the Performance of the SUR Office.....	5
2.1 Strategy and Workplans.....	5
2.2 Programme and Projects.....	5
2.3 Engagement in Programme Delivery with the Union.....	5
2.4 Management and Operations.....	6
2.5 Membership.....	6
2.6 Service to Members.....	7
2.7 Relations with Members.....	7
3. Performance of the IUCN Office for South America in Key Areas.....	8
3.1 Relevance.....	8
3.2 Staffing.....	8
3.3 Existing Core Competencies.....	9
3.4 Mandate.....	9
4. Issues Emerging from the Analysis.....	11
4.1 Regional Director.....	11
4.2 Geographic Coverage and Location of the SUR Office.....	11
4.3 Support from IUCN Headquarters.....	12
4.4 Core Competencies IUCN must bring to its Work in South America.....	13
4.5 Degree of Interaction with Donors.....	13
4.6 The Southern Cone Sub-Region.....	14
4.7 The Guyana Sub-Region.....	14
5. Future Directions: Choices for the Way Forward.....	15
5.1 Business as Usual.....	15
5.2 Closure of the Regional Office for South America.....	15
5.3 Closing of Quito Office – Opening of a Small Regional Office in Brazil.....	16
5.4 Reduce Operations in Quito Office – Open Formal National Office in Brazil.....	16
5.5 Reduce Quito Office – Open Brazil National Office and Sub-Regional Office for Southern Cone.....	17
5.6 An Integrated Programme for Latin America.....	17
5.7 Strengthen IUCN's Regional Presence in South America.....	18
5.8 Strengthen IUCN's Regional Presence, Including the Southern Cone.....	19
5.9 Strengthen IUCN's Regional Presence, Discontinuing National-Level Efforts in Brazil.....	19
6. Concluding Comments.....	21
6.1 Training for Regional Directors and other Senior Staff.....	21
6.2 Conducting Strategic Reviews in Future.....	21
6.2.1 Review Team Composition.....	21
6.2.2 Timeframe.....	21
6.2.3 Logistical Support.....	22
6.2.4 Briefing and Transparency.....	22
6.2.5 Data Collection Process.....	22
6.2.6 Learning and Information Sharing.....	22
List of Annexes.....	23

1. Introduction

1.1 Background – Origin of the Review

The strategic review of the IUCN office for South America (SUR) originated from the annual budget hearings concerning the allocation of general programme funding, held in November, 2000. The budget task team noted in the submission presented by SUR that a significantly high percentage of staff time was factored against projects not yet developed or submitted to a potential donor, either internal or external. A third observation by the budget and task team was the fact that for several years SUR has drawn significantly from General Programme funds. In addition to this observation, a number of major projects in SUR had closed or would be closing in the near future. Taken together, it was also noted that these factors presented a high level of financial risk for the programme in South America as well as for IUCN as a whole. Drawing heavily on this information the acting Director General, based on the recommendation of the Senior Management Team of IUCN, requested a strategic review of the IUCN operation in South America in December 2000.

It should also be noted that this decision was not taken in isolation. Fully 4 component programmes were selected for strategic reviews, based on similar analysis of financial data during the budget hearings of November 2000. However, strategic reviews of this nature form an integral component of IUCN's overall evaluation policy. It is the intention of Senior Management that periodic reviews of this nature will soon become a regular occurrence within the activities of all IUCN component programmes.

1.2 Mandate – Purpose of the Strategic Review

The focus of this review is strategic in an operational sense, rather than programmatic. As such, it is not the intent of this review to analyse in detail the conservation success or impact of the IUCN programme in South America. Rather, this review seeks to answer strategic questions, which are more operational in nature. These questions may refer to issues of mandate, relevance, effectiveness/efficiency, and financial viability of the office. Within this context, the following objectives for this review were defined:

- Analysis of the strategic mandate of the programme – particularly in the context of the IUCN membership in the SUR Region. (This analysis will be conducted in the context of the current IUCN Quadrennial Plan and Business Plan recently approved by Council. It will take note of the strategic opportunities and benefits of an IUCN presence in South America, as well as its associated costs.);
- Assessment of the financial viability and financial risk of the programme;
- Overview of the effectiveness and efficiency of SUR as an organisational unit within IUCN.

In essence, the above would normally constitute the core objectives of any strategic review conducted within IUCN. In addition to these objectives, however, two additional issues of specific interest to the SUR programme were also taken into account:

- Analysis of the approach and progress in establishing an IUCN presence in Brazil;
- Assessment of the degree of interaction currently existing between SUR and other component programmes within the Union.

The full terms of reference for this review may be found in Annex 6 of this report.

1.3 Methods and Approach

The review of the IUCN SUR office was a joint exercise carried out by Enrique Lahmann, Regional Director of IUCN ORMA (team leader), Tom Hammond, Programme, Policy and Evaluation Team – IUCN HQ, and Natalia Ortiz, an independent consultant based in the region with past monitoring and evaluation experience with IUCN SUR. Initial preparations for the review took place during the week of January 15, 2001. Consultations with IUCN SUR staff and stakeholders of the IUCN programme based in Ecuador, including participation of the entire review team, took place in Quito during the week of January 22. Additional consultations with stakeholders took place in Cali and Bogota, Colombia, on January 27 - 30. Initial analysis of results took place during the first week of February, which included consultations with key members of the IUCN Council during their meeting in Gland at this time. The draft final report was prepared during the third week of February.

The collection of data during this review was based on two distinct sources of information: review of background documentation and consultation with stakeholders. A list of the individuals consulted during the course of this review may be found in Annex 1 of this report. In addition, a list of the documents reviewed and consulted during this study may be found in Annex 4. Individuals consulted during this exercise were considered to be in one of five discrete stakeholder groups:

- IUCN SUR staff;
- Member representatives (including country chairs, Commission members, and Councillors);
- Directors and senior staff of IUCN global thematic programmes based in Gland;
- Representatives of the donor community;
- Former staff of IUCN SUR.

Consultation with stakeholders was accomplished via four distinct methods:

- Face to face interviews;
- Focus group sessions;
- Telephone interviews;
- Questionnaires sent to IUCN member representatives electronically.

In all, 34 face to face interviews were conducted, 8 telephone interviews, 8 responses to the IUCN member questionnaire were received as well as 13 responses to the IUCN staff questionnaire. A copy of the interview guide, which was also used as the basis for electronic questionnaires, may be found in Annex 7 of this report.

An in-depth analysis was conducted for all of the data collected through the above processes. This analysis was based on the specific objectives of the review, and was applied for each of the major stakeholder groups noted above. The analysis matrix used during this process may be found in Annex 3. The intent of this analysis was essentially two fold – to determine the overall perspective for each stakeholder group with respect to each of the specific objectives of the exercise as well as to identify in a similar fashion a consensus view for the way forward in each of these areas.

1.4 Limitations and Constraints of the Study

The review team was faced with two primary limitations during the course of this study: time and geography. Due to the expressed need by the senior management team to move quickly and generate results in a relatively short timeframe, it was only possible for the review team - due to other important commitments - to work together for 5 days in the region (although additional data collection work was conducted outside of this time frame by individual team members). It was thus necessary for the team to begin the process of distilling recommendations and scenarios for the way forward (as it is essential to do this together as a team) well before the analysis of data collected (and the data collection process itself) was complete. In addition, it must be emphasised that attempting to manage a comprehensive review of a component programme in a 1 – 2 week timeframe, given the history of IUCN engagement in the region here and the widespread IUCN membership in South America, is an exceedingly difficult exercise.

The other primary limitation of this study, which is also a limitation for IUCN's activities in general in this region (and discussed further in the body of this report), is geographic coverage. South America is as large as sub-Saharan Africa (where IUCN has 4 regional offices) and in socio-economic, political and cultural terms at least as diverse. Given the time constraints noted above, as well as the difficulty and high cost of travel within this region, it was impossible (outside of meetings held in Ecuador and Colombia, and later in Gland) to have a balanced approach to meeting with membership and other important stakeholders throughout the region that a review of this importance calls for. In effect, with the exception of a number of telephone interviews and questionnaires completed electronically, the “southern cone” countries and Brazil were virtually excluded from this exercise. Given the high level (and growing) membership activity in these areas, not to mention their importance from a biodiversity standpoint, it is unfortunate (and a significant weakness in this report) not to have had sufficient time to converse directly with members and other stakeholders in these sub-regions.

1.5 Outline of the Report

The balance of this report is structured around the following major headings:

- Factors related to the Performance of the IUCN SUR Office
- Performance of the IUCN SUR Office in Key Areas
- Primary Issues emerging from the analysis
- Future Directions – Choices for the Way Forward
- Concluding Remarks

This report also includes a detailed annex, providing the names of the individuals and documents consulted during this exercise. In addition, the document in annex 5 provides an update of the IUCN SUR strategic plan and ABC list. Additional methodological details concerning this strategic review may also be found in the Annexes 3 and 7.

It should also be emphasised here that, although the views of many stakeholders were taken into account in this review, the contents of the following report represent the opinions of the Review Team and not necessarily those of the Union. The IUCN Management Team, as noted above, was the initiator of the review process, and will act on the results of the review, as they deem appropriate.

2. Factors Related to the Performance of the SUR Office

2.1 Strategy and Workplans

The IUCN Office for South America has a well-developed strategic plan for the quadrennium, prepared in late 1999. A follow-up Strategic Review was prepared in late 2000, up-dating and revising the original plan. This review incorporated issues arising from the Harmonisation process, member views, and the Amman Congress. A copy of this document is found in Annex 5 of this report.

Within this context, IUCN SUR has developed an annual workplan for 2001 which fits specifically within IUCN's current results based planning system. Although this was not a specific objective of the strategic review, the Review Team did not detect any deficiencies in this regard. Indeed, it was felt that IUCN SUR has both a clear and well-developed strategic plan and an annual workplan that is fully integrated within the overall planning and monitoring system.

2.2 Programme and Projects

The IUCN SUR Programme, when compared to other IUCN regional offices, does not have an extensive portfolio of projects and other activities under implementation. As such, this significant potential source of revenue for both programme development and the building of core competencies, as well as for the generation of funds to sustain the office locally, are currently lacking. This fact has significant implications with respect to whether IUCN is capable of achieving its mandate in South America. It also has implications with respect to whether the membership recognises any particular "value added" from SUR's relatively low level of project/programme delivery.

The IUCN SUR Programme does, however, have a well developed list of project concepts ("A" list) which reflect both the strategic issues described in the documents noted above as well as the concerns of members in the implementation of projects by IUCN in the region. Irrespective of this fact, a significant issue facing the SUR Office in the short term will be the internal technical capacity necessary to develop these concepts into full-fledged project proposals submitted to funding agencies. It is questionable whether, in the short term at least, the SUR Office will be able to fully develop project initiatives in sectors for which there is currently no installed capacity (wetlands, coastal and marine, environmental law, etc.). An alternative to developing project initiatives in house, which is perhaps preferable in the SUR context, is mandating this responsibility to national committees or ad hoc groups of members. This would require financial support, in addition to technical support, which currently does not exist in the Region.

2.3 Engagement in Programme Delivery with the Union

Programme development and delivery, as noted above, has been a problem in general in IUCN SUR over the past 3 to 4 years. While project initiatives have been developed and initiated over this time period a number of these have resulted in a high degree of criticism from members. Those projects singled out, such as the IDB sponsored project to develop a management plan for the Galapagos Marine Reserve, were viewed this as national-level project initiatives placing IUCN in direct competition with members for funding.

Perhaps symptomatic of the above, there has been a general lack of engagement or declining engagement over this time period between SUR and component programmes (i.e. Global

Thematic Programmes) in other parts of the Secretariat. Directors and senior staff of Global Thematic Programmes in the Secretariat who were interviewed during the data collection phase of this review noted that past investments made in support of thematic programme initiatives in South America did not prove successful from a financial point of view in developing new projects and other activities (although most acknowledged that from a technical perspective the work carried out in these sectors was of high quality).

A number of factors were identified as contributing to the situation of poor return on investment noted above. Clearly the membership in the region, as noted elsewhere in this report, were adamant that IUCN not become a competitor for traditional sources of bilateral donor funding. In addition, former senior level technical staff responsible for programme sectors did not appear to clearly understand the expectations from headquarters in this regard. Finally, many respondents in the review noted that technical support and guidance from headquarters to programme activities in many thematic areas has been quite weak. This issue is discussed further in Section 4.3, "Support from Headquarters".

2.4 Management and Operations

With respect to office management, administration and general operations, the SUR office functions very well. Financial management has been handled with a very high level of professionalism in the 9 years the office has been open, verified by both Finance and Audit in headquarters. Services, such as information management, the web site, and communications with members also appear to be carried out with a high degree of efficiency and effectiveness. The SUR web site, which contains a variety of member and staff services available permanently on line, represents an example to the rest of the Union with respect to how these services may be developed in future in other regional offices.

Issues related to management, administration or general operations were generally not raised or identified by stakeholders during the interview/data collection process. The exception to this was the question of staffing in the office, both the level of current staffing and the balance of staffing between senior technical and administrative support staff, the subject of a specific discussion below.

2.5 Membership

There are currently a total of 86 IUCN members in South America, representing almost 10% of world wide membership. Non-government organisations make up the largest contingent, with 75 organisations represented throughout the continent. The balance is made up of 6 governmental organizations, 3 states, and 2 affiliated organizations.

The majority of the NGO members are well-developed organisations working at national level, many with a diversified portfolio of projects and other activities. Many of these members are well integrated into national-level policy making on environmental issues.

In terms of Commission membership, a total of 821 experts are found in the region listed amongst the 6 Commissions. Within this context, a number of these individuals have risen to the level of Chair or Vice-Chair on a number of Commissions.

2.6 Service to Members

The issue of service to member may be divided into two distinct aspects: 1. Services the SUR office is currently capable of delivering; 2. Services that the membership would like to see coming from the SUR office. With respect to the first point, the view of stakeholders was overall very positive. The staff at IUCN SUR has clearly worked hard in coordinating information flow to members, the distribution of publications, and stakeholder consultations, particularly over the past 18 months. The development and continuous updating of the SUR web site, noted above, has also been recognised as a significant service to members. The web site provides regular updates of current events, on line publications, links, a mechanism that allows members to develop their own web site housed on the IUCN server, and a variety of other services.

With respect to the second point, it is clear that there are specific services of a technical/programmatic nature, which the membership and other stakeholders in South America wish to see, and expect, from the IUCN SUR office. These issues (technical expertise in key sectors; leader in bi/multinational undertakings; regional policy development, information clearing house; regional facilitation role) will be detailed under Section 3.4 relating to Mandate. While the Mandate of IUCN SUR may be clear amongst (particularly) the membership and other stakeholders, the delivery on this mandate is currently lacking. The impact this has on perceptions amongst stakeholders of the relevance of the IUCN programme in South America is correspondingly significant. Given that technical and programmatic issues are paramount in the minds of most members and other stakeholders, the overall perception of respondents in this study is that SUR is currently not delivering an adequate service to members. This perception is reinforced by the knowledge of recent past history in SUR, when senior level technical capacity existed in a number of sectors.

The above technical and programmatic issue certainly has implications with respect to current staffing with the IUCN SUR office. This point is discussed further below under Staffing.

2.7 Relations with Members

The past history of relations between the Regional Office and the IUCN Membership in South America has been fraught with controversy. IUCN Members in the region are, generally, quite sophisticated and have significant capacity for the development and implementation of conservation projects. As such, tensions have existed with respect to the degree to which IUCN SUR may engage in project activities itself.

These issues came to a head approximately two years ago when IUCN SUR engaged in a number of activities that were viewed by many members as project activities in direct competition with themselves. A case in point was a consultancy with the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) aimed at developing a marine conservation strategy for the Galapagos Islands, initiated in early 1999.

Of late, relations with members has improved markedly. This is due largely to the last two Regional Committee meetings, the "Cochabamba" workshop of 13-15 October, 1999, as well as the meeting held in Paraguay held on July 20-21, 2000. A survey of member needs and perspectives was also conducted in late 1998 in preparation for the development of the 2000 – 2005 Strategic Plan. These actions have greatly clarified IUCN's mandate in the region and its relationship with the membership in achieving this mandate. The specifics of this mandate are discussed in Section 3.1 below.

3. Performance of the IUCN Office for South America in Key Areas

3.1 Relevance

The issue of relevance, in the context of this review, may be divided into two distinct themes defined by the following questions: First of all is it relevant for IUCN, given the organisation's mission and constituency, to be present in South America? Secondly, is the work of IUCN in South America relevant to the membership and other stakeholders present in the region? The issue of relevance, of course, particularly in the context of the latter issue, links very closely with mandate.

With respect to the first issue, at no time during the course of data collection and speaking with stakeholders was there any indication that IUCN's presence in South America was immaterial or irrelevant. On the contrary, there was strong consensus from all stakeholder groups that IUCN has a very significant and highly necessary role to play in the region, and that a well-established and active IUCN presence in South America would be highly beneficial.

From an environmental perspective, South America is considered to be a "mega-diversity" continent. Four countries from South America rank in the top 12 most biologically diverse countries on the planet. The moist tropical forests of the Amazon Basin and Guyana Shield are almost double the extent of similar forest types in the Congo Basin of Africa. Economically speaking, using commonly accepted socio-economic and human development indicators, the countries in South America generally rank higher than their counterparts in other parts of the developing world, such as Africa, and many of the countries in the region are considered "emerging economies". However, the rate of economic growth in the region has brought with it a precipitous rate of environmental degradation and decline, the pace of which is almost unparalleled anywhere in the world.

Issues arising with respect to the second question are of a far more serious nature. Stakeholders were virtually unanimous in their view that IUCN SUR has not lived up to its mandate and their expectations. The root causes of this perception relate to a number of issues, particularly the manner in which IUCN had implemented a number of projects in the past as well as weaknesses over the past 18 months in the senior technical staff complement in the office. The ongoing lack of senior technical staff in SUR, perhaps more than any other issue, has prompted a large number of members contacted during the course of this study to begin questioning the relevance of IUCN's work in the region.

3.2 Staffing

As noted above, the Review Team identified a clear lack of technical capacity in the Regional Office for South America. In terms of senior programme staff, at present there is only the Regional Director and the Forest Programme Co-ordinator. The position of Programme Co-ordinator is currently vacant. The manner in which this vacancy will be addressed is dependent upon the final decision taken by Management Team concerning the outcome of this review. Donor funding from BMZ supporting the position of Education Coordinator (seconded at IUCN's expense to the Ecuadorian Ministry of the Environment for the past 2 years) has ended. Although this position remains open, it is presently not funded and a proposal for a second phase to this project has not yet been prepared. The Species Co-ordinator left IUCN in May 2000, and the Wetlands Co-ordinator left in May, 1998. Funding for these positions, from global thematic programmes in Gland, has not been renewed. With respect to administration and service

functions, the Review Team did not identify any issues that required further investigation, and was of the opinion that these functions were currently being handled very effectively. Nevertheless, it seems that the current proportion of administration staff to technical staff is too high.

Programmatically speaking, the situation described here certainly has an impact on the level of professional staff competency in the office. The direct relationship between this fact and the perception amongst members and other stakeholders concerning the relevance of the IUCN programme in South America has already been identified. A number of senior technical level staff positions in SUR are clearly lacking. Further detail with respect to the nature of these positions is provided in Section 4.5 below.

3.3 Existing Core Competencies

Administratively speaking, the Regional Office for South America presently has well established capacity in finance, member relations, communications, information management, and overall administration. As noted above, the Review Team felt that these functions were being handled very efficiently. In fact, it was the opinion of the Review Team that the professional and often innovative manner in which these functions were being addressed could well be an example for other regional offices within the Union.

Programmatically speaking, the only current area of technical expertise in SUR at present is in forest conservation. The Review Team noted that members and other stakeholders, including a number of key donor representatives, were very happy with the manner in which programme activities were being pursued in this sector. The Regional Director, the only other senior technical staff person presently on staff in SUR, is a professional with many years of experience in environmental planning, biodiversity conservation, and impact assessment. The Director, however, has many responsibilities including with the added responsibilities of pursuing development opportunities in Brazil and managing overall programme co-ordination issues.

3.4 Mandate

The issue of overall mandate for IUCN in South America has been an important issue on the agendas of a variety of regional and national members meetings over the past two years. The need for clarity on this key issue is a shared concern, by the membership, staff of SUR, and other interested parties. The Review Team noted that it has been a priority of the current Regional Director to work with the membership in South America in order to clarify this mandate, and equally as importantly to allay fears amongst this stakeholder group that IUCN would potentially compete for funds from sources upon which these organizations were dependant.

Based on the numerous reports from national and regional membership meetings which were reviewed, as well as discussions with member representatives themselves, the mandate for IUCN in South America may be expressed as a summation of the following 6 key areas:

- Catalyse regional and national level conservation initiatives in areas of global importance (e.g. wetlands);
- Facilitate the design, implementation, management, as well as monitoring and evaluation of a regional conservation programme in South America through working with members, building capacity, and identifying areas of complementarity;

- Act as a leader in the region into the research, development, and diffusion of approaches, strategies, and other tools necessary for the effective conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in the region;
- Promote the generation, sharing and use of conservation expertise at a regional level, through thematic or geographically based member and stakeholder networks;
- Facilitate and promote the implementation and/or adoption of global and regional conservation agreements (or policies) and support regional level policy development, capacity building and implementation in this regard;
- Promote agreements between public sector agencies, non-government organizations, and the private sector towards the adoption of innovative strategies for sustainable development.

The value added of IUCN in South America, due to its unique structure and membership, is clearly its ability to operate at a regional level on environmental issues – where governmental agencies and national level NGOs cannot. Given the cross-boundary nature of most environmental issues on the continent, IUCN is well placed to act in a co-ordinating, capacity building, information sharing, as well as in a programme development and delivery capacity at this level. The membership, in addition, would be well disposed to work with IUCN in this manner. Clearly, this approach poses significant hurdles for IUCN with respect to programme development and funding, as it is traditionally difficult to obtain funding for regional level activities in South America. While this concern must be monitored closely, it is the opinion of the Review Team, however, that in partnership with members in the region these hurdles are not insurmountable.

4. Issues Emerging from the Analysis

A number of specific issues, both expected and unexpected, arose during the course of this review, which are discussed below. One significant issue, touched on above, which is self-evident to many but at times overlooked in strategic terms within IUCN, is the question of biodiversity. South America is certainly one of the most biologically diverse continents on the planet. With respect to aggregate levels of species diversity amongst vertebrates and birds, South America contains 6 of the top 12 countries in the world. Five of the top 12 countries in the world in terms of amphibian diversity are also found in South America, as are 4 of the top countries in terms of superior plant species.

In economic terms, South America evolved rapidly, albeit not particularly smoothly, in the latter half of the last century and is currently a region which contains a number of significant “emerging economies”. Brazil, for instance, is the 7th largest economy in the world in terms of overall production. Chile and Argentina, despite current problems, are economically quite stable and in general have a very high standard of living.

This pace of economic development, in a region with a poor track record in environmental governance issues, has come at a high cost. Rates of land degradation, ecosystem fragmentation, biodiversity loss, and contamination are among the highest in the world. The gap between rich and poor is wide and becoming increasingly wider. In light of these issues, and given IUCN’s mission with respect to biodiversity conservation and human development, it is difficult to contemplate a reasonable scenario for the future wherein IUCN is not present in South America.

4.1 Regional Director

A number of scenarios for the future of the IUCN SUR office have been outlined in the following section of this report. What is common to all of these scenarios, however, is the need to have the Regional Director for SUR based in the same location as the Regional Office. This situation would create a more effective management structure and consolidate the current level of technical capacity for IUCN in the region. It is strongly recommended by the Review Team, therefore, that this transfer be completed without delay.

An issue, which should also be noted here is the fact that the Regional Director’s responsibilities for Brazil are stipulated in this person’s contract of employment. No mention, however, of the Regional Director’s specific responsibilities with respect to Brazil may be found in the terms of reference for this position. While not central to this review, it is the recommendation of the Review Team that a similar situation of significant divergence between responsibilities laid out in an employment contract for a senior position and those of the terms of reference for the same position not be repeated in future.

4.2 Geographic Coverage and Location of the SUR Office

South America is roughly the size of sub-Saharan Africa, an area of the world where IUCN maintains 4 regional offices and a series of 10 national offices. South and Southeast Asia are also served by one regional office and a series of 6 national offices. Geographically speaking, running a regional programme for South America from Quito is similar to running a regional programme for North America (Mexico, USA, and Canada) solely from Miami, or a regional

programme for sub-Saharan Africa solely from Cape Town. Feasible, perhaps, in both instances, but not necessarily effective from a logistical or “representativeness” point of view.

Despite this constraint, it was acknowledged by most stakeholders that Quito is still a reasonable location for a regional office with responsibility for all of South America. The office is well established and, from an administrative point of view, functioning very efficiently. The cost of living in Ecuador is moderate compared to some its neighbours. Ecologically speaking, most of the main ecosystems of particular interest to IUCN are found in or near the Andean region. Telephone and Internet communications are reasonable, however Quito is not as well served by international airline connections as compared to other capital cities in South America.

Although Quito is a good choice for a regional office for South America, the difficult logistical constraints this entails remain. It is difficult and time consuming to travel from Quito to Montevideo or Buenos Aires, and the cost of these trips is generally higher than an airline ticket to Europe. Given these constraints, it is extremely difficult to service the needs of the well-developed membership in the region and address key environmental issues in an effective manner. The low level of senior technical staff currently in the SUR office compounds this problem.

What has become exceedingly clear during the course of this review is, over the medium to long term, the need for IUCN sub-regional offices in South America. South America is far too large and diverse to have a regional programme effectively developed and implemented via one regional office. In order to address this issue, at least two potential country or sub-regional offices (or focal points) should be considered, particularly Brazil as well as the “Southern Cone” countries.

4.3 Support from IUCN Headquarters

In terms of support from Headquarters, two areas of concern were noted. Specifically, these are support in the development of regional thematic programmes in the region as well as introduction and training on IUCN systems, methods, and approaches to programme development. In terms of the latter issue, this is discussed more fully under section 6.1 below.

With respect to the development of thematic programmes in the region, the Review Team noted that current levels of support to SUR from headquarters are low with respect to other regional programmes. At present, only the Global Forest Programme is providing funding for the ongoing development of a regional forest initiative. It is also perhaps worthwhile to point out that in the past 18 months there have only been two visits from IUCN Headquarters to the regional office in Quito.

In the past, the Water and Wetlands Programme, Species, Protected Areas, Biodiversity, Monitoring and Evaluation and other programmes (including Forests) provided support to SUR in order to build professional technical capacity on staff and develop a programme of work in the region in these areas. Water and wetlands was also indicated by many IUCN members as an obvious niche area for IUCN in South America, given the importance of this sector in South America, IUCN’s expertise in this area, as well as the fact that no other international conservation organisation currently has an integrated programme of work in wetlands on the continent.

This situation is unfortunate on a number of levels, some of which have already been identified in Section 2.3 above. In particular, initial investment from Headquarters in the first years of IUCN’s presence in the region came at a time when it was not at all clear, with respect to the relationship

with members in South America, how IUCN could develop a programme of work there. Early efforts in this regard tended to alienate the membership and create further barriers to programme development.

The unique role for IUCN in the region and its modus operandi for working with membership is currently much clearer, due in large part to the efforts of the current staff in SUR to repair relations in this regard. At the same time, however, support from global thematic programmes has fallen off dramatically, due in large part to past experience and the poor results in terms of project development which occurred during the initial era of investment.

4.4 Core Competencies IUCN must bring to its Work in South America

As noted in section 3.2 above, it is necessary for the senior technical staff complement (currently 2 persons – one of which is the Regional Director) to be strengthened in the Regional Office for South America if a coherent programme is to be established and maintained in the region. Key thematic areas which should be given priority are water and wetlands, biodiversity, climate change, World Heritage Areas, as well as marine and coastal issues. Forest conservation, of course, is another major area of work that was identified, however it was also recognised that IUCN's efforts in this sector are at present very good. These sectors were repeatedly singled out by participants in this review as areas where little effective work was currently being carried out on a regional basis, and where IUCN could most easily bring to bear its comparative advantage in the region.

Ideally, as noted in the earlier discussion under staffing, it is estimated that a total of 5 senior technical staff persons would be required in the region in order to be effective in demonstrating IUCN's competency in these areas. Responsibilities for the thematic sectors noted above would be distributed in the most efficient manner possible amongst these staff.

4.5 Degree of Interaction with Donors

The Review Team noted that interaction with donors and potential donors in the region were relatively weak. Senior staff in SUR identified few established contacts with bi-lateral donor representatives in Quito to the Review Team, the major exceptions being the Dutch Embassy and the Swiss Development Corporation. Contacts with multilateral agencies, on the other hand, particularly the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, were extremely good. The representatives for these organizations in close contact with IUCN SUR were based in Washington.

It is the opinion of the Review Team, however, that the situation described with bi-lateral donors is not due to lack of effort on the part of SUR staff. One serious issue is that, for the past 12 months, there have only been 2 senior staff members in the office with the necessary background and experience to interact effectively with potential donors, both of whom have multiple responsibilities given the current staffing situation. More importantly, however, the membership in the region has made it clear that they do not wish to see IUCN as a competitor for funding. Since all of these members essentially operate at a national or local level, traditional bi-lateral donors represent a major source of funds for these organizations.

Within this context, the emphasis on multi-lateral funding agencies with more flexibility to finance activities at a regional level, a clear niche area for IUCN in South America, makes sense, and these efforts should be continued. Much greater effort in future, however, should be devoted to

exploring avenues of cooperation with bi-lateral donors (and private foundations) in bi-national or regional level undertakings, in partnership with members.

4.6 The Southern Cone Sub-Region

The Southern Cone sub-region, comprising Argentina, Chile and Uruguay, is an area under-developed in programmatic terms. Conversely, however, it is an area with a well-developed and active membership, particularly in Argentina. A number of important constraints to developing a programme in this sub-region currently exist. Air travel links between Ecuador and the Southern Cone countries are generally not efficient. This logistical issue was also noted as one of the constraints in undertaking the strategic review. Moreover, traditional sources of donor funding are essentially unavailable in these countries due to their degree of economic development.

A major difficulty, of course, in improving this situation will be start-up funding. In the short term, IUCN likely does not have the resources to establish a Secretariat focal point in the sub-region, an undertaking which would likely require a budget of approximately USD100,000 annually. In the medium term, however, it is difficult to conceive of a comprehensive and coherent IUCN programme in South America, which does not effectively include the Southern Cone. The Union may wish to consider non-traditional options such as "sub-contracting" representational and focal point responsibilities to a local member or national committee, in order to reduce costs and explore new approaches to working in this sub-region. It is important in consolidating IUCN's presence in South America, however, that this sub-region not be marginalised in future strategic planning and programme development exercises.

4.7 The Guyana Sub-Region

The countries of the Guyana sub-region, comprising Guyana, Suriname and French Guyana, as opposed to the Southern Cone countries, is a forgotten sub-region of South America within IUCN. In fact, it became increasingly clear when discussing strategic programme issues with many of IUCN's members, IUCN staff, and other stakeholders that, despite shared geography, the countries of the Guyana sub-region are not actually considered part of the region in programmatic terms.

The reasons for this situation are not difficult to understand. Air travel and other communication links between Quito and these countries are extremely difficult. South America is a very large continent, even without the countries of the Guyana sub-region, to effectively manage all-important programmatic issues from just one office. Moreover, the common working languages in these countries (English, Dutch, and French respectively) does not facilitate easy interaction between this sub-region and the predominately Spanish and Portuguese speaking areas of the continent.

In the short term, it is not expected that the SUR Office or IUCN in general will have any excess capacity to begin exploring programme possibilities in the countries of the Guyana sub-region. In the medium term, however, IUCN should not overlook these countries. This part of the continent is an area of unique biodiversity - increasingly under threat (with many of these threats originating in Brazil). Conservation International and WWF are active in these countries, and there may be avenues for IUCN to complement their work. IUCN currently has no members based in these countries, a situation that could be redressed. Finally, traditional donor funding opportunities, particularly in Guyana and Suriname, exist in these countries - more so than in many other countries on the continent such as Brazil and those in the Southern Cone sub-region.

5. Future Directions: Choices for the Way Forward

The following section describes the possible scenarios for the future of SUR presented to the Review Team by stakeholders in the process or which became self-evident during this exercise. These scenarios have not been ranked formally here, although the view of the Review Team concerning the viability of each is provided. A one-page summary table of all of the options described in detail here is provided in Annex 2. This table also provides an estimate of the financial impact the Union should expect from each of these. As noted earlier in this document in Section 4.1, all of the options described here (with the exception of closing the SUR Office altogether) take for granted the fact that the Regional Director should be based directly out of the Regional Office.

5.1 Business as Usual

Clearly, one possible option for IUCN's future in South America would be to maintain current staffing levels and programme activities as they are. Provided that the 2 senior technical positions currently vacant are not filled, it would be feasible under this scenario for the Regional Office to operate within the limits of its current confirmed income and General Programme allocation for the year. The regional office for IUCN would be maintained and the financial risk to the Secretariat would be greatly reduced or eliminated.

The "Business as Usual" approach, however, presents a variety of distinct disadvantages. Although the mandate and way forward for IUCN in South America has been clarified amongst the membership, the Regional Office currently has very little technical capacity to act on this mandate. The membership is acutely aware of this situation, as it has existed for some time. Most members interviewed are very interested in collaborating with IUCN based on the mandate as defined, within the context of the current regional strategic plan. Concomitantly, they question the value added of the IUCN presence in the region based on current levels of technical capacity in the office. In the opinion of the Review Team, this option would exacerbate the current situation of membership dissatisfaction with IUCN's activities and role in the region and likely result in the "natural death" of the office within two to three years.

5.2 Closure of the Regional Office for South America

The impact of closing the IUCN Regional Office in South America altogether was also considered by the Review Team. This option would have the distinct advantage of completely eliminating the current projected deficit in this programme and significantly reducing the overall financial risk for the Secretariat this year. Funds earmarked for SUR could be re-directed to other component programmes where there may be a greater likelihood of these resources generating a wider variety of project or programme spin-offs. This is, however, the only foreseeable benefit this option presents.

Closure of the office would present a number of distinct disadvantages. The SUR programme now has a clear strategic plan and, more importantly, a clear mandate, the latter developed with significant input and support from members in the region. The way forward in this regard is clear. Moreover important funding, new membership, and membership renewal possibilities exist on the continent. Finally, IUCN would face a situation where it would not be present on a continent of extremely high biodiversity and where threats to this biodiversity were equally as high.

Should this option be pursued, any new funding possibilities present in the region would effectively be lost, and membership would likely plummet. Provided the financial status of the Union as a whole does not dictate otherwise, it is the opinion of the Review Team that this does not represent a viable option for the future of the Regional Office for South America,

5.3 Closing of Quito Office – Opening of a Small Regional Office in Brazil

At present the level of scepticism amongst members, particularly in the Andean and Southern Cone regions, that IUCN can re-establish a meaningful programme in South America is relatively high. In Brazil, however, recent additions to membership and the resurrection of the National Committee suggests that a positive basis for developing a programme may exist here. This situation, therefore, presents a possible scenario that would entail closing the current Regional Office in Quito, which has been performing relatively poorly from a programmatic perspective, and opening a small regional office in Brazil.

This option would certainly allow for a fresh start for IUCN in the region, and could be managed within existing budget constraints. Moreover, this option would also further improve IUCN's presence in Brazil, building on the successful work in this regard carried out over the past 18 months there.

The potential constraints to operationalising this scenario, however, are significant. Foremost among these is the very strong likelihood of further disenfranchising a wide body of membership based in the Andean and Southern Cone countries who are already dissatisfied with IUCN's work of late. In addition, basing the regional office in Brazil may further exacerbate, within the context of IUCN's work at least, problems associated with the fact that Brazil plays a hugely dominant role politically and economically on the continent. It was the opinion of the Review Team that, while the ability to balance the Regional Office budget this year within this option may be appealing, the advantages presented do not sufficiently outweigh the associated disadvantages. This option should only be considered as a possibility only in the event that financial issues are of an overwhelming concern.

5.4 Reduce Operations in Quito Office – Open Formal National Office in Brazil

This option would allow IUCN to maintain a presence in the Andean region, which has been the base of much of the Union's work on the continent for the past 9 years, and would continue to build on work already underway in Brazil. Moreover, it would likely be possible to maintain a small regional office in Quito and a small national office in Brazil within the current budget allocation for SUR.

The primary disadvantage of this arrangement, as well as with the previous option and that which follows below, is that IUCN's presence in South America is essentially reduced to a representational function. Member representatives and other stakeholders repeatedly made clear during the course of this study that they wished to see IUCN increase its technical capability in the region, establish a number of clear core competencies in programmatic terms, and increase its value added to the membership and region as a whole. Reducing IUCN's presence in South America to a representational function, irrespective of the number of country or sub-regional focal points, which may be established, would not serve the needs of the Union as perceived by the majority of those consulted during this exercise.

A number of other disadvantages with this option are also apparent. Most significant amongst these is the issue that the low level of technical capacity this option entails virtually ensures that the Regional Office for South America will require a very high degree of unrestricted funding in future in order to cover the bulk of its operating costs. Similar to Scenario 5.3 above, the Review Team is of the opinion that this option should only be considered in the event that financial issues are of an overwhelming concern.

5.5 Reduce Quito Office – Open Brazil National Office and Sub-Regional Office for Southern Cone

This option is essentially identical, in terms of possible advantages and disadvantages, as that discussed in Scenario 5.4 above. An additional benefit arising from this approach, however, is the establishment of an IUCN presence in the Southern Cone sub-region. This is an area of particular interest from a biodiversity standpoint for IUCN, which has been overlooked in programmatic terms, and is also an area where the IUCN membership is well developed and active.

There are a variety of modalities for accomplishing a strategy of sub-regionalisation in South America. The model of IUCN regionalisation, which exists in the Africa or Asia regions, of course, need not be the model applied in South America. A system of focal offices or persons in a number of key locations outside of the regional office in Quito would likely be more cost-effective, at least initially.

In terms of structure, these sub-regional focal points could be developed under the direct auspices of the IUCN Office for South America and function as integral components of the Secretariat. Alternatively, IUCN members or National Committees could be given the task of managing these sub-regional offices. The rationale in developing these focal points could also be thematic in nature rather than simply geographic. A particular focal point, in addition to providing sub-regional coordination, could become the regional-level centre of expertise in, for instance, water and wetlands or other thematic areas of the Union.

With respect to budget, however, it is unlikely that an office in the Southern Cone sub-region, in addition to a small regional office in Quito and national office in Brazil, could be managed within the current allocation for SUR. Moreover, it was also noted by a number of participants in the review process that this approach may lead to the “Balkanisation” of IUCN’s activities in the South American region and the creation of un-necessary barriers if overall co-ordination were weak. It is the opinion of the review team, therefore, that this option should not be pursued without the existence of a strong technical and representational focal point anchoring IUCN’s presence in the region (discussed further under scenarios 5.7 and 5.8 below).

5.6 An Integrated Programme for Latin America

The IUCN regional programmes in South America and Meso-America were often compared and contrasted during the course of this review by participants in the process who were familiar with both. Although consideration of this option was not within the terms of reference for this exercise, it is nonetheless noted here as it does present an interesting possibility for the future of IUCN in Latin America.

Meso and South America have a number of things in common. Integrating the regional offices for Meso and South America could provide a key stimulus to IUCN’s work in South America by building on the significant technical capacity and experience present in Meso-America. It may

also be possible to achieve greater economies of scale by merging the administrative support and service functions carried out by both IUCN offices in San José and Quito.

While this may appear, at least initially, as a potentially viable way forward, the complexities inherent in merging two regional offices are such that many issues remain unaddressed and were outside of the scope of this review to explore. It may indeed be possible to achieve certain economies of scale, however other costs (such as travel) would likely go up. It would also be necessary for sub-offices to be established, as the new Latin American region would be far too large for one office to handle - perhaps further increasing costs depending on the approach taken. The question of where to locate the regional office under this scenario also has the potential of becoming a contentious issue. Given these and a variety of other complexities regarding this approach, it was not possible for the Review Team to come to any formal conclusion concerning this option. A full and accurate proposal in this regard would necessarily require a separate study.

5.7 Strengthen IUCN's Regional Presence in South America

The four key elements of this scenario are the following: Maintaining the regional office in Quito, significantly improving the current technical capacity there, relocating the Regional Director to Ecuador as soon as possible, and continue efforts to build IUCN's presence in Brazil.

In order to successfully act on this option it is necessary to put in place a coherent and successful programme on the ground, building on and complementing the expertise of members as well as clearly demonstrating IUCN's value added in the region. The problem at present, as noted above, is not the lack of a clear strategic plan or mandate. Rather, there is a severe shortage of senior technical staff to develop and concretise the strategic plan and mandate. Thus, should this option be acted upon the current vacancies of Programme Co-ordinator and Programme Officer (Biodiversity) should be filled as a matter of urgency. In addition, all efforts should be made to secure a senior level secondment or a junior professional officer in order to complement the skills of the SUR technical staff and help obtain the necessary "critical mass" within the programme team required in a region of the size and diversity of South America, along with the high degree of professionalism and expertise exhibited from the IUCN membership there.

All efforts must also be made to cut operating costs within the SUR office. The current budget relating to non-staff costs must be reviewed and an austerity budget put in place in order to cut costs to the greatest extent possible. In addition, and while acknowledging the efficiency of the administrative support in SUR, there is a need to bring the level of administrative support into balance with the complement of technical staff in the office.

Much more effort must be devoted to fundraising under this scenario. Provided a good technical team is put in place, the regional director should be able to devote much more time and effort to this high priority area. Ideally, any fundraising effort should be developed primarily with the support of the fundraising and donor relations units within headquarters, the PPET, the US office, and ORMA.

Finally, the positive efforts to develop an IUCN presence in Brazil, along with developing new membership opportunities, improving the capacity of the National Committee, as well as improving relations with the government of Brazil, should be continued. It is the opinion of the Review Team that Brazil is an extremely important country in the region that requires a unique

strategy. To halt efforts that have taken place in Brazil over the past 18 months, in the view of the Review Team, would seriously damage IUCN's reputation in this important country in the region.

This scenario has the multiple advantages of addressing the primary concerns of members/stakeholders regarding technical capacity and value added in the IUCN SUR Office, providing the necessary core competencies to build a strong, coherent, and self-sufficient programme, as well as continuing and building upon IUCN's presence in Brazil. The primary disadvantage of this option, however, is that it is certain to generate a significant budget deficit for at least the next two years, and perhaps three (please refer to Annex 8). Should programme development and implementation proceed as expected, however, it is estimated that the SUR budget could be balanced within 3 years. Despite this constraint, and provided that funding within the Secretariat as a whole is not of an overwhelming concern so as to rule out the possibility of absorbing a significant budget deficit in SUR, it is the opinion of the Review Team that this scenario should be given strong consideration.

5.8 Strengthen IUCN's Regional Presence, Including the Southern Cone

This option is essentially a variant of the scenario described in detail under item 5.7 above, where all of the advantages and disadvantages described therein would apply. This approach, however, would have the distinct additional advantage of building IUCN's presence in the Southern Cone countries. This is an area, as noted above, of particular interest from a biodiversity perspective and where there is a high level of existing support from a well-developed and established membership. At the same time, it is a region of the world long-neglected by IUCN. A comprehensive IUCN strategy for South America cannot logically exclude the Southern Cone region, and the establishment of an IUCN presence in this part of the continent would go a long way to ensuring the success of this strategy.

The primary disadvantage of this option, of course, is the significant increase in cost this would entail. It is estimated that the start-up costs of a small office or focal point in the sub-region would be in the area of USD 100,000 annually. A high budget deficit is already predicted under scenario 5.7 above. Opening of an addition sub-regional office (or even sub-contracting this to a local member or national committee) would further exacerbate this situation.

Ideally, given the current level of willingness amongst the membership to work closely with IUCN in the development of a comprehensive regional programme, IUCN should also be present in the Southern Cone sub-region. In the short term, however, this will likely not be possible given current budget constraints. In the medium to long term, as the SUR regional programme evolves and the financial situation stabilises, development options for the Southern Cone may be considered. In the meantime, particular attention should be focused on this sub-region wherever possible in the development of the IUCN programme in South America. It is the opinion of the Review Team, therefore, that this option not be considered at present but remain as a medium term goal in the development of IUCN's activities in the region.

5.9 Strengthen IUCN's Regional Presence, Discontinuing National-Level Efforts in Brazil

Again, this option is a variant of scenario 5.7 presented above. The primary difference, however, is that this approach calls for discontinuing current efforts in Brazil over the past 18 months in the development of a national office there.

The estimated cost of maintaining a small but permanent presence in Brazil is USD100,000 annually. In a situation where maintaining budget control is of overwhelming concern, largely discontinuing current efforts in Brazil would represent one of a number of straightforward options for keeping costs under control which would not incur staff retrenchment. This option, as a variant of option 7 above, would still entail a budget deficit over this year and next. However, this deficit would be significantly lower – by roughly the amount indicated above – than that indicated in Scenario 5.7

The fundamental disadvantage of this approach is that efforts to date in establishing an IUCN presence in Brazil would essentially be lost. Moreover, discontinuing efforts in this area may actually result in a backlash in Brazil amongst the membership (and potential membership), setting IUCN development efforts back a number of years in this country. Finally, discontinuing IUCN's current work in Brazil would ensure that the process of negotiating payment on membership dues with the Government of Brazil would become a very difficult (if not impossible) exercise. It is the opinion of the Review Team that all efforts should be made to maintain an IUCN presence in Brazil.

6. Concluding Comments

6.1 Training for Regional Directors and other Senior Staff

An issue that became exceedingly clear during the course of this review is the urgent need for an induction course for incoming regional directors and other senior staff with no previous experience in IUCN. This is particularly necessary for staff based outside of headquarters in Gland.

The success of regional programmes is dependent, to a very large degree, on a strong level of interaction with the global thematic programmes and Commissions based in headquarters. A significant level of funding for new programme development in regional offices may be secured internally within IUCN in conjunction with these programmes. Strategic planning, project planning, and M&E support is also available from the Programme, Policy and Evaluation Team. Additional support for regional programmes in terms of diversifying funding sources may be obtained from donor relations. It is essential, therefore, that any incoming regional director or senior staff be fully aware of these important relationships within the organisation.

The responsibility for adequately orienting incoming senior staff rests primarily with headquarters. The danger of not adequately orienting incoming senior staff, particularly in the regional offices, is to potentially create situations where the relevance and mandate of the programmes is endangered, and significant funding opportunities are lost.

6.2 Conducting Strategic Reviews in Future

Notwithstanding the constraints and limitations to this review outlined at the beginning of the report, which were significant in the view of the Reviewers, in general the process for this exercise went very well and the expected results for this review were obtained. One issue already mentioned under the review limitations, however, bears repeating here. Specifically, a strategic review of this type should be sufficiently resourced (in terms of time and budget) to allow for balanced face-to-face consultations amongst stakeholders throughout the region. Again, the SUR Strategic Review Team is of the opinion that the lack of consultations of this type (due to time and budget) outside of the Andean sub-region was a significant weakness in this study (and perhaps detrimental to member relations). In addition, the following issues should be taken into consideration in the preparation of exercises of this type in future:

6.2.1 Review Team Composition

The composition of the SUR Strategic Review Team worked very well for the assigned task, and could be used as a model for similar exercises in future. Specifically, a minimum of three persons is recommended for the review of a component programme. A high degree of background knowledge of the programme is required, as is knowledge of IUCN's overall programme and approach, objectivity, as well as necessary evaluation and language skills. These skills may be spread amongst the review team. At least one member of the team must be a senior programme employee with IUCN, preferably on the Senior Management Team.

6.2.2 Timeframe

It is estimated that a minimum of 8 person/weeks is required to adequately review a component programme with a three-person team. It is highly recommended that within this timeframe a

continuous and overlapping commitment of 2 weeks per team member (6 person/weeks) be made during the course of the review itself. This will have implications with respect to other professional commitments of IUCN staff on the review team.

6.2.3 Logistical Support

It is expected that the review team will require a high level of administrative and logistical support. The component programme in question should be prepared to provide this support. Support of this nature may be estimated as 2 person/weeks.

6.2.4 Briefing and Transparency

It is important that staff working in the component programme subject to a strategic review be fully briefed throughout the process. These staff should also participate in development of the specific terms of reference of the exercise.

6.2.5 Data Collection Process

Given the complexity of IUCN's programmes and the variety of stakeholders involved, the use of electronically distributed questionnaires as a data collection tool is almost unavoidable. Given this reality, it is important that stakeholders consulted in this way are fully briefed on the purpose of the review well in advance of the main body of work (minimum 2 weeks suggested). Also, electronic questionnaires should be distributed no later than one week in advance of the main body of work in the review, so that there is sufficient time available for follow-up if required.

It should also be noted that the questionnaires initially designed for this process were useful, with some modification, for members and other organisational stakeholders. The Review Team found, however, that the questionnaire was not particularly applicable to addressing the particular points of view of Commission members or heads of global thematic programmes. These two important stakeholder groups should be given more specific attention when formulating future data gathering tools such as questionnaires in reviews of this type.

6.2.6 Learning and Information Sharing

It was the experience of the SUR Strategic Review Team that this exercise was a powerful learning and information sharing experience for all stakeholders involved. Members, Donors, and other non-Secretariat stakeholders were impressed with the seriousness with which IUCN approached the issue of reviewing and improving the operations of a component programme. The renewed optimism created amongst stakeholders during the course of this review should be acted upon as soon as possible. Likewise, IUCN staff at all levels appreciated the opportunity to discuss the issues arising from the review in depth. The SUR Review Team recommends that strategic reviews become a regularly used tool for learning and information sharing within the Union.

List of Annexes

1. [List of Persons Contacted](#)
2. [Future Directions for the South America Regional Office – Summary Table](#)
3. [Analysis Matrix – Questionnaire and Interview Data](#)
4. [Documents Consulted](#)
5. [Terms of Reference](#)
6. [Interview Guide](#)
7. [Financial analysis of Scenario 5.7, Future Directions](#)
8. [Summary of comments from SUR staff on the draft report of the Strategic Review](#)
9. [Strategic Review - Regional Office for South America \(January, 2001\)](#)

PERSONA	INSTITUCIÓN/FUNCIÓN	FECHA DE ENTREVISTA/CONTACTO	TELÉFONO	E-MAIL
EX-STAFF UICN SUR				
Juanita CASTAÑO	Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores Colombia Ex-Representante Regional UICN-SUR 1994-1998	Martes 30 Enero Entrevista personal Bogotá 13h30-15h30	Phone: (57-1) 2177853 (57-1)5627657-59	vraseso02@minrelext.gov.co
Tarcisio GRANIZO	TNC Especialista en Áreas Protegidas Unidad Técnica Regional	MARTES 23 Entrevista personal 12H00	Phone: 593 2 248 588 / 6 249 872 Fax: 593 2 462 217	tgranizo@q.tnc.org.ec
Bernardo ORTÍZ ECUADOR	TRAFFIC Director Regional	MIERCOLES 24 15h00 Entrevista personal	Phone: 593 2 466 622 ext. 401 Fax:593 2 466 624	bernardo.ortiz@traffic.sur.iucn.org
Ana PUYOL	Coordinadora de la ENB en Ecuador - Proyecto con el PNUD Y MIN.DE AMBIENTE	MIERCOLES 24 10H30	Phone 593 2 523 269	anapuyol@ambiente.gov.ec
Segundo COELLO	Ex Coordinador Programa UICN	MIERCOLES 24 9h00 Entrevista Personal	Phone: 593 2 26 48 55 celular 593 2 9 756 169	s_coello@hotmail.com
REPRESENTANTES DE ORGANIZACIONES MIEMBRO ENTREVISTADOS PERSONALMENTE EN ECUADOR				
Ricardo MORENO	F. NATURA Director Ejecutivo Miembro del Comité Nacional	MARTES 23 16H00 Focus Group	Phone: 593 2 503 391 / 2	rmoreno@fnatura.org.ec
Marco ENCALADA	Corporación OIKOS Gerente General Miembro Comité Ecuatoriano	MARTES 23 16H00 Focus Group	Phone: 593 2 242 524/ 6 462 012 Fax: 593 2 461 212	oikos@uio.satnet.net

Luis SUÁREZ ECUADOR	F. ECOCIENCIA-ECUADOR Punto Focal ENB Miembro Comité Nacional	MARTES 23 16H30 Focus Group	Phone: 593 2 451 338/ 339 Dom. 593 2 897 622 cel. 09 806 378	ecobio@hoy.net
Ma. Helena JERVIS ECUADOR	F. ANTISANA Directora Ejecutiva Miembro del Comité Nacional Ex- Coordinadora del CN	MIERCOLES 24 11H00 Entrevista personal	Phone: 593 2 260 381/2 cel. 593 2 9 709454 dom. 593 2 492 295	mhjervis@uio.telconet.net
REPRESENTANTES DE ORGANIZACIONES MIEMBROS ENTREVISTADOS PERSONALMENTE EN COLOMBIA				
Eduardo Guerrero	CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL Ex Director Ejecutivo FEN- Ex Coordinador CN	LUNES 29 16H00 – 18H00 Hotel Howard Johnson Plaza ubicado en la siguiente dirección: Calle 71A No. 5-47 Tel. 3171100	Apartamento: 6294336, Oficina: 3146371 ó 3452852, Celular:033-3096701	eduardoguerrero@tutopia.com
Luis Guillermo Henao	INGUEDE Director Ejecutivo Miembro de Comisión Supervivencia y Especies	Martes 31 17h30-19h30	Phone: 57-1-2219332 Fax: 57-1-2217995	inguede@andinet.com
Alexander SILVA Astrid Puente (Abogada ambientalista)	FUNDEPUBLICO Director Ejecutivo miembro de CDA	MIERCOLES 1º. Febrero 14h00 – 17h00 Entrevista personal	Phone: 57 1 2104586 57 1 2100 839 fax: 57 1 2117077	fundepublico@cable.net-co
Guillermo Hurtado	CORPOCUENCAS Coordinador Comité Colombiano	DOMINGO 28 Entrevista personal	Phone: 57-2-8899407 Fax: 57-2-8896480 PHONE: 6652087	ccuerval@col2.telecom.co
Ximena Franco (Entrevista Personal) Elsa Matilde Escobar (Aportes via e-mail)	FUNDACIÓN NATURA Asistente de Dirección y Directora Ejecutiva	Miércoles 1 Febrero 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 Entrevista personal y aportes via e-mail	Phone: PBX – 57-1-3456188 57-1-2485820 fax : 57-1-2496250	enatura@impsat.net.co
Maria Camila Díaz Granados	FUNDACIÓN PRO SIERRA NEVADA DE SANTA MARTA Directora Ejecutiva	MARTES 31 Entrevista personal	Phone: 57-1-3100571 57-1.2173487	sevada@uniandes.edu.co

Rafael Colmenares	ECOFONDO Director Ejecutivo	MARTES 31 Entrevista personal	Phone: 57-1-6913442- 52- 63- 74- 85	
CONTACTOS TELEFÓNICOS MIEMBROS INSTITUCIONALES Y DE COMISIONES SUR AMERICA				
Javier GARCIA ARGENTINA	FUCEMA Miembro CN Argentino Ex Coordinador C. Nacional	JUEVES 25 11H00 Contacto telefónico	Phone: 54 1 981 4792 / 1538 / 0115	cacheng@fucema.org.ar
Armando HERNÁNDEZ VENEZUELA	F. POLAR (Miembro Afiliado) Coordinador Comité Nacional	JUEVES 25 9h00 Contacto telefónico	Phone: 58 2 2027547	armando.hernandez@fpolar.org.ve
Carmen MIRANDA	Estación Biológica del BENI Coordinadora Comité Nacional	JUEVES 25 13h00 VIERNES 26 17h00 (EC) contacto telefónico	Phone: cel. 59 1 1533931 dom. 591 -2 227659	cmiranda@mail.megalink.com
FORMULARIOS DILIGENCIADOS POR ORGANIZACIONES MIEMBRO				
Raúl Eduardo MANEYRO LANDO	SOCIEDAD ZOOLOGICA DEL URUGUAY Vocal	Formulario diligenciado 25 de Enero de 2001	Phone: (598-2) 5258618 int. 149	rmaneyro@fcien.edu.uy
Claudio C. MARETTI	Fundación Forestal, Secretaría de Estado del Medio Ambiente, de Sao Paulo	Formulario diligenciado 24 de Enero de 2001 Carta anexa escrita el 22 de Enero de 2001	Phone: (55-11) 2510005	cmaretti@uol.com.br
Ing. Javier Francisco ALVAREZ	FUNDACIÓN HABITAT Y DESARROLLO Director Ejecutivo	Formulario diligenciado 24 de Enero de 2001		habitat@unl.edu.ar
Eric Cardich	UNIVERSIDAD DE LIMA Coordinador Centro Estudios Ambientales	Formulario diligenciado 24 de Enero de 2001		ecardich@correo.ulima.edu.pe
Micha Torres	PRO NATURALEZA Fundación Peruana para la Conservación de la Naturaleza	Formulario diligenciado 23 de Enero de 2001	Phone: (51-1) 4413800	micha@pronaturaleza.com.pe

Eduardo Pires Castanho Fiho	FUNDO DE DESENVOLVIMIENTO FLORESTAL SAO PAULO Director Ejecutivo	Formulario diligenciado 25 de Enero de 2001		florestar@floresta.org.br castaño@floresta.org.br
Ana Maria Velazco	FUNDACIÓN HERPETOLÓGICA GUSTAVO ORCES (NG/1305) Directora Ejecutiva	Formulario diligenciado 24 de Enero de 2001	Phone: (593 2) 566309 o, 230 988	
PROYECTOS ASOCIADOS A UICN SUR				
Xavier IZKO ECUADOR	PROBONA Director	JUEVES 25 15h00 Entrevista Personal	Phone: 593 2 466 622 ext 305	xavier.izko@probona.sur.iucn.org
CONSEJEROS Y EX CONSERJEROS REGIONALES				
Silvia SANCHEZ PERU	APECO- PERU Presidenta Ejecutiva Consejera Regional Coordinadora del Comité Nacional UICN	MARTES 23 16H30 Focus Group- Ecuador	Phone: 51 1 2640094	silviasanchez@terra.com.pe peru.uicn@datos.limaperu.net
Sonia RIGUEIRA BRASIL	INSTITUTO TERRA BRASILIS consejera regional	MARTES 23 Vía telefónica ENTREVISTA EN SUIZA		Rigueira@terrabrasilis.org.br
Juan MAYR COLOMBIA	MINISTRO DEL AMBIENTE Ex Consejero Regional	MIÉRCOLES 31 de Enero 14h00 – 15h00 MARTES 30 17h00 – 18h00	Phone: 288 9897/ 6110 directo	Contacto Marcela Carvajal mcarvajal@minambiente.gov.co
PRESIDENTE(A) – VICEPRESIDENTE(A) MIEMBROS COMISIONES				
Denise HAMU BRASIL	PRESIDENTA CEC	Viá e- mail ENTREVISTA EN SUIZA		denise.hamu@mma.gov.br
Gustavo SUAREZ DE FREITAS PERU	Vicepresidente de WCAP	Contacto Via e- mail	Phone: celular 51 1 9003902	gustavosf@pronaturaleza.com.p e

Claudio Maretti BRASIL	CMAP Vicepresidente CMAP - Brasil	Contacto telefónico - Formulario miembros	Phone: 55-11-251 0004 Fax: 55-11-6232-4333 x 241	cmaretti@uol.com.br
Jorge CAILLAUX PERU	Vicepresidente de la CDA	JUEVES 25 11h45 Contacto telefónico	Phone: 51 1 421 1394	jcaillaux@drokasa.co.pe viva@terra.com.pe
Jorge RABINOVICH ARGENTINA	Comisión de Supervivencia de Especies punto Focal para el Cono Sur			rabinovi@netverk.com.ar
Maria MARCONI BOLIVIA	Vicepresidenta CEM (período anterior)			marconi@mail.megalink.com
STAFF DE LA OFICINA REGIONAL QUE DILIGENCIÓ FORMULARIO DE AUTO-EVALUACIÓN DE PERSONAL				
Verónica BENITEZ	Oficial de Comunicaciones Corporativas		593 2 466 622 (Central office telephone for all staff)	(Available from global contact list)
Valeria CHAMORRO VAZQUEZ	Coordinadora de Membresía			
Gilma DEL POSSO VERNAZA	Secretaria			
Mónica ESPINOSA CHAVEZ	Oficial Financiera			
Roberto FRANCO MESSIAS	Representante Regional			
Manuela GONZALEZ GARCES	Asistente de Programa			
Azucena LEON RAMIREZ	Secretaria-recepcionista			
Alvaro LUNA TERRAZAS	Coordinador del Programa de Bosques, Asesor Científico de SUR			
Tamara MONTALVO RUEDA	Coordinadora Administrativa-financiera			
María Mercedes MORALES MIÑO	Oficial de Comisiones			

Verónica NUÑEZ TERÁN	Asistente de Programa			
Gricelda RIVADENEIRA AGUIRRE	Asistente Administrativa-Financiera			
Denise RODRIGUEZ CISNEROS	Secretaria			

COORDINATORS AND STAFF OF GLOBAL THEMATIC PROGRAMMES

Bill Jackson	Coordinator of Global Forest Programme Headquarters	12 January, 2001 Personal interview	41 22 999 0264	bill.jackson@iucn.org
Simon Rietbergen	Senior Programme Officer Global Forest Programme Headquarters	19 January, 2001 Personal interview	41 22 999 0258	simon.rietberben@iucn.org
Jean Yves Pirot	Coordinator, Water and Wetlands Programme Headquarters	19 January, 2001 Personal interview	41 22 999 0256	jeanyves.piro@iucn.org
Wendy Goldstein	Head, Environmental Education and Communication, HQ	19 January, 2001 Personal interview	41 22 999 0282	wendy.goldstein@iucn.org
Christina Espinosa	Head, Social Policy Programme Headquarters	19 January, 2001 Personal interview	41 22 999 0266	christina.espinosa@iucn.org
Pedro Rosabal	Senior Programme Officer Parks and Protected Areas Programme, HQ	19 January, 2001 Personal interview	41 22 999 0163	pedro.rosabal@iucn.org
Mariano Gimenez-Dixon	Senior Programme Officer Species Programme Headquarters	19 January, 2001 Personal interview	41 22 999 0155	mag@iucn.org

DONANTES

Jan BAUER ECUADOR	Embajada del Reino de los Países Bajos JEFE	MIERCOLES 24 12H00 Entrevista personal	Phone: (+593) (0) 2 229 229/32 fAX: (+593) (0) 2 567 917 CELULAR: (+593) (0)9 806 350	holgui@attglobal.net
----------------------	--	--	--	--

	Cooperación al Desarrollo			
Holger TAUSCH Representante para A. de Sur Galo SANCHEZ	COSUDE Agencia Suiza para el Desarrollo y la Cooperación	Jueves 25, 14h00 Entrevista personal	(593 2) 459 370	quito@sdc.net
Christian Albert Peter	Forest Team World Bank, Washington	02 February, 2001 Personal interview	1 202 458 4771	cpeter@worldbank.org

Future Directions – Regional Office for South America: Summary Table

Scenarios	Advantages	Disadvantages	Financial Risk ¹
1. Business as usual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible to balance budget if current technical staff openings are not filled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perpetuates situation of significant member dissatisfaction in region; Will likely result in “natural death” of office in 2-3 yrs 	3
2. Closing of office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elimination of deficit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to implement politically in region; Potential loss of membership in region; IUCN would be absent in region of extremely high biodiversity; Difficult to justify with Council. 	1
3. Closing Quito office; open small regional office in Brazil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would enable a fresh start to IUCN work in region; Could be managed within existing budget; Would further improve IUCN's presence in Brazil. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brazil issues would likely dominate region; Non-Brazil members would likely reject this (potential loss of membership). 	3
4. Greatly reduce size of Quito office; open small national office in Brazil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible to manage within current budget allocation; Maintains IUCN presence in region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May not be able to meet current obligations; Technical capacity remains low; Office will always require a high degree of flex funds for support; Members would continue to be dissatisfied with level of IUCN capacity in region. 	3
5. Greatly reduce size of Quito office; open national office in Brazil and sub-regional office for Southern Cone Countries ²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotes better relations with Southern Cone countries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not possible to manage within current budget; Would create barriers between sub-regions; All disadvantages in no. 4 above apply. 	4
6. Develop an integrated Latin American Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could reduce admin costs (economies of scale) Would improve integrated programming in Latin America 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates very large region – which would require sub-offices; Location of HQ in region would be a political issue; <i>This scenario requires much more study to evaluate accurately.</i> 	2-3
7. Improve existing technical capacity of regional office, reduce current operating costs, & continue current efforts in Brazil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates opportunities to capitalise on existing programme options; Improves regional unity/integration; IUCN becomes a major player on the continent; Creates opportunities to build/renew membership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will result in a significant budget deficit for minimum 2 yrs; Will also require a significant level of non-financial input/support from HQ; 	5
8. Improve existing technical capacity of regional office, reduce current operating costs, continue current efforts in Brazil, and develop a sub-regional focal point in the Southern Cone Countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates new opportunities to work with membership in Southern Cone region; All advantages in no. 7 above apply. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further increases existing budget deficit noted in no. 7 above; Other disadvantages in no. 7 also apply. 	5+
9. Improve existing technical capacity of regional office, reduce current operating costs, and discontinue efforts in Brazil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower, more manageable, budget deficit than option 7; All other advantages listed in no. 7 above apply. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would significantly impact IUCN's reputation in Brazil, and eliminate possibility of renewing Govt. of Brazil membership; All disadvantages in no. 7 also apply. 	4

¹ **1** – Significant cost savings; **2** – Possible cost savings; **3** – Balanced budget; **4** – Budget deficit (± CHF 250-300k); **5** – Significant deficit (± CHF 350-400k); **5+** - Very high deficit (± CHF 500-600k)

² A number of possible modalities exist with respect to the development of national or sub-regional focal points. For instance, these may be geographic or thematic in orientation. Also, they may be fully Secretariat focal points, Secretariat focal points based with a member or national committee, or focal points fully “sub-contracted” to a member or national committee.

Annex 3

Matrix: Analysis of interview and questionnaire responses

Primary Themes of the Review

Assignment of questions from questionnaires and interview guides

Geographic coverage & location of IUCN SUR						
Relations with Members and Commissions						
Relations with Global Thematic Programmes						
Financial Viability						
Effectiveness Efficiency and Structure						
Mandate/Role						
Relevance						
← Stakeholder Groups	Staff	Members	Global Thematic Programmes	Donors	Ex-staff members	

In each cell, the following analysis was undertaken:

- Summary and consensus of perceptions re: current situation
- Summary and consensus of perceptions re: the way forward

Shading refers to areas where this analysis was not applicable

Annex 4

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED (Organised by date)

UICN SUR, *Enero 21, 2001*. "Oficina Regional para América del Sur, Revisión Estratégica".

UICN SUR, *18 January 2001*. "South America, KRA Results : All KRA's by Programme, Budget, Result Activity"

UICN SUR. "Programa 2001-2004 de la UICN-Sur : La megadiversidad de América del Sur, un desafío para la conservación".

Gémin, M. Director General's Office, *December 2000*. "Letter to Silvia Sánchez Councillor (Presidenta Ejecutiva Asociación Peruana para la Conservación de la Naturaleza), 18 December 2000."

UICN SUR, Regional Office for South America. *November 2000*. "Annual Plan 2001, version nov/2000".

UICN SUR : Regional Office for South America. *23-10-00*. "Staffing Components (only Secretariat). One page of one.

IUCN, *2000*. "Plan Programme - Transition to Results Driven Programme". Pgs. 7. 8.

IUCN, *2000*. "Progress & Assesment Report, January - June 2000". Pgs. 29-30, 69-73.

SUR : Regional Office for South America. *Version November 2000*. "2001 Annual Budget".

The World Conservation Union Regional Office for South America, *November 2000*. "Projects Portfolio November 2000".

IUCN SUR, *September 2000*. "Bussiness Plan" - Draft-

UICN SUR, *Julio 2000*. "Memorias VIII Reunión del Comité Regional Sudamericano de Miembros : Principios, Políticas y Reglamentos que Guían el Accionar de la Unión Mundial para la Naturaleza en América del Sur". Documentos ANEXOS : 18a - "Reglamento del Comité Regional Sudamericano" ; 18b - "Documento Guía para la Formulación del Reglamento de los Comités Nacionales" ; 18c - "Lineamientos para el Proceso de Identificación y aprobación de proyectos de la UICN de América del Sur."

UICN SUR, *Julio 2000*. "Memoria del Talle de Evaluación SUR". Hacienda Georgia, 3-4 de Julio del 2000.

UICN SUR, *March 2000*. "Stepping into the New Millenium : IUCN's Quadrennial Programme 2001-2004" - Draft approved by IUCN council for adoption at the World Conservation Congress, Amman, Jordan, 4-11 October 2000.

UICN SUR, *1999*. "2000 Proposed Budget".

UICN SUR, *Noviembre 1999*. "Programa de la Unión Mundial para la Naturaleza en América del Sur para el Periodo 2000- 2005 - Un mundo justo que valora y conserva la Naturaleza". (Documento para uso exclusivo de los constituyentes de UICN, no para distribución).

UICN Sur - Messias Franco, R. Regional Representative for South America. *21 October 1999*. "SUBJECT : IUCN-SUR Programme and Budjet for 2000".

UICN SUR - Segundo Coello, *1 September 1999*. "Memorandum : Advances of programme preparation in SUR". 2 pages.

UICN SUR, *Octubre 1999*. "VII Reunión del Comité Regional Sudamericano de Miembros, - Memoria-".

UICN SUR - Comité Colombiano UICN, *Septiembre de 1999*. "La UICN vista por los miembros Suramericanos : Percepciones sobre la Unión, Capacidades y Expectativas de la Membresía en América del Sur".

UICN SUR, *March 1, 1999*. "Strategy 1999 : "Situation of IUCN-SUR and Future Strategies".

Oficina Regional para América del Sur, *Octubre de 1999*. "VII Reunión del Comité Regional Sudamericano de Miembros - Ayuda de Memoria". Octubre 13 al 15 de 1999.

IUCN SUR - Juanita Castaño, *November 1998*. "Final Report, Regional Representative, IUCN Regional Office for South America". Period : February 1995 - October 1998.

UICN SUR, *Agosto 6, 1998*. "UICN SUR Programme and Budget 1999" (Sent to David McDowell, GD, cc to Patrick Dugan DGP, by Juanita Castaño RR.)

UICN SUR - Natalia Ortiz, *Julio 25, 1998*. "Informe : Síntesis del Proceso de Diseño del Programa Trienal de UICN Sur".

Kimball, Lee A. *1-20-98*. "Review of IUCN-US Members' collaboration with Partners in Latin America and the Caribbean"

UICN SUR, *November 12, 1997*. "1998 Proposed Budget (in US dollars) Regional Office for South America, C C 9 3".

NEI - Netherlands Economic Institute - Montoya, M. & Cornelissen, W. Quito, *Julio de 1997*. "Informe de Evaluación de la Primera Fase del Proyecto Manglar : Manejo

Comunitario y uso Sostenible de las áreas de Manglar en los Cantones Eloy Alfaro y San Lorenzo de la Provincia de Esmeraldas, Ecaudor”.

Cooperación Suiza al Desarrollo, Ref. No. t.300-33 (201) - Zanetti, L. & Galves Ríos, M. La Paz/ Quito/ Berna, *31 de Octubre de 1996*. “PROBONA, Programa Regional de Bosques Nativos Andinos en Bolivia y Ecuador, IC/UICN/COSUDE - Evaluación Externa 2 al 28 de Septiembre de 1996.

Van Ginneken, P. & Bernale A. 1994. “Informe de la Misión de Evaluación de Medio Término del Proyecto UICN/Holanda : Apoyo al Programa Regional UICN en Améria del Sur”. 29 de Agosto a 17 de Septiembre 1994.

UICN SUR - Mac Farland, C. & de Oliveira Costa, J.P., Budowski, G., Julio 1994. “Informe sobre la Evaluación del Programa de la UICN en América del Sur (Programme Review)”.

Annex 5

Regional Office for South America (SUR) – Strategic Review

Terms of Reference

Introduction

The purpose of Strategic Reviews in IUCN is to analyze, on either a regular or selective basis, the strategic focus, relevance, effectiveness/efficiency, and financial viability of an organizational unit within the Union. The organizational units normally implicated in reviews of this type are global thematic programmes, regional programmes, country offices, and Commissions, although similar reviews may be adapted to other organizational units within IUCN (such as projects). Data and analysis from these reviews allow Senior Management, from time to time, to make key decisions concerning the future directions of a unit within the organization's overall strategic plan. These reviews differ significantly from in-depth technical programme reviews (or evaluations), as they seek to answer higher order strategic questions concerning mandate, strategic focus, organization and resource allocation within the unit.

Objectives of the Review

The objectives for the Strategic Review of the Regional Office for South America, of course, flow directly from the overall purpose of strategic reviews within IUCN as noted above. Specifically, the overall **objectives** of the review may be summarised as follows:

- Analysis of the strategic mandate of the programme – particularly in the context of the IUCN membership in SUR region. This analysis will be conducted in the context of IUCN current Quadrennial Plan and Business Plan recently approved by Council. It will take note of the strategic opportunities and benefits of an IUCN presence in South America for the Union, as well as its associated costs;
- Assessment of the financial viability and financial risk of the programme;
- Overview of the effectiveness and efficiency of SUR as an organizational unit within IUCN.

In addition to the overall objectives, two additional issues specific interest to the programme in question will also be analysed:

- Analysis of the approach and progress in establishing an IUCN office in Brazil;
- Assessment of the degree of interaction currently existing between SUR and other component programmes within the Union.

Ultimately, the review seeks to determine whether the Regional Office for South America has made optimum use of the investment of IUCN resources in the region, as well as what (if any) changes in the form or direction of that investment could be contemplated in order to improve the effectiveness of that investment in future.

Finally, a number of factors that contribute to overall effectiveness and performance, which are listed in the appendix to this document, will also be considered during the course of this review. These issues, such as the existence of basic management systems, will be assessed in checklist fashion and will be analysed in greater detail (time and resources permitting) provided any significant areas of concern are identified.

Methodology and Approach

The overall objectives noted above represent the primary focus of the review, and will be given priority weighting in the analysis of results and presentation of recommendations. The issues specific to the SUR Programme, as well as those contributing to overall management effectiveness and performance, will in most cases be accorded secondary importance in the presentation of results. In the case where a significant area (or areas) of concern are identified in the overview of management systems, the review team may propose that this issue be considered of primary importance in terms of the weighting of overall results.

The main stages of the strategic review (detail for each provided in the appendix of this document) will be the following:

1. Initial preparation
2. Data collection
3. Analysis and preparation of report
4. Presentation and discussion of the report

Collection of data necessary to conduct this review will be derived from the following sources:

1. Review of existing documentation (strategic, programmatic, financial)
2. Facilitating an initial workshop with staff in the unit to clarify objectives and approach;
3. Interviews with senior staff members and key individuals outside of the unit;
4. Focus groups sessions (issue or theme specific, etc.) if appropriate;
5. Development and distribution of questionnaires (if necessary);
6. Closing workshop with unit staff to discuss preliminary findings.

The identification of key questions to be addressed during the course of these reviews will provide the necessary framework both to analyse relevant background documents as well as to develop an interview guide. The definition of these questions will be the responsibility of the review team. Sample questions, developed by the IUCN M&E Initiative, are provided in the appendix to this document

The development of a list of individuals to interview during the course of the review will be the responsibility of the review team. Interviews should be conducted either in person or via telephone, and wherever possible be conducted by at least two interviewers on the review team. Questionnaires, circulated electronically or by other means, may also be used - although it may be necessary to follow on the submission of questionnaires with a short interview (provided confidentiality is not an issue) to help ensure data accuracy and improve response rates. At a minimum, the review team should draw on the following groups in the development of an interview list:

- Senior programme and administrative staff in the component programme being reviewed;
- Former staff members where appropriate
- Senior representatives of IUCN members in the country/region;
- Senior staff from other component programmes working with the unit being reviewed;
- Senior financial and administrative staff from IUCN-HQ

Steering Group and Review Team

The IUCN Senior Management Team has initiated and commissioned the Strategic Review of the IUCN Office for South America, as well as a number of other similar reviews. As such, the Senior Management Team will act as the steering group for this review and be the primary consumers of the results. The Senior Management Team will also provide guidance where necessary prior to and during the conduct of the review.

The rationale for the composition of the review team is based on the need for familiarity with the programme of the unit in question, knowledge of methodological approaches with respect to reviews of this type, as well as the necessity to have a senior IUCN staff member involved in the conduct of the review. Based on these criteria and the availability of staff, the team for this review will be made up of Enrique Lahmann (Regional Co-ordinator for Mesoamerica), Tom Hammond (Programme and Policy Team, HQ), as well as a local consultant knowledgeable of the programme to assist in field work component of the exercise. Enrique Lahmann will act as team leader for the review.

Timeframe and Reporting

It is expected that the review will be conducted over a two to three week period, split roughly between analysis of background material/write-up and field work. At present it is proposed that the visit to the SUR office in Ecuador take place during the week of January 22, 2001. Background document review would take place the week previous to this, while write up of the draft report would take place in the week subsequent to the field visit.

A draft summary report, containing the key findings and recommendations as well as an outline of the overall report, will be prepared within 1 week of the completion of the field work component of the review. A complete draft final report, taking into account comments or feedback received, will be prepared within 3 weeks of the completion of field work.

Appendix

Objectives: Key questions to be addressed

Strategic Mandate	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is the fundamental purpose for the existence of the unit clear – has the senior management of the unit adhered to that purpose?2. Is it strategically advisable for IUCN to maintain this unit in its current form – what recommendations can be made in this regard?3. How relevant is the unit's work in relation to its constituency (membership, donors, other IUCN component programmes)?4. How well respected or credible is the work of the unit, both within and outside IUCN?
Financial Viability	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. How broad is the funding base for the unit (number/variety of funding sources and level of support from these sources)?2. How dependant has the unit been on IUCN unrestricted funds over the past 3 years – what has been the trend?3. How effective has the unit been in securing external (non-IUCN) funding or its programme (trend over the past three years)?4. Has the unit been able to keep expenses within budget over the past three years?
Effectiveness/Efficiency	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is the current project pipeline (OABC list) sufficient to deliver on the planned programme as well as meet the needs of unit financial viability (above)?2. Has the unit been effective in achieving its own programmatic results and/or in contributing to those of the Union?3. Has the unit efficiently drawn on the resources available within the Union (other component programmes, Commissions, etc.) in order to maximise its effectiveness?4. Overall, how well has the unit managed its resources (staff time, funding)?5. How effective has unrestricted funding investment been in generating new initiatives for the unit or the Union as a whole?

Checklist of factors contributing to overall performance¹

Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) Does the unit have a strategic plan to guide its work?b) Is the plan aligned with the current IUCN Quadrennial Plan?
Structure	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) Does the structure of the unit (management, decision making) facilitate the achievement of results?b) Are roles and responsibilities of staff clearly defined?
Programme	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) Do staff at different levels receive adequate guidance from the senior managers of the unit?b) Is the programme of the unit integrated with that of other component programmes?c) How innovative are the projects and programme?
Stakeholders	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) What is the perception from donors of the unit's products and services – and how is the unit affected by trends in donor funding?b) What is the perception from membership of the unit's products or services?c) Within this context, has the unit developed a viable niche for itself?
HR Management	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) How well do staff profiles fit programme and project needs?b) What incentives exist for performance and career development?c) Is the overall working environment conducive to supporting good staff

¹ These will be addressed at a level of secondary importance to the Objectives noted above

	performance?
	d) Is there an effective performance appraisal system in place?
Financial Management	<p>a) What is the quality and timeliness of the financial information produced by the office?</p> <p>b) Has the unit been regularly audited?</p> <p>c) Do managers receive timely information on the financial status of their activities?</p>
Monitoring & Evaluation	<p>a) Does the unit have basic systems in place for ongoing monitoring and periodic evaluation of its programme?</p> <p>b) Are staff trained in approaches to monitoring and evaluation?</p>
Administrative Support	a) Is the necessary equipment, tools, and administrative staff support in place to ensure the smooth delivery of the programme?

The main stages of the Strategic Review are:

1. Initial Preparation:

- Identification of the unit to be reviewed – and the audience / client for the Review. (Who needs to know what.)
- Agreement on the purpose, objectives and uses of the Review – who will use the results for what purposes.
- Development of TOR and methodology for the Review, and identification of sources of data
- Selection of the Review Team and TOR for the Team
- Distribution of tasks among the members of the Team
- Identification of participants and preparation of protocols for interviews and questionnaires to be used.

2. Data collection

- Collection of reports, desk studies.
- Start-up workshops with participants of the review to clarify purpose, objectives, questions, data.
- Carrying out interviews (in person or by phone)
- Focus groups if appropriate
- Distribution and receipt of questionnaires (paper and electronic),
- Identification and review of the documentation
- Visits to members, partners and donors, etc.
- De-briefing workshop with unit staff at the end of the field work component of the exercise

3. Data analysis and preparation of Report.

- After entering data, the Review Team meeting to analyze the data, produce findings, reach conclusions and draft the Review Report.

4. Presentation and discussion of the report.

- Depending on the scope of the Review, the urgency of the matter and the time available there may be an several cycles of comment and response on the report before the report is considered final by the client.

Annex 6

IUCN STRATEGIC REVIEW: SOUTH AMERICA MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

IUCN South America is currently conducting a strategic review in order to build the organization's capacity and improve its services. We are asking that IUCN South America members take about 15 minutes to complete the following questionnaire to provide the members' perspective as a key part of the review.

Please fax your completed questionnaire back to *****. If you have any questions concerning the review or this questionnaire please contact ***** at *****

If any of your comments extend beyond the space provided please include them on a separate sheet of paper with the question number referred to clearly marked on each additional sheet.

Thank you for your input to this review.

1. Identification

- 1.1 Name _____
- 1.2 Position _____
- 1.3 Organization _____
- 1.4 Contact information (Phone, e-mail) _____
- 1.5 Date _____

2. Performance

	Very relevant	Somewhat relevant	Not very relevant	Not relevant at all	Do not know
2.1 How relevant are IUCN South America's activities and projects to the work of your organization?	0	0	0	0	0

- 2.2 Comments on 2.1 _____

	Very Clear	Clear	Some what unclear	Very unclear	Do not know
2.3 How clear is IUCN South America’s mandate to you?	0	0	0	0	0

2.4 Comments on 2.3 _____

	Appropriate	Location of no importance	Somewhat In appropriate	Not appropriate at all	Do not know
2.5 How appropriate is IUCN South America’s Quito office location for serving members in your view?	0	0	0	0	0

2.6 Comments on 2.5 _____

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Somewhat ineffective	Very ineffective	Do not know
2.7 How effective is IUCN South America’s leadership on conservation issues in your view?	0	0	0	0	0

2.8 Comments on 2.7 _____

	Very effective	Somewhat effective	Somewhat ineffective	Very ineffective	Do not know
2.9 How effectively is IUCN South America managed?	0	0	0	0	0

2.10 Comments on 2.9 _____

	No emphasis	Little emphasis	Adequate emphasis	Significant emphasis	Do not know
2.11 How much emphasis does IUCN South America place on the quality of the service it provides and projects it undertakes?	0	0	0	0	0

2.12 Comments on 2.11 _____

	Very innovative	Somewhat innovative	Adequate emphasis	Significant emphasis	Do not know
2.13 How innovative is IUCN South America perceived to be in its approach to working with members?	0	0	0	0	0

2.14 Comments on 2.13 _____

	Significant value	Adequate value	Little value	No value	Do not know
2.15 How much value does IUCN South America add to its members' programs and activities in your view?	0	0	0	0	0

2.16 Comments on 2.15 _____

	Significant value	Adequate value	Little value	No value	Do not know
2.17 How effective is IUCN South America in retaining members?	0	0	0	0	0

2.18 Comments on 2.17 _____

	Significant value	Adequate value	Little value	No value	Do not know
2.19 Is IUCN South America's membership sufficiently representative of South America's conservation community?	0	0	0	0	0

2.20 Comments on 2.19 _____

How important is each of the following to ensuring IUCN South America's success?

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Important	Very important	Of utmost importance
2.21 A strong emphasis on innovation in conservation activities.	0	0	0	0	0

2.22 Comments on 2.21 _____

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Important	Very important	Of utmost importance
2.23 Superior delivery of service in projects and programs.	0	0	0	0	0

2.24 Comments on 2.23 _____

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Important	Very important	Of utmost importance
2.25 Significant support to member organizations.	0	0	0	0	0

2.26 Comments on 2.25 _____

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Important	Very important	Of utmost importance
--	----------------------	--------------------	-----------	----------------	----------------------

2.27 Clear organizational vision.	θ	θ	θ	θ	θ
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

2.28 Comments on 2.27 _____

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Important	Very important	Of utmost importance
--	----------------------	--------------------	-----------	----------------	----------------------

2.29 Strong organizational values.	θ	θ	θ	θ	θ
------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

2.30 Comments on 2.30 _____

2.31 What do you feel are IUCN South America's strengths?

2.32 What do you feel are IUCN South America's weaknesses?

2.33 Are there any other comments you would like to add that you think may be relevant to our strategic review?

Please fax back the completed questionnaire to ***** by January *****

Thank you for your cooperation.

Annex 7

Regional Office for South America

Financial Estimate for Scenario 5.7 - Future Directions

Currency – US dollars

1. Current Proposed Budget - 2001	\$ 867,000
2. Recommended Austerity Budget - 2001	\$ 700,000

3. Confirmed Income	\$ 493,000
4. Estimated Income from Italian PA Project	\$ 35,000
5. Estimated Income from B list	\$ 50,000
6. Total	\$ 578,000

7. Difference between lines 2 and 6	\$ 122,000
8. Estimated cost of Brazil national office	\$ 100,000

9. Projected budget deficit - 2001	\$ 222,000
---	-------------------

1. Note – This estimate was based on budget estimates and the SUR ABC list valid as of February, 2001, and is subject to change.

Annex 8

SUR'S COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT OF THE STRATEGIC REVISION

1. The "Cono Sur" is not isolated. The Regional Office maintains a tight working relationship with Argentina, Uruguay and Chile. The Members were not contacted during the mission due to the fact that it took place during the holiday season (December to February or even March).
2. The level of response to the survey from the members was low due to the holiday season and also because they generally do not respond to surveys sent, independently of their provenience.
3. Fundraising (point 4.5): In this issue SUR faces a dilemma in that it has a weak institutional fundraising framework and is at the same time facing the possibility of competing with the Members for available funds. There are two alternatives to these problems. Regarding the weak fundraising framework, SUR would be in a position to establish relations with important donors only if there is more transparency and openness from headquarters. Regarding the relationship with the members, it is a matter of image and it should be made clear that SUR, when presenting projects to donors will do so with the members' co-operation.
4. It is important to recognise Roberto's work in Brazil. In fact, IUCN's presence in that country was not strong, until headquarters requested a closer working relationship with the Brazilian Committee and a strengthening of the membership.
5. Regarding point 4.3 we would like to clarify that the only person from headquarters who had visited SUR was Cristina Espinosa, from the Social Policy Programme who came to Quito last November to attend a Workshop on Gender and Management of Natural Resources.
6. We consider that there are three alternatives for discussion: Concerning alternative 5.5 SUR has a question: What does cost-effective mean; and what are the parameters for comparison?

Regarding alternative 5.6 we believe that joint efforts will strengthen both Regional Offices, ORMA and SUR. However, to control one Latin American Office will become unmanageable.

We believe that alternative 5.7 is more in line with the present situation and with the work accomplished during the past 18 months. It would be interesting to define together with headquarters the conditions require to carry. It should be made clear in this proposal that Cono Sur would continue to be under the responsibility of the Regional Office in Quito.

7. We would like to make some clarifications concerning the document:

The post of Ana Puyol as Education Co-ordinator was partially financed with funds provided by GEF through the UNDP (not the BMZ as mentioned in the report). The second phase of

the BMZ project has nothing to do with the UNDP project and we are not sure whether or not a proposal will be presented.

SUR has not initiated a negotiating process for the second phase of the National Biodiversity Strategy

The Species Co-ordinator left IUCN on 31 March 2000 (not May as mentioned in the report)

The Wetlands Co-ordinator left IUCN in May 1998.

List of Annexes

1. List of Persons Contacted
2. Future Directions for the South America Regional Office – Summary Table
3. Analysis Matrix – Questionnaire and Interview Data
4. Documents Consulted
5. Strategic Review - Regional Office for South America (January, 2001)
6. Terms of Reference
7. Interview Guide
8. Financial analysis of Scenario 5.7, Future Directions