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# DRAFT AGENDA

Saturday, 30 March 2019 – Plenary sittings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:10</td>
<td>Agenda Item 1: The President’s opening remarks and approval of the agenda</td>
<td>C/96/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agenda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10-9:25</td>
<td>Agenda Item 2: Matters brought forward by the Bureau (unless included under</td>
<td>B/76/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other relevant items of the present agenda)</td>
<td>(agenda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C/96/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:25-11:00</td>
<td>Agenda Item 3: Report of the Director General including:</td>
<td>Cf. C/95/3/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic Risk Matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approval of the Director General’s Objectives for 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:30</td>
<td>Agenda Item 4: Strategic discussion</td>
<td>C/96/4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 External Evaluation of IUCN’s governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of the findings and recommendations of the external consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. D. Cossin, whose written report is due March 15, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-15:30</td>
<td>4.1 External Evaluation of IUCN’s governance (continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-17:30</td>
<td>4.2 Transition towards a new IUCN Director General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This item will be introduced on behalf of the Bureau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-18:30</td>
<td>4.3 Reflections and lessons from IUCN engagement with the extractive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sector, particularly in light of recent Brumadinho catastrophic dam failure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic discussion and options for Council consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taking into account the findings and recommendations of the Private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sector Task Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:30-19:00</td>
<td>Dinner break (buffet dinner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00-20:30</td>
<td>Agenda Item 5: Annual Council session on the performance of the Commissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 Presentation of the reports of CEM, CEESP and CEC by the Chair of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>respective Commission 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complementing the written reports of the Commissions incorporated in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>document &quot;IUCN Annual Report 2018&quot; which will be discussed by the PPC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under agenda item PPC47/1. Each Chair presents for 20’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Discussion on the performance of the Commissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sunday, 31 March 2019 - Plenary sittings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:00</td>
<td>Agenda Item 4: Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24</td>
<td>C/96/4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taking into account the recommendations of the PPC (cf. agenda item 3 of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPC47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council document C/96/1
version 2.0 - 28 March 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10:00-11:00  | Agenda Item 6: Report of the Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC) | with recommendations concerning, among others:  
- Appointment of the 2020 Congress Election Officer  
- Deadline for receiving nominations for Regional Councillor and for proposals for persons to be nominated by Council as President, Treasurer or Chair of a Commission *(Regulations 35 and 38)*  
- Observers  
- Registration fees  
- Sponsored Members  
- Council specific objectives linked to the Gender strategy for Congress |
| 11:00-12:30 | Agenda Item 7: Reports of the standing committees of the Council |  
7.1 Report of the Governance and Constituency Committee (GCC) |
| 12:30-14:00 | Lunch Presentation of Regional and Global Programs: | By Mason Flynn Smith, Regional Director - Oceania Regional Office (ORO) and Alvaro Vallejo Rendon, Regional Director – South America Regional Office (SUR)  
*(buffet lunch)* |
| 14:00-15:30 | Agenda Item 7: Reports of the standing committees of the Council (Continued) |  
7.2 Report of the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) |
| 15:30-17:00 | 7.3 Report of the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) | |
| 17:00-17:30 | Agenda Item 4: Strategic discussion (Continued) |  
4.5 Status of “Strategic Priorities for Council 2017-20” *(Regulation 44bis; decision C/95/6 Annex 7)*  
At the end of its meeting, the Council reviews the status of the Council’s strategic priorities in light of the results of the meeting and takes any measures necessary to ensure timely delivery. |
| 17:30-18:00 | Agenda Item 8: Any other business |
Thursday, 28 March 2019 and Friday 29 March 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item/Content</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 28.03:09:00-12:30 | **Meetings of the standing committees of the IUCN Council**  
The agendas of the committees constitute an integral part of the Council agenda. The committees will suspend their meetings on Thursday afternoon 28 March 2019 enabling the task forces to hold face-to-face meetings and prepare their report for presentation in the relevant standing committee on 29 March 2019. |                      |
| 29.03:09:00-18:00 | **Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) (47th meeting)**  
1. IUCN Annual Report 2018  
   Prepared by the Secretariat and including the implementation of the IUCN Programme by the Secretariat and the Commissions  
2. Specific Programme and Policy issues  
   2.1 Update on the implementation of 2016 Congress Resolutions and Recommendations  
      Based on a report from the Secretariat  
   2.2 Retirement of Resolutions / Recommendations  
      Approval of the archive of ‘retired’ Resolutions and Recommendations (WCC-2016-Res-001) and of a mechanism to ensure regular review of all active Resolutions between Congresses, based on recommendations of the Retirement of Resolutions Task Force  
   2.3 Consideration of a guidance note for implementing the WCC-2016-Rec-102 (Protected areas and other areas important for biodiversity in relation to environmentally damaging industrial activities and infrastructure development)  
   2.4 Progress report from the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Task Force  
3. Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24  
   Approval of the first draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 for the purpose of consulting IUCN Members online and during the Regional Conservation Forums  
4. Council motions for the 2020 Congress  
   Recommendation to Council of the topics for Council motions and a mechanism to prepare and approve them in time to be submitted by 28 August 2019 (Rule 49)  
5. Follow-up on assignments  
   2016 Congress Resolutions requiring action from Council  
   5.1 Report from the chair of the Task Force on WCC-2016-Res-086 (Synthetic Biology)  
   5.2 Other Resolutions requiring action from Council  
6. Reports from task forces established by PPC:  
   6.1 Urban TF  
   6.2 Private Sector TF, including among others the IUCN engagement with the extractives sector, particularly including an update on Rio Doce and the Brumadinho tragedy  
   6.3 Climate Change TF  
7. Report from Council’s Global Oceans Focal Person  
8. Other issues announced in advance  
   8.1 IUCN response and engagement on the issues of Environmental Defender, Human Rights and Conservation from now through the IUCN Congress | Agenda with timetable  
C/96/PPC47/1  
C/96/PPC47/2.1  
C/96/PPC47/2.2  
C/96/PPC47/2.3  
C/96/4.4  
C/96/PPC47/5.1 Part1  
C/96/PPC47/5.1 Part2  
C/96/PPC47/6.1/1 (agenda)  
C/96/PPC47/6.2/1 (agenda)  
C/96/PPC47/6.3/1 (agenda) |
# Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) (67th meeting)

1. Welcome and approval of the agenda
2. Review minutes of the previous meeting and check the follow up points and decisions taken and where they stand
3. Report from the Head of Oversight
4. Follow up of the FAC Report to C95 (section FAC/10 – Supplemental report of the Head of Oversight; Council decisions C/95/19 and C/95/21)
5. Report from the Legal Adviser (including 5.2 Update on General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) implementation)
7. Review of the draft, unaudited financial statements for 2018
8. Investment update and portfolio performance
9. Outlook for 2019
10. Resource mobilisation update
11. Congress 2020 Budget
12. Information systems update
13. Update from the Joint FAC/GCC Task Force on Membership Dues
14. Financial planning post-2020
15. Any other business

# Governance and Constituency Committee (GCC) (20th meeting)

1. Governance issues
   1.1 Improving IUCN’s governance including proposed amendments to the Statutes, Rules of Procedure and Regulations:
      - Proposals prepared by GCC’s working groups and the Commission Chairs, due by March 2019 (decisions C/94/5 and C/95/12)
      - Proposals of the Working Group established pursuant to WCC-2016-Res-003 (Including regional governments in the structure of the Union)
   1.2 Adoption in 2nd reading of amendments to the Regulations
      Amendments to improve the motions process (decision C/95/11) and regarding the renewal of the membership of the IUCN Commissions (decision C/95/12.3), taking into account the comments from IUCN Members and the results of the e-vote on the amendments to the Rules of Procedure to improve the motions process
   1.3 Approval of the criteria for the qualities required for the elected positions, to be attached to the Call for nominations, including
      - “IUCN Council’s Guidance for 2016 Election Candidates” and
      - “Eligibility for nomination to Council for members of Council and members of the Secretariat staff”.
      (Cf. decision C/85/8 Annexes 3, 4 and 5; Council Handbook §12 to §17)
1.4 External Review of IUCN’s Governance (see C/94/18 for the ToR)
   Discussion of the external consultant’s report with findings and recommendations and preparation of the discussion in Council plenary (agenda item 4.1).

2. Constituency issues
   2.1 Members’ feedback on version 1.0 of the Membership Strategy – presentation of version 2.0
   2.2 Update on IUCN membership
   2.3 Membership applications, including
      2.3.1 (Annual) update of the membership application review process (C/94/13)
### 2.4 Changes of Members' name or membership category

#### 2.5 National, Regional and Interregional Committees
- Incl. the recognition of newly established committees and the revision of the by-laws of existing committees, if any applications are received

#### 2.6 Regional Conservation Forums (RCF): update on the RCF to be held in 2019, consideration of the role of Council members during the RCF

#### 2.7 Membership dues
- 2.7.1 Progress report of the Joint GCC/FAC working group
- 2.7.2 Update on Members whose rights were rescinded by the 2016 Congress and by e-vote in 2018

### 3. World Conservation Congress

#### 3.1 Motions process – approval of the template for the submission of motions and dates for the electronic vote on motions [Rules 54 (b) x. and 62quinto (a)]
Based on the recommendations of GCC’s Task Force to update the motions process

#### 3.2 Approval of guidance for the nomination of candidates for Honorary membership, and the Phillips and Coolidge Medals

### 4. Any other business

---

1. Version 2.0 was issued on 28 March 2019 following the removal of item 8.1 on the PPC agenda: “SSC proposal for Council endorsement of a definition of Human Wildlife Conflict” which will be prepared for a future meeting of PPC; and the addition of a new item 8.1 on the PPC agenda – “IUCN response and engagement on the issues of Environmental Defender, Human Rights and Conservation from now through the IUCN Congress”.

2. A document code with hyperlink means that the Council document for this agenda item is available in the Union Portal. A document code without hyperlink means that the document is under preparation. Other agenda items will be introduced verbally or with a PowerPoint presentation.

3. Due to the unforeseen absence of the Chair of WCEL, the Chair of CEC will present his annual report to Council.

4. As part of the “Enhanced practices and reforms of IUCN’s governance” approved by Council in April 2016 (decision C/88/7), Council enhanced its oversight of the work of the Commissions through strengthened annual performance reporting by the Chairs to the Council on outputs, outcomes, impact and resources raised against the Commission’s work plan approved at the beginning of each term, and decided to conduct once a year a session of Council, with the Director General, to discuss the performance of the Commissions. The first such discussion was held during the 94th Council meeting in April 2018. To reduce the time required for six presentations in one single Council meeting, it is proposed to invite three Chairs to make a presentation at the 1st Council meeting in 2019, followed by discussion, and the three remaining Chairs to make their presentation, followed by discussion, during the 2nd Council meeting in 2019.

5. Pending a decision regarding the membership of the Congress Preparatory Committee. Its draft agenda, approved by the President of IUCN, is available as document C/96/CPC1/1.

6. Continuing a practice from the previous term, the order in which committees present their reports rotates at each meeting (C92: PPC, FAC, GCC; C93: GCC, PPC, FAC; C94: FAC, GCC, PPC; C95: PPC, FAC, GCC; C96: GCC, PPC, FAC). The draft agendas of the standing committees follow hereafter on pp. 4-6.

7. Documents of the Task Forces can be found here:
   - Private Sector TF: [https://portals.iucn.org/union/anglist/groupdocuments/13709/20999](https://portals.iucn.org/union/anglist/groupdocuments/13709/20999)
   - Urban TF: [https://portals.iucn.org/union/anglist/groupdocuments/13709/20996](https://portals.iucn.org/union/anglist/groupdocuments/13709/20996)
   - Climate Change TF: [https://portals.iucn.org/union/anglist/groupdocuments/13709/21002](https://portals.iucn.org/union/anglist/groupdocuments/13709/21002)

8. All documents of the FAC are available to all Council members with the exception of the Report of the Head of Oversight and the Report of the Legal Adviser which are only distributed to FAC members.

9. Explicitly mentioned in the Council agenda as required by Article 101 (c) of the Statutes.

10. New applications which have received no objections from the membership will be considered by GCC by email correspondence prior to the Council meeting.

11. Will be considered by GCC by email correspondence prior to the Council meeting.
1. 1 March 2019

Estimada Unidad de Coordinación de Miembros UICN,

Gracias por enviar el Proyecto de Orden del día de la 96 Reunión del Concejo de la UICN a finales de Marzo este año, para participación nuestra enviando nuestros comentarios. Así, a continuación presento unos comentarios que agradeceré sean tomados en cuenta en esta importante 96 reunión:

1. Todos los puntos de Agenda ya incluidos son importantes y algunos muestran acción relevante que requerirá seguimiento.

2. Sin embargo, pienso que se puede darle mas peso a la Visión de la Unión "Un mundo justo que valora y conserva la naturaleza". Estoy seguro que la UICN en todas sus partes (Membresía, Secretariado y Comisiones) está dispuesta a ser una entidad global "confiable de las mejores prácticas y herramientas de conservación..." Pero entonces tenemos un vacío en la aplicación de estas prácticas, porque globalmente se sigue degradando la tierra y los bosques, y sigue severamente amenazada o desapareciendo la fauna terrestre, aérea y marítima.

3. Hay datos confiables como el IV Congreso GEF, Cancún 2014, que reportó "dos mil millones de Hectáreas de bosques deforestadas y tierras degradadas" Mientras tanto miles de millones de personas que dependen directamente del bosque están en una situación de pobreza extrema y hasta miseria. Debemos preguntarnos "Es eso justo?" "Podemos valorar la conservación de la naturaleza bajo ese esquema?" Honestamente, creo que estamos frente a un desafío enorme, pero verdadero. Y debemos emprender las estrategia y acciones necesarias para revertir ese escenario por uno donde podamos declarar, hemos reducido la pobreza en tantos miles de millones de personas y recuperado tantos miles de millones de Hectáreas de tierras degradadas como contribución para conservación de la naturaleza.

4. Por lo anterior, propongo que el Proyecto de Orden del día de la 96 reunión del Concejo, en atención a la Visión "Un mundo justo que valora la conservación de la naturaleza" incluya:

4.1 El diseño y ejecución de un Programa de Restauración, Recuperación o Reconstrucción de Tierras y Bosques degradados, con alivio a la Pobreza de los Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Locales a través de la Resolución No. 104 “Seguridad Alimentaria, Restauración de Ecosistemas y Cambio Climático, del WCC de 2012 en Jeju, Corea del Sur.

4.2 Instalar un equipo de expertos que atienda la aplicación de esta Resolución 104 del WCC 2012. Este equipo de expertos debería tener al menos una persona que se encargue de acompañar a los Comités Nacionales de Miembros, de una o varias regiones, en el cabildeo con los Gobiernos de cada país e Instituciones Financieras, para asegurar el apoyo logístico y financiamiento a esta iniciativa.

4.3 Ya hay al menos Un modelo resultado de una investigación científica, probado/validado y exitoso en alcanzar la Seguridad Alimentaria, la Restauración de Ecosistemas y Cambio Climático en el Trópico Húmedo, que puede ser aplicado de inmediato sin mas investigaciones y estudios.

4.4 Iniciar de inmediato las investigaciones en el Trópico Seco que provea resultados similares al modelo del Trópico Húmedo.

4.5 Favorecer a las personas que viven y dependen del bosque y de la tierra, para el éxito en asegurar la conservación de la naturaleza.
Para cualquier pregunta al respecto estoy a la orden.

Con los mas cordiales saludos y deseándoles los mejores resultados en la 96 reunion del Concejo,

Osvaldo

Osvaldo Munguia
Director Ejecutivo MOPAWI
Miembro de las Organizaciones de Pueblos Indígenas (OPI) en UICN

Courtesy translation

Dear IUCN Coordination Unit,

Thank you for submitting the Draft Agenda of the 96th IUCN Council Meeting at the end of March this year, for our participation by sending our comments. So, below I present some comments that I would appreciate to be taken into account in this important 96 meeting:

1. All the agenda items already included are important and some show relevant action that will require follow-up.

2. However, I think that we can give more weight to the Vision of the Union "A just world that values and conserves nature". I am sure that the IUCN in all its parts (Membership, Secretariat and Commissions) is willing to be a global entity "reliable of the best conservation practices and tools ..." But then we have a gap in the application of these practices, because globally, land and forests continue to be degraded, and terrestrial, air and maritime fauna continue to be severely threatened or disappear.

3. There are reliable data such as the IV GEF Congress, Cancun 2014, which reported "two billion hectares of deforested forests and degraded lands" Meanwhile billions of people who depend directly on the forest are in a situation of extreme poverty and even misery. We must ask ourselves "Is that fair?" "Can we value the conservation of nature under that scheme?" Honestly, I think we are facing a huge challenge, but true. And we must undertake the strategy and actions necessary to reverse that scenario for one where we can declare, we have reduced poverty in so many billions of people and recovered so many billions of hectares of degraded land as a contribution to nature conservation.

4. For the foregoing, I propose that the Project of the Agenda of the 96th Council meeting, in response to the Vision "A just world that values the conservation of nature" include:

4.1 The design and execution of a Program for the Restoration, Recovery or Reconstruction of Degraded Lands and Forests, with alleviation of the Poverty of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities through Resolution No. 104 "Food Security, Restoration of Ecosystems and Climate Change , of the WCC 2012 in Jeju, South Korea

4.2 Establish a team of experts to attend the application of this Resolution 104 of the WCC 2012. This team of experts should have at least one person who is responsible for accompanying the National Committees of Members, from one or several regions, in lobbying with the Governments of each country and Financial Institutions, to ensure logistical support and financing for this initiative

4.3 There is already at least one model resulting from scientific research, tested / validated and successful in achieving Food Security, Ecosystem Restoration and Climate Change in the Humid Tropics, which can be applied immediately without further research and studies.

4.4 Immediately initiate research in the Dry Tropics that provides similar results to the Humid Tropic model.

4.5 Favor people who live and depend on the forest and the land, for success in ensuring the conservation of nature.

For any question about it I am to order.
With the most cordial greetings and wishing you the best results in the 96th Council meeting,

Osvaldo

2. 20 March 2019

From: Ottinger, Prof. Richard L. <rottinger@law.pace.edu>
Sent: 20 March 2019 21:07
To: IUCN Membership <MEMBERSHIP@iucn.org>
Cc: BENJAMIN Antonio (private) <ahbenja@gmail.com>; ANTOLINI Denise <antolini@hawaii.edu>; VOIGT Christina <christina.voigt@jus.uio.no>; ROBINSON Nick <NRobinson@law.pace.edu>
Subject: RE: IUCN - Draft agenda for the 96th meeting of the IUCN Council

In response to your invitation below to comment and the forthcoming IUCN Council Draft Agenda the Pace Center for Environmental Legal Studies submits the following:

Considering the conclusions of the 2018 Special Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on Global Warming of 1.5 Degrees, that limiting global warming to 1.5°C would require “rapid and far-reaching” transitions in land, energy, industry, buildings, transport, and cities, and that global net human-caused emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) would need to fall by about 45 percent from 2010 levels by 2030, reaching ‘net zero’ around 2050, and the evidence presented therein that the goals of the Paris climate change are not being realized, that the time for meeting them is running out to do so, and that effects of global warming are being more rapidly realized than anticipated, we submit that it is essential that IUCN weigh in with its members on this vital issue.

It is therefore proposed that Agenda Item 42, Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24, be amended to include the substance of Resolution 6.089, Energy efficiency and renewable energy to promote the conservation of nature, that was adopted almost unanimously, electronically, at the 2016 Congress, providing that the Congress:

“URGES IUCN State Members to design, adopt and implement energy efficiency and renewable energy programmes, including advanced technologies and public participation,” and “FURTHER INVITES State Members to amend, modify, or repeal existing laws and policies that obstruct the uptake and distribution of energy efficiency and renewable energy”;

It should be noted that, pursuant to the Report of the Programme &Policy Committee 2.1, Update on the implementation of 2016 Congress Resolutions and Recommendations, concluded that no action has been taken on implementation of the aforesaid Resolution 6.089.

If IUCN, as the most prestigious international environmental organization, cannot address the energy causes of climate change, it fails to meet the UN Secretary General’s call to all nations and organizations to take action to transition from fossil fuels to clean energy and phase out all fossil fuel subsidies. For IUCN to fail to carry out this mandate sets a bad example for other organizations, minimizes its efforts to address climate change, and diminishes its stature. Indeed, there is no greater threat to biodiversity, the
preservation of which is claimed to be our primary issue, than from climate change for which reliance on fossil fuels is the largest contributor.

Many thanks for your consideration. Respectfully submitted:

Pace Center for Environmental Legal Studies
Elisabeth Haub School of Law at Pace University
78 North Broadway
White Plains, NY 10603

by Richard L. Ottinger, Co-Director
Dean Emeritus
E-mail: rottinger@law.pace.edu
tel: 914-422-4121
fax: 914-422-4180
The IUCN Council,

1. **Endorses** decision B/76/1 – Establishment of the Succession Planning Committee, adopted by the Bureau at its 76th Meeting on 26 March 2019 (Appendix 1);

2. **Endorses** decision B/76/2 – Establishment of the Motions Working Group, adopted by the Bureau at its 76th Meeting on 26 March 2019 (Appendix 2)
Establishment of the Succession Planning Committee

(Adopted by the Bureau at its 76th Meeting, 26 March 2019)

BUREAU DECISION B/76/1

The Bureau of the IUCN Council,

Confirms the establishment of a “Succession Planning Committee” with the following members:

• The President (Chair)
• The four Vice-Presidents, and
• The Treasurer;

Approves the Terms of Reference of the Succession Planning Committee (Annex 1).
Appendix 2

Establishment of the Motions Working Group

(Adopted by the Bureau at its 76th Meeting, 26 March 2019)

BUREAU DECISION B/76/2

The Bureau of the IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee,

Approves the Terms of Reference of the Council’s Motions Working Group (Annex 2) and the process for appointing the members of the Motions Working Group (Annex 3).
Succession Planning Committee

Terms of Reference

1. Background

Following the decision of the IUCN Director General to apply for and accept the post of Executive Director (ED) of the UNEP, the Bureau, in discussion with the IUCN President and Vice-Presidents, agreed unanimously to establish a Succession Planning Committee (SPC).¹

The SPC has held two meetings. The President via email has informed the Council of the decisions and process initiated following the formal approval of the appointment of the IUCN DG by the UNGA on 20 February 2019 and the request for confidentiality was no longer applicable,

2. Objective

The Succession Planning Committee is established as a standard practice in similar international organizations and is part of good and prudent governance and leadership transition. The Succession Planning Committee has the responsibility to ensure smooth transitional secretariat leadership. Under the present circumstances, this responsibility will include facilitating the selection of an Acting DG and developing a TOR for a search committee to identify a new Director General

3. Functions

The Succession Planning Committee will make recommendations to the Bureau, for onward transmission to the Council for decision, on:

a. Necessary transitional secretariat leadership arrangements;

b. Accelerating the process leading to global search externally and internally and recruitment of the new Director General, including Terms of Reference (TOR) of a DG Search Committee

c. Other matters related to succession planning, transitional arrangements and recruitment of new DG.

4. Modus Operandi

The members of the Succession Planning Committee will implement their work primarily via email and conference calls and carry out any face-to-face meetings when needed.

The Succession Planning Committee will consult members of the Council, and of the

¹ The first Succession Planning Committee (SPC) meeting realized that it would be customary to develop the ToRs of the Committee, which would need more time, information and secretariat services, thus risking the spread of the information. In order to deal with this urgent situation, to start necessary preparations and meanwhile to respect DG Inger Andersen’s own wishes not to inform all the Council members and to avoid any adverse impact on her application, the SPC meeting acknowledged the importance of having a succession plan, failing to do which could imply that IUCN was not at all prepared to handle this type of situation for the members of IUCN, international community and donors. In light of this, it was agreed that the ToRs had to be developed later and would be submitted to the Council for validation after DG Inger Andersen is officially approved by the UNGA as the ED of the UNEP, as planned.
Commissions and of the Secretariat as appropriate.

The Succession Planning Committee will report to the Bureau, after which the Bureau will report to the Council.

5. Duration

The Succession Planning Committee will perform its mandate during the process of setting up Secretariat transitional leadership arrangements until a Search Committee is established, by then the SPC will only do regular succession planning unless decided otherwise by the Bureau.
Terms of Reference of the Motions Working Group of the IUCN Council

In accordance with Article 46 (q) of the IUCN Statutes, Regulation 29, and Part VII of the Rules of Procedure ("Agenda and Motions"), the Council appoints a Motions Working Group with the mandate to:

a. Provide guidance to IUCN Members on the submission of motions;
b. Receive the motions and determine that they are consistent with the purpose of motions as defined in Rule 48bis and meet the requirements listed in RoP 54;
c. Prepare, including editing, the motions for the online discussion and, as appropriate, for submission to the Resolutions Committee of Congress and the World Congress;
d. Submit the motions to an online discussion to be held prior to Congress, specifying which motions that warrant debate at the global level during the Congress will continue to be discussed and voted upon during the Members’ Assembly subject to RoP 45bis, and which motions will be put to an online vote prior to Congress subject to Rule 62quinto;
e. Facilitate and oversee the online discussion of motions between Members prior to the Congress, ensuring that it is transparent and will adhere to the greatest possible extent to the procedure for discussion and amendment of motions during the Congress;
f. Following the close of the online discussion, submit motions to an electronic vote prior to Congress and refer others to the Members’ Assembly for continued debate and vote.

The Motions Working Group to be established by Council in accordance with Regulation 29 shall consist of:

(i) five (5) to seven (7) members of the IUCN Council,
(ii) three (3) individuals who will be appointed by Council in their expert, personal capacity to represent the common interests and the diversity of the IUCN membership and Commissions, following Council’s call for nominations to all IUCN Members and Commissions; and
(iii) the Director General ex officio.

The Motions Working Group shall present periodic reports on its work to the IUCN Council and shall keep the Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC) closely informed. The Motions Working Group shall receive adequate support from the IUCN Secretariat in order to deliver on its mandate.

The Motions Working Group shall, among others, perform the following tasks:

1. Establish specific procedures for the motions process in advance of the Congress to ensure its effective and efficient management. As part of this procedure, it shall guide the development of guidelines and templates for IUCN Members for the motions process which shall be sent to all IUCN Members before the opening of the submission of motions. The procedures will also specify the tasks which the Secretariat accepts to undertake in support of the work of the Motions Working Group, and contain the criteria and transparent processes for making the determinations which the Motions Working Group is required to make by the Rules of Procedure.

2. Be informed of and take into account to the extent possible the results of discussions of motions in National Committees, Regional Committees and Regional Fora, including those that warrant discussion at a local and/or national level;
3. Ensure that the statutory requirements are strictly applied to the submitted motions and that motions which meet the requirements, are treated fairly and equitably, with adequate communication with proponents and sponsors of motions related to rejecting, amending, combining or categorizing motions, explaining the rationale.

4. Make effective use of the information provided by proponents and co-sponsors about the actions and resources required to implement the motion and the contributions which they intend to make towards its implementation (RoP 54 (b) viii.), including publishing the information and/or the rating described in the template throughout the motions process, thereby encouraging IUCN Members to take responsibility for the implementation of the motions they submit, once they are adopted. Transmit a report to the Resolutions Committee of Congress regarding the status of the resources committed/pledged on all the motions adopted through the electronic vote prior to Congress.

5. Communicate clearly and comprehensively to the IUCN membership the rationale for referring certain motions to the electronic vote prior to Congress and others to the Members’ Assembly, either at the time of publication of the motions prior to the online discussion (RoP 62bis) and/or after the online discussion, at the time the motions are submitted to the electronic vote (RoP 62quinto) e.g. by explaining what the issues are that could not be solved during the online discussion and that require continued debate during the Members’ Assembly.

6. Monitor the quality of motions, alert Members and facilitators before/during the electronic discussion of quality issues, and provide guidance to facilitators empowering them to raise issues of poor quality of motions and actively work with Members to solve them before the end of the electronic discussion.

7. Oversee the online discussion on motions in advance of the Congress, providing guidance and direction, and assistance, to ensure that facilitators are designated and receive adequate training and guidance in the spirit of IUCN’s ‘One Programme approach’ and fully understand the intent and requirements of the IUCN Statutes, Rules of Procedure and Regulations pertaining to motions.

8. Provide clear guidance to the facilitators of the online discussion with a view to alerting Members to issues of alignment with the IUCN Programme, or alert Members directly to such issues during the online discussion, e.g. at the beginning of the 2nd reading.

9. Encourage broad participation of Cat. A Members (through reminders, incentives, etc.) and to keep a record that shows its adequate engagement with and invitation to State Members.

10. Monitor the electronic discussion and assist / guide the facilitators to proactively build a consensus during the online discussion, thereby reducing as much as possible the application of RoP 62quinto (b), i.e. the referral to the Members’ Assembly of motions that led to such divergent proposed amendments that it was not possible to submit them to the electronic vote prior to Congress.

11. Prepare the motions, as amended during the online discussion or together with proposed amendments, for an electronic vote in accordance with Rule 62quinto explaining as clearly as possible in the Guidance for IUCN Members on electronic voting the way of voting on amendments.
12. Prepare the motions that require continued discussion during the Members’ Assembly, for hand-over to the Resolutions Committee of the Congress with any advice and background, as appropriate, including motions which, in the view of the Motions Working Group, are controversial and consensus would be beneficial for conservation, and so may have to be referred to the next Congress (Regulation 62quinto as revised).

13. Formally transmit to the Congress 1) the motions approved during the electronic vote in order for the Congress to ‘record en bloc the adoption’ of these motions, and 2) the motions that require continued debate and vote during the Members’ Assembly.

14. Prepare the urgent and new motions submitted from one week prior to the opening of the Congress for the consideration of the Congress Resolutions Committee as soon as it will have been established, with a view to enabling the Committee to timely distribute the motions that it will have admitted.

15. Make recommendations to the next Council for improving the Working Group’s role and functioning based on its own evaluation to be made before the end of the 2020 Congress taking into account Council’s guidance for self-evaluation.
Process for the appointment of the members of the MWG

Extract from document GCC19/1, as revised by the Bureau at its 76th meeting

7. **Five (5) to seven (7) members of the MWG will be appointed from among the members of the IUCN Council** according to the following process which is based on the process adopted in 2015 (decision C/85/12):

7.1 Members of the MWG must be aware of the importance of the motions process and make the commitment to reserve significant time between September 2019 and June 2020 to effectively discharge their duties through email exchange, remote meetings and at least one physical meeting of at least 5 working days (tentative date: 9 to 15 October 2019).

In case the diversity of time zones of the members of the MWG is high, it may mean that telephone meetings are scheduled at inconvenient hours. As a result of Rule 20, the members of the Motions Working Group must also make the commitment to attend the 2020 Congress to be held in Marseille 11 to 19 June 2020.

7.2 The process for the appointment of members of the Motions Working Group from among the Council members should be as follows:

a. The Bureau appoints the Council members to become members of the Motions Working Group on the recommendation of the Vice-Presidents acting as Nominating Committee, taking into account the expressions of interest and the following criteria:
   - Expressed interest in serving on the Working Group
   - Good knowledge of IUCN and previous Congress(es)
   - Good knowledge of IUCN’s Programme and policies
   - Representation of IUCN Commissions
   - Not personally involved with the motions process as proponent or sponsor of motions
   - Regional balance
   - Gender balance
   - Including first and second term Councillors.

b. Following Council’s endorsement, at its 96th meeting, of the Bureau decision approving the ToR of the Motions Working Group, Council members send their expressions of interest indicating the role they can play within the Motions Working Group and their time availability, to [name of a Vice-President] by 6 April 2019. The Vice-Presidents will subsequently make a recommendation to the Bureau as expeditiously as possible. The Bureau will appoint the members of the Motions Working Group.

8. **Three (3) individuals who will be appointed by Council in their expert, personal capacity** to represent the common interests and the diversity of the IUCN membership and Commissions, following Council’s call for nominations to all IUCN Members and Commissions:

a. The Bureau makes the appointment before 1 August 2019 taking into account the following criteria:
   - Good knowledge of IUCN and previous Congress(es);
   - An understanding of and sensitivity to the diversity of interests of IUCN State/Government and I/NGO Members and/or Commissions;
iii. One State/Government Member, one I/NGO Member, one Commission Member.

b. The Bureau shall consult the Councillors who are members of the Motions Working Group before taking a decision.

c. The Director General will send a call for nominations/expressions of interest to all IUCN Members and the Steering Committees of the 6 IUCN Commissions before 15 May 2019, inviting nominations/expressions of interest by 31 June 2019 at the latest.
Director General’s Objectives for 2019

Origin: Director General

**Action Requested:**
The Council is invited to approve the Director General’s objectives for 2019.

**Background**
At its 88th Meeting in April 2016, the IUCN Council modified the procedure for evaluating the Director General based on the Director General’s objectives henceforth to be approved on an annual basis instead of biannually. At the same meeting, the IUCN Council approved the Director General’s objectives for 2016.

The Director General’s report on results achieved in 2018 can be found in Council document C/95/3/1.

The present document presents the Director General’s objectives for 2019. During 2019, the Director General of IUCN will plan to focus on the eight priorities presented to Council in October of 2015. As in previous year, and for the purpose of accountability, the document spells out objectives in some detail.

Combined, they form a deliberate, multi-year strategy for ensuring that the organisation is significantly better positioned for post-2020. This entails that it (1) is equipped with a focused, impact-driven, measurable Programme architecture which is relevant to the global conversation; (2) is reunited with its Members in the delivery of high-value, high-impact, programmatically-coherent projects and leverages Commission-generated data and knowledge; (3) recognizes, deploys and challenges its membership across the full spectrum of its unique Government-IP-civil society heritage while, at the same time, it seeks, secures and treasures its IO status; (4) generates sharp analytics and essential data to influence policy processes, shape global ideas and impact the construction of the 2020-2030 decade, demonstrating its relevance to donors, partners and members at all times on all fronts; (5) embraces a culture of accountability, efficiency and good governance at all levels where decision-making is informed on risk. Combined, these priorities help ensure that, more than ever, conservation enterprise is relevant to the prevailing policy priorities of our times.

It is to be recalled that these priorities are:

1. Programme and Operations
2. Membership
3. Policy, Knowledge, Science and Economics
4. Communication and Influence
5. Financial Sustainability
6. Secretariat Management
7. Governance Support
8. Thematic Priorities/New Horizons
1. Programme & Operations

1.1. Quality Assurance, Timeliness and Results/Impact in Preparation, Implementation and Reporting on projects and programmes

1.2. Results and Impacts
   • Revised and updated Project Guidelines and Standards (PGS) to improve programme quality, compliance and risk management.
   • In application of the Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, create a Performance Monitoring Standard and update the 2004 Managing Evaluations guide.

1.3. 2017-2020 Programme
   • Issue 2018 report, including trend analysis over the first 2 years of implementation.
   • Issue the External Review of the 2017-2020 Programme.

1.4. 2021-2024 Programme
   • Draft of the final 2021-2024 Programme informed by enhanced Member consultation.

2. Membership

2.1. Membership engagement
   • Gear the IUCN Secretariat programme towards Members’ direct benefits in line with IUCN’s One Programme, including increasing the degree to which Members are involved in/responsible for Programme implementation. Identified engagement dimensions will be tracked during the new 2017-2020 Programme period.

2.2. Membership Strategy
   • Finalisation and implementation of Membership Strategy.

2.3. World Conservation Congress
   • Strategy for Congress messaging and marketing finalized. Congress promoted.
   • Implementation of Congress fundraising strategy well underway and key sponsorships secured for high-priority budget lines
   • Forum event types defined and draft programme finalized, in line with Congress themes and VVIP/VIP participation confirmed
   • Members’ Assembly processes successfully concluded or launched (motions, nominations, draft programme consultation)
   • RCF cycle completed, paving the way for effective participation by Members in the Congress and Assembly
   • Key suppliers contracted to meet requirements of IUCN’s constituencies as well as sustainability and gender-responsiveness objectives
   • IT systems for Congress developed and integrated, as appropriate, with existing IT databases

3. Policy, Knowledge, Science and Economics

3.1. Strengthened integration of Commissions and Secretariat under the One Programme approach
   • Specific deliverables agreed between Secretariat Focal Points and each of the
Commission Chairs for enhanced delivery of the IUCN Programme as well as Commissions own operations according to One Programme principles.

3.2. Continued strong engagement in policy influencing drawing from all parts of the Union including on the ground learning.

- 2019 will be a key transition year leading to 2020 likely to be a “super year” of policy influencing with IUCN’s 2020 WCC anticipated to be a launching pad and springboard for the Union to amplify and scale up its influencing power on many dimensions of the sustainable development agenda. As regards the biodiversity conservation imperative in particular, IUCN intends to strongly advocate for the adoption of a robust post 2020 global biodiversity framework underpinned by ambitious science-based targets to be adopted at COP 15 in late 2020, not only to safeguard our natural world but also the nature-based solutions it underpins UNFCCC-COP 25. Some notable policy fora in 2019 include IPBES 7th plenary session, HLPF 2019, UNCCD-COP 14, UNGA 74.

- Emphasis will be placed on the identification of key strategic issues that IUCN needs to bring to the attention of these processes, as opposed to reacting to developments and documents within these processes.

3.3. Partnerships for the creation of integrated biodiversity & conservation data

- 20,000 new assessments completed for The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species towards the Barometer of Life goal of a total of 160,000 by 2020

- A major upgrade (redevelopment of the website and database) of the World Database of KBAs www.keybiodiversityareas.org is planned for 2019. BirdLife International, who hosts and manages the database, on behalf of the KBA partnership, has recruited a new website designer and a database designer who will be leading on this development.

- Green List: Improvements in site performance towards the Green List Standard and progress towards elements of Aichi Target 11 to be displayed on http://www.protectedplanet.net/

- On the integration of datasets: Grow commercial and non-commercial user base ensuring development decisions are taking biodiversity into account (IBAT 80 subscribers by end 2019); improve IBAT functionality to address key user needs; increase awareness of IBAT with the private sector (including energy, extractives, finance, and other industries) and within governments, NGOs and academia; grow the revenue to over $1.3million; further development of BRIM to help governments and private sector, donors and others to make and then measure biodiversity commitments (NDCs) in the post 2020 global biodiversity framework.

3.4. Knowledge: science and economics

- Strengthen analytical capacity of Secretariat, including through effective use of Publications Committee.

3.5. Roll out the first IUCN flagship report

- Publish and disseminate the first edition of the flagship report, select the theme and initiate the preparation of the second edition.

4. Communication and Influence

4.1. Enhanced communications and outreach

- Prepare and implement communications and marketing activities for the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020 with the dual aims of establishing the event as a critical step toward achieving global biodiversity and sustainable development goals and enhancing IUCN’s Union identity and positioning beyond the Congress.
• Continued enhancement of communications coordination and consistency across the Union through matrix management, internal capacity building and establishing guidelines
• Build on the success of corporate communications products and initiatives such as the revised IUCN Annual Report, Crossroads blog, IUCN Issues Briefs and major event support.
• Enhance IUCN’s visibility and positioning in the areas of work which will be the Congress themes

5. Financial sustainability

5.1. Efficient, effective and stable IUCN Secretariat
• Continue investment in process improvement projects, specifically: rollout of time recording system to all IUCN offices; continue rollout of e-banking strategy to regional offices; implement e-signing of contracts (Docu sign)
• Rollout improvements to the project budget methodology thereby standardising structure, demonstrating value and increasing the level of indirect costs funded from project funding.
• Develop financial plan 2021-2024 linking with a broader financial strategy

5.2. Continued and strengthened engagement with bilateral donors
• Strategic engagement with key bilateral donors for increased support to IUCN’s work (eg. Germany, UK, Canada, Japan, Spain, UAE, Luxemburg).

5.3. Framework donor management
• Continued and strengthened strategic engagement with current Framework partners with a view of securing continued engagement post 2020
• Outreach to potential new framework partners with full support of Council

5.4. Outreach to new potential funders
• Strengthened engagement with foundations in US, Europe and Asia
• IUCN Patrons of Nature initiative strengthened with the recruitment of additional Patrons and new commitments from Patrons to support IUCN’s work
• Legacy/Bequest programme underway

5.5. Ambitious programme delivered to and approved by GEF and GCF
• Strategy implementation, portfolio development and management – The strategy for IUCN GEF and GCF operations is under implementation along with procedures and tools to identify, appraise, manage and supervise projects implemented; The IUCN portfolio of GEF-funded projects is developed further in alignment with IUCN’s strategy for GEF; The IUCN portfolio of GCF-funded projects is further development in alignment with IUCN’s strategy for GCF; The IUCN portfolio of approved GEF and GCF projects is implemented according to plans.
• Strengthened application of the ESMS across IUCN.
• Representation in, and contributions to the GEF & GCF Partnerships.
• Enhanced communication.

5.6. Invigorated programmes with IFI partners
• Engagement and deepening of relationship and collaboration with the European Commission, Asian Development Bank, Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, African Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the World Bank, and the German Development Bank-KfW. Collaboration will take a variety of forms, including knowledge work, project design and implementation, policy
coordination and environmental and social safeguards collaboration.

5.7. Moving further on the development of financial vehicles for conservation finance/natural capital investments

- The CPIC working groups, including the landscape finance working group led by IUCN, deliver investable opportunities with measurable biodiversity conservation impact
- The Blue Natural Capital Financing Facility (BNCFF: EUR 2mn) is building a pipeline of deals for which technical advisory grant funding will be made available. A total of around 4 projects will receive funding.

6. Secretariat Management

6.1. Staff morale, performance excellence and strengthening leadership and integration across silos

- Through regular staff updates, Global Town Halls, monthly communications, annual staff engagement surveys and transparent communication, continue to invest in staff morale while at the same time strengthening the compliance, quality and accountability culture.
- Invest in leadership awareness and development through training as well as annual 360-degree leadership assessments for all IUCN managers.

6.2. Change management at IUCN Secretariat

- Programme delivery – business lines and IUCN-wide thematic frameworks applied by global, regional and country units to enhanced programme development, expansion of wholesale delivery models and quality of reporting; and enhanced quality and relevance of IUCN-generated knowledge to global challenges through cross-thematic strategic priorities.
- Resource mobilization and Cost Recovery – continued engagement with current framework donors; development of partnerships with new donors on global priorities.

6.3. Systematic review and reassessment of IUCN legal status in key office locations

- A number of office locations are in need to regularize their legal situation, thereby providing IUCN with the full recognition that it deserves. The DG will continue focus on key offices where the IUCN status is inadequate with a view to regularizing these with IO status.

6.4 Modernization of Secretariat processes. A significant list of modernizations and policy updates will be delivered in 2018

- On HR, the following will be conducted in 2019: (1) Workforce Planning Exercise – Approval and launch by the DG and LT. Briefing and training for Regional, Global and Outposted Directors and all management teams; (2) Outreach to staff on the new Career Development Framework – Criteria for career development, Geographical and functional mobility, Developmental and Stretch Assignment; (3) Enhancements to the annual Talent Reviews – Succession Planning, Performance/Potential matrix; (4) Action plan on Gender Pay Gap Analysis; (5) Action plan on Benefits harmonization across regions; (6) Launch of the High Potentials and the Emerging Leaders Programmes.
- Further strengthening compliance with policies and guidelines.

7. Governance Support

7.1. Supporting governance reform

- Continue to refine and implement the planning and reporting tools as contained in the Strategic Planning and Reporting Framework (2016).
8. **Thematic Priorities/New Horizons**

8.1. **Thematic priorities/horizon areas**

- Generate concept notes for new initiatives aligned to the 2021-2024 Programme in anticipation of delivery starting in 2021.
- In response to the Hawaii Commitments as well as a series of Congress Resolutions, the DG will continue to place emphasis on developing a deeper understanding and analysis of the intersect of conservation and biodiversity with some of the prevailing policy priorities of our times such as agriculture and food systems, climate change, oceans, urbanization and conflict.
- Understand and invest in natural capital.
- Continue the strengthening of IUCN’s overall engagement on climate change.

A reinvented programme delivery – at scale along a limited number of strategic, results-driven horizon areas relevant to the global conversation – holds the promise of reengaging the donor community. By the 2020 Congress, existing donors as well as new donors will be invited to make commitments around the 2021-2024 Programme.
Agenda item 3
Report of the Director General

30 March 2019
Introduction

• I have structured the material along 8 headings, as per my previous reports to Council.

• This report spans my 4 ½ years at IUCN and provides headline messages, backed by data, as well as recommendations.

• The report should be viewed as part of my handover notes to Council and to the next Director General. In this sense, the material can also serve towards the drafting of the Report of the Director General for the 2020 IUCN Congress.

• In the interest of comprehensiveness, the version posted on the Union Portal contains some additional slides.

• The document, as it appears on the Union Portal, also contains an annex on reforms, policy updates, system shifts and upgrades conducted since 2015.

Inger Andersen, 30 March 2019
Outline

1. Programme and Operations
2. Membership
3. Policy, Knowledge, Science and Economics
4. Communication and Influence
5. Financial Sustainability
6. Secretariat Management
7. Governance support
8. Thematic Priorities/New Horizons
1. Programme and Operations
IUCN has developed a healthy project portfolio

As the size of the portfolio increases, so too will expectations on delivering **impact** on development **at scale** with an efficient machinery that guarantees **responsible use** of public money.
Steady growth was achieved across delivery models.

Continued attention is required to ensure coherence and impact of the portfolio. The added value of IUCN’s data has yet to translate into sizeable project financing.
A foundation for excellence in Programme execution was established

Procedures, Standards and Guidelines adopted since 2016

Further professionalise programme management: (1) Accountability through project portfolio reviews; (2) Transparency through public access to project information; (3) Digitalisation of project management.
IUCN demonstrated it can achieve its targets for the Programme 2017-2020

Programme progress against 2020 targets: 14/30 targets achieved

Raise ambitions: (1) Set Secretariat targets on outcomes for nature and people; (2) Create objectives that can only be achieved through joint action.
The organisation has embraced the development and integration of Governance, Risk, Control/Compliance (GRC) systems.

From 2019, the organisation has focused on defining and measuring strategies, tactics, and progress toward objectives. An integrated GRC system will provide IUCN with a competitive advantage and maintain and enhance trust with its partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>Integrated GRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Control Management</strong></td>
<td>Foundation for helping to direct business activities in accordance to policies and procedures to address risk as IUCN drives toward objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Management</strong></td>
<td>Foundation for helping to address uncertainty as IUCN drives toward objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance, Strategy and Performance</strong></td>
<td>Define and measure strategies, tactics and progress toward objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance</strong></td>
<td>Foundation for helping an organisation act with integrity and stay within boundaries as it drives toward objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics &amp; Culture</strong></td>
<td>Integrating culture and ethics into an overall GRC capability ensures that all other activities are conducted in an environment where people are aligned toward the general interests of the organisation and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit</strong></td>
<td>Foundation to provide assurance to management, Council and other stakeholders that IUCN is achieving objectives, addressing uncertainty and acting with integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IT and Security</strong></td>
<td>Foundation to provide integrity and security around important information assets; and to provide technology to enable other GRC activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued investment in an integrated GRC will provide IUCN with a competitive advantage; maintain and enhance trust with its partners.
Thanks to significant engagement with staff throughout 2018, the drafting of the 2021-2024 Programme is well underway.

Ensure that the Programme Construct: (1) Meets all its timeline targets; (2) Is continuously reviewed and strengthened; (3) Serves as a powerful conservation framework for IUCN.
The machinery has been significantly modernised; aligned with industry best practice and donor expectations

100+ reforms, policy updates and system shifts/upgrades planned…

Ensure that the organisation (1) remains aligned with best industry practice; (2) does not slip back to old “comfortable” habits; (3) invests in compliance.
ERP is now widely used across IUCN as a unique, trusted and secure Financial System.

Ensure that management accompanies the 2019 upgrade to the underlying package, including a revised user interface.
End-user computers have become “managed”, more secure, and cheaper to maintain

Number of end-user computers standardised

- "Managed" = Secured systems, standard configuration, optimal support, connectivity to global application
- Focus has been on Regional and Outposted Offices

A gap will always exist as we have fewer computers than employees.

Reduce number of non-managed systems (mostly found in very small IUCN offices).
The cost of running global IS was significantly reduced

Continuing the common processes, automatisation and standardisation that were the lead drivers of costs reduction.
IT infrastructure energy usage was significantly reduced through the Green IT Strategy

From 2019

HQ Data Center Energy Total (Total yearly kWh)

- Technologies used for Global Network shows a reduction of 75% in kWh used (164MWh saved in 2018)
- Reduction of Regional/Outposted office located systems show 20% reduction of power (8.4MWh in 2018) vs. previous configurations.

Further implementation of Green IT Strategy to show we “walk the talk”, e.g: Replace storage technology throughout 2019 to further reduce power usage per TeraByte stored by 85%.
The number of incidents logged and fixed globally more than doubled, increasing IUCN productivity.

Support Tickets/Day

- Initial ramp-up of Service Portal across IUCN
- Implementation of expiring password and self reset
- 2019: +226%

- Global systems, processes and standard systems enables the sharing of incident solutions globally.
- Incident tickets are now handled round the clock by Regional IS Officers located across the World.

Further increase productivity: (1) Decrease average time needed to close support tickets; (2) Increase number of support tickets logged per day.
**From 2019**

**Staff have remained highly engaged and motivated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff survey results (2016-2018)</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>72%</th>
<th>72%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High commitment; intent to stay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proud to be in IUCN; recommend as place to work</td>
<td>Give high marks to culture and values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff survey frequency has gone up</th>
<th>Pre-2016</th>
<th>From 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sporadic surveys every 6-8 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yearly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keep seeking staff feedback and measuring their sentiment.
The Staff Compensation programme was implemented to track good performance with clear and consistent criteria, thus fairly rewarding staff.

**Pre-2016**

- 89% of staff did not receive yearly salary increases.

**From 2016**

- 76% received yearly salary increases/performance awards.
- Promotion increases were introduced.
- Labour market surveys done annually.

Improve staff compensation: (1) Continue linking pay-for-performance with labour market data & budget affordability; (2) Maintain progressive structure of salary increases; (3) Address overall competitiveness and staff recognition.
Leadership effectiveness and accountability was enhanced throughout the organisation since 360-degree exercise implemented in 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>77</th>
<th>Top senior leaders in IUCN assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66% → 96%</td>
<td>Managerial effectiveness growth (2016-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Leadership development programme introduced (2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintain the 360’s developmental aspect and integrate the 360 score into the Manager’s Scorecard to improve accountability.
2. Membership
IUCN membership has remained stable with a ratio of government to non-government members of 1 to 5.

Continue expanding Membership with the following considerations: (1) Decide between striving for quality versus quantity; (2) Possibly look towards new sectors.
IUCN hosted the most successful World Conservation Congress yet

2016 Congress key figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10,000+</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Resolutions, recommendations and decisions adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Hawai‘i commitments announced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moving towards the World Conservation Congress 2020 in Marseille: (1) Holding regional conservation fora (May-Sept 2019); (2) Refining science-based targets concept to showcase in Congress.
The Commissions’ communications were improved to increase the impact of their work.

Webpage redesigned in Mar ‘18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan ‘18</td>
<td>40,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec ‘18</td>
<td>47,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+17.4%

Newsletter standardised throughout ‘18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Subscribers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar ‘18</td>
<td>50,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar ‘19</td>
<td>58,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+15.8%

Improve readership and impact of Commission publications through increased promotion and refining the website design.
3. Policy, Knowledge, Science and Economics
IUCN ensured that the 2030 Agenda/SDGs promote nature-based solutions to sustainable development

Contribute to the delivery of the SDGs through the next quadrennial Programme, data collection and monitoring.
IUCN engaged in the UNFCCC to secure greater recognition for nature-based solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4</strong></th>
<th>articles in the Paris Agreement recognise importance of ecosystems (§ 4, 5, 7, 8 and preamble)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td>of NDCs recognise importance of ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>official high-level statements (Paris 2015, Marrakech 2016, Bonn 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>140+</strong></td>
<td>events hosted in IUCN Pavilions (Paris 2015, Bonn 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>exhibit booths showcasing IUCN’s work (Paris 2015, Marrakech 2016, Bonn 2017, Katowice 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>official UNFCCC side-events co-organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>issues briefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>major climate risk reports (Ocean Warming, World Heritage)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengthen institutional capacity on climate change to engage more systematically and effectively.
IUCN advice on World Heritage continued to be followed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Evaluations</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>evaluations of World Heritage nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>monitoring reports on existing World Heritage Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>advocated for recognition of indigenous peoples and the importance of their free prior informed consent in the nomination process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>reports monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>evaluations of proposals for inscription on the World Heritage List or boundary changes of listed sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>warned that illegal fishing, logging and poaching are impacting 2/3 of the 58 natural World Heritage Sites IUCN monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>sites facing threats targeted with recommended action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Essential to maintain reputation of scientific credibility, consistency and objectivity by drawing on expertise of IUCN scientific networks.
IUCN has opened new spaces for Indigenous Peoples

2016
Indigenous Peoples' Organisations (IPO) category approved

2017
16 Members in IPO category

2018
1 additional Member in IPO category

Total IPO Members: 17

IUCN to work with French government to organise an Indigenous Peoples’ event on the margins of the World Conservation Congress 2020.
IUCN's role is welcomed and influential. Engagement must continue in the context of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 SBSTTA19</th>
<th>2016 COP13 SBSTTA20 SBI1</th>
<th>2017 SBSTTA21</th>
<th>2018 COP14 SBSTTA22 SBI2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 position paper</td>
<td>2 position papers</td>
<td>1 position paper</td>
<td>4 position papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 information paper</td>
<td>1 information papers</td>
<td>1 information papers</td>
<td>11 information papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 side events</td>
<td>47 side events</td>
<td>7 side events</td>
<td>10 information papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 interventions from the floor</td>
<td>12 interventions from the floor</td>
<td>3 interventions from the floor</td>
<td>13 interventions from the floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 COP Decisions explicitly acknowledging IUCN/giving a mandate; 9 COP Decisions involving IUCN through large partnerships; 9 IUCN Hawai‘i Resolutions reflected in COP decisions.
The 2016 IUCN Congress shaped the world to move on SDGs & climate; highlighted emerging issues

Encourage measures to improve implementation, including by further emphasising the important role of Members through actions and financing.
In line with the relevant WCC Resolutions, IUCN should pursue its engagement with IPBES through the IPBES second work-programme (2019-2023).

IUCN continued to provide strong, strategic support to IPBES through data.

Figures from the IPBES Asia-Pacific Assessment Summary for Policy-Makers (2018)
IUCN contributed to closing the scientific literature gap for conservationists

- 47% of 2,004 IUCN-wide survey respondents* lack institutional access to scientific literature online
- Of these, 96% say lack of access negatively impacts IUCN-related work
- ~50 publications published per year help close this gap

*Data from 2016 Access to Scientific Literature survey sent to IUCN Secretariat, Commission members, and Members. Preprint forthcoming

Invest in publishing to assure scientific quality; alignment with best practice; improve metadata management and dissemination efforts; provide institutional access to scientific literature.
Investments were made to better understand the impact of IUCN publications.

Use the Altmetric subscription to track online attention to IUCN Publications; take corrective steps where needed.
To understand impact of IUCN Publications, papers, and grey literature, encourage IUCN Commission members to list IUCN as an institutional affiliation; invest in digital asset management.
IUCN laid the foundations for seminal publications


**Aim:**
Show critical role nature plays to human well-being

**1-2 years:**
Period between publication of each edition

**Audience:**
Policymakers, business players, media worldwide

**Funding:**
- France (€225,000)
- Italy (€500,000, pending)

**Timeline:**
- 2019:
  - Publish 1st report *Conflict, Migration and Nature*
  - Finalise topic for 2nd report
- 2020:
  - Publish 2nd report

IUCN to publish periodic Flagship Report that will contribute to and shift the global conversation.
4. Communications and Influence
Much-needed internal infrastructure for communications was put in place.

- 4 New targeted strategies developed
- 3 New internal policies developed
- 11 Best practice guidelines developed
- 12+ Communications training sessions
- 30+ Coordination meetings with region and programme communicators

Establish clear strategic objectives, together with investing thought and resources in internal quality and capacity-building builds quality and cohesion. This should continue.
Tools and methods for monitoring and analysing results were developed

IUCN must continue to monitor KPIs, evaluate for strategic performance and adjust strategies accordingly to prioritise limited resources and develop content relevant to target audiences.
Smart, strategic investments in communications delivered exceptional results

- 21k+ Media hits
- 75m Reached on social media
- 1.2k+ Media hits about IUCN and climate
- 1.5k Mentions of IUCN on Twitter during event
- 52k Page views for 70th content
- 7.9m People reached with #IUCN70
- 200% Social media mentions over COP22

“IIt is definitely an emergency,” said Prof Axel Hochkirch, who leads on insects for the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, the global authority on the status of the natural world.

THE GUARDIAN, Feb 13, 2019

IUCN must continue to plan for strategic communications investment to establish and maintain desired corporate positioning.
A new strategy and investment led to marked improvement in KPIs

Investment in communications capacity and strategy has led to quantifiable results, and therefore will be increased. When there is quality content, timely coordination or additional resources, performance for a specific initiative, and therefore for IUCN overall, is even greater.
The annual report was revamped, published about 4 months earlier in the year, and saw significantly increased downloads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Publication date</th>
<th>Downloads*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 version</td>
<td>2017 version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13/07/2015</td>
<td>21/02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>10/08/2015</td>
<td>19/03/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>10/08/2015</td>
<td>19/03/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Downloads calculated from launch until launch of following year’s report

Increase the impact of the annual report: (1) Find new ways to market it in a targeted way according to audience; (2) Continue to promote French and Spanish versions.
The Director General frequently engaged with IUCN staff and external audiences

12 Jan 2015 – 30 Mar 2019:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Monthly reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Town halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>Tweets (~43 tweets/month)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;160</td>
<td>Speaking engagements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DG can best serve as an ambassador to the organisation when there is content and smart analysis to convey.
5. Financial Sustainability
Funding patterns have shifted from unrestricted to restricted

This trend is likely to accelerate and so IUCN has to consider whether it can maintain an extended platform of offices, partially supported by unrestricted funds.
The funding of expenditure from cost recovery has stabilised

Project Managers need to secure and accelerate project burn rates, which has remained a challenge, including during IUCN Congress years, to ensure adequate cost recovery.
Reserves have remained a priority

As the project portfolio grows and the number of large projects increases, the level of reserves required to cover operational risks needs to be re-examined.
A key element of the proposal for a stable and relevant IUCN was turned down; regional hubbing arrangements are effective but a distant second best.

The operational footprint is way beyond what the organisation can carry and outside of global norms; the organisation will not be able to shy away from reform for ever.
IUCN has sought to successfully leverage core funding to raise restricted funding and build a strong portfolio.

IUCN's business model heavily relies and is likely to continue relying on core funding for some time. Maintaining and growing core income must remain a priority.
Core funding has declined due to a shift in donor priorities, but has provided significant leverage for new funding.

Maintaining and growing core income must remain a priority: the added value and pertinence for Framework Partners needs to be clearly demonstrated.
Stronger risk management and monitoring systems have resulted in larger investments by donors.

Continued and increased funding will be dependent on strong systems to ensure full accountability and value for money.
IUCN has been successful in tapping new funding mechanisms and influencing environmental stewardship.

Partnerships and delivery will be critical in ensuring transformational change and future funding.
IUCN has continued to deliver projects through its Members

Continued investment in the Project Portal will allow to better assess the contribution of Members to the delivery of the IUCN Programme, beyond contractual arrangements.
Revamping the Patrons of Nature initiative resulted in significant new core funding and increased influence.

IUCN should pursue this area of funding and influence through the recruitment of new Patrons leading up to 2020.
IUCN has continued to successfully engage with philanthropy

IUCN should strengthen its engagement in the U.S. and in emerging economies through new philanthropic funding mechanisms.
Private sector income remained stable at 3% but the business engagement portfolio has grown in impact and influence.

Continue growth in business engagement with a shift in funding through institutional donors and foundations.

- Funding received from corporate sponsorship: ~CHF1.2m/year
- Change business practices (directly funded by company): average 3% annual budget
- Projects with business engagement component: 2015: CHF10m, 2019: CHF65m
6. Secretariariat Management
Council requested information on the total gender landscape

“Observing that standing committees and Secretariat deal with aspects of gender related issues (gender policy focusing on Programme delivery in PPC, gender related anti-harassment policy in FAC, gender pay equity in the Secretariat, etc.), it would be important to provide the big picture on gender in order to be able to demonstrate that we have our house in order”.

Summary Minutes, 95th Meeting of the IUCN Council, Jeju (Republic of Korea), 6-8 October 2018, Agenda Item 3. Report of the Director General
Very significant efforts have been made to mainstream gender in IUCN operations

Gender aware reforms, policy updates and system shifts/upgrades over 2015-2019

- Organizational culture
- Flexible working conditions
- Leadership development, training and mentoring
- Recruitment and promotion
- Equal pay for equivalent work

It will be critical to maintain alignment with best practice; Several legacy policies (e.g. Travel, Safety & Security) need updating; Reporting/benchmarking key; Consider relevant certification.
HR policy upgrades have led to measurable change in the organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50%</th>
<th>65%</th>
<th>&gt;50%</th>
<th>71%</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance appraisals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Promotions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leadership Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Women in senior roles</strong></td>
<td><strong>Improve female representation in senior roles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past 3 years, the highest ratings have been assigned proportionately (almost 50/50) to men and women.</td>
<td>In the past 3 years, more women than men (65%) have been promoted to a higher grade.</td>
<td>More than 50% of the High Potentials and Emerging Leaders participants are women.</td>
<td>Since 2017, 71% of all appointments for leadership positions in global and regional management teams have been women.</td>
<td>All vacancies of P2 and above must have at least two women in the short list for interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined with assurances of equal pay as well as the prevention of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment, the organisation has the potential to move towards gender equality.
A gap remains in leadership positions across the organisation

For Secretariat: continue to implement policies, report and benchmark against best of class; for governance body: encourage female candidates as well as parity in Bureau and VPs.
Significant efforts have been made to profile the next Congress as a Gender Responsive Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Guide</strong></td>
<td><strong>Application</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-harassment Policy, including bullying and sexual harassment, for IUCN events (2019)</td>
<td>Gender mainstreaming strategy for IUCN events (2019)</td>
<td>Gender-Responsive Assembly Toolkit published by International Gender Champions (2018) with significant input from IUCN</td>
<td>IUCN co-developing application to display information on how many women are speaking, for how long, in which role and on which topics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next DG to consider renewing engagement with International Gender Champions; Consider certification options for Gender Responsive Assemblies; Deliver on a GRA!
IUCN has set an ambitious target to mainstream gender-responsiveness in its programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best of class policy</td>
<td>Gender marker</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Comprehensive project toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Policy: Mainstreaming gender-responsiveness within the IUCN programme of work (adopted by Council, October 2018)</td>
<td>Gender marker to be integrated into online PAAS (to be rolled out in 2019)</td>
<td>In the draft 2021-2024 Programme gender responsiveness is part of the IUCN delivery model</td>
<td>The Project Guidelines &amp; Standards (2016) to engender projects; the Environmental and Social Management System (2016) to avoid risks of creating, aggravating or perpetuating inequalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenge will reside in measuring implementation of policy; A systematic gender marker will go a long way to assess the gender responsiveness of the IUCN portfolio of projects.
7. Governance Support
Governance reforms were carried out

45 practices & reforms approved by Council (Apr 2016)

Steps must be taken to increase governance capabilities such that it becomes even more focused, efficient and effective, and transparent.
The Secretariat provided full support to the External Review of IUCN’s governance and is ready to support the Management Response

Review (conducted 2018) results:

4 Critical issues found:
- Ethics & independence
- Relationships between the Union’s governance bodies
- IUCN Councillors’ roles & responsibilities
- Nomination, evaluation & succession process

30 Issues found in total

63 Recommendations made

The organisation’s internal machinery must: be (1) Well-oiled and aligned with best practice at all levels; (2) Committed to fostering a culture of ethics and a harmonious and inclusive work environment that is (3) Anchored in the values of integrity, accountability, transparency, respect and professionalism.
8. Thematic Priorities / New Horizons
IUCN laid the ground for it to shape the 2030 Decade

- **Develop** “Celsius scale” for biodiversity (aka “Apex Target”)
- **Modernise** Union so it can scale up to tackle global problems
- **Ramp up** preparations for rendezvous in Marseille

Continue to position IUCN, including through its Members, as a key driver in the delivery of the SDGs.
My message to Council has been consistent and uncompromising over the years – urging us to build an organisation which...

1. is equipped with a FOCUSED, IMPACT-DRIVEN, MEASURABLE Programme architecture which is relevant to the global conversation;

2. is reunited with its Members in the delivery of HIGH-VALUE, HIGH-IMPACT, PROGRAMMATICALLY-COHERENT projects and leverages Commission-generated data and knowledge;

3. recognises, DEPLOYS AND CHALLENGES its membership across the full spectrum of its unique Government-IP-civil society heritage while, at the same time, seeks, secures and treasures its IO status;

4. generates SHARP ANALYTICS and essential data to influence policy processes, shape global ideas and impact the construction of the 2020-2030 decade, demonstrating its relevance to donors, partners and members at all times on all fronts;

5. embraces a CULTURE OF ACCOUNTABILITY, efficiency and GOOD GOVERNANCE AT ALL LEVELS where decision-making is informed on risk.

The best years of the organisation are undoubtedly ahead but only if the above conditions are all met.
Thank you
Annex

List of reforms, policy updates, system shifts / upgrades conducted since 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPGT category</th>
<th>Added</th>
<th>Name of reform/policy update/system shift</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business engagement, Operational Guidelines</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>IUCN Operational Guidelines for Business Engagement: Sponsorship (Path B) and Licensing (Path C)</td>
<td>Completed 2015/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>IUCN Social media policy</td>
<td>Completed 2015/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Governance of the IUCN website</td>
<td>Completed 2016/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>IUCN Media Policy</td>
<td>Completed 2016/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Writing for the IUCN website</td>
<td>Completed 2016/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Photo policy</td>
<td>Postponed indefinitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Reserves policy</td>
<td>Completed 2015/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Investment Principles and Socially Responsible Investment (SRI) Framework</td>
<td>Completed 2015/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Cash management strategy</td>
<td>Completed 2016/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Global hub for programme administration and finance extended to US office</td>
<td>Completed 2018/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Implementing partners financial procedure</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Project budgeting guidelines</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Finance manual (revised)</td>
<td>Expected 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Regional hubbing of finance for Country Offices completed</td>
<td>Expected 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPGT category</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Name of reform/policy update/system shift</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Fraud prevention awareness with Leadership Team</td>
<td>Completed 2018/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Fraud and corruption prevention campaign</td>
<td>Completed 2018/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Managers’ Guide to Internal Control</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Internal Control Questionnaire</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Internal Control eLearning (beta version)</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Fraud prevention eLearning pilot</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Policy on Internal Control</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Travel Policy and Procedures</td>
<td>Completed 2015/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Insurance procedure</td>
<td>Completed 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Guidelines on handling suspicious mail</td>
<td>Completed 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Energy and Waste Management Guidelines</td>
<td>Completed 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Update, Procedure on Regional Office Hubbing</td>
<td>Completed 2019/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Procurement procedure for Commission members</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Implementing partner selection procedure</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Update, Time management policy</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Procedure for the hosting of IUCN staff attached to other offices</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>IO status with EU</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPGT category</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Name of reform/policy update/system shift</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Sexual Exploitation, Sexual Abuse, and Sexual Harassment (SEAH) awareness raising with leadership team and IUCN-wide – complete</td>
<td>Completed 2018/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Gender mainstreaming strategy for IUCN events</td>
<td>Completed 2019/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Anti-harassment Policy for IUCN events</td>
<td>Completed 2019/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Policy on preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (SEAH)</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Delegation of Authority</td>
<td>Completed 2018/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Guidelines for IUCN’s delegations to major meetings</td>
<td>Completed 2015/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Guidelines on exit processes when departing Switzerland after employment with IUCN</td>
<td>Completed 2015/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Guidelines for planning maternity leave/adopter</td>
<td>Completed 2015/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Junior Professional Officer - Guidelines</td>
<td>Completed 2016/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>International Safety and Security Principles &amp; Guidelines</td>
<td>Completed 2016/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Transition to a cloud-based Performance Management system</td>
<td>Completed 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Formalisation of a matrix structure for programme staff working in Regions</td>
<td>Completed 2017/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Staff Compensation Programme [Salary and Promotion Increases, Performance Awards 2017]</td>
<td>completed 2017/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form for Secretariat staff</td>
<td>Completed 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Guide to Conflict of Interest</td>
<td>Completed 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Conflict of Interest eLearning – Awareness and Improvements</td>
<td>Completed 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPGT category</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Name of reform/policy update/system shift</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Performance Management Guidelines</td>
<td>Completed 2018/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Global Policy for Expatriate Staff</td>
<td>Completed 2018/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Launch, Emerging Leaders programme (P2-M2)</td>
<td>Completed 2018/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Launch, High Potentials (O to P2) programme</td>
<td>Completed 2018/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Internship policy</td>
<td>Completed 2018/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Membership and ToRs, Ethics Committee</td>
<td>Completed 2018/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Staff Rules</td>
<td>Completed 2018/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>End of Employment Policy [Included as a section of the revised Staff Rules]</td>
<td>Completed 2018/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Gender Pay Gap report</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Conflict Resolution Chart</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Ombudsperson Terms of Reference</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Competency Framework with career tracks and job families by grade</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Career Development Framework (including international mobility)</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Flexible Work Toolkit</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Training policy</td>
<td>Postponed indefinitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Storage and Backup Policy for IUCN Information Systems</td>
<td>Completed 2015/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>IS Strategy*</td>
<td>Completed 2015/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>CRM Standards and Data Policy</td>
<td>Completed 2015/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Global Wide Area Network*</td>
<td>Completed 2017/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPGT category</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Name of reform/policy update/system shift</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Global IS Help desk/support</td>
<td>Completed 2017/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Policy for the usage of IS Resources</td>
<td>Completed 2018/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Mobile devices policy</td>
<td>Completed 2018/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Email policy</td>
<td>Completed 2018/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>IS User Account Management Policy</td>
<td>Completed 2018/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>IS Security policy</td>
<td>Expected 2019/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Global, Local and Wireless Network Policy*</td>
<td>Superseded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Contract review procedure</td>
<td>Completed 2016/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Template for Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDA)</td>
<td>Completed 2016/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Template Donor Agreement</td>
<td>Completed 2016/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Template Donor Agreement for Business</td>
<td>Completed 2016/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Template for Implementing Agreements</td>
<td>Completed 2016/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Templates for consultancy agreements for self-employed</td>
<td>Completed 2017/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Templates for consultancy agreements for companies</td>
<td>Completed 2017/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Data Protection Policy for the IUCN Secretariat</td>
<td>Completed 2018/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Policy for the establishment of IUCN’s offices worldwide</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Procedure for retaining external legal counsel</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Tool for contract drafting, review and negotiation</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Guidelines for the establishment of IUCN’s presence</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPGT category</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Name of reform/policy update/system shift</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Terms of Reference for IUCN Editorial Board members</td>
<td>Completed 2016/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Classification of outputs, including guidance on application of ISBN numbers</td>
<td>Completed 2017/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Concept paper on the measurement of IUCN publication output and uptake is under development</td>
<td>Completed 2017/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Terms of reference Publications Committee</td>
<td>Completed 2017/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Publishing Guidelines revision</td>
<td>completed 2018/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Library: Measurement of input of science and knowledge into IUCN</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Assessment of ‘Options for reducing overstock of publications’ conducted</td>
<td>Postponed indefinitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Guidelines for Establishing and Managing IUCN Taskforces &amp; Advisory Panels</td>
<td>Postponed indefinitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>In compliance with the Enterprise Risk Management Policy, risk reporting is integrated into annual budget and workplan planning</td>
<td>Completed 2018/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Project Appraisal and Approval procedures are integrated into the Project Portal</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPGT category</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Name of reform/policy update/system shift</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Strategic Planning and Reporting Framework</td>
<td>Completed 2016/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Project Appraisal and Approval System [online version expected 2019, to include gender marker]</td>
<td>Completed 2016/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>IUCN Project Guidelines and Standards</td>
<td>Completed 2016/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme and project tools</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Programme and Projects Portal</td>
<td>Completed 2016/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>IUCN Style Manual</td>
<td>Completed 2015/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Policy on Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)</td>
<td>Complete 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>IUCN Risk Appetite Statement</td>
<td>Complete 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Soft reporting lines for regional fundraising focal points</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Annual Meeting of Framework Partners and Strategic Partners (revised format)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPGT category</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Name of reform/policy update/system shift</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Legacy/Bequest strategy developed.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Reform Board of Trustees, IUCN UK Charity</td>
<td>Completed 2016/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Development (Membership/Gov</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Procedure for electronic voting</td>
<td>Completed 2015/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ernance/Congress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Development (Membership/Gov</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Membership Applications Form</td>
<td>Completed 2016/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ernance/Congress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Development (Membership/Gov</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Membership Strategy</td>
<td>Expected 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ernance/Congress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item 4.1

External Review of IUCN’s governance

Origin: Chair of the Governance and Constituency Committee

Required action:

The Governance and Constituency Committee (GCC) is invited to consider the Report of the External Review of IUCN’s governance (attached hereafter) and:

a. structure feedback to the SGA and to Council,
b. frame the discussion in Council under agenda item 4.1 on Saturday 30 March 2019, including the role of GCC members in ensuring effective facilitation on Saturday,
c. on Monday 1 April, based on the reflections of the GCC and Council, plan for Council’s “management response” to the external review, including the identification/preparation of any decisions for Council’s consideration at the October meeting and for presentation during the Regional Conservation Forums.
Dear members of the Governance and Constituency Committee,

It is my pleasure to forward to you the report of the External review of IUCN’s governance which the Secretariat received from The Stewardship and Governance Associates (SGA) this afternoon (25 March 2019). Kindly accept our apologies that we were unable to get this to you earlier, but we had several rounds of comments after receiving the first draft ten days ago.

THE GCC will meet on the 28 March to consider this report. I propose that we (1) structure our feedback to the SGA and to Council and (2) frame the discussion in Council under agenda item 4.1 on Saturday 30 March 2019. In addition, we will need to decide on the role of GCC members in ensuring effective facilitation on Saturday.

On Monday 1 April, the GCC will, based on the reflections of the GCC and Council, plan for Council’s “management response” to the external review, including the identification/ preparation of any decisions for Council’s consideration at the October meeting and for presentation during the Regional Conservation Forums. There are also important overlaps with other items on the RCF agenda to consider, including the membership strategy.

I would like to thank Jenny Gruenberger and Ali Kaka, who the GCC designated to support me and work with the Secretariat and the SGA to ensure the TOR are fulfilled and a useful report, that supports the improvement of IUCN’s governance, is produced. Thank you, Jenny and Ali for your leadership and insights and I look forward to your ongoing support. My thanks too to Charles Lor, the Head of the Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk in the Secretariat.

I look forward to our discussions. See you soon!

warm regards
Jennifer
External review of aspects of IUCN’s governance

Report

10 July 2019
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Executive Summary

This report outlines and prioritizes the key gaps between governance practices at IUCN and best practice, using the Four Pillars of Good Governance methodology (supported by Four Areas of Failures), on the basis of the principles held at IUCN such as leadership, delegation, stewardship, integrity, transparency and inclusiveness. It is focused on finding solutions to these gaps. IUCN’s governance is defined as the combination of processes and structures which are overseen by the IUCN Council with regard to how decisions are made in the organization. The Four Pillars of Good Governance framework is a widely-used model to analyse the governance fabric of an organization in a systematic and comprehensive manner and to diagnose potential areas of vulnerability, by assessing four areas: (1) the quality, focus and dedication of an organization’s people; (2) its information architecture; (3) effectiveness of its structures and processes; and (4) group dynamics and the degree to which these enable productive discussions. It is complemented by four areas of failures described later. SGA assesses IUCN’s governance risk to be critical; in other words the organization’s governance weaknesses significantly raise the possibility of a critical failure occurring, with dire consequences to the organization’s mission. However, the organization also has important assets which strengthen its governance capability, namely a high degree of commitment and energy that Councillors and staff, as well as Members, bring toward fulfilling IUCN’s mission.

In order to address the above issues, we recommend taking the following actions to address gaps in and strengthen the four pillars of IUCN governance, as detailed below. In each case, the suggested timeframe for action is also indicated, i.e. short-term (within one year), medium-term (2 to 3 years) or in the long-term (3 to 4 years).

I. People

While Council’s size and diversity are satisfactory overall, our recommendations are mostly related to the clarity of performance standards of Council members and more structured evaluation. We also focus on potential improvements to Standing Committee’s size and composition.

Short-term

We propose a series of recommendations around job description, clarity of expectations, standards of preparation and of evaluation for council members.

Medium-term

- In order to improve the independence and efficiency of the decisions taken by the Council’s Standing Committees, we recommend reducing their size. For the Finance and Audit Committee, we recommend considering the inclusion of independent subject matter experts (ideally with voting rights). This should be supported by the Council’s nomination and evaluation process.

- A minimum 2-year “cooling-off period” for Secretariat members to join Council (and vice versa) will help ensure distinct boundaries and mitigate against the risk of conflict of interest.

II. Information Architecture

The information design is currently comprehensive with a high degree of internal focus. Increasing the focus of the Council papers, would contribute to more strategic discussions during meetings. Ensuring Council members also supplement papers with their own external information sources, would further enhance discussion quality. Also, the agenda seems to be circulated relatively late, preventing effective consultation beforehand.

Short-term

- Councillors need to complete the information provided by the Secretariat with information to which they have access personally to match best practices of information gathering.

- Council meeting agenda should be focused on more strategic issues for the organization, and circulated before the meeting; with amendments made and a final version sent along with the papers 2 weeks ahead of time, to allow an opportunity for more meaningful consultation and suggested additions or amendments by Councillors.
Medium-term

- **Council papers** should complement internal information with greater attention to relevant external developments, to better inform strategic thinking and ability to assess strategic risk.
- **Better communication** between the HQ to IUCN regions would help improve coordination of efforts, to allow for alignment on projects working toward common goals and thus greater impact.
- **Council members** need to work with the Secretariat to co-design the Council portal and papers, to better allow them to fulfil their role of strategic support and oversight.

III. Structures and processes

The quality of Council decision-making depends on structured access to the right individuals who have the required and relevant competence, as well as effective processes. The effectiveness of Council decision-making could be strengthened by enhanced processes in a few key areas, as described below.

Medium-term

- **Risk process at Bureau and Council level**: we recommend further bolstering the council’s ownership of the risk process, to ensure highly professional oversight. The bureau could potentially take a more proactive role in defining risk appetite and expressing a view of risks that is complementary and differentiated from the secretariat and feeds into the council.
- **The Onboarding process for** Councillors should be more structured and amplified to facilitate rapid integration of new council members and continuity across councils. Mentoring by experienced (second-term) councillors could help build continuity.
- A more detailed and structured **Bureau calendar** of all critical processes which require greater sophistication (i.e. strategy, budget, risk, DG oversight) will help systematize regular council attention to these.
- There is a Council perception that IUCN has been having a high level of impact in achieving its mission. Building on the efforts which are already being undertaken by the Secretariat, we would recommend further **professionalizing and systematizing monitoring and evaluation** of IUCN operations, in order to credibly and systematically report and demonstrate impact, according to key indicators, at the Council level.

IV. Culture, dynamics and discussion styles

There seems to be a certain degree of fragmentation at the Council, as indicated by the differing views among Council members with regard to IUCN's purpose and the nature of its responsibilities to its Members. This fragmentation makes strategic alignment difficult and results in potential lack of ability to effectively create and implement strategy. To counteract these, SGA recommends that Council take the following actions.

Short-term

- **Strategic alignment & ownership**: A facilitated discussion and decision process in the first instance would allow for an open, transparent exchange on strategy, respective roles and responsibilities, respect for authority and mutual support, accountability and consequences for inaction or inappropriate action.

Medium- to longer-term

- **Further clarify decision-making responsibilities**, clearly demarcating what responsibilities are within council’s sphere and which decisions are within management’s realm will help to improve accountability and re-establish trust.
- **Improving Council meeting effectiveness**: Since Bureau and Standing Committee meetings are scheduled immediately before Council meetings, there is insufficient time for meaningful consultation of- and reaction to- committee reports by the rest of Council, leading to a lapse in oversight. Also, there is a considerable level of absenteeism and lack of engagement that can be observed during Council meetings Consider increasing the frequency of bureau and committee meetings to four to six times per year (with additional meetings via call or electronic methods/ web conference);
• **Meeting chairing:** chairing of meetings should set clear boundaries for professional councillor conduct. We would recommend temporarily that along with the president, either each of the four vice-presidents co-chair one half-day of council meeting respectively or another facilitation system be chosen.

There is a deeper root cause driving more systemic dysfunction at the Union governance level, and threatening its financial sustainability, as demonstrated by lack of agreement and clarity by the different Union constituents on the overall mission and strategy, and the role of members and donors in this.

• **Rethinking IUCN’s membership model:** Much of the current fragmentation and tension in the current governance system at IUCN is due to the a fundamental disagreement regarding the nature of IUCN’s membership model. We propose consideration of different potential models for membership representation at the Council level, based on a deep analysis of members’ contributions and how these are aligned with the Union’s key priorities. The analysis should have as its objective establishing the direction IUCN should take now and in the future, based on a considered assessment of both developments in the external environment as well as internal resources and capabilities; this area is critical.

• In order to proactively support a positive organizational culture, to build transparent communications and to ensure alignment of communications between the Councillors and members of IUCN management, the Councillors can become more actively involved in supporting the DG to positively influence the organizational culture. This could include regularly receiving measures of employee engagement, as well as talent development and retention strategies, for example.

The above gaps are the result of governance weaknesses, which could be addressed by action taken over the medium- and longer-term (as described above). In addition, we have analyzed the four Areas of Failures of boards as described in the methodology. There are some critical areas toward which SGA recommends IUCN takes action as a priority, some of which would require changing the statutes.

**Key risks:**

1. **Strategy:** lack of strategic alignment within and across bodies lead to a failure to make a focused choice regarding the direction IUCN should take now and in the future, based on a considered assessment of both developments in the external environment as well as internal resources and capabilities; this area is critical.

2. **Relationship between governance bodies of the Union,** notably between Council and Management, but also between other bodies; this area is critical as the bodies are not in a productive, genuine and aligned relationship with a strong professional basis and clarity of roles.

3. **Risk of outright fraud,** or other misbehaviour with potential reputational impact resulting from ethical misconduct or conflict of interest; and, risk of mishandled decision making linked to misunderstood or mishandled conflict of interest. This area is critical.

**1. Introduction**

The IUCN has undertaken extensive efforts to improve its governance in recent years, as evidenced by its regular external governance review process, and its resulting actions to improve its governance practices and processes, resulting in a significant evolution of its decision-making bodies and processes. This includes the range of governance reforms introduced in response to the 2015 governance review recommendations, at the 88th Council meeting (Council document c(88/9/2).

In June 2018, IUCN commissioned Stewardship & Governance Associates (SGA) to conduct an external governance review, in conformity with its commitment to regular external review of governance at least once every four years (IUCN, 2016). The objective of this participatory review was to contribute to the continued improvements in the effectiveness of IUCN’s governance structures, processes and functions including Council’s responsibility and role, provide recommendations to ensure alignment of IUCN governance structures and practices with global best practice.
As per the terms of reference, SGA is delivering an in-depth report including the analysis of survey findings, poll results and background research, additional recommendations for reform / enhanced practices on corporate governance. The recommendations we make are categorized into measures to take in the short term (reforms that can be implemented before 2020 period) to address critical issues, medium term (that require adoption by the next World Conservation Congress in 2020), as well as long-term (additional considerations of further work to move towards best practice). We have had several meetings or calls with members of the GCC, including the Chair, as well as the Director General, to present key findings and to receive feedback.

2. The Governance Framework

Governance is the way in which decisions are taken at the top of organizations – whether corporations, governments or others. With ever-increasing societal expectations of high standards of governance, organizations need to become more sophisticated in their governance capabilities. Quality governance requires a balance between the governance bodies of the IUCN: the Council, the Director General and the Secretariat leadership team (IUCN management), as well as the rest of the IUCN Secretariat, the Commissions, the Congress, and its Membership. As defined by the Terms of Reference, for the purpose of this review, “IUCN governance is defined as the combination of processes and structures as overseen by the IUCN’s Council and implemented by the IUCN Council and its Bureau, Members, Secretariat and Commission to inform, direct, manage, and monitor the organization’s activities toward the achievement of its objectives.”

While governance practices need to be adapted to the specificities of each individual organization, and can take different forms depending on the context and identity of the organization, our view is that organizational governance shares universal principles: the Four Pillars of Governance Effectiveness. This report assesses the strengths and weaknesses of IUCN’s governance, by analyzing the capability of the system to make decisions that are strategic and provide effective oversight. The Four Pillars framework integrates the principles of good governance at IUCN as defined by the Terms of Reference: leadership, organizational performance and accountability; delegation; stewardship, controlling and risk management; integrity; transparency, access to information and public participation; and inclusiveness, diversity and renewal.

The Four Pillars of Governance Effectiveness\(^1\) that underpin organizational governance health are the following:

1. **People quality, focus and dedication**: The quality of the people involved includes the combination of their competence, personal abilities and attributes, leadership and integrity and is typically mapped through a skill map. Also, there needs to be a good fit between the skillset of each member and the corresponding body’s requirements. Diversity in terms of industry, professional background, gender, age, national origin, personality and opinion improves the quality of board decisions – but must be well managed for productive discussion. Just as important as quality are focus and dedication, i.e. what individuals are paying attention to and spending their energy on, as well as the level of energy dedicated to the organization.

2. **Information architecture**: Quality of information is critical to the calibre of debates and of the decisions taken. The information provided to members cannot be limited to formal, internal information provided by the directorate. Formal internal information is ideally balanced with external information through a variety of means, as well as informal processes of information; these must be well-structured when overlapping with the information provided by the organization.

3. **Structures and processes**: Good decision-making depends on the professional organization of what are considered to be key processes, such as strategy, nomination/succession, risk, education and audit, as well as a clearly defined remit and responsibility for each of the different organizational bodies of governance (including committees, commissions and working groups, but also regional committees, national committees and regional fora).

4. **Group dynamics**: A high-functioning governance culture depends on healthy discussion styles and the process of decision-making. In this regard, it is important to consider the congeniality of

discussions as well as the degree of openness to a process of constructive dissent within each body and across bodies.

Several bodies are important actors in IUCN’s governance: the Council, the Bureau, the Standing Committees, the Commissions, the Secretariat and the Congress (refer to Annex 2). As a body with strategic and oversight responsibilities, the IUCN Council has an important role to play in the Union’s governance. Other governance bodies – including the Council Committees and commissions, as well as Members and Donors are also important actors.

Good governance in IUCN entails the application of the following principles: leadership, organizational performance and accountability, delegation, stewardship, controlling and risk management, Integrity, Transparency, access to information and public participation, inclusiveness, diversity and renewal. These principles are also integrated into the Four Pillars methodology, across all four pillars.

While the Four Pillars are the drivers of governance health, there are Four Areas of Governance Failures that relate where governance failures typically lead to critical failures within an organization (refer to Annex 3).

The Four Areas of Governance Failures, which potentially threaten an organization’s ability to fulfil its mission, are:

1. **Technical risks**: Failure to identify, assess and manage critical risks to an organization inclusive of financial and non-financial risks as well as reputational risk.
2. **Strategy**: Selection of non-adapted strategy and lack of agility around strategy.
3. **Relationship across governance bodies** and typically between executives and non-executives, possibly characterized by poor interpersonal dynamics and weak processes around nominations, succession and performance review; and,
4. **Integrity**: inclusive of lack of processes and culture failure around fraud, conflict of interest, and other major forms of potential misconduct.

---

2 Cossin, D. 2014. Board at Risk. Lausanne: IMD Global Board Center
The Four Pillars of Governance Excellence combined with the Four Areas of Governance Failures are the methodological basis for this governance review. The decisions the IUCN takes now are of critical importance. A fundamental question to build into consideration of its governance bodies and structures is: what kind of organization will the IUCN be in 10 years’ time? Our work is intended to help the IUCN to prepare for the governance required over the next decade, in a world characterized by increasing complexity and disruption on a number of levels, including technological, geopolitical, social, and economic.

This report assesses the strengths and weaknesses of IUCN’s governance, in an attempt to highlight the areas it can leverage but also the gaps it needs to address.

Central to its analysis are two guiding objectives:

1. To review the effectiveness of the governance roles and relationships between constituent parts of the Union (Council, Bureau, Secretariat, Commissions, Members and National and Regional Committees) and the principles needed to improve governance.

2. To assess progress and review the effectiveness of the implementation of the Council’s Management Response to the External Review of Aspects of IUCN’s Governance (2015), in particular items of the “Enhanced practices and reforms of IUCN’s governance.”

It is certain that the IUCN has many strengths upon which it can build, including the dedication of its many stakeholders to their view of the organization’s mission, as well as diversity on a number of levels. Never-the-less, our report focusses on identifying the key gaps, in the spirit of building up the awareness needed to shore up areas of vulnerability and therefore further build the Union’s resilience. This includes whether IUCN can professionally assess major strategic choices, whether it has the necessary expertise to mitigate risk, to what degree there is clarity around the roles of different governance bodies and notably the Council, as well as the strength the of the relationship between Council and Management.

3. The Review Process

The SGA governance review process of the IUCN took place from August 2018 to February 2019, and is divided into three phases: (1) exploration, (2) testing of our hypotheses (diagnosis), and (3) recommendations (validation) (refer to Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Exploration</th>
<th>Phase 2: Testing</th>
<th>Phase 3: Validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducted 46 semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Probed emerging hypotheses through polling and discussions during IUCN Council meeting in Jeju</td>
<td>Test recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed IUCN governance documentation</td>
<td>Survey to test hypotheses and deepen understanding of drivers</td>
<td>Probe other areas of concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulated hypotheses to test</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build commitment &amp; buy-in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Three stages of the review process

3.1 Exploration and Assessment

The first phase of the review process involved assessing the current state of governance practices at the IUCN, during the months of August to December 2018. It focused on gathering relevant data/information through engagement with IUCN councilors, members of the Secretariat and selected members. Central to this phase was the process of conducting a set of semi-structured interviews with 28 council members, 15 IUCN secretariat staff members and 4 members (refer to Annex 4 for a full list of the interviews conducted). Interviews were conducted either via Skype, phone or in person (where possible). These interviews were conducted systematically and confidentially, using an interview protocol which was adapted for each respondent. The interview protocol was structured around the above methodology and questions were designed to probe key hypotheses. In most cases, questions were sent to participants prior to the interviews, in an attempt to create a more relaxed atmosphere and foster a meaningful discussion. Interviewees were thus engaged in an informal but in-depth dialogue with the main purpose being to gather information about IUCN’s governance structures.
and practices, and its underlying principles. The majority of interviews lasted between 45 minutes and 1 hour. To respect confidentiality and anonymity of interview responses, results are reported in aggregate, and direct quotes are not attributed to any individual. Analysing these interview responses, SGA identified emerging hypotheses.

We also reviewed available IUCN documents pertaining to governance. An examination of these documents enabled us to contextualize data gathered through interviews as well as enrich our understanding and knowledge of the evolution of governance practice at the IUCN. This phase provided us with insights into the governance conditions of the IUCN council, and some ideas of the challenges facing the organization.

3.2 Testing & Diagnosis
In order to probe emerging issues, and to better understand the (based on those identified through an analysis of the themes identified during the interviews), drivers identified, explored and hypotheses developed. Using the data collected up to that point, SGA prepared a preliminary assessment, which was delivered at the council meeting at Jeju in October. Some initial hypotheses were tested during this meeting, through an in-meeting poll to probe key areas of risk identified. This allowed SGA to investigate further key areas identified and test hypotheses formulated., which served as the basis for the formulation of the questions for the survey, which was conducted over the course of December 2018 and January 2019.

The level of response to the survey was satisfactory. We received 36 responses out of 37 surveys sent to council members. It should be noted that in order to obtain survey responses from council members, SGA sent numerous reminders through a variety of channels (email, phone, and text message). For the IUCN secretariat staff, 38 over 40 replied to the survey; two did not invoking their lack of knowledge of IUCN governance. 22 members and 3 donors responded to the survey. None of the four former staff or council members responded. (Refer to Annex 5 for the full list of survey respondents.)

3.3 Validation
During the third stage, our analysis was further probed, to validate our findings and test the viability of our recommendations. The extensive number of interviews, as well as the richness of the discussions, combined with the extensive comments made by participants during the survey process were helpful indicators in establishing credibility and reliability of our findings. Our report focuses on identifying gaps which need to be addressed to strengthen the IUCN’s governance, as well as on opportunities to reinforce the constant improvement of its governance. This builds on previous reports from external reviews of IUCN’s governance. The extent to which these recommendations can help to improve governance effectiveness at IUCN will be determined by the commitment and buy-in by the organisation to implementing these.

4 Overview of IUCN Governance
As specified in IUCN’s statutes, the World Conservation Congress is the highest organ of the IUCN. Member states and NGOs participate in the Congress, which meets every four years in order to elect Council members, as well as approve the quadrennial plan and the financial plan, appoint the auditor, and approve any proposed statutory amendments.

The Council is the Union’s main governance body, taking decisions on behalf of the Congress. According to the IUCN statutes (Art. 37), “Subject to the authority, direction and policy of the World Congress: (a) the Council shall have responsibility for the oversight and general control of all the affairs of IUCN;”. The roles of the Council are to: “(i) set strategic direction and policy guidance for the work of the Union; (ii) provide oversight and guidance on the performance of the components of the Union as a whole and of the Director General in particular, encouraging coherence among its component parts; (iii) fulfil its fiduciary responsibilities to the Members of the Union and render account to them on the achievement of the Union’s objectives; and (iv) support the Director General in communicating IUCN objectives and policy, and IUCN Programme to the world community.”

At each Congress, up to 38 Council members are elected, as are the Council President, Treasurer, Regional Councillors and Commission Chairs. Statutorily, the Council is required to meet once per year; however, it typically meets twice in any given year. The Council may appoint committees and working groups. These include the Programme and Policy Committee, the Finance and Audit Committee and the Governance and Constituency Committee, but are not limited to these. Committee and working group chairs are elected for the first half of the term of Council; they may be re-elected at the mid-term.
In between meetings, the Bureau makes decisions on behalf and under the authority of the Council (IUCN Statutes, Art. 49). It is composed of the President (Bureau Chair), two Vice Presidents, the Treasurer, one Commission Chair, two Regional Councillors, and the Chairs of the Programme and Policy Committee, the Finance and Audit Committee and the Governance and Constituency Committee.

In addition, there are National and Regional Committees. Every IUCN Member has the right to join the respective National Committee of its State and participate in the election of only one Regional Committee. If an IUCN Member belongs to a State with territory located in more than one IUCN Region, it may participate in the Regional Committee in the IUCN Region to which the State belongs or to the Region, where it is geographically located (IUCN Statutes, Art. 70). Each National and Regional committee may have their own separate legal personality distinct from that of IUCN in form acceptable to the Council. (IUCN Statutes, Art. 71, a). They participate in the Regional Fora of members.

Another important governance body are IUCN’s Commissions, “networks of expert volunteers entrusted to develop and advance the institutional knowledge and experience and objectives of IUCN.” (IUCN Statutes, Art. 73). The Council may propose to the World Congress the creation, abolition, or subdivision of a Commission, or amendment of a Commission’s mandate. Their main functions are to “(a) analyse issues and prepare assessments, reports, action plans, criteria and methodology and undertake research and other scientific and technical work; (b) to undertake tasks assigned to them within the integrated programme of IUCN; (c) to provide advice on any matter within their fields of competence; (d) to broaden knowledge and competence on matters relating to their mandates; (e) to work with Members and the Secretariat to develop activities within the various Regions, and to support Members and components of IUCN with necessary expertise,” (IUCN Statutes, Art. 75).

The Secretariat is composed of IUCN’s staff, and is headed by the Director General (IUCN Statutes, Art. 78). The Council appoints the DG (IUCN Statutes, Art. 79).

As a body with strategic and oversight responsibilities, the IUCN Council has an important role to play in the Union’s governance. It is also mandated to provide oversight and support to the DG, and to safeguard Members’ interest – as well as the Union as a whole and to encourage “coherence among its component parts.” The governance bodies and their inter-relationships are represented in the Figure 3 below.

Figure 3: Bodies of IUCN’s governance system
5. Findings
After analysing the data (refer to a detailed analysis in Annex 8), our findings are listed in this section, structured in three parts: first, around the benchmarking exercise conducted; second, along the Four Pillars of Governance Effectiveness; and third, then around the areas of governance failure and how to mitigate IUCN’s risk. The benchmarking exercise was carried out along the lines of the four pillars of governance effectiveness, which form the methodological framework of this review (refer to Annex 9 for details on the benchmarking methodology). The benchmark offers many insights into current and evolving ways of designing governance practices, as well as structures and processes. Through our examination of different organizations – environmental NGOs and international organizations as well as other organizations–some interesting and innovative practices emerged across what we consider sensitive areas for IUCN, which we highlight below.

Benchmarking
Since there is no established universal definition of “best practices,” each organization has to define aspirational ones depending on its own mission, purpose and context. Some organizations have structures and processes in place that enable them to maximize their efficacy in certain key areas of governance. For this reason, it was fundamental for this review to identify the relevant dimensions of governance for the IUCN’s structures and processes in order to construct the benchmarking criteria. The SGA team carried out a qualitative benchmarking exercise of different types of organizations. First, a few international organizations were selected, in recognition of IUCN’s unique nature, operations and organization. It is important to note that some benchmarking is based on publicly available information, and some not, as we also had recourse to SGA’s knowledge base. Accordingly, there is considerable asymmetry in the information.

The international organizations subject to benchmarking for the purpose of this review were selected because they individually or collectively had a large geographic reach with national subsidiaries or national organizations with whom they need to coordinate and/or have taken recent steps to substantially modernize their governance standards. One other environmental organization was selected for benchmarking because it has a similar environmental conservation mission, is not-for-profit and demonstrates innovation in key governance areas.

Based on the criteria and methodology described above, the following organizations were selected:

- GAVI
- The Global Fund
- WWF
- Gates Foundation
- IFRC (International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent)
- ICRC (International Committee of the Red Cross and Red Crescent)
- ITU (International Telecommunications Union)

These organizations were benchmarked using sub-criteria of each of the four Pillars (though relatively few from Pillar 4: Group Dynamics / Decision-making, since it is difficult to assess consistently across organizations from an external standpoint), as follows:

i. People: number of people, meetings per year, whether proxies are allowed, virtual vs face-to-face meetings, composition (representation), and term limits.

ii. Structures and processes: Committee structure (including whether there is an Executive Committee / Bureau), how explicit and complete the processes are dealt with: Strategy, Nominations and Risk are dealt with, Ethics, conflicts of interest, agenda-setting, transparency of minutes, voting.

iii. Information architecture: structure of board papers / portal, time in advance of meetings that papers are sent, degree of external information included, strategic level of information provided to members.

iv. Decision-making / group dynamics: clarity of delineation of roles & responsibilities between management and board/ Council, degree to which sub-committees report back to full board / Council for decision-making, meeting discipline / chairing.
While our analysis was conducted along the four pillars, we feel that benchmarked organisations can offer the most insight in three critical structures and process, described below.

A. Board composition - representation and independence
Of the organisations benchmarked, independence of board members was important; in several of the organisations, a certain proportion of board seats were reserved for independent subject matter experts. In addition to its 18 “representative” seats, Gavi has 9 seats reserved for independent or “unaffiliated” individuals. As such one-third of its members are unaffiliated individuals who are appointed in their personal capacity on the basis of their skills and networks. ICRC’s assembly is predominantly composed of independent members. Independence is typically defined as having no material interests in an organization, to ensure members are not influenced by interests in the organization. In other words, their decisions as council members have no material impact on them individually.

B. Conflict of interest
In addressing how to prevent, manage and address conflicts of interest, all organizations benchmarked seek to prevent individuals from being in situations that could compromise their objectivity, professional judgement, professional integrity and/or ability to carry out their responsibilities. Their policies vary in the degree of detail and stringency, as well as the requirement for disclosure. To ensure compliance with its conflicts of interest policy, the Gates Foundation requires employees to complete a Conflict of Interest Questionnaire in specified situations. It also includes detailed scenarios in its guidelines, to help employees better understand the application of the policy. WWF has a comprehensive ethics and compliance framework, including a detailed description of what constitutes a conflict of interest and an annual disclosure process.

C. Risk management
In managing risk, all organizations benchmarked include, to greater or lesser degrees, a risk management framework aimed at identifying, assessing and mitigating risk. For example, at the Gates Foundation, the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) and Assurance functions conduct ongoing review and analysis of potential exposures critical to the organization, and ensure mitigation strategies are in place. Common practice across many organizations is the development of a risk register validated at board level.

D. Internal controls
The ethics body of our benchmark organizations is empowered to varying degrees to proactively investigate ethics breaches. The independence of internal audit is a norm respected by the organizations benchmarked. At ICRC, the head of internal audit reports to the chair of the audit committee (an independent experienced member in the field), who is responsible for coaching, supervising and supporting the former on the effectiveness of the internal audit function. The audit covers non-financial matters as much as financial ones. Similarly, the norm is that oversight is provided by the Audit Committee at board level. Organizations commit to varying degrees of disclosure for internal audit. The Gates Foundation reports the results of audit across the organization, whereas the IFRC publicly discloses internal audit reports and uploads them to its public website quarterly. In cases of suspected breaches, a number of organisations benchmarked have whistleblowing policies and independent hotlines. GAVI has a Hotline whereby incidents are reported to Audit and Investigations (“A&I”), an independent function designed to assist the management and stakeholders of Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance (“Gavi”), in accomplishing its objectives.

E. Representation and membership models
The International Telecommunications Union provides an example of a membership-based governance model, which integrates stakeholders from a multitude of sectors and regions. While the ITU is intergovernmental in nature, it has been characterized by public-private partnerships since it was founded, and has always considered the input of private sector organizations to be essential to maintaining its relevance. ITU’s membership includes 193 Member States and around 800 public and private sector companies, and academic institutions as well as international and regional telecommunication entities. Non-state members can apply to be sector Members and/or Associates, and they work to produce international standards under ITU-T’s supervision). Membership dues differ according to member type, as well as geography. Sector Members have the right to participate in all activities in ITU, including chairing groups, taking part in consensus-based decisions, and contributing to all meetings. Associates (who pay a lower membership fee) may participate in one Study Group from one sector, and are not entitled to participate in the decision-making process. As such, the ITU provides a model allowing for non-state members to contribute to developing global standards and best practices, to engage in global and regional debates, to launch innovative public-private partnerships, as well as to network with ICT regulators, policy-makers and experts from industry and academia.
The ITU’s Plenipotentiary Conference meets every four years to elect the leadership team, composed of the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General, the Directors of the Bureaux of the three Sectors (Radiocommunication Bureau (BR), Telecommunication Standardization Bureau (TSB), and Telecommunication Development Bureau (BDT)), as well as the members of the Radio Regulations Board (RRB). In between the Plenipotentiary Conferences, ITU’s Council makes decisions on behalf of the organization. The Council is made up of Member states (5 regions, each with an amount of seats proportionate to population). Each Member has one vote. The 48 Council seats are allocated per region, on the basis of the total number of ITU Member States from each of the five regions. While only State members have voting rights on the ITU’s Council, non-state Members are involved in drafting standards in the working groups. The Conference elects five top officials: the Secretary-General and Deputy Secretary-General, and the Directors of the Bureaux of the three Sectors: the Radiocommunication Bureau (BR), the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau (TSB), and the Telecommunication Development Bureau (BDT).

Four Pillars of Effective Governance

5.1 People
High quality decision-making and strategy relies on the people who make up the governance bodies being highly competent, dedicated and conscientious individuals.

5.1.1 Composition of the Council
While the composition of all governance bodies here is clearly important, the composition of many bodies is determined by a specific required membership structure (addressed in 5.2.2. above). Here we address the composition of the council. A majority of council members are satisfied with the diversity of the council’s composition, yet there is a sizeable minority (35%) who express some degree of discontent. The size of the council seems to be satisfactory for most council members. Some Council members have too limited engagement with one another outside Council meeting, with 11% reporting that they spoke with other council members rarely (1-3 times per year), 29% reporting occasional engagement (5-10 times per year), 29% reporting a moderate amount (10-20 times per year) and 31% reporting more than 20 times per year (refer to Annex 8 – Figure 31). When asked if they agreed with the following statement during the Jeju Council meeting: “We have the right standing committees and commissions and the right people on them,” just 33% of IUCN Management agreed or strongly agreed, compared with 86% of Council who either strongly agreed or agreed. As such, when it comes to composition, there is a striking divergence. There does not appear to be a systematic skill and personal attributes mapping of council members that could inform areas of improvement and development for the Council.

5.1.2 Lack of preparation by Council members
The requirements of the role of IUCN Councillor does not appear to be well understood, as demonstrated by the lack of preparation, lack of engagement by many councillors during meetings, insufficient focus on strategic issues, and inadequate amount of time dedicated to council work between meetings. There appears to be a significant gap for many between Council and best practice, as demonstrated by survey comments, a few of which are listed below for illustrative purposes:

"Inadequate preparation by some council members for Council meetings."

"Because of the workload, many Councillors don’t even read the documents/reports prepared by their Committees. Committee members themselves are often not even aware. The Secretariat is putting lots of effort in the preparation of documents and this is really frustrating to see that people don’t even read them."

"Create spaces for learning and discussion that allow members and commissions to better understand the functioning of IUCN and thus stimulate their participation in the governance processes."

The depth of expertise in finance and audit within the FAC committee should be strengthened to ensure adequate oversight. In addition, the definition of audit should be further expanded beyond its current financial focus.
5.1.3 Lack of systematic performance evaluation follow-up
Council members conduct a self-evaluation; however, when gaps are identified, there is no corrective action taken, resulting in an insufficient degree of accountability. Performance standards are rising as evidenced by increasingly stringent standards and emphasis on measuring performance gaps in both public and private organizations. The IUCN needs to ensure that it has a Council that can partner with its management and vice versa. This means there is a need for greater accountability through evaluation and feedback at all levels, including Council (for example potentially through 360° evaluations). But even if a common performance standard was implemented, contrary to Part IV(j)(1) of the council handbook, which clearly stipulates that councillors should focus on their global roles, a number of councillors perceive themselves as representatives and accountable to IUCN's members, rather than to the union, leading to weakened support for the overall council.

Ensuring individuals are prepared for discussions, have expertise that is relevant to bring added value to the conversation at hand, and a high degree of professionalism in terms of evaluation of performance is essential to governance effectiveness. To this end, we recommend establishing and formally communicating performance standards to all Council members on an individual level at the nominations stage, ensure that Councillors who are nominated have relevant expertise and regularly report on actual performance vs expected performance.

5.2 Information Architecture
Well-structured channels for internal and external information, digested briefings and a portal which has been co-designed by Council and Management are all important factors for the construction of an information architecture that supports a strategic level of discussion.

5.2.1 Meeting information / Council papers
Overall, Council members are satisfied with the briefings that are supplied in advance of meetings. While 60% of council members are satisfied that information for Council meetings is delivered sufficiently early for analysis, a considerable minority (40%) feels that they need more time to analyse the information supplied.

5.2.2 Insufficient involvement of Council in information design
According to the qualitative survey data, Council sometimes feel the information presented to them is not well digested or designed to allow for effective decision-making. In proactively articulating and prioritizing the strategic questions which are critical to achieving IUCN's mission, Council members should be involved in designing the information package, with structured proposals made by the Bureau, so that it contains the answers to these questions and facilitates a discussion centred on strategic support and oversight.

5.2.3 External information incomplete
52% of Council members surveyed at Jeju indicated that the external information provided to the council was not complete, for example on issues such as reputation analysis, customer knowledge, substitutes, stakeholder understanding, technological evolution, etc. Also, there is a lack of systematic process by council members to develop their own channels of external information (and a way to monitor these effectively) to allow them to construct their own external perspective on issues which are of potential strategic relevance to the Union.

In order for Council to fulfill its mandate, it is essential to ensure that the Council information package content is adapted to allow for the right level of strategic questioning and discussion, with sufficient advance of Council meetings to allow for meaningful review. To this end, we recommend an audit of the board portal structure and content together with Councillors, to ensure structured and timely access to key strategic drivers are included in the design.

5.3 Structures and Processes
Overall there is a perception that the current roles (scope), structure (bodies) and processes of the council are well aligned with its responsibilities. Having said that, there are gaps in a few critical structures and processes. The more in-depth processes should be prepared by the Bureau (risk, strategy, succession, etc.) for more elaborated council discussions.

5.3.1 Council agenda
The Council agenda is currently not designed to focus on the council's strategic priorities, and is not well structured. The survey findings indicate that there more than half of Council members feel that the design could be improved, more regularly adapted and adjusted to cover all matters of importance. Best practice
boardroom agenda design leverages the content of management presentations to maximize the percentage of meeting time dedicated to strategic level discussions. Currently, excessive Council meeting time is devoted to management presentations and not enough on discussions. Circulating an agenda 3-4 weeks prior to the Council meeting would allow for more meaningful consultation and allow for revisions in advance.

5.3.2 Committee meeting structure

Nearly half of respondents (46%) indicated that the council and committee meetings’ agenda does not allow sufficient time for a decision-making process based on high quality debates and in-depth board discussions. One possible root cause of this is that the current practice of holding committee meetings immediately prior to council meetings does not allow sufficient time for proper reporting by standing committees to the council. In practice, this translates into much of the work being done and decisions taken at the committee level instead of at Council. In general, use of electronic means for meetings can be expanded as technology evolves to hold virtual standing committees further in advance of Council meetings, and therefore more time to report back to the full Council, before discussion during Council meetings.

5.3.3 Perceived lack of neutrality in the evaluation process for DG

The performance evaluation process for the DG is outlined in Art. 62 and 63 of the Council Handbook with objectives along the One Programme Charter. These could be improved for greater transparency (in terms of specific evaluation criteria), and anonymity (in terms of the 360° feedback), which is considered to be best practice. When it was most recently initiated, the process followed was perceived as lacking credibility, transparency and neutrality, and therefore as not valid by a number of respondents. As such it was not concluded. More professionalism in the process, either via an evaluations committee which includes non-voting council members (independents) or potentially undertaken by an independent third party. Transparent assessment criteria, as well as ensuring anonymity in the responses to the 360° feedback survey would help to bolster its credibility and validity.

5.3.4 Lack of perceived transparency regarding DG succession/renewal

During the review process, we observed that there was a lack of successor in place when the DG announced her imminent departure from the organisation in February 2019. An important function of the Council should be to select and approve the choice of DG, and to then coach and support the DG by providing a constructive context. It is the responsibility of the Council to monitor the DG’s performance and to ensure a proper succession planning in place. This process needs to be engaged in a constant way so that any surprises can be handled smoothly and professionally. As the process is sophisticated and demanding, this could be prepared by the Bureau.

5.3.5 Variable performance of commissions

Commissions are composed by experts to provide advice on IUCN’s conservation projects and to allocate resources among them. As such, they a key governance structure. Their performance is critical to the credibility of the Union. There is a significant degree of variability in the performance of the Commissions and no formal governance mechanism to hold them accountable. For example, Council survey respondents, when asked to rate the effectiveness of the Commissions rated the Species Survival Commission (SSC) and World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) as performing at a level of 2.71 and 2.66 out of 3 respectively, while the Commission on Education and Communication (CEC) and the Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM) were rated lower (rated as 2.06 out of 3). The Management view of Commissions similarly rated SSC and WCPA as being the higher performing commissions (2.61 and 2.39), compared with CEC (1.42), and the World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL) as being less effective (refer to Figures 44 and 45 in Annex 8).

5.3.6 Monitoring & evaluation

Monitoring impact is essential to oversight, which is an essential Council role. This could be significantly deepened and improved by proactively requesting that specific KPIs be designed into the information architecture, for example. In addition to monitoring the impact of projects, this could also include tracking aspects of secretariat culture, since talent is a strategic asset. In the absence of a deep understanding by council of IUCN’s culture and impact, there is a loss of motivation and support.

5.4 Group Dynamics

Dynamics are fundamentally linked to the governance culture. In this aspect, it is necessary to consider areas of dysfunction at the level of group dynamics within the Council. More than half of survey respondents feel that responsibility is a strong value; however, accountability and moral authority are perceived as weaker values.
Differences in opinion and constructive dissent helps to enrich governance. While the diversity of Council members is an asset for the richness of discussion, this is only true where differences in opinion can be effectively exchanged, allowing for a critical view of assumption, which is essential for the development of an effective strategy. In the absence of psychological safety that allows constructive dissent, the Council runs a real risk of sharing common views and heuristics, undermining its governance effectiveness. We recommend a concerted effort to build trust, ensuring a Council culture in which a concerted effort is made for an issues-based exchange of informed views.

5.4.1 Low-energy council meetings

There seems to be low engagement by Council members in meetings, as demonstrated by only 20% of respondents characterizing these as highly energizing. Long presentations take up time and miss opportunities for meaningful exchange. The focus is lost as a result, with council members spending too much time on operational issues, as demonstrated by the qualitative data of the survey findings, such as the following comment (extracted from the survey):

“Council needs to assume (and allocate much more time) to the bigger strategic and directional decisions as well as holding Secretariat accountable to adherence to corporate policy and high level operational KPIs. Currently it spends a lot of the time getting into managerial and technical details.”

We recommend ensuring presentations are kept to a specific number of slides, and that sufficient time is dedicated to discussion.

Chairing of council meetings often falls short in terms of fostering productive dynamics and time management needed to cover the agenda. As a result, meetings often descend into discussions of operational issues and at times derail into unproductive conflict. This contributes to low energy and disengagement by Council members during meetings, due to frustration that the agenda is not covered at that discussions are not more productive. We recommend that the Council meeting Chair implement more disciplined time management, and aim to facilitate discussions that drive toward decisions emerging from the views expressed, where possible.

5.4.2 Lack of "One Voice"

Council members often express that they are the voice of the members (by region) but they should be the IUCN voice inside the membership. In this way, many Council members feel that they have a duty to regional members instead of to the Union as a whole. Council members are expected to take “a global view of the role of the Union in achieving its mission”, while also contributing their regional perspectives “to promote the work of IUCN in the regions,” according to the Council Handbook (art. 14). Also, “elected Councillors have a global role in governing the affairs of the Union as opposed to representing regional interests” (art. 14). While debate and constructive dissent are to be encouraged during discussions, a unified view of related to IUCN’s strategy, mission and role may be lacking, as evidenced by the diversity of views expressed in the survey responses related to IUCN’s mission, strategy and role. This may potentially undermine its ability to communicate effectively and contribute to confusion and frustration at the Union level. We would recommend a one- to two-day Council working session to align on mission, strategy and role followed by commitment to the One Voice principle.

5.4.3 Little impact by Council on IUCN organizational culture

Healthy corporate culture is essential for long-term organizational viability, and as such should be within Council’s scope of influence. However, Council seems to have little impact on IUCN organizational culture. It is important that Council has access to regularly assess (via information obtained from leadership as well as internal management data), whether there is congruence between IUCN’s stated mission and the shared organizational norms that determine how things get done. One important data point to understand organizational culture is how members of management interact with each other at formal and informal occasions, such as Council meetings, site visits, training forums, events, and informal gatherings. By interacting with IUCN’s other employees, for example, during site visits, Council presentations, and organizational events, Council members can deepen their understanding of both the culture and talent. The Bureau could prepare a systematic process thereof.
Areas of governance failure: mitigating IUCN’s risk

Our view is that there are several areas of vulnerability, which are putting IUCN at risk of governance failure across four areas:

i. **Technical risks:** exposure arises from a lack of competence to fully understand the risk exposures of the organisation and to effectively monitor performance and impact at Bureau and Council level. This area is not at a critical level but requires professional work from the Bureau and as follow up by the Council.

ii. **Strategy:** absence of strategic alignment within and across governance bodies lead to a failure to make a focused choice regarding the direction IUCN should take now and in the future, based on a considered assessment of both developments in the external environment as well as internal resources and capabilities; This area is critical.

iii. **Relationship** between governance bodies of the Union, notably between Council and the Secretariat management; this area is critical as these bodies are not in a productive, genuine and aligned relationship with a strong professional basis and clarity of roles.

iv. **Risk of outright fraud, or other misbehaviour by members of Council with potential reputational impact** resulting from ethical misconduct or conflict of interest through their influence on Council decisions which may benefit them or their organizations either directly or indirectly; and, risk of mishandled decision-making linked to misunderstood or mishandled conflict of interest by Councillors. This area is critical.

We will look at each of these dimensions in turn to assess the nature of the risk and its components, the basis upon which we make these claims, as well as recommendations to mitigate the risk. In the following section, we outline the critical issues we have identified, as well as our basis for making each claim and the proposed actions we recommend to address the issue. Our recommendations to address each of the issues raised are made on the basis of the insights gained through benchmarking best practice as well as our experience in conducting governance reviews with other organisations.

### 5.5 Technical Risk

Technical risk is the probability of undesired results occurring due to incomplete, incompetent or simply poor execution of a technical risk process required for effective governance. Extraordinary risks do occur more frequently than expected and preparation is essential as well as a detailed agreement on risk appetite (how much are we willing to take of each risk). Typical risks may include operations, financial, health and safety, cyber, culture. Technical risks may increase due to factors such as lack of accountability, lower levels of dedication among people, incomplete understanding of strategic design or use of information, or dominance by specific individuals (refer to Annex 3). It is important to be conscious of this risk and to actively assess it.

### 5.5.1 There is a lack of risk thinking at the Council level.

Risk thinking is core to the responsibility of Council, as is setting risk appetite across risk dimensions. The Council has identified inadequate risk thinking at Council level (refer to Annex 8, section 5.1.1) as being an issue. In addition, the Council lacks expertise and focus in risk management, which is essential for its role of oversight. Currently, the only place where risk is considered is within the Finance and Audit Committee. Budget planning is discussed in FAC while the work plan is in PPC. The role of the Bureau in risk preparation and oversight of risk management is unclear. One recommended action is that the Bureau take a more proactive and focussed role in this essential process. Another way to mitigate risk is structural independence of oversight; for example, the head of Oversight could have a dual reporting line to the DG and the chair of the FAC.

### 5.6 Strategy

Strategic failures and blind spots can also pose serious problems for governance bodies. Such blindspots can be the result of failing to anticipate disruptive trends. We acknowledge the attention devoted to strategic planning, as part of the governance reforms, including notably Annex 4 to Council decision C/88/7 (Strategic Planning and Reporting Framework), approved by the IUCN Council, 88th Meeting, April 2016, decision C/88/7. There has been indeed an effort to systematize and embed strategic processes within the organisation, as documented in this decision, including critical areas such as the DG’s performance, council planning and reporting, strategic risk analysis. While progress has been made, work remains to be done – notably in the area of alignment around strategic priorities. We acknowledge that the IUCN Programme provides the framework for planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the conservation work undertaken by the Commissions and the Secretariat with and on behalf of IUCN members. However, strategy extends beyond planning and implementing to include a deep analysis of the organisational position vis-à-vis other organisations.
IUCN’s lack of strategic capability was highlighted as being a key organizational weakness, as demonstrated by some of the survey comments below.

**Insufficient time is allocated to the other (non-administrative) functions, i.e. policy making and strategic direction-setting.**

There is a lack of commitment and effort from the great majority of Councillors to engage and discuss strategic directions, threats and opportunities for the organisation, with some preferring (or only able) to delve into the minutiae of IUCN management and the Director-General’s responsibilities.

In certain issues, there has been progress on Council related to IP and some governance elements but Council has not been strategic, nor really assisted with fundraising or setting the future stage for IUCN in terms of making it relevant in the world today.

All the key indicators for biodiversity and ecosystems are going in the wrong direction. We have tended to focus on the wrong strategic priorities at times. Protected area policy has been progressive, albeit with the caveat that many are still under threat and being poorly managed. We are losing the battle to save nature by any measure.

IUCN have been very effective, but I believe this is despite rather than because of Council. Councillors say they want to engage more in discussing strategic directions, but cannot seem to do this practically. Few Councillors (other than Commission chairs) bring ideas to Council or take responsibility for initiating or leading discussion in Council.

To address this, we recommend mapping the organisation’s external context together with the internal capabilities, allowing a more focused approach to how it makes it unique contribution and achieving impact (refer to Annex 10 for a detailed discussion of the board’s strategic-making role).

**5.6.1 There is a high degree of fragmentation within the governance bodies.**

In light of the high degree of commitment among its Council and Management, the fact that 50% of Council member responses to the survey responding that IUCN has been either average or poor in having impact, and 45% of Management responding that this has been either average, poor or very poor, could be interpreted as reflecting a degree of frustration. The fragmented nature of the responses also indicate a lack of alignment, which is undermining a productive governance culture. In some cases, there are perceived factions forming across different lines, in some instances described as North/South, OECD/non-OECD. In addition, several qualitative comments indicated that discussions at Secretariat, Committee and Council level are sometimes dominated by specific individuals such as the DG or the President. This fragmentation makes strategic alignment difficult and results in potential lack of ability to effectively create and implement strategy, a key risk.

**5.6.2 Renewing and updating membership engagement**

Disagreement related to the responsibilities of the Union toward the Members creates issues for strategic planning. The resulting confusion around representation, power distribution, respective roles and financial responsibilities make it difficult to formulate a coherent strategic plan. For example, in the survey, many Councillors expressed a view that they are the voice of the Members (by region). A number express that their duty is to Members in their region instead of to the Union as a whole. While they do indeed have a fiduciary duty to members, their mandate as IUCN council members is to act in the Union’s best interest. This leads to fragmentation of discussion along regional lines when it comes to discussion such as resource allocation or membership admission, inhibiting constructive discussion toward an agreed prioritization and unified course of action.

At the membership level, a number expressed their dissatisfaction with the membership model, including the representation and voting during Congress and the barriers to participation for those members lacking the resources to attend meetings (despite the financial support, the time and human resources dedicated is considerable). 74% of Council members and 65% of Management members feel that there is a need to rethink the principles and structure of IUCN’s membership for the future of IUCN (number of members, principles for selection, services to different groups of members).

The distribution of votes means that in some cases, NGOs of minimal size and impact on IUCN’s mission carry large weight in comparison to larger members. This results in an imbalance between members’ power, with
the voice of national governments sometimes not being sufficiently represented. Financial responsibility between Members and Council is another area wherethere is disagreement. Management more often takes the view that IUCN's role is not to financially support members, while Councillors are less unified in this view. Another question is whether members should members be financially supporting IUCN. There is divergence within both Council and Management in this regard. Strategy requires that an organization make a clear choice as to where to allocate resources, based on its perceived mission and role, relative to other organizations. An additional point of disagreement centres on whether members, for example, should rely on the Union to advocate on their behalf. Within the management team, there is disagreement as to whether it has an advocacy role or not again, indicating the lack of a clear mandate in this regard. Making strategic alignment a priority would allow for a clear and coherent vision on IUCN’s obligations toward its members, and allow for greater cohesion among Council members.

At the heart of this tension lies a fundamental governance question: is the membership model in its current form still relevant to IUCN’s mission and purpose, or could it be updated to better support and further the Union’s goals? IUCN’s membership model is essential to determining what IUCN’s responsibility is to its Members.

IUCN Council and Secretariat management are in agreement with the need to change current practices, and there is a clear requirement for the organization to reinvent itself. Many members also express the need to shift to a different model of representation. However, there is divergence regarding what direction this organizational evolution should take. IUCN’s founding purpose was clearly to represent its members, when it was founded in 1948. This view continues to be held by many of the members, though some express the wish for a better segmentation of the programme of activities corresponding to greater demonstrable impact on member priorities. On the other hand, this view is less firmly held among Secretariat management. Increasingly, there is a general recognition that IUCN’s raison d’être has moved beyond acting solely on behalf of its members. While we recognise the importance of representativeness to IUCN’s core values, the current membership is based on a model of regional representation which may be less adapted to mission completion than another segmentation linked to impact.

Alternative membership models might include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Categories based on combination of both region and organisation rather than solely by regional representation. Categories could be based on IUCN’s statutes: NGOs, INGOs states, etc. or potentially states, NGOS (both national and international), and academia. Differentiated voting weights could help to consolidate and align viewpoints and voices, to mitigate against fragmentation and promote greater constellation around a few poles to allow for more productive exchange.

- Allocation of two council seats per region. The success of this model would depend on effective and fluid coordination and communication between national and regional committees, to ensure integration of members’ voices between the national and regional levels. This could be envisioned through the promotion of a more systematic form of exchange at the regional level, allowing for aggregation of views. However, adequate measures would need to mitigate against the risk of dominance of the discussion by larger members. We would recommend a deep strategic analysis of members, their contribution to IUCN’s mission and their alignment with IUCN’s strategy, as a basis for reflection regarding how to best structure the model for council representations for members. We also recommend the inclusion of independent members potentially on council.

A deep strategic analysis of IUCN’s membership model and what value it is providing (as well as how members are contributing value to IUCN) will help to define the best-suited membership model, upon what basis representation should be considered, and how representation should be balanced with efficiency. We would recommend conducting a comprehensive analysis of the membership models possible, and how these respectively meet strategic requirements. There is a possibility to change structures, and to do this more frequently as organization adapts, via electronic voting. There is no need to wait for a physical meeting of the Congress for structure changes and the organization can adapt faster in order to reinforce itself.

5.6.3 Lack of Ownership of Strategic Thinking

We have observed insufficient ownership when it comes to strategic thinking at the level of Council and Secretariat management. During the poll conducted at the Jeju Council meeting in October 2018, 74% of council members who responded rated the council as either average, poor or very poor in terms of its ability to challenge strategic thinking and co-creating the strategy with management. This leads to a lack of strategic
clarity, with no clear vision for the future, little focus on strategy thinking and design at Council level and management, and little collaboration between council and management in this regard. The Bureau could play a more strategic role in preparing and constructing strategic options to be considered in a systematic and sophisticated process, by council in productive relationship to management.

One of the positive notes emerging from the survey responses is a high level of agreement that IUCN has the ability to have a strong alignment around a clear strategy, demonstrating a willingness to work together. There is a certain level of recognition of the organization’s role in influencing and advocacy – with governments, businesses and other stakeholders, which may be due to IUCN's historical role in advocacy. However, there is less alignment around where IUCN should be directing its efforts to secure its immediate and near-term priorities. Management places relatively greater importance on raising funds than Council, and relatively less on mobilizing the public to support nature conservation.

5.7 Relationships between IUCN governance bodies

The quality of relationships between the governance bodies of the IUCN is an area of concern. Principles of healthy relationship should be the foundation of interaction upon which the bodies who make up IUCN’s governance systems, i.e. its secretariat ( HQ and regional / national offices), council, bureau, commissions, standing committees, regional committees, national committees, members and donors. To this end, clarity and complementarity of roles between these bodies are essential, and should be characterized by the following dimensions:

- Transparency of roles, processes and structures of the different bodies
- Clear accountability within the system
- Clear demarcation of responsibility - absence of overlaps at parallel level of decisions

The relationships between IUCN’s different governance bodies in many cases lack transparency and accountability, as well as clear distinctiveness between roles. This leads to duplication of efforts and a lack of accountability, as well as undermining trust between many of the bodies. Effective relationships between the following bodies are essential for strong governance of the Union:

- Council (including regional and national committees) and Secretariat (HQ and regions)
- Bureau- Council
- Bureau- Secretariat
- Commissions with the rest of the Council
- Standing Committees with the rest of the Council
- Members- Council- Secretariat
- Donors- Council- Secretariat

The result is inefficiency of decision-making, overlap of roles, and a distrust between bodies. The lack of accountability is also a potential source for members’ disengagement, as well as a tendency for donors to distance themselves.

5.7.1 Relationship between Council and Management

The relationship between IUCN’s council and its management both at the individual and group level characterized by a high degree of tension and mistrust. This lack of trust is undermining the organization through a number of destructive impacts to the organization, including difficult interactions and tense relationships. In response to the following question: “Do you think management feels safe to elevate difficult issues to the Council?”, only 3% of respondents replied “Yes, absolutely”. A lack of psychological safety at an organizational level is highly problematic. A major risk that we see is that Management does not feel safe to alert the council to potential areas of concern it sees to the organization. We recommend that a process be put in place to ensure respectful interactions are maintained in the case of difficult relationship, to ensure that interactions remain professional and non-personal, and to adhere to highly professional standards. This may require facilitation in order to rebuild trust, and re-establish the foundation for healthy relationships. Clarity, respect and professionalism of sensitive processes such as nomination and performance review is essential.
Qualitative data from the survey indicate that Council members are getting involved in operational issues which are outside the scope of their mandate, as demonstrated by the following comments made:

- “Some Councillors are going too much into the Operational role.”
- “Confusion between the governance role of Council on the roles and responsibilities of the Secretariat.
- “Not everybody understands how IUCN governance works. There is a lot of micro-management which creates much (and often unnecessary) work. This can create pressure and tensions.”

While a deeper involvement on sensitive and complex processes should be expected from the Bureau, ad hoc involvement of council members (for example in issues related to secretariat staffing) can be seen as dysfunctional. Greater clarification, respect and accountability of delineated roles and responsibilities would help to resolve this tension.

5.7.2 Members’ disengagement

There is a diversity of views regarding the best model of governance for IUCN. While 40% of Council feels that members should be driving IUCN’s organizational direction, 44% of management sees Council as the body responsible for this function. As such, there is a clear division between these two bodies regarding how governance responsibility within IUCN is perceived. The current lack of a mutual understanding on where governance responsibility lies is natural, given this difference in perception.

A number of Members feel that their interests are not being actively considered, that there is a lack of tangible benefits of IUCN membership and/or that the Secretariat is unresponsive when they do send requests. There is a degree of frustration, which is demonstrated by the following survey comments made by Members:

- There is little opportunity for members to interact with the Secretariat or the Council, other than via national/regional Councilors. Many Councilors are not regularly in touch with the membership; thus, we often feel that IUCN operates independently of the members. The Council is, in reality, supposed to be supporting the Union, which IS the membership. Furthermore, the Secretariat does very little to support national and regional committees. These committees are doing the work of IUCN and working hard to engage members, recruit new members, and retain existing ones. Having no support from Headquarters is a shame
- Members cannot exert their full role and influence.
- Disposent de part leur position d’informations clés qui leur donne une longueur d’avance sur le conseil et les membres; en communiquant l’information à quelqu’un, on a toujours un pouvoir sur la personne Améliorer le partage de l’information et clarifier les responsabilités dans les prises de décisions

Also, regional and national offices sometimes fail to sufficiently coordinate with members in their regions or countries. A number of regional offices lack budget and resources to be able to proactively engage with members. A number of members have expressed the view that the implementation of projects at the regional level is competing for resources with their own efforts. Many members may not have sufficient knowledge or be empowered enough to respond to this type of competition for resources. One of the survey comments from a Member demonstrates this perceived lack of coordination.

No clear links and interactions among global and regional governing bodies and the national committees and the members of different commissions. Commissions work differently and relate to national experts independently this causing conflicts and image and reputation problems for the Union.
Another issue is that while some members applaud the democratic decision-making, others believe it should be more proportional to size, i.e. that smaller or less impactful NGOs should not have the same decision-making power as larger or more impactful ones. One of the comments from a Member survey respondent illustrates this perception of a lack of proportionality when it comes to Member representation.

Improving the strategic clarity of the Union's core purpose, and the corresponding revenue and service model, will help to ensure greater alignment of governance structures, power distribution, as well as to set expectations correspondingly.

5.7.3 Relationship between Council and Standing Committees

Standing committees are the Council bodies mandated to take ownership for analyzing and assessing their respective area of responsibility, and to report back to Council an overview of the status of this area, as well as any areas of potential concern. It is important that Council views the work done by the Standing Committees as the highest level of quality and integrity, and to trust its findings. Respondents rate the relationship between Council and its Standing Committees as appropriate, for the most part – with a small minority expressing disagreement. This seems to be a relationship that is working well for the most part, helping to improve Council’s effectiveness in exercising its oversight mandate.

5.7.4 Variable performance of IUCN Commissions

Since Commissions mobilize experts in different areas of resource, their performance is of critical importance to the Union’s governance. There is considerable variability in the way that different Commissions’ effectiveness is perceived; when asked to evaluate their performance out of 3, scores ranged from 1.42 for Commission on Education and Communication (CEC) to 2.61 for the Species Survival Commission. Introducing stronger accountability in commission performance requirements could be considered to achieve more consistently high levels of Commission performance.

5.7.5 Relationship between Bureau, Committees and Secretariat

The relationships between the following bodies have been characterized by varying levels of dysfunction:

- Council with Secretariat: this is discussed in 5.7.1.
- Within Council:
  - Council with Bureau: The qualitative data from the survey findings indicated a lack of transparency within the Bureau, and a perception that the Bureau has undue influence within the decision-making process of the council. Processes do not clearly specify that the Bureau is specifically expected to prepare for council discussions.
  - There is also a view that Council members, in particular standing committee members, are not consistently held accountable to responsibilities included within their role of strategic support and oversight to the Union as a whole. The result is insufficient engagement by many councillors on issues which are critical to the organization’s future, as well as a feeling by secretariat that the demands placed upon them by the council are onerous. This may be further exacerbated by the voluntary nature of the role of councillor, and the nominations process which does not always systematically assess the capabilities or level of dedication to IUCN. Also, within the secretariat, many have expressed the view that committee chairs are frequently unresponsive or in some cases lacking respect in their interactions with staff.
- Council and Secretariat with Members: qualitative survey findings indicated that there is no formal contact or forum for Members to meet and exchange with the IUCN Council and President. Additionally, Members reported a lack of responsiveness on the part of Council to Members’ communications. These dysfunctions are illustrated by the survey comments from Members below:
• Council and Secretariat with Commissions: While in general, the work of Commissions is well respected across the organization, as well was the way that the Secretariat, Council and Commissions work together to implement the One Programme, qualitative survey data indicated a degree of competition in some cases between the Secretariat and Commissions. Also, there is potentially insufficient structural accountability by Commissions to Council. Commission Chair report annually to whole Council. Linking performance of the Commission, based on specific criteria, to evaluations of Commission Chairs, but also Commission members, would help to improve accountability.

5.7.6 Revolving door between Secretariat & Council
As discussed above, Council is mandated with oversight and strategic role, while Secretariat is responsible for operations. These distinct roles and responsibilities have not always been respected. This blurring of boundaries is further exacerbated by former Secretariat employees who immediately took up Councillor positions, upon terminating their employment with the Secretariat. There is currently no mandated time period between ending employment at IUCN secretariat and becoming an IUCN councillor. This leads to situations in which councillors are sometimes perceived as lacking independence and/or intervening into matters which are within the jurisdiction of the IUCN Management.

5.8 Integrity
Integrity is also key to effective governance. Fraud is a major area of risk, which can undermine the organization’s reputation and mission. Elements of fraud include material false statement, a knowledge that the statement was false when it was uttered, reliance on the false statement by the victim, and damages resulting from the victim’s reliance on this false statement. The major areas of exposure include corruption, misappropriation of assets, and financial statement fraud. There are a number of red flags which organizations need to monitor and pay close attention to, including timing differences, concealed liabilities, and improper disclosures. It is therefore important to put into place appropriate fraud detection techniques as well as a whistleblowing program, and an action plan for when fraud does occur. Building a values-based culture along with building a positive working environment, including education and reinforcing values are key to reinforcing the organization’s ability to fight against fraud. Effective oversight structures are essential to preventing against fraud and reinforcing a high level of integrity.

5.8.1 Lack of independent ethics oversight
The IUCN Council’s ethics committee is comprised of the president vice presidents (Art. 42 of the IUCN Council handbook). It is responsible for consideration and administration of all matters relating to the Code of Conduct and for assisting the council in implementing the provisions of Article 65 of the IUCN Statutes and all other statutory provisions relevant to the ethical conduct of Council members. Part V of the Code of Conduct contains detailed provisions for the implementation of the Code and includes an Annex defining a “Procedure for dealing with issues submitted to the Ethics Committee for consideration and decision”. The Secretary to Council acts as the Secretary to the Ethics Committee (Art. 43). The composition and process lacks sufficient structural independence and the capability to manage conflicts of interest of Council members or other potential cases of ethical misconduct of Council members appropriately.

Within IUCN, the lack of and independent ethics body raises the risk of ethical misconduct not having proper oversight. Over half of respondents indicate being aware of ethical misconduct at the senior staff level. 70% of councillors reported being aware of misconduct more generally within IUCN. This is a critical area for concern, as it presents a significant organizational risk for the organization if unaddressed, including legal action but also reputational damage, talent attraction and staff retention. Council members seem to lack sufficient
knowledge and dedication around potential and perceived conflicts of interest within IUCN. In addition, while there are mechanisms for fraud detection, strengthening these would help to safeguard against the risk of misconduct going unreported, as well as contribute to further reinforcing the organizational culture of integrity.

Recommendation: We recommend the creation of an ethics and conduct body comprised of independent, non-voting members, education on conflicts of interest norms and standards, as well as a complete interest registry made public. In order to respond effectively in cases where misconduct occurs, and to contribute toward a culture in which employees, Members and Councillors are empowered to report cases of misconduct, we recommend a third-party (or external or independent) Ethics Hotline that safeguards anonymity and data security. A whistleblowing policy that protects the rights of individuals who report ethical misconduct of any kind is also an important measure to help build a culture that is serious about detecting fraud.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

We are highly aware of the areas of governance failures which can have destructive consequences. Our report seeks to highlight key vulnerabilities of IUCN’s governance, and the risk this poses to the organization, with a view to helping raise awareness and build the case for improvement. Clarifying the nature of the council’s role and reinforcing its strategic view going forward is fundamental. Fundamental to this is its relationship with members, as well as with donors. An in-depth analysis to critically re-examine IUCN’s membership, what value it delivers to its members, but also how members are contributing to the union, will be an important strategic reflection to undertake; the outcome of this thinking will inform the nature of the governance reforms regarding the nature of representation. Clarity around this will go a long way in resolving the centralization-decentralization tension that we observed.

Reinforcing structures and processes to support effective Council discussion and decision-making, will help foster more productive discussions. Essential to this is greater structural independence of the ethics function, to prevent conflict of interest and mitigate against the risk of ethical misconduct. Ensuring highly professional nominations and evaluation processes – notably the DG’s succession process – is also key to ensure both continuity and renewal in the organisation’s leadership. Greater accountability by individual bodies and members, will help to bolster the consistency of performance, and again raise the quality of discussions and decision-making. Critical to any improvement is rebuilding trust between council and management, and using this as the basis to instigate a culture change in the organization.

We hope that our recommendations will be implemented to help reinforce IUCN’s governance, as it works to fulfil its mission which is more important than ever, and to build its resilience to overcome the risks it now faces.

Drawing upon our analysis of the survey findings (refer to Annex 8), which details the issues identified and possible solutions, we have summarized our recommendations in two tables: Table 1 provides recommendations structured around the 4 pillars of governance effectiveness, again summarizing the key issues as well as recommendations to respond to the issue identified. Table 2 lists the key risks and issues, with the corresponding recommendations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 People</td>
<td>6.1.1 Council composition / dedication of councillors</td>
<td>6.1.1 Nominations process to stress expectations regarding time spent on Council work, including time spent engaging outside of meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.2 Lack of preparation by council members</td>
<td>6.1.2.a Council (this could be a task force for example) could conduct a detailed skill and personal attribute mapping at the council level to assess what skills, competence and expertise are needed at council level, to help build alignment of skills with strategic direction, value added to the current board composition, as well as cultural fit with the board and training/improvement needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.2.b Communicate expected preparation norms in councillor job description, including time and commitment involved and performance indicator / evaluation standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.2.c Draft clear job descriptions of role of IUCN Councillor, aligned with the strategic and oversight goals of the Council, and the roles &amp; responsibilities, including performance indicators and independent evaluation, conducted externally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.3 Lack of sufficient evaluation at the individual councillor level</td>
<td>6.1.3.a A council charter would help in clearly articulating the responsibilities of each Council member, the culture expected on the council and all governance bodies, inclusive of values of accountability and responsibility, and the process for a regular (annual or bi-annual) assessment against objectives (which should be specified in council members’ contracts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.3.b Write job descriptions of desired profiles, customized by type of Council member, role, what they need to achieve and how they are adding value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.3.c Evaluation of individual members to be conducted by a third party, and any performance gaps addressed by the Governance &amp; Constituency committee within the limitations of the structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.3.d The FAC ToR should explicitly articulate the role and responsibility of the committee with regard to its: its expectation of the external auditors; its relationship with the internal auditor function; its role in overseeing the full range of audits conducted within the organisation; disclosure of financial and related information; as well as any other matters that the FAC feels are important to its mandate or that the council chooses to delegate to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Information Architecture</td>
<td>6.2.1 Meeting information / Council papers</td>
<td>6.2.1.a Systematically ensure papers for council meeting are available at least 2 weeks before council meetings on the council portal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2.2 Insufficient involvement of Council in information design.</td>
<td>6.2.2.a Bureau to determine what strategic questions and risks are vital and ensure that the information package contains the relevant data and sufficient analysis, allowing for an effective discussion centred on strategic support and oversight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2.3 External information incomplete</td>
<td>6.2.3.a Bureau should determine what external information should complement internal information in the Council papers, to better inform strategic thinking as well as its ability to assess strategic risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6.3 Structures and Processes | 6.3.1 Council agenda not sufficiently structured or focused on strategic priorities | 6.3.1.a Final meeting agenda circulated three to four weeks in advance of council meetings in order to allow adequate time for meaningful consultation, proposals of items by council members for final inclusion and approval.  
6.3.1.b Maximum of 30% of meeting time allocated to management presentations, to allow sufficient time for discussion (hold maximum number of slides (e.g. 7) and time to each presentation (e.g. 7 minutes) with more materials potentially in appendix or in information package). |
| 6.3.2 Committee meeting structure allows too little time for proper reporting by standing committees to the council | 6.3.2.a Hold Standing Committee and Bureau meetings 4 to 6 times per year, at least twice by electronic/web conference and twice in person before Council meetings.  
6.3.2.b Prepare podcasts and/or reports of critical management issues, so that committee and bureau members can prepare beforehand. |
| 6.3.3 Perceived lack of neutrality in the DG evaluation process | 6.3.3.a Establish clear metrics upon which DG will be evaluated. Conduct the evaluation professionally and anonymously, via an evaluations committee. |
| 6.3.4 Perceived lack of transparency regarding DG succession/renewal | 6.3.4.a. Proactive and transparent process for DG succession and renewal process to be undertaken as a regular activity of the Bureau. Succession planning for critical leadership positions and identification of qualified pool on both an emergency basis and over the longer term, also by the bureau. |
| 6.3.5 Variance in performance of commissions | 6.3.5.a Consider introducing stronger accountability in commission performance requirements, including systematic reviews of individuals involved in leadership of Commissions. |
| 6.3.6 Monitoring & evaluation | 6.3.6.a Professionalize monitoring and evaluation of IUCN’s strategic process. |
| 6.4 Group dynamics | 6.4.1 Low-energy council meetings | 6.4.1.a Chair to maintain greater discipline of Council discussion, to ensure its strategic focus, to surface areas of difficulty and concern, as well as to drive a professional, disciplined and productive council culture, as well as to manage meetings with discipline.  
6.4.1.b Feedback to the Chairman via an evaluation or other should be prepared by the council on a yearly basis, and provided by the chair of the Governance and Constituency Committee.  
6.4.1.c Council meetings to be temporarily co-chaired with VPs taking it in turn (e.g. 1 VP per half-day) or by another facilitator to increase council meeting efficiency immediately |
| 6.4.2 Lack of “one voice” | 6.4.2.a While Council members are encouraged to engage in constructive dissent during meetings, after the decision has been taken, Council members need to be aligned and to actively support this decision.  
6.4.2.b Council to make use of any site visits, presentations, or other Union events, to deepen their understanding of both the culture and talent. The Bureau to prepare a systematic process thereof. |
| 6.4.3.c | Council members should seek input from the senior leadership team, including asking for information to better understand cultural dimensions of the organisation, such as employee survey results, internal audit reports, reward and performance management systems, and organisational measurement systems. |
| 6.4.3.d | The Council needs to determine, through a process of iterative conversations with management, the shared norms that IUCN aspires to have and identify the gaps within the existing culture. |

<p>| 6.4.3 Little impact by Council on IUCN organizational culture | 6.4.3.a | Council to make use of any site visits, presentations, or other Union events, to deepen their understanding of both the culture and talent. The Bureau to prepare a systematic process thereof. |
| 6.4.3.b | Council members should seek input from the senior leadership team, including asking for information to better understand cultural dimensions of the organisation, such as employee survey results, internal audit reports, reward and performance management systems, and organisational measurement systems. |
| 6.4.3.c | The Council needs to determine, through a process of iterative conversations with management, the shared norms that IUCN aspires to have and identify the gaps within the existing culture. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Technical</td>
<td>6.5.1 Lack of risk thinking at bureau and Council level</td>
<td>6.5.1.a Professionalize risk thinking and building capabilities at the Council level, to mitigate technical risks. The Bureau could take an extended role in risk oversight preparation, developing a more considered view of risk appetite, for example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.1.b Modify reporting lines to strengthen independence of oversight: Head of Oversight to have a dual reporting to the head of the FAC and the DG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Strategy</td>
<td>6.6.1 Fragmentation within the governance bodies</td>
<td>6.6.1.a A facilitated process amongst governance bodies with a goal to build alignment around the IUCN strategy, and focused on allowing for sufficient attention to external developments as well as potential future opportunities and threats emerging from the external competitive landscape would be useful to conduct on an ongoing basis. This should be prepared by the bureau in interaction with management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.1.b Develop a more extensive continuing education program for councillors regarding the strategic process, including deepening understanding of the strategic role required of council members. These could be designed both as online and offline sessions (refer to Annex 6 for a proposed education program).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.2 Renewing and updating membership engagement</td>
<td>6.6.2.a Based on outcome of strategic planning process, the Bureau should conduct a comprehensive analysis of the membership models possible, and how these respectively meet strategic requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.2.b Conduct an analysis of the membership model best adapted to IUCN’s strategy; consider adoption of a more agile process to adapt membership model to IUCN’s strategic changes in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.3 Lack of Ownership of Strategic Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.3.a Building the Council’s strategic muscle through facilitated strategy sessions, to build understanding and alignment around strategic priorities. Use of online tools could help alleviate cost impact. The Bureau should be deeply involved in the strategy process and the preparation for the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.3.b Detailed description of strategic function in Councillor’s job descriptions should be developed and part of an education process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.3.c Further education strengthening the emphasis on Council’s strategic role and building strategic capabilities during the onboarding process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 Relationships between IUCN governance bodies</td>
<td>6.7.1 Relationship between IUCN Council and Management</td>
<td>6.7.1.a Process to ensure respectful interactions are maintained in the case of difficult relationships: following an established process will help to ensure that interactions remain professional and non-personal, and to adhere to highly professional standards. This may require facilitation in order to rebuild trust and re-establish the foundation for healthy relationships. Clarity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1.b</td>
<td>IUCN Secretariat to interview members with regard to their communication and information needs, with a view to enhancing formal and informal information flows between IUCN Secretariat HQ and regions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.2.a</td>
<td>Through interviews with select members, a concrete proposal of different membership models could be developed to better understand how these would contribute to enhanced member engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.2.b</td>
<td>Develop more proactive communication plan to improve transparency and coordination between regional and national offices with members in their regions or countries, for more proactive engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.3.a</td>
<td>Introduce committee-specific performance standards into Council member job descriptions, and ensure accountability to these standards is done regularly and transparently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.4.a</td>
<td>Introduce stronger accountability in commission performance requirements – at both body and individual levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.5.a</td>
<td>Accountability strengthened through clear performance indicators and evaluation procedure for standing committee members, as well as council members more broadly, conducted externally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.5.b</td>
<td>Greater transparency of bureau’s own processes and discussions and reporting back to council for decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.5.c</td>
<td>Nominations process which systematically assesses subject matter expertise for the scope of work of the committee, as well as emphasis on understating the role and dedication of the individual candidate during the onboarding process (refer to skill map in Appendix 11).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.5.d</td>
<td>Discipline regarding reporting lines and appropriate channels of communication between Secretariat and Bureau &amp; standing committee members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.8.a</td>
<td>Require a minimum of a 2-year “cooling-off period” for secretariat employees who wish to become Councillors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8.1.a</td>
<td>An Ethics and Conduct body (committee for example) that is comprised of independent, non-voting members and which has processes that engages IUCN on an elevated awareness of potential conflicts of interest and ensures that incidents can be dealt with promptly and securely in a confidential and professional way. IUCN should have transparency on the work of this body.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8.1.b</td>
<td>Education on conflicts of interest norms and standards, as well as more sophistication on processes to observe, including a complete interest registry made public (including links to individual disclosure of interest forms).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8.1.c</td>
<td>A third-party (or external or independent) Ethics Hotline that allows the safeguarding of anonymity, with data stored securely and access to data username/password protected. This should be included in the councillor code of conduct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8.1.d</td>
<td>A Whistleblowing policy that protects the rights of individuals who report ethical misconduct of any kind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
96th Meeting of the IUCN Council, Gland (CH), 28-31 March 2019

Agenda Item 4.4

Draft IUCN Programme 2021-2024

Required action:

The Council is invited to consider the draft 2017-2020 IUCN Programme and may wish to make comments, as appropriate, to allow the Director General to prepare a revised version to be used for initiating the consultations with IUCN Members and other partners, including through the Regional Conservation Fora.

Note

The attached draft IUCN Programme so far consists of the substantive elements of what IUCN intends to seek as objectives and to deliver as contribution in the period 2021-24. An Operational and Financial Plan will be developed in later stages once there is more buy-in about the broad directions of the IUCN Programme and the feedback from the IUCN membership will have been taken into consideration.

During the 96th Council meeting, the Programme and Policy Committee will review the draft Programme 2021-24 and present its recommendations to Council under agenda item 4.4.

At Council’s 97th meeting (17-20 October 2019), the Programme and Policy Committee will be informed of the feedback from the membership, through the Regional Conservation Fora and online and have the opportunity to consider at that time, as the case may be, proposals for reflecting this feedback in a revised draft.

At its 98th meeting (8-11 February 2020) Council will consider the revised draft Programme that will form the basis of discussions during the 2020 World Conservation Congress.
The IUCN Programme 2021-2024

I. Nature conservation: From world challenge to global opportunity

The world is living through a decisive moment in its history and in the conservation of nature. Never before has the assault on nature, and the foundation for all life on earth, been greater. Never before has the world been more capable, including through its knowledge and experience, of finding an effective response. The pivotal year of 2020 is seen by many as the defining moment of our times.

A critical challenge for the global community is to understand and secure nature’s life support systems so that humanity and all life on Earth may continue to prosper. Conserving nature is a non-negotiable prerequisite for achieving the broader vision of a more prosperous, healthy and equitable world. The year 2020 is first in a decade where that pathway will be defined, once and for all. If the world does not reverse the loss of nature, it will undermine any prospect of achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by 2030.

But there is great room for optimism, because the integrity of the natural world can be strengthened as the foundation for achieving humanity’s vision for 2030. The evidence that effective conservation not an obstacle to human aspirations, but an essential partner, it offer s essential and valuable contributions towards all human endeavours. Safeguarding nature not only provides the essence of life and livelihoods, the way it is done can help provide decent work and prosperity for millions of people around the world. It can greatly enhance food and water security, help tackle climate change and contribute significantly to securing human rights and world peace. Put simply: nature conservation enhances peoples’ lives.

IUCN has a proud record of coordinating action across its global constituency to support success. The ten years leading to 2030 will be crucial for the future of all life on Earth. In 2020, this IUCN Programme 2021-2024 provides the roadmap of how IUCN will catalyse this opportunity. Building on the strengths of our existing work and launching some bold new initiative, the programme recognises the complete interconnectedness of nature and society and addresses them accordingly. It is designed for an increasingly prosperous, urban, and yet crowded planet whose vision for 2030 can be achieved only if it gets conserves nature and life support systems.

II. Our Challenges and IUCN’s Approach to the 2021-2024 Programme to address them

<add summary of the IPBES 2019 report>

The future of life on Earth depends on the choices we make in 2020. The 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda positions environmental sustainability at the same level as social and economic sustainability for the first time. The IUCN Congress 2020, being convened ahead of the UN General Assembly and the negotiations on the post-2020 biodiversity framework offers a grand opportunity to position the nature conservation arguments at the centre of debate and to provide expert input into delivering these in practice. The IUCN Programme 2021-2024 has the historic opportunity to influence and support implementation of a bold and transformative suite of activities to ensure that the world takes the second of these paths towards 2030 in 2020 by addressing the following four challenges:

- **Land degradation and the overexploitation of terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems.** The 2018 Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) Assessment Report on Land Degradation and Restoration gave the world a stark warning noting that “degradation of the Earth’s land surface through human activities is negatively impacting the well-being of at least 3.2 billion people, pushing the planet towards a sixth mass species extinction, and costing more than 10 per cent of the annual global gross product in loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services.” Besides meeting food production needs of a growing population, land is under increasing pressure to supply biofuel, bioplastics, and other goods and services. The technological solutions introduced to meet these demands introduce new risks to biodiversity (synthetic biology, systemic pesticides, etc.).

- **The asphyxiation of oceans:** The First Global Integrated Marine Assessment (2016) found that the pressures on marine biodiversity are increasing, particularly near large population centres and in areas, such as the open ocean, that have so far suffered only limited impacts. Crucial areas for
marine biodiversity, particularly coastal areas, are magnets for human uses. To long-standing uses of the ocean, such as fishing and shipping, are added newly developing uses such as mining and offshore energy generation. The current, and growing, levels of population and industrial and agricultural production result in increasing inputs of harmful material and excess nutrients into the ocean. The exploitation of living marine resources has exceeded sustainable levels in many regions. Globally, the current mix of the global capture fisheries is near the ocean’s productive capacity, with catches on the order of 80 million tons. Overexploitation has also brought about increased by-catch and changes to ecosystems. Reproductive success and survival is being reduced by overexploitation, pollution, noise, loss of habitat and other forms of disturbance, including climate change. Climate change and related changes in the atmosphere have led to rises in sea level, higher levels of acidity in the ocean, the reduced mixing of ocean water and increasing deoxygenation.

• The threat of climate Change. The 2018 IPCC Special Report confirmed that human activities are estimated to have caused approximately 1.0°C of global warming above pre-industrial levels, with a likely range of 0.8°C to 1.2°C. It predicts that global warming is likely to reach 1.5°C between 2030 and 2052 if it continues to increase at the current rate. Limiting global warming to 1.5°C would require deep transformation, including on land, urban and industrial systems. It would reduce climate-risks on biodiversity and ecosystems, including species loss and extinction.

• The disempowerment of people and nature: The 2018 Report of the UN Secretary General report on Gaps in International Environmental Law bemoans the fact that implementation and compliance with the cluster of biodiversity-related treaties remains a major issue. It identifies the adoption of the concept ecosystem services as a unique opportunity to mainstream biodiversity in other areas of policy and law. It urges more attention be given to the governance of both direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss.

III. 2020 – a pivotal moment for nature and people

The 2011–2020 Decade of Biodiversity and progress against the 2011–2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity has been one of mixed success. On the one hand, where implementation of programmes has been effective, there is no doubt that the state of nature is much better than it would have been in the absence of conservation. For example, IUCN analyses show that declines towards species extinction would likely have been at least 20% worse without the efforts of the conservation community, and national governments have supported the extensive growth of the world’s protected and conserved areas, especially in the marine realm. On the other hand, the state of nature has continued to decline.

Where targets in the 2011–2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity were structured to elicit commitments and measurable action from all of society, they have been more productive. A great innovation of the 2015 Paris Agreement under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change was the adoption of a planetary science-based target – of keeping human-caused climate change to 1.5–2°C above pre-industrial levels. This target is of the form that can then be disaggregated into specific science-based targets for reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by individual actors. These actors include countries who embed their specific targets into Nationally Determined Contributions, but also engage non-state actors – businesses, cities and regional governments, indigenous and local communities – such that all of society has the opportunity to make the contributions needed to achieve the planetary target.
Biodiversity needs an equivalent mechanism, and the post-2020 biodiversity framework can provide this with IUCN’s support. Current proposals regarding a 2030 Mission for biodiversity are taking the form of a planetary science-based target, that could involve “stabilising trends”, “retention”, “no net loss”, “net gain” and “bending the curve” for species, ecosystems, and genetic diversity, as a waypoint towards the 2050 Vision of recovery and restoration of nature. Such a planetary target could be disaggregated to allow state and non-state actors to make the cumulative contributions required to achieve the 2030 Mission.

Much of the data, and much of the capacity, to support societal actors in defining such specific science-based targets for biodiversity, has been developed by IUCN. In proposing an IUCN Programme 2021-2024, IUCN has the threefold opportunity to: is advance negotiation among IUCN’s government members for establishing a planetary science-based 2030 target at the 15th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and soliciting commitments towards this; Second, to encourage IUCN’s non-governmental and indigenous peoples’ organisations to make equivalent pledges; and third, to convene high-level summits for non-state actors, including businesses and cities to make their contributions.

IV. The interdependence between economic prosperity and a healthy planet

Most people around the world enjoy greater economic prosperity today than did their previous generations did. While 10% of global population still suffers from extreme poverty, more than one billion people have lifted themselves out of poverty during the last 25 years. On the other hand, no time in history has seen the magnitude of impacts on nature by human activities that we see today. While our wellbeing and survival depends on nature as a source for food, clean water, pure air, building materials, medicinal products, shelter, and many other services, human activities threaten nature’s capacity to support these essential benefits. Conservation actions have helped dampen human impacts on nature, but have not been able to stop let alone reverse them. Future challenges are greater yet, as the human population will approach 10 billion globally in just the next few decades.

Fortunately, a growing recognition exists that human wellbeing does not need to come at the expense of nature. Rather, nature provides the basis that supports human prosperity and economic systems, and the involvement of communities everywhere in the restoration and maintenance of natural ecosystems can itself generate economic benefits. The Global Commission on Climate and the Economy asserted in its 2018 New Climate Economy report that a shift to more sustainable forms of agriculture combined with strong forest protection could deliver over US$2 trillion per year of economic benefits. Overall, the Commission sees Low-carbon growth could deliver economic benefits of US$26 trillion to 2030.

One basic need to advance these objectives is to have a better understanding of nature’s contributions to economy to inform decision-making. This is the objective of ecosystem accounting currently under development internationally and in many countries around the world. In the long term, sustainable green growth requires decoupling economy from its degrading impacts on nature. This will require considerable innovation, for example, through enabling a shift towards increasingly circular economies that reuse and restore, rather than waste and degrade natural resources.
IUCN contributes to realigning economies by providing nature-based solutions. Nature-based solutions are actions to protect, sustainably manage, and restore natural or modified ecosystems, that address societal challenges effectively and adaptively, simultaneously providing human well-being and biodiversity benefits. Whether they take the form of ecological restoration, ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction, forest landscape restoration, or integrated water resource management, among others, IUCN will strive to promote, across its Programme Areas and objectives.

**World Conservation Congress 2016 Resolution 69 – Defining nature-based solutions**

1. Embrace nature conservation norms (and principles);
2. Can be implemented alone or in an integrated manner with other solutions to societal challenges (e.g. technological and engineering solutions);
3. Are determined by site-specific natural and cultural contexts that include traditional, local and scientific knowledge;
4. Produce societal benefits in a fair and equitable way, in a manner that promotes transparency and broad participation;
5. Maintain biological and cultural diversity and the ability of ecosystems to evolve over time;
6. Are applied at a landscape scale;
7. Recognise and address the trade-offs between the production of a few immediate economic benefits for development, and future options for the production of the full range of ecosystems services; and
8. Are an integral part of the overall design of policies, and measures or actions, to address a specific challenge.

**V. Where IUCN makes a difference**

Many of the multilateral structures that were built over the past seven decades are today under pressure and the international cooperation they facilitate is under threat. Yet the challenges that the world faces require collective action internationally and at all levels of society. As an organisation that brings together States, civil society and Indigenous Peoples’ Organisations, IUCN is a singular vehicle of cooperation and action that can rise above the shifting international political landscape. By harnessing the experience, resources and reach of some 13,000 experts, IUCN is the global authority on the status of the natural world and the measures needed to safeguard it.

IUCN has honed a unique value proposition among international organisations supporting the advancement of nature and people, IUCN:

1. provides credible, trusted knowledge
2. convenes and builds multi-stakeholder partnerships for action
3. has a global-to-local and local-to-global reach
4. sets and influences standards and practices impartially
5. incubates innovations from networked volunteer experts worldwide

These five features of IUCN’s value proposition make the Union distinct from others in the conservation and sustainable development arena.
IUCN’s core strengths have allowed the Union to influence global policy since its founding in 1948. IUCN shaped the conservation agenda by introducing landscape planning and national conservation strategies, spearheading the recognition of diverse stakeholders for conservation action, and mainstreaming human rights, poverty reduction and gender considerations. Back in 1960, IUCN called attention to climate change and its impacts. The World Conservation Strategy of 1980—the first document to put the phrase “sustainable development” into the international vocabulary, legitimized linking conservation with development. IUCN has supported the development of international conservation law from the World Heritage Convention of 1966 to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Throughout its history, IUCN had developed and introduced into the mainstream a powerful suite of standards, tools and guidance that supports efforts everywhere. What will be the key achievement of the 2020s? The IUCN Programme 2021-2024 will strive to leverage the legacy of IUCN 70 years to assert a new ambition and underpin this through four inter-related Programme Areas.

Lessons learnt in Programme implementation

When seeking transformational change, IUCN must combine knowledge, policy and action for a common objective. Organizational planning processes and professional communities of practice tend to compartmentalize knowledge generation, policy influencing and technical assistance to delivery. This tends to reinforce a focus on products instead of the change we want to enact. However, they are interconnected and mutually reinforcing. This Programme proposes outcome-based objectives will only be achieved if knowledge, policy and action are jointly delivered.

To encourage joint action for results, IUCN must adopt outcome-based indicators for its Programme. IUCN has largely focused on output indicators with a narrow scope at the expense of clarity of purpose. As a consequence, indicators have multiplied to cover every aspect of delivery. This proliferation of indicators has further encouraged compartmentalized thinking. This Programme incorporates a limited set of key immediate and long term outcome indicators of relevance to progress for nature and people.

To ensure sustainability of results, IUCN must entrench systemic change across stakeholders at all levels. We tend to vertically divide strategies and programs by level of action from the local to the global. Horizontally, we compartmentalize actors and sectors. We separate out support to public action and capacity development for civil society. Private sector engagement is confined to its own strategy. This Programme systematically incorporates actions at all levels, fosters public private dialogue with civil society and the private sector across all objectives and reaches out to new audiences outside the conservation community to mainstream biodiversity.

To be strategically relevant at inception and remain relevant throughout the quadrennial period, the IUCN Programme must prioritize specific objectives. The Programme cannot be a response to all necessary conservation actions. It must arise from the combination of analysis of needs and of the strengths of IUCN. Focus in delivery will increase value to Members in the chosen priorities, clarify accountability for results and sharpen the mobilization of different IUCN constituencies.
VI. IUCN Prioritized Programme Areas

Building on IUCN’s foundation and capacity, and leveraging IUCN’s members and expertise, the IUCN Programme 2021-2024 will focus on four main areas that together can make a significant difference in confronting the global challenges facing our world. While there are many ways of focusing effort, each Programme Area will strive to achieve maximum impact through collective action. This will be IUCN’s first commitment to achieving the 2030 Mission.

With the overall aim of securing the planetary life support system by 2024, the Programme Areas are:

1. Healthy and Resilient Landscapes for Nature and People
2. Healthy Oceans
3. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation
4. Inclusive and Equitable Natural Resources Institutions

These Programme Areas are rooted in the Sustainable Development Goals for Life on Land (SDG 15), Life Under Water (SDG 14), Climate Action (SDG 13) and Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions (SDG 16). At the same time, the IUCN Programme Areas interact with the social and economic goals including No Poverty (SDG 1), No Hunger (SDG 2), Clean Water and Sanitation (SDG 6); Good Health and Well-Being (SDG 3), Gender Equality (5), Affordable and Clean Energy (SDG 7) Decent Work and Economic Growth (SDG 8), Industries, Innovation and Infrastructure (SDG 9), Reduced Inequalities (SDG 10), Sustainable Cities and Communities (SDG 11), Responsible Consumption and Production (SDG 12), Global Partnerships for the Goals (SDG 17).
IUCN’s core foundational expertise lies in fostering the SDGs related to the biosphere, life on land and underwater, and climate change. Simultaneously, threats and opportunities for the biosphere will only be achieved if the SDGs underpinning more just and equitable societies and economies, including peace, justice and strong institutions. The three spheres of the biosphere, society and economy are bound by stronger partnerships.

To achieve transformational changes, each of the Programme Areas leverages a common IUCN integrated delivery model where:

1. IUCN generates data and scientific information to guide conservation policy, target setting, standard setting and action
2. IUCN provides analytics and recommendations for policymakers and conservationists
3. IUCN convenes a neutral forum for inclusive, multi-stakeholder dialogue and agreements on policy, standards and actions
4. IUCN provides gender-responsive, rights-based implementation support, demonstrations and lessons from project experience

IUCN is uniquely positioned to mobilize multiple constituencies of the Union to flexibly apply this integrated delivery model. Throughout, IUCN will also lead the way in demonstrating the highest scientific integrity, promoting transparency, and in applying environmental, social and governance safeguards for conservation action.
1. Healthy and Resilient Landscapes for People and Nature

The Healthy and Resilient Landscapes for People and Nature Programme Area will deliver a renaissance in the relationship between people and nature on land and inland waters. IUCN will strive for a world in 2030 where ecological integrity is achieved in natural landscapes, that are fully understood, valued and conserved by a diversity of actors. While ensuring that key biodiversity areas are protected and conserved, a restorative land economy would ensure the maintenance of ecosystem functions in production landscapes. IUCN also see nature conquering a new place in urban environments and cities expanding in harmony with nature.

Under this Programme Area, guided by World Conservation Congress 2016 Resolution 110 on Strengthening business engagement in biodiversity preservation, Resolution 98 on the human right to water and sanitation, Resolution 86 on Awareness of connectivity conservation definition and guideline, Resolution 85 on connecting people with nature globally, Resolution 45 on Protection of primary forests including intact forest landscapes, Resolution 41 on Recognising the cultural and spiritual significance of nature in protected and conserved areas, Resolution 33 on Recognising and respecting the territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCs), Resolution 30 on Recognising and respecting the territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCs) overlapped by protected areas, Resolution 29 on Incorporating urban dimensions of conservation into the work of IUCN, Resolution 18 on Toward an IUCN standard classification of the impact of invasive alien species, Recommendation 102 on Protected areas and other areas important for biodiversity in relation to environmentally damaging industrial activities and infrastructure development, WCC 2012 Resolution 109 on Green growth as a sustainable strategy for nature conservation and economic development, Resolution 103 on Supporting, promoting and strengthening local agri-food systems, Resolution 49 on Redesigning future cities and related urban zones with protected areas: cities, return to nature, Resolution 45 on Broadening awareness of benefits and relevance of protected areas, Resolution 36 on Biodiversity, protected areas and Key Biodiversity Areas, and WCC 2008 Resolution 65 on Freshwater biodiversity conservation, protected areas, and management of transboundary waters, IUCN will pursue the following key results:

1. All key biodiversity areas are conserved
2. Ecological integrity of production landscapes secured
3. Sustainable river basins maintained
4. Environmental net gain from industrial activities and infrastructure secured

1.1 All key biodiversity areas are conserved

IUCN will work to ensure that all areas that are essential for the persistence of biodiversity at the ecosystem, species and genetic level are identified and included in effective systems of protected and conserved areas and other relevant conservation management programmes. IUCN will continue to accumulate the knowledge of priorities, and engage with governments, civil society organisations, indigenous peoples and local communities to improve the coverage, management effectiveness and equity of protected and conserved areas across all biomes and ecoregions, including through application of the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Area Standard. IUCN will work to create connectivity within natural landscapes to maximise resilience and avert the threat of climate change. IUCN will mitigate threats to biodiversity, including invasive alien species, and to geodiversity posed by extractive industries.

These efforts will be informed by the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species and the Red List of Ecosystems, Key Biodiversity Areas, the World Database on Protected Areas, the IUCN Green List and other IUCN knowledge products, guidelines and best practice tools. Lessons learned will be captured and analysed through PANORAMA, IUCN’s partnership for learning and solutions. IUCN’s world leading biodiversity knowledge joins up with its global role in setting nature conservation standards and defining best practice for protected and conserved areas, and key biodiversity areas that respect cultural heritage and leverages diverse knowledge systems.
1.2 Secure the ecological integrity of production landscapes

The second objective is to facilitate a shift to sustainable production landscapes that make a positive contribution to nature. IUCN will encourage policies and institutional capacity development for the restoration and sustainable management of production landscapes to achieve a Land Degradation Neutral world by 2030.

IUCN will work to strengthen farm, pasture and forest management practices through knowledge, policy advice and action on the ground that balance the imperatives of livelihoods, economic development and nature conservation. To entrench lasting changes to production practices, IUCN will engage with the wider food and wood systems. Change needs to happen along these value chain from promoting crop biodiversity to anchoring restorative models in consumer behavior. IUCN will support the adoption of nature-positive agricultural production systems, including by making agriculture less demanding of water and agro-chemicals and generating real positive environmental benefits including conserving biodiversity, protect watersheds and provide climate change resilience.

1.3 Maintain sustainable river basins

IUCN will promote and facilitate change in water resource management that will conserve biodiversity and help to ensure a water secure future for all. Water management and freshwater biodiversity conservation require disruptive change in how water resources are perceived, used, managed, and protected.

IUCN will strengthen the policies, laws and institutions needed at local, national and transboundary levels for the protection of freshwater ecosystems, the conservation of freshwater biodiversity and the sustainable management of water resources. Water diplomacy strengthens negotiation of agreements at all levels and improves transboundary cooperation in water management. Strengthening the promotion and facilitation of contemporary approaches to water governance; building water agreements with water users e.g. on freshwater biodiversity conservation, transboundary cooperation and sustainable development, ensuring that equity considerations are front and centre, and mobilising women as agents of change in water governance.

IUCN will implement and support actions that conserve and restore freshwater ecosystems, including wetlands, to ensure water-related ecosystem services and freshwater biodiversity thrives across river basins from source to sea. Protecting freshwater species is an intrinsic part of maintaining healthy freshwater ecosystems and conservation knowledge is needed that works with and for river basin management and governance.

IUCN will increase investment in ecosystems, specifically wetlands and terrestrial ecosystems in watersheds that provide water-related ecosystem services for water storage, regulation and filtration for climate change adaptation and water security. Investments in ‘natural infrastructure’ as a nature-based solution provides water-related ecosystem services that intrinsically require the safeguarding of biodiversity and natural systems. IUCN will provide support and advice to ensure that investment in natural infrastructure provides benefits for human water security and freshwater biodiversity and will support and promote innovative finance and investment that better values water resources, and integrates water security for people and nature.

1.4 Secure a net environmental gain from industrial activities and infrastructure

The IUCN Programme aims to establish greener, nature-positive industry and infrastructure. IUCN will challenge these sectors to maintain ecosystem connectivity and deliver sustainable solutions. IUCN will accelerate engagement with public and private sector actors to reduce their environmental impact whist maintaining higher social and ecological integrity.

IUCN will work with partners to develop the frameworks and tools to help decision makers strategically integrate the relevant environmental and social information as the basis for selecting new infrastructure development options. The choices made today will determine how the infrastructure (transport, production and energy systems) will impact nature and people for the next 100 years.

Further, IUCN will scale up engagement on urban nature and smart urban planning. IUCN launched the IUCN Urban Nature Alliance to raise awareness of the value of ecosystems in urban areas, and of how these ecosystems can help address urban challenges including air pollution, flooding and health problems. IUCN
will work with partners to support the establishment and strengthening of protected and conserved areas in or near cities to engage a new generation who conserves and benefits from nature in cities. The integration of biodiversity values in metropolitan planning will reduce pressures on nature and enhance the quality of life and safety of cities. Biodiverse urban spaces will provide nature-based solutions to crowded and heating cities and resilience to floods and climate change.

<once the programme areas, objectives and content are agreed upon, we will design indicators to make progress>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators reflecting change for nature expressed in coverage or technical index</td>
<td>Number of women and men benefit to people in the programme area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Results</td>
<td>Financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of access, practices, policies for each of the objectives</td>
<td>Volume of financing mobilized in the concerned area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Healthy Oceans

IUCN’s Healthy Oceans Programme Area is to secure healthy oceans. By 2030, IUCN will secure the functioning of marine ecosystems by protection, restoration, effective management over seascapes and oceans, minimizing stresses and building resilience, mitigating pollution, including CO₂ emissions, and stopping biodiversity loss. Reducing harmful human activities, like overfishing and pollution, will help build ocean’s resilience to warmer and more acidic waters, and will contribute to shared prosperity and climatic stability.

To restore the oceans, guided by the World Conservation Congress 2016 Resolution 57 to take greater account of the ocean in the climate regime, Resolution 50 on Increasing marine protected area coverage for effective marine biodiversity conservation, Resolution 32 on achieving representative systems of protected areas in the Antarctica and the Southern Ocean, and WCC 2012 Resolution 79 on protection, of the deep ocean ecosystem and biodiversity from the threats of sea bed mining, Resolution 77 on Promoting Locally Managed Marine Areas as a socially inclusive approach to meeting area-based conservation and Marine Protected Area targets, Resolution 76 on Accelerating the global pace of establishing marine protected areas and the certification of their effective management, as well as Resolution 75 on strengthening policies relating to the sea and the oceans, IUCN will pursue the following key results:

1. Ecological integrity of the oceans secured
2. Coastal resilience strengthened
3. Oceanic and coastal conservation outcomes enhanced

2.1 Secure the ecological integrity of the oceans

IUCN will develop and strengthen principles, frameworks and legislation for the protection of the whole ocean by aiming for the highest level of sustainable management of the world ocean. It includes improving the governance of the areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ) and Polar Regions, and the ocean floor. IUCN will support effective transboundary governance and governance beyond national jurisdiction for unifying legal and institutional frameworks, and for securing equitable benefits from marine resources.

IUCN will provide science-based data and recommendations to the international community on all ecosystem conservation issues that face the ocean. IUCN will strengthen scientific knowledge about all CO₂ emission-related threats affecting life in the ocean, such as ocean warming, acidification, deoxygenation, and define risks and mitigation measures from a cumulative impacts perspective.

IUCN will address systematically pollution, notably plastics, coming from land and from the sea, and promote nature-based solutions for waste minimisation. IUCN will continue to bridge land and sea by convening and leading multi-stakeholder dialogues. IUCN will intensify work with a range of industries to facilitate their effective management and to build a sustainable “blue” world economy, including through best-practice fisheries, deep-sea mining and shipping, through providing credible knowledge particularly focusing on threatened biodiversity and cumulative effects, and innovative solutions.

2.2 Strengthen coastal resilience

IUCN will secure marine and coastal resilience and livelihoods through restoration and adaption actions. IUCN will play a central role in linking ecosystem-scale implementation, landscape and seascape restoration and coastal disaster-risk reduction, especially for mangrove and coral reefs systems, as well as marine protected and conserved areas. IUCN will promote marine spatial planning as a tool for engaging with stakeholders and communities for sustainable development of marine and coastal activities such as tourism and leisure, fisheries, aquaculture, emphasizing the linkages between culture and nature.

2.3 Enhance oceanic and coastal conservation outcomes

IUCN will strengthen the basis of marine biodiversity conservation for delivering sustainable development, through disseminating and implementing global standards for marine protected areas (MPA) as well as for other effective conservation measures (OECM) applying the Green List Standard
IUCN will continue to monitor the conservation status of the marine realm and catalyse conservation actions by delivering global assessment of the extinction risk of marine species for the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species™ as well as global assessments of the risk of collapse of major marine ecosystems, for the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems. The impacts of invasive species will be assessed using the recently published standard on the Environmental Impact Classification of Alien Taxa (EICAT) and then mitigated to the extent possible. IUCN will also identify solutions for sustainable fisheries in relation with biodiversity conservation (by-catch, biomass fisheries, etc.)

<once the programme areas, objectives and content are agreed upon, we will design indicators to make progress>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;indicators reflecting change for nature expressed in coverage or technical index&gt;</td>
<td>Number of women and men &lt;benefit to people in the programme area&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate Results</th>
<th>Financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;indicators of access, practices, policies for each of the objectives&gt;</td>
<td>Volume of financing mobilized &lt;in the concerned area&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation

The goal of the Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Programme Area is to simultaneously reduce the risks posed by climate change to the world’s natural systems and responsibly harness the full potential of these natural systems in achieving a low-greenhouse gas emission, climate-resilient, biodiversity-rich future in support of the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals. By 2030, ecosystem-dependent communities and vulnerable ecosystems will be made more resilient to climate change, and nature-based solutions will be fully integrated within the climate mitigation and adaptation policies and actions of every country in the world.

Under this programme area, guided by World Conservation Congress 2016 Resolution 56 on the IUCN response to the Paris Agreement, Resolution 39 on Protected areas as natural solutions to climate change, Recommendation 107 on Integration of nature-based solutions into strategies to combat climate change, WCC 2012 Resolution 86 on Integrating protected areas into climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies, Resolution 84 on Promoting ecosystem-based adaptation, as well as WCC 2008 Resolution 76 on Biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation and adaptation in national policies and strategies, IUCN will pursue the following key objectives over the 2021-2024 period:

1. Climate risks and impacts on nature reduced
2. Nature-based solutions for climate change mitigation, adaptation, and disaster-risk reduction expanded
3. Negative impacts of other sectoral responses to climate change on biodiversity and society avoided or reduced

3.1 Reduce climate risks and impacts faced by the world’s ecosystems and species

IUCN will systematically assess the growing risks of climate change for the world’s natural systems and to take steps to reduce their impacts, particularly on climate-vulnerable species and ecosystems, especially those that underpin human livelihoods and well-being. Building on previous work, IUCN will aim to integrate and profile climate risks within its flagship assessments, approaches and tools for biodiversity conservation. IUCN will draw the attention of both decision makers and the global public to the risks posed by climate change to the natural world, to mobilise greater climate ambition and action. It will initiate and drive concrete global interventions to support the adaptation and climate-proofing of the planet’s ecosystems and species, ranging from coral reefs and polar systems to the world’s coasts, mountains and oceans.

3.2 Expand nature-based solutions for climate change mitigation, adaptation, and disaster-risk reduction

IUCN will responsibly and inclusively harness the full potential of nature-based solutions to climate change through the better management, conservation and restoration of the world’s ecosystems – its forests, wetlands, peatlands, grasslands, soils, production landscapes, coastal zones and other natural carbon sinks and reservoirs. IUCN will strengthen its institutional capacity to meaningfully demonstrate how healthy and sustainably managed ecosystems provide effective and inclusive solutions for climate change mitigation, adaptation and disaster risk reduction, while also supporting local livelihoods and conserving biodiversity – quantifying these benefits in each case, and building up a portfolio of successful solutions on its learning platform PANORAMA: Solutions for a Healthy Planet. Building on existing initiatives, it will support the expansion of these solutions at scale on the ground, and across different geographies and biomes, including through innovative financing mechanisms. It will work to ensure that these solutions are gender-responsive and socially-equitable, and take into account the interests of the most vulnerable, especially indigenous peoples and local communities.

IUCN will also continue to promote the expanded and concrete integration of nature-based solutions within both the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and the mid-century Long-Term Low Emission Development Strategies (LT-LEDS) that countries are required to submit in support of the Paris Agreement. It will develop and disseminate standards for such solutions. In cities, it will support the uptake of natural and blended green-grey infrastructure to enhance the resilience of urban populations to climate change.
3.3 Avoid and reduce the negative impacts of other sectoral responses to climate change on biodiversity and society

IUCN will assess and help reduce the negative environmental and social impacts of the measures that are undertaken in other sectors to combat climate change, particularly as they relate to biodiversity. IUCN will work in collaboration with key stakeholders from these other sectors (such as energy, agriculture, transportation, buildings, etc.), including with businesses, to ensure that the policies and measures that they undertake to address climate change do not harm nature, but rather harnesses their support in a responsible fashion, adhering to the highest levels of environmental and ecosystem integrity.

IUCN will aim to ensure that these other sectoral responses to climate change adhere to best social standards, and adequately take into account the interests of indigenous peoples and local communities, particularly those dependent on the natural systems that may be adversely impacted by these responses. IUCN will also assess the risks posed to biodiversity and human-nature dependencies by other new and emerging technologies to address climate change, such as bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS), Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) and other Negative Emission Technologies (NETs), and other geoengineering-based initiatives.

<once the programme areas, objectives and content are agreed upon, we will design indicators to make progress>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;indicators reflecting change for nature expressed in coverage or technical index&gt;</td>
<td>Number of women and men &lt;benefit to people in the programme area&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Results</td>
<td>Financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;indicators of access, practices, policies for each of the objectives&gt;</td>
<td>Volume of financing mobilized &lt;in the concerned area&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Inclusive and Equitable Natural Resources Institutions**

IUCN recognizes that inclusive policy making, good governance and the rule of law critically determine both the extent to which ecosystems contribute to human well-being and the long-term prospects for the conservation of nature. By 2030, we see a world where good governance and the rule of law foster healthy ecosystems and biodiversity while contributing to the realization of human rights, social equity, gender equality, rights of nature and resilience to global changes. IUCN will strive to realize justice and equity for people, communities and nature, with a particular focus on enfranchising indigenous peoples and local communities and achieving gender equality.

Under this programme area, guided by World Conservation Congress 2016 Resolution 88 on *Safeguarding indigenous lands, territories and resources from unsustainable developments*, Resolution 81 on *Humanity’s right to a healthy environment*, Resolution 77 on *Environmental courts and tribunals*, Resolution 76 on *Improving the means to fight environmental crime*, and Resolution 70 on *Crimes against the environment*, Resolution 30 on *Recognising and respecting the territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities*, IUCN will pursue the following key results:

1. Nature integrated in sustainable development policy
2. Implementation of equitable and effective natural resource governance accelerated
3. Rights and roles of indigenous peoples and local communities advanced in relation to the conservation and sustainable use of nature
4. Gender equality in environmental and resource management enhanced

### 4.1 Integrate nature in sustainable development policy

To achieve this first objective, IUCN will influence public policy and private sector strategies for biodiversity and human well-being. IUCN will continue to promote the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Nagoya and Cartagena Protocols, as well as the other sustainable development-related conventions and agreements, fostering inclusive implementation through national and regional biodiversity policies, strategies and plans. Furthermore, IUCN will strengthen the voice of non-state actors in National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and other relevant global, regional and national instruments. IUCN will promote mainstreaming of biodiversity in national development policy. IUCN will also influence the private sector in adopting sustainability standards, frameworks and strategies that integrate biodiversity.

Public and private decision-makers at all levels use credible knowledge on nature. IUCN will further strengthen and demonstrate the application of the biodiversity knowledge base, including the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, World Database on Protected Areas, the Red List of Ecosystems, the Green List, Key Biodiversity Areas and other IUCN knowledge products, to inform species and ecosystem conservation planning, and support governments and others in setting national, regional and international sustainable development targets and tracking progress. IUCN will not only use this knowledge base to monitor biodiversity baseline scenarios but also to identify the potential environmental, economic and social performance of alternative scenarios. IUCN will actively promote the use of this knowledge by increasing the capacity of public and private sector actors to analyse and apply data to improve conservation action and by enhancing the civic constituency supporting change, particularly among youth.

### 4.2 Accelerate the implementation of equitable and effective natural resource governance

IUCN will promote and secure equitable and effective governance of ecosystems and natural resources. Good natural resource governance entails the adoption and implementation of inclusive decision-making, recognition and respect for diverse tenure rights, cultural values and knowledge, transparency, accountability, rule of law, access to justice, civic engagement and other principles.

To strengthen governance arrangements, IUCN will use the Natural Resource Governance Framework, and related standards and tools, to enable decision-makers at all levels from concerned communities, government agencies, the private sector and civil society to make better and more equitable decisions on the conservation and use of natural resources and the distribution of nature’s benefits. IUCN will foster public-
private dialogues and promote innovative and diverse forms of governance, with particular attention to community and indigenous and local community-led governance and the active involvement of women and youth. A particular focus will be on enhancing the diversity, quality and vitality of governance for area-based conservation, including in protected and conserved areas, and OECMs, at both system and site scales, supported by the application of the Green List Standard and other governance and equity assessment and evaluation frameworks.

IUCN will work to inform the development and implementation of legal and institutional frameworks for the conservation and sustainable use of nature that incorporate the obligation to protect nature, the right of nature and the rights to nature, the right to a healthy environment, minimization of adverse impacts, the recognition of ecological functions of property, and intra and inter-generational equity, including with regards to gender and indigenous rights. To strengthen the frameworks and implementation of the rule of law will require building its legislative, procedural and substantive components at sub-national, national, regional, and international levels. In particular, IUCN will work relentlessly to fight environmental crimes, activities that breach environmental legislation and cause significant harm or risk to the environment, human health, or both. IUCN will focus primarily on the illegal trafficking of flora and fauna through by addressing critical issues along the supply chain from habitat to market. IUCN will engage directly with prosecutors and judges in understanding and facilitating information sharing to improve transparency and effectiveness in the enforcement and implementation of law at all levels.

4.3 Advance the rights and roles of indigenous peoples and local communities in relation to the conservation and sustainable use of nature

IUCN will advance the rights and roles of indigenous peoples and local communities in nature conservation. Indigenous peoples hold and manage significant areas of the Earth’s most biodiverse regions and play a vital role in conserving lands, waters and other natural resources. In keeping with the self-determined strategy developed by IUCN IPO Members, IUCN will expand the involvement of indigenous peoples in its own governance, programs and international policy engagements in a manner that is fully consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. IUCN will work to increase the recognition of indigenous rights to lands, territories and resources, including by expanding the evidence base demonstrating the values of indigenous and local community collective management for nature conservation. IUCN will support efforts of indigenous peoples and local communities to secure their cultural heritage and protect their rights to and use of traditional knowledge for livelihoods and ecosystem and human health. IUCN will also actively support measures to reduce conflicts impacting indigenous and communal lands and protect environmental defenders.

4.4 Enhance gender equality in environmental and natural resource management

IUCN will work to achieve gender equality as a fundamental right and a driving force for effective, equitable, and sustainable environmental solutions. While women and girls—together with men, boys and all people—possess invaluable knowledge, experiences and capacities for conservation, persistent gender gaps block their realization and undermine sustainable development progress. To enable gender-responsive action, IUCN will work to empower women, strengthening women’s engagement, leadership, and organizations as a basis for their full and active participation in environmental decision-making at all levels. IUCN will further promote the access of women and girls to land, natural resources and other assets that reduce their vulnerability and provide a foundation for their economic empowerment and active roles in natural resource management. IUCN will provide training and capacity building for gender-responsive action at multiple levels, and ensure that its programmes, projects, partnerships and actions to inform policy integrate gender equality.

| Nature | People |
| <indicators reflecting change for nature expressed in coverage or technical index> | Number of women and men <benefit to people in the programme area> |
| Intermediate Results | Financing |
| <indicators of access, practices, policies for each of the objectives> | Volume of financing mobilized <in the concerned area> |
VII. Implementing the IUCN Programme as One Programme

To deliver on the ambitious agenda of transformation proposed in this Programme and in the light of accelerating disruptive change of modern societies, more than ever has the One Programme approach been the key to achieving the objectives of the Programme. The targets of the Programme will not be achieved without the different parts of IUCN – government, NGO and indigenous people organizations Members, Council, National and Regional Committees of Members, Commissions of experts, and the Secretariat – working together to develop, implement and advance IUCN’s Programme of work. The unique strength of IUCN lies in proactive collaboration across the different parts of the Union but IUCN will also have to leverage new partnerships to have systemic impact, retain its relevance and reach new audience.

Knowledge is the starting point of every engagement area in this Programme. The IUCN Commissions, and their networks of volunteer conservation scientists, experts and managers, play the central role in IUCN in broadening conservation knowledge and competence and foster innovation in conservation. The IUCN Secretariat will act as a platform to integrate multiple knowledge products and different forms of knowledge, including traditional and indigenous knowledge. IUCN will harness innovation in data sensing, big data and artificial intelligence to deliver conservation knowledge and insights.

The IUCN Programme is also premised on translating knowledge into policy and action. IUCN Members, whether national States, government agencies, non-governmental organizations or indigenous people organizations. IUCN Members participate in programme development and delivery where their priorities and capacities align with the IUCN Programme. IUCN will utilize its Secretariat expertise, along with that of its Commission experts and Members to provide support to Member State, government agencies and NGOs to plan and implement quality initiatives that take to scale transformative actions in these areas of engagement.

To this end, IUCN will also work with players from the private sector to bring in investment opportunities that catalyse the engagement of market players along value chains, the banking and insurance sectors, alongside those engaging in areas such as digital finance and information, in order to catalyse change at scale.

Conservation action can only be as strong as conservation organizations and actors. The IUCN Secretariat and National and Regional Committees, as officially recognized groups of Members in countries and regions, will support strengthening the organizational performance and financial sustainability of Members.

IUCN plays a vital role in mobilizing multilateral funding to fight for the conservation of nature and natural resources. The IUCN Secretariat is an accredited entity of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and an implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). During the period 2021-2024, IUCN will provide support to Member States, NGOs and IPOS to plan and implement GCF and GEF co-financed initiatives that revolve around large land and seascape planning, management and restoration that combines biodiversity conservation alongside productive land and seascapes, that involve food systems and other productive uses.

The Union must also connect with stakeholders and emerging actors beyond the conservation community in a fast moving environment. As a consequence, this Programme defines 3 enabling themes – 1. Technology, Data and Innovation; 2. Youth, Media and Communications; 3. Investments and Financial Sustainability - that will support each of the Programme Areas. The table below shows how each of these enablers could interact with the individual Programme Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How we deliver…</th>
<th>Healthy and Resilient Landscapes</th>
<th>Healthy Oceans</th>
<th>Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</th>
<th>Inclusive and Equitable Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology, Data and Innovation</td>
<td>Innovation in data sensing, big data and AI in conservation knowledge and insights</td>
<td>Innovation in data sensing and machine learning for marine species and marine and coastal ecosystems</td>
<td>Innovation in data sensing, big data and AI in climate change knowledge and insights</td>
<td>Blockchain to protect right holders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth, Media and Communications</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investments and Financial Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental footprint of the fourth industrial revolution</td>
<td>Shifting investments flows to sustainable production and de-risking investments the restorative economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation in data analytics for sustainable land management</td>
<td>Mobilizing conservation finance and financing of conservation outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth engagement on biodiversity policy, terrestrial and freshwater ecosystem management</td>
<td>Steering finance towards sustainable blue industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer awareness on biodiversity</td>
<td>Facilitating climate finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of threats to the oceans</td>
<td>Mobilizing eco-disaster risk resilience financing and insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth engagement on ocean action</td>
<td>Ensuring the financial sustainability of environmental governance and rule of law institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth engagement on climate change</td>
<td>Public dissemination of climate risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT for greater environmental transparency and accountability, and legal education</td>
<td>Youth participation in governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programme 2021-2024 development: Timeline

23 November 2018
PPC reviews Programme Construct

7 Feb 2019
Programme design workshop

Feb-Mar 2019
Drafting of Programme

March 2019
Council reviews draft Programme

May-Sept. 2019
Regional Conservation Fora

May-Sept. 2019
Consultation of Members

October 2019
Council informed of feedback on Programme

February 2020
Council approves Programme

October 2019 - Jan 2020
Drafting of final version of Programme

March 2020
Programme posted online before WCC

2018

2019

2020
3. Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee,

welcomes the progress made in the development of the IUCN draft Programme 2021-2024;

requests the Secretariat to prepare a revised version of the document incorporating new feedback received during this Council; and

agrees that, after endorsement by the Programme and Policy Committee, the revised version be used as the basis for further consultations with IUCN Members and constituencies at Regional Conservation Forums and other means of soliciting comments.
IUCN will actively support youth engagement in conservation. Today’s youth is the largest in human history, with roughly 52% of the world’s population being under 30 years old. Throughout history and in every society, youth have always been the catalysts for change. The imperative of caring for the earth and people has never been greater, and yet the challenges ahead are bigger than anything we have ever faced before. To successfully address these challenges, IUCN will engage with and invest in youth who have the potential to advance the future of conservation, helping foster the new generations of conservation leaders. To empower youth in conservation, IUCN will work across three fronts: education, engagement and activation. This will involve development of a long-term vision and strategy for intergenerational knowledge-sharing and collaboration; deepened commitment to enhancing both formal and informal relevant education materials and applications; enhancing meaningful participation of youth at all IUCN events; and, ensuring that its programmes, projects, partnerships and policy advocacy encourage genuine youth involvement.
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Mission
To strengthen the work of the Union through creative, innovative, and effective communication and education, ultimately influencing behavior change for conservation and sustainability.
2018 – 2020 Work Program
CEC Membership

new members May-Oct
new members Jan-May
members by the end of 2017

2018

1083
165
81
Total Members per Region 2018

- East Asia: 33
- Eastern Europe, N-Ctr Asia: 26
- Meso and Southern Africa: 99
- North Africa and Middle East: 178
- Oceania: 72
- North America and Caribbean: 220
- South and Southeastern Asia: 216
- West and Central Africa: 93
- West Europe: 259
- West Asia: 76
14 co-authors
60 reviewers from 22 countries

Launched at CBD COP14 in Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt
Recommendations for Policy

Healthy nature has economic benefits. Healthy and accessible natural environments support healthy people. Healthy people reduce social costs. Achieving these benefits requires that we have access to nature. And having access depends on enough of us caring enough to make sure that there are places and spaces where people from all walks of life can experience nature daily or often, through all stages of their lives.

Recommendations for policy supported by the evidence:

- **Education and child care policies** that enable time outdoors in nature and experiential learning about nature in early childhood and throughout life;
- **Health and elder care policies** that deliver the health benefits of contact with nature for all people of all ages;
- **Community planning and urban development policies** to create nature-rich cities that include parks and protected areas for the benefit of people and nature;
- **Parks, outdoor recreation, and tourism policies** that encourage family-friendly experiences; interpretive programmes; and outdoor, nature-based and experiential education;
- **Arts and culture policies** that promote the integration of culture and nature to develop a sense of oneness with nature while celebrating stories of connection and healing;
- **Policies that encourage private sector investment** in environmentally sustainable programming, infrastructure, and innovative solutions, such as technology, for connecting people with nature;
- **Policies that call for biodiversity conservation organisations** to work across sectors so that all people, equitably and inclusively, experience the diverse benefits of connectedness with nature.

Recommendations for Research

As research and programming in this field continue to grow, well-designed and rigorous research is needed to inform both policy and practice. So too is conscious attention to the wisdom still available today from Indigenous people, especially about how to connect with and learn from nature over time.

Recommendations for research are:

- The evidence is strongest that childhood experiences are key to fostering connectedness with nature and care for the Earth. Research is required to clarify the kinds of experiences that contribute to connectedness for adults.
- The evidence overwhelmingly indicates that positive feelings for nature are critically important to care for the Earth and suggests that meaningful nature-based experiences can occur in a variety of places, including cities. There is a need to better understand the influence of location, duration and frequency of nature experiences.
- Studies that look at the connections between nature-based experiences and human tendencies to connect with nature, including actions undertaken to benefit it, tend to be based on correlations. Cause and effect relationships are difficult to assess. Longitudinal studies—those that follow people over long periods of time—are rare, and needed.
- In some studies, adults are asked to look backwards in time to remember and describe what life experiences led to their behaviours to benefit nature. This provides a helpful, while limited, base of understanding. Future research that monitors and evaluates the impact of lifestyles, programming and experiences that are implemented specifically to increase care for nature would go a long way towards filling this gap.
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IUCN’s 70th Anniversary
IUCN 70th – by the numbers

- 24+ events
- 20 countries
- 3000+ participants
- 7,900,000+ people reached with #IUCN70
- 10 Crossroads Blog posts
- 51,590 total web page views
- 225+ news articles
- 19 countries
- 100s of publications and presentations feature the 70th logo
CEC products: highlights

Translated by CEC members to:
• French
• Spanish
• Russian
• Arabic
• Persian
• Greek
• Kyrgyz
• Indonesian
• Malay
• Setswana
• Kiswahili
• Italian
• Hungarian
• And more!
CEC products: highlights
CEC and #NatureForAll Meetings
1st IUCN Mexican Committee Meeting
Bogis-Bossay Biodiversity dialogue
CEC Day at CBD COP14 CEPA Fair
#NatureForAll is

- Sharing best practices for connecting people with nature
- Showcasing how we and our own organizations are caring for nature and inspiring and empowering others
- Providing toolkits, communication and education tools, compiling evidence and knowledge to help others do the same
- Creating billions of moments to fall in love with nature
• National networks
• National campaigns
#NatureForAll Australia
#NatureForAll UK
What’s next?

Looking ahead

1. Global Biodiversity Communications (CBD COP15)

2. #NatureForAll Youth Champions

- World Scouts Jamboree
- Regional Conservation Fora
- Parks Conferences: Canada, Latin America and Africa
- Marseille WCC
- China CBD COP15
Global Biodiversity Communications

Nature is the basis of sustainable development.

The importance of nature conservation and the post-2020 framework must be communicated through a coordinated ecosystem of campaigns and key messages.
Activating youth and intergenerational partnerships for nature conservation

IUCN will actively support youth engagement in conservation. Today’s youth is the largest in human history, with roughly 52% of the world’s population being under 30 years old. Throughout history and in every society, youth have always been the catalysts for change. The imperative of caring for the earth and people has never been greater, and yet the challenges ahead are bigger than anything we have ever faced before. To successfully address these challenges, IUCN will engage with and invest in youth who have the potential to advance the future of conservation, helping foster the new generations of conservation leaders. To empower youth in conservation, IUCN will work across three fronts: education, engagement and activation. This will involve development of a long-term vision and strategy for intergenerational knowledge-sharing and collaboration; deepened commitment to enhancing both formal and informal relevant education materials and applications; enhancing meaningful participation of youth at all IUCN events; and, ensuring that its programmes, projects, partnerships and policy advocacy encourage genuine youth involvement.
#NatureForAll
Youth Champions

- Gather over 1,000 youth from IUCN and #NatureForAll partner organizations under one banner to WCC and CBD COP15
- Provide mentorship and learning opportunities
- Responds to WCC core objective of engaging next generation
- Provide youth (under 35) with a platform to make a real contribution to the WCC and post-2020 biodiversity framework

Need to move from notional to meaningful youth engagement.
Launch at
World Scout Jamboree

- West Virginia, USA
- July 22 – August 2, 2019
- 40,000+ boy and girls Scouts aged 14-17
- 38 million Scouts worldwide
- #NatureForAll Pavilion
- Working with almost 10 IUCN members
IUCN Regional Conservation Fora
Parks Congresses

• Canada Parks Conference
  – Quebec City, Canada
  – October 7 – 10, 2019

• Congress on Protected Areas for Latin America and the Caribbean
  – Lima, Peru
  – October 14 – 17, 2019

• African Protected Areas Congress
  – Nairobi, Kenya
  – November 18 – 23, 2019
3rd Congress on Protected Areas for Latin America and the Caribbean (III CAPLAC)
2020 World Conservation Congress

• Youth Summit
• Youth Pavilion in Exhibition Space
• Youth participation in Forum
Thank you!
IUCN Commission on Environment Economics and Social Policy (CEESP)

Kristen Walker Painemilla, Chair
Ame Ramos, Deputy Chair
CEESP Vision & Mission

Vision:
A world where sustainability, social justice and equity are valued in nature conservation and in development.

Mission:
- To contribute to the IUCN Mission by generating and disseminating knowledge, mobilising influence, and promoting actions to harmonise the conservation of nature with the critical social, cultural, environmental, and economic justice concerns of human societies.
- CEESP’s natural and social scientists, environmental and economic policy experts, and practitioners in community-based conservation provide IUCN with critical resources to meet the challenges of twenty-first century nature and natural resource conservation and the goal of shaping a sustainable future.
Commission Structure

Themes

1. Theme on Business, Best Practice and Accountability

2. Theme on Culture, Conservation and Spirituality (CCS)

3. Theme on Economics

4. Theme on Environment and Peace

5. Theme on Human Wellbeing and Sustainable Livelihoods (HWSL)

6. Theme on Governance, Equity and Rights (TGER)

Specialist Groups

1. Specialist Group on Indigenous Peoples Customary and Environmental Law and Human Rights (SPICEH) (WCEL)

2. Specialist Group on Religion, Spirituality, Environmental Conservation and Climate Justice (ReSpECC)

3. Specialist Group on Sustainable Use and Livelihoods (SULI) (SSC)

4. Specialist Group on Gender

5. Specialist Group on Local Economies, People and Nature

6. Specialist Group on People and Oceans (launched in 2019)

7. Specialist Group on Green Criminology (launched in 2019)
Building New Partnerships
Communities, Livelihoods and Conservation Conference

- 500 Participants from around the globe
- Sessions on gender, local governance, environmental defenders, etc
- Numerous IUCN Events
- Engagement with Members and Councilors
- Knowledge sharing and co-generation
Task Force on Migration and Environmental Change

International Working Group on Human Wellbeing, Governance and Conservation

International Conference on Human-Wildlife Conflict and Coexistence

Save the Date
1-3 April 2020
Oxford, UK

www.hwctf.org/conference

Inter Commission Task Forces: Ecosystem Values and Nature
The potential of indigenous agricultural food production under climate change in Hawai‘i

Natalie Kurashima, Lucas Fortini and Tamara Ticktin

The value of land-use strategies that increase food production while conserving biodiversity is widely recognized. Many indigenous agroecosystems are productive, adaptive and ecologically principled, but are largely overlooked by planning in terms of their potential to meet current and future food needs. We developed spatial distribution models of indigenous agroecosystems in Hawai‘i to identify their potential past distribution, productive and carrying capacities, and future potential under current land-use and mild-to-severe future climate scenarios. Our results suggest that Hawai‘i’s traditional agroecosystems could have had production levels comparable to consumption today. Carrying capacity estimates support hypotheses of large pre-colonial Hawaiian populations (>800,000). Urban development has reduced (~13%) traditional agroecosystems but 71% remain agriculturally zoned. Projected effects of three future climate scenarios vary from no change in potential production to decreases of 19% in the driest and warmest end-of-century scenario. This study highlights the food-producing potential of indigenous agriculture even under land-use and climate changes, and the value of their restoration into the future.
Purpose: To provide a robust, inclusive, and credible approach to assessing and strengthening natural resource governance, at multiple levels and in diverse contexts

Completed NRGF Conceptual Framework and Assessment Guide

Piloted three types of NRGF application

Outreach
Raising awareness and expanding use of NRGF
- Conceptual Framework & Assessment Guide (completed, doing formal peer review)
- Beginners’ guide
- Operational guidance
- Guidance on integrating governance in IUCN project cycle
- Presentation at Regional Conservation Forums
- Capacity building – webinars, etc.

Systematic application NGRF in IUCN Secretariat
- Starting - engagement with Global Forest and Climate Change Prog., ESARO, ARO
People in Nature

PiN as part of the CEESP mandate:

People in Nature will improve understanding of how nature contributes to local livelihoods and well-being. It will focus on material use (such as food and nutrition, health and medicine) recognising that use is embedded in worldviews that include cultural norms, values, identities and beliefs.
Moving forward in 2019-20 PiN will focus on:

- Further **methodological development** and consolidation to provide users with practical, robust approaches and methods for landscape assessments
- **Application** of PiN assessments in IUCN projects and programmes
- **Integration** with other IUCN knowledge products
- **Social Safeguards**: PiN to develop guidance to assess impacts of projects in which access is restricted
- Fundraising
Major Thematic Areas of Work: Highlights
Environment and Peace

1. Review of IUCN’s work on peace and conflict: survey and analysis
2. Develop a civil society advocacy strategy for global policy around environment and security in collaboration with Conflict and Environment Observatory
3. Task Force on Environmental Change and Migration
   - Nature based solutions
   - Transforming Narrative
Engaging with Members
Human Wellbeing and Sustainable Livelihoods

'Evidencing links between human wellbeing, governance and conservation effectiveness project

1. International working group: CEESP SC, Indigenous Peoples, IPBES, IUCN Staff, GIZ
2. 22 HWSL members (global spread, practice, policy & academia, 9F/13M)
3. 200k in funding leveraged French Centre for the Synthesis and Analysis of Biodiversity.
Economics

• Increased membership in Economics work
• Proposal for an African Union Commission-endorsed high level workshop on natural resource accounting & national sustainable development goals in process
• Joint CEM/CEESP task force on ecosystem values & nature
• Engagement with IUCN Secretariat input into development of niche markets as part of Mediterranean Cultural Landscapes programme
Engagement in Policy
Engagement of Indigenous

- 17 IPO Members and 2 in process
- Strategy in Place
- Recruitment of IPO position in IUCN Secretariat
- Indigenous Summit in Development for IUCN Congress: Seeking partnership and support
- 2nd IPO Meeting to be held in Guatemala in May
- Support via SPICEH to Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform evidence base
Environmental Defenders, Human Rights and Conservation

**Acceleration in loss of biodiversity linked with increasing violence toward those defending remaining biodiversity and related rights**

2. Despite extensive legal basis for human rights protection, there is a global shortfall in enforcement
3. Violence and tensions are expected to increase in coming decades with continued environmental destruction, migration and conflict
4. Recent examples: India, Guatemala, DRC
Environmental Defenders, Human Rights and Conservation

Challenges

1. Continued increase of environmental defenders
2. Fortress conservation and the call for a new paradigm
3. Scrutiny of conservation organizations and practice related to indigenous rights and human rights
4. Change of governments globally that are impacting indigenous rights.
Building the Conversation on Environmental Defenders, Human rights and Conservation from now to Congress

CEESP to Produce
• Policy Matters : Collection of case studies, articles and case studies of resistances, plights and successes
• Podcasts and video testimonials (online version)
• Launched at WCC2020 with series of events, seminars and workshops on the topic

Challenge to Council: What are we going to do?
• These are issues of the UNION
• Raise issues to a higher level building to Congress
• Engage UNSR on Environment and Rights
Communications + Membership
Upcoming Activities
## Commission Finances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Type</th>
<th>2018 CEESP Budget USD</th>
<th>2018 CEESP Expenses USD</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy &amp; Prof. Services</td>
<td>38,509</td>
<td>48807</td>
<td>(10,298)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, Hospitality, &amp; Conferences</td>
<td>129,726</td>
<td>122123</td>
<td>7,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; General Admin Costs</td>
<td>10,058</td>
<td>2704</td>
<td>7,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Publication Costs</td>
<td>20,696</td>
<td>2795</td>
<td>17,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Expenditure</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in USD</strong></td>
<td><strong>210,390.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>187,570.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,820.76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEESP Areas of Engagement</th>
<th>2016 CEESP Expenses</th>
<th>2017 CEESP Expenses</th>
<th>2018 CEESP Expenses</th>
<th>Match To Date</th>
<th>Total Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme on Culture</td>
<td>10,598.00</td>
<td>12,127.88</td>
<td>14,500.00</td>
<td>37,225.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme on Human Well-Being</td>
<td>13,781.00</td>
<td>5,600.00</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>269,381.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme on Environment and Peace</td>
<td>5,250.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>4,365.35</td>
<td>204,615.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme on Gender</td>
<td>2,282.35</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>12,282.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme on Business, Best Practice, and Accountability</td>
<td>537.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Baskets (NRGF, PIN, etc)</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>33,600.00</td>
<td>9,844.93</td>
<td>197,944.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Engagement</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>1,856.31</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>22,356.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPICEH: Indigenous Protection Areas</td>
<td>8,596.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>10,496.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Across Commissions</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>20,355.92</td>
<td>27,655.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Engagement (CBD, UNFCCC, Chair Travel)</td>
<td>12,161.00</td>
<td>6,101.00</td>
<td>17,843.88</td>
<td>44,105.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEESP Steering Committee</td>
<td>5,519.00</td>
<td>30,214.00</td>
<td>68,023.75</td>
<td>118,756.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Support</td>
<td>3,885.00</td>
<td>38,237.00</td>
<td>41,033.38</td>
<td>315,856.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation Services &amp; Consultants</td>
<td>8,554.00</td>
<td>340.32</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>9,894.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>1,971.00</td>
<td>8,983.00</td>
<td>2,458.88</td>
<td>13,912.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax Conference Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Volunteerism of CEESP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,039,751.00</td>
<td>$8,441,271.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,786.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182,164.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$187,570.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,039,751.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,441,271.10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you! Gracias! Merci!
Commission on Ecosystem Management

Angela Andrade
Chair
96th Council Meeting
2019
Main Highlights- 2018

- 1217 Members, 21% increase since 2017
- 17 scientific papers published in 2018
- 3 scientific books published in 2018
- 17 international events with relevant contributions from CEM
- 11 workshops promoted by CEM
- 7 Training/ disseminating courses
- 3 MOOC (Massive Online Courses)
- 4 Webinars
- 10 Social media accounts
- 7 Thematic or Specialist Newsletters
CEM Mission

To provide expert guidance on **integrated approaches** to the management of natural and modified ecosystems to promote effective biodiversity conservation and sustainable development.

CEM Objectives

To promote the adoption of, and provide guidance for, **ecosystem-based approaches** to the management of landscapes and seascapes; provide authoritative guidance and support for ecosystem-based management; and promote **resilient socio-ecological systems** to address global changes.
5 Priority Areas

THEMATIC GROUPS
- Nature-based Solutions (NBS)
- Ecosystem Resilience
- Ecosystem-based Adaptation and Mitigation (EbA)
- Eco-Disaster Risk Reduction
- Ecosystem Restoration
- Ecosystem Services
- Red List of Ecosystems (RLE)
- Sustainable Use of Biodiversity and EM (SUME)
- Ecosystems and Invasive Species
- Business and Ecosystem Management
- Biosphere Reserves
- Ecosystem Governance
- Cultural Practices and Ecosystem Management

SPECIALIST GROUPS
- Agroecosystems
- Coastal and Marine ecosystems
- Deep Sea and Mining
- Dryland ecosystems
- Forest Ecosystems
- Island ecosystems
- Mediterranean ecosystems
- Mountain ecosystems
- Oasis and Deserts
- Peatlands
- Holarctic Steppes
- Urban Ecosystems
- Wetlands

TASK FORCES
- Systemic Pesticides
- EbAquaculture
- Fisheries Expert Group
- Re-wilding
- Synthetic Biology & E.
- Human Health and EM
- Emergent Pollutants

Young Professionals Network
Steering Committee

Pokhara, Nepal. (Feb.-Mar. 2018), Amman, Jordan (September, 2018)
1217 CEM members in Portal.
Ecosystem Risk Assessment

RLE- Activity Highlights 2018

- **Finalized** national assessments: Finland (2nd), Czech Republic, Madagascar.
- **Ongoing** national assessments: China, Myanmar, Paraguay, Bolivia, South Africa.
- **New countries interested**: Uruguay, Argentina, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Mexico.
- **3 Australian jurisdictions** incorporate RLE criteria into biodiversity laws.
- **RLE informing on risks to ES**: Mesoamerica
- **Training/ Dissemination workshops**:
  - RLE: World heritage Decision Panel.
  - Gland, Business and Biodiversity week.
  - Global ecosystem typology (London)
  - Georgetown-Guiana.
- **Webinars**:
  - “Assessing the Conservation Status of the World Ecosystems”. Pulse of the planet (Provita). **138 participants**.
  - Natural Capital Accounting Unit, France.
  - Analytical tools for Red List Assessments( Deakin, UNSW)
Red List of Ecosystems

Impacts:

- **RLE website** [www.iucnrle.org](http://www.iucnrle.org): **150,073** visits from **209** countries. (50% more than 2017).
- **4 scientific publications** by RLE members finalized and accepted.
- **2 policy perspectives** in review.
- Information from **37 RLE assessments**:
  * **1837** ecosystem types.
  * **1231** ecosystem types data, converted into xml files, and added additional assessment information.
- **Facebook** (IUCN Red List of Ecosystems): **24,841 followers**
- **Twitter** (@redlisteco): **5,771 followers**
- **Instagram** (@redlist_of_ecosystems): **3,204 followers**. (20% more than 2017).
Global Typology of Ecosystems

Terrestrial & Subterranean

Freshwater & transitional

Marine & transitional

Progress on descriptive profiles

- Complete
- Compete ex map
- Draft
- To do
Ecosystem Risk Assessment

Drylands

- **Scientific publications**: 2 papers and 1 book: Land Use and Spatial Planning and Conceptual framework on Land Degradation Neutrality.
- **Technical brief** on Soil Organic Carbon and soil biodiversity.
- **Projects and papers**: relating dryland EM, in collaboration with IUCN Secretariat, ECARO, agriculture and rangelands.
- **Contribution** to IPBES Global Assessment, ECODRR and CCA in Palestine.
- **Workshop**: CEM Rangeland Ecosystem Management, Amman.

Task Force of Systemic Pesticides

"Systemic Pesticides: A Worldwide Assessment"
2018 Outstanding Scientific Book Award

- **Symposiums**: 11th, 12th and 13th:
  - University of Southeastern Philippines,
  - National Taiwan Normal University (NTNU)
- **Task Force meeting**: co-hosted by the Société Nationale pour la Protection de la Nature (Paris).
- **Workshops**:
  - Africa on neonicotinoids
  - 1st African workshop on systemic neonicotinoids pesticides (S. African Academy of Sciences – Pretoria)
Ecosystem Risk Assessment

Peatlands

- Conferences:
  - 3rd meeting of partners of the Global Peatland Initiative (Congo Basin)
  - Strategic Approach to peatland conservation - International Peatland Society (Rotterdam)
  - Experiences in developing blended finance mechanisms for funding restoration after wildfire (COP 24)
- Contributions to the Peatland code and initiatives on peatland restoration, carbon markets, as part of EU-LIFE exchange programmed.

Holarctic Steppes

- Publications: 4 papers and 1 book on grasslands
  - Virtual Encyclopedia of Kazakh steppes
  - Starting project on Russian Steppes
  - List of steppe protected areas for model countries (Mongolia, Hungary)
- Conferences: Session on Central Asian Rangelands with IUCN WCPA & CEM. (SCB Conservation Asia. Aug, Bishkek-Kyrgyzstan)
- Start of project: Innovations for Sustainable Use of Agricultural Resources and Climate-adaption in the Arid Steppes of Kazakhstan and Southwestern Siberia

Virtual Encyclopedia of the Steppes (Kazakhstan)
Ecosystem Risk Assessment
Fisheries Expert Group

- **CBD-Background paper**: Other Effective Area-Based Conservation measures (OECMs), focusing on area-based measures used in managing fisheries for:
  - CBD Expert workshops on Other Effective Area Based Conservation Measures (Montreal, Feb.)
  - 22nd meeting of the CBD (SBSTTA) Montreal
- **CBD Sustainable Ocean Initiative** – *Fostering dialogue for the sustainable use of fisheries resources* presented work in relation to Aichi Target 6 and 11. **European Parliament**
- **FAO** Committee on Fisheries (COFI)- FEG: Serge Garcia and Despina Symons (July, Rome)
- **Joint FAO/CBD/FEG** : *Towards sustainable fisheries: mainstreaming biodiversity – what are our commitments and how do we deliver* to raise awareness of COFI members of the ongoing processes.
Nature-based Solutions

NBS-Inter-Commission TG

- **Scientific papers** (drafts):
  - Going Beyond the Principles for Implementing NbS
  - NbS in Practice
  - Assessing Case Studies.

- **Workshops:**
  - Link between NbS, nature conservation and ecosystem services (Global ESP Conference, Hangzhou- China)
  - operational framework in relation to principles adopted in Hawaii

- Consultancy: SDGs and comparative approaches, advancing in scientific basis
- Support the development of NBS Standards
Nature based Solutions

ECO-Disaster Risk Reduction

- **CBD Guidelines on Eco-DRR and EbA:** inputs from various thematic group members

- **Publications:**
  - “Advancing Ecosystems and Disaster Risk Reduction in Policy, Planning, Implementation, and Management” (International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction IJDRR)
  - Green-blue-grey infrastructure session at GPDRR drafted and accepted, with IUCN DG as moderator.

- **MOOC:** “Disasters and Ecosystems: Resilience in a Changing Climate” more than 5.700 participants
Nature based Solutions

Ecosystem-based Adaptation and Ecosystem-based Mitigation – EbA&M

COP14- CBD:
- Biodiversity and Climate Change (item 21).
- 4th Science and Policy Forum: Scaling up NBS.
- Strengthening linkages between BD and CC- NBS solutions for climate change.

SBSTTA 48 and COP24- UNFCCC:
- SBSTTA 48: 3rd EbA knowledge day: Moving from pilots to mainstreaming opportunities and challenges of Scaling up EbA.
- TEP-A Technical examination on adaptation: Adaptation planning and vulnerable ecosystems.
- Celebration of 10 years of EbA: High level Session: Successes and Setbacks in Mainstreaming EbA.
- International Mountain Day: Saving the 3rd Pole.
Ecological Restoration

Workshops:
- **Selection of Native Plant Materials for Restoration and Ecosystem Management** (Eco. Soc. America Conference, New Orleans).
- **Effective Ecological Restoration Monitoring** (Missoula, USA)
- Key note speech: 4th Colombian Congress of Ecological Restoration
- Global challenges and opportunities in ecological restoration. (Indigo Partners Corp. Meeting, Montana, USA)
- **The science behind the selection of native plant materials for restoration.** (Invited seminar, Montana Tech. USA).

Beginning Feb: 2019, monthly webinar series: "Ecosystem Restoration: Global Initiatives in Science and Practice"

Written production:
- Comments: UN CBD Short-term Action Plan for Ecosystem Restoration (STAPER)
- Revision: International Principles and Standards for Ecological Restoration/NBS
- **Improving biodiversity outcomes from Forest Landscape Restoration** - SER newsletter.
- **International Principles and Standards for the Practice of Ecological Restoration.** (in review)
- Leading a special issue of the journal *Forests* on forest landscape restoration (in prep).
Business and Ecosystem Management

COURSERA MOOC: A Business Approach to Sustainable Landscape Restoration

New ENABLE MOOC launched on Feb.14: Business Model Innovation for Sustainable Landscape Restoration  4.7/5 Rating

Teaser Video with CEM leaders

Business4Landscapes LinkedIn group

Ecosystem Services

Conferences:

- Key note speech: *The role of ecosystem service approaches to addressing contemporary environmental issues* - International Conference on Environmental Sciences: Disaster Mitigation, Environmental Issues and Sustainable Development and subsequent university lectures (Sumatra, Indonesia Nov.)

- *Regional perspectives of national policy uptake of Nature human-well-being concepts in Africa, Europe and Central Asia, the Americas and Asia Pacific.* (ACES 2018 WDC)

Coordinating committee: ONET - the organised stakeholder network supporting IPBES. To assist IPBES to implement its Stakeholder Engagement Strategy.

II World Forum on Ecosystem Governance (Hangzhou City, China Nov.). More than 290 participants from 33 countries.

Declaration:
- Comprehensively Understand Values of Ecosystems. Enhance Ecosystem Governance to Promote the Supply of Ecosystem Services.


Sustainable Use of Biodiversity - SUME

- Global naturalliance.org network:
  - multilingual hub in 44 languages
  - 73 satellites at regional and country levels.

- Multilingual Online Research/Restoration Project Hosting (MORPH) www.perdixnet.org
  - to restore farmland
  - in 18 languages across 24 countries
  - building national satellites continues
  - national site for Slovenia was added
Cultural Practices and Ecosystem Management

Conferences:
- Panel on cultural practices and climate change for the Communities, Conservation and Livelihoods Conference in Halifax (May)
- Dialogues for Collaborative Action on the Links between Biological and Cultural Diversity (NYC)
- Joint meeting CPEM and CEESP (Halifax-Canada, May)

Publications:
- Special issue of a journal on social and cultural aspects of EbA
- Call for papers to be targeted at Conservation Biology/ Conservation Letters
- Work plan for the CPEM case studies compendium (30)

Consultations:
- NBS global standards
- Pastoralism and World Heritage sites
- Biosphere Reserves & Ecosystem Governance TGs.
- Abstracts for the ICOMOS Nature-Culture Journey (Nov.)
Ecosystem Resilience

**Ecosystem Resilience TG - RTG**

**Conferences:**
- Session on *Climate Change's Role in Disasters and Disaster Risk Reduction*. 19th ISA World Congress of Sociology (Toronto Jul.)

**Publications:**
- *Understanding Vulnerability from a Social-Ecological System Perspective to Enhance Resilience for Ecosystem-Based Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction: Finding a Path of Acceptance.*

Annual online survey of RTG members to:
- Identify practitioner needs and contributions
- Primary overlaps with other IUCN bodies and activities
- Conference-based networking events that members volunteered to host.

**Deep Sea Mining**

**Scientific publications:**
- Strategic Environmental Goals and Objectives for Seabed Mining.

**Workshops:**
- Impacts on pelagic environments, Impacts on fish and fishery resources.
- Development of guidelines and standards to support the draft ISA exploitation regulations.
Communications

CEM Newsletters

Twitter

1,062 followers

Facebook Pages

3,172 followers

TG- Newsletters

Followers: 1458
## Financial Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Example activities</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Cont-in kind</th>
<th>Cofinance/leverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair &amp; D. Chair</strong></td>
<td>Travel Costs/ COP/ CEM events/</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local staff support</strong></td>
<td>Chair’s assistant, administrative costs</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering C.</strong></td>
<td>Travel &amp; venue costs</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications</strong></td>
<td>Open access fee, newsletter translations</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributions to Programme</strong></td>
<td>“Support a global IUCN RLE”</td>
<td></td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>500,000 (ARC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000 Virgin islands-Darwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEM hosted events</strong></td>
<td>2nd Forum in Ecosystem Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>503,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oceania Mangrove, ES; CC adaptation, DRR Workshop, Fiji.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities Conservation and Livelihoods conference, Canada.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UN Forum, SEEA, NY.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBD, SBSTTA and COP 14 (Canada and Egypt).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Congress of Sociology, Canada.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthening knowledge in Ecosystem Services, Togo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building networks  CEM North East Asia. China.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEM members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total- CHF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>172,000</td>
<td>8,460,000</td>
<td>193000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Muchas Gracias
1st meeting of the 2020 Congress Preparatory Committee  
96th Meeting of the IUCN Council  
HQ, Gland (Switzerland), 27 March 2019  

Council report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPC1/1</th>
<th>Introductions, adoption of the agenda and election of Committee Chair (C96/CPC1/1v2.0)</th>
<th>INF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The President informed the Congress Preparatory Committee that the following Council members have been appointed to the CPC (in alphabetical order):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Andrew Bignell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mamadou Diallo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hilde Eggermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sixto Inchaustegui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ali Kaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Malik Amin Aslam Khan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kathy MacKinnon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• John Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ana Tiraa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nihal Welikala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He welcomed the two representatives from France: Virginie Dumoulin from the Ministry for an Ecological and Inclusive Transition, and Ambassador Yann Wehrling from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The apologies of Ana Tiraa and Kathy MacKinnon were noted (Kristen Walker participated in the second half of the meeting to represent the Commissions, following a request by the President).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The President expressed his gratitude towards the Host Country for their generous offer to host the Congress and confirmed IUCN's strong wish to make the 2020 Congress a historical landmark event towards the CBD COP15 in China and the 2020-2030 decade in general.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was explained that the CPC will become the Congress Steering Committee during Congress and it will be presided over by the President at that moment. As requested by Council, the CPC elected its chair. Following nomination by Ali Kaka and seconded by Malik Amin Aslam Khan, the Committee elected Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere as chair of the CPC. The Chair accepted the election and highlighted her wish to lead the Committee in a collaborative manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC1/2</td>
<td>Overview of Congress timeline and CPC work plan 2019-2020</td>
<td>INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CPC took note of the preparatory timeline for the Congress and the related work plan for the Committee presented by the Congress Director (see Annex 1). The timeline has been developed starting from the opening day of the Congress to the present moment, taking into account statutory deadlines and timing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was explained that for the Regional Conservation Forums (RCF), preparations are well underway and handled by the Regional Offices together with the National and Regional Committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was clarified that the financial oversight for the Congress was responsibility of the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) and that the Congress Unit was reporting regularly to them. The CPC noted that in the past oversight by FAC was sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
but given that the overall responsibility for Congress lies with the CPC it decided to request formal reports by the FAC with regards to the Congress budget. It was noted that the timing of these reports might be difficult as the FAC tends to meet after the CPC.

CPC noted that it would need to approve a process for appointing three additional CPC members who would join the CPC when acting as appeals body on the motions process (foreseen between 30 October and 27 November 2019). The Secretariat will make a proposal of possible candidates for consideration of the CPC by July 2019. The Committee took note that the decisions on appeals would be taken via virtual meetings.

Overview of the venue layout, Congress schedule, and themes

The CPC reviewed the layout and plans for the venue and took note of the general Congress schedule from 10 to 19 June 2020 as well as the schedule for Forum and Assembly.

The Secretariat presented a proposal of 7 themes for the Congress which are in line with the draft 2021-24 Programme (4 major areas plus Fresh water and 2 of the cross-cutting areas):

- Land and Landscapes
- Oceans
- Climate change
- Governance and rights
- Water
- Finance
- Either “Frontiers of conservation” (technology & innovation) or “post-2020”.

The CPC agreed to adopt the first six themes and further that the “Frontiers of conservation” would be the seventh item. In addition, the CPC decided that the post-2020 agenda be treated as a journey running through these themes and that this would be given appropriate prominence. The following cross-cutting issues were identified:

- Influence important stakeholders (youth, local governments, private sector, general public, Ministers beyond the Environment Ministers
- Drivers of biodiversity loss (urbanisation, pollution, etc.)
- States and outcomes
- SDGs

The Host Country mentioned that the themes are well aligned with France’s priorities but that more clarity in the title is needed to have a clearer focus.

Following a brainstorming discussion, the CPC proposed and agreed the following focus for the first six themes:

**Water:** Freshwater is critical for life; How will freshwater systems be restored at all scales? How can water-related ecosystems survive and flourish? Avoid pollution, contamination of freshwater; manage water needs of cities and rural communities;

**Governance and Rights:** Effective governance underlies water, oceans and lands; it depends on authority, capacity and power; and it depends on gender, equality, it is vested in government (national, regional, local) but also, Indigenous People, civil society, and the private sector. Challenges include increasing social political and financial inequity, disempowerment of groups, relationship that
humans have with nature; advance gender; what are key leverage points for transformational change.

**Climate change:** connections between climate change and biodiversity are vital; improved biodiversity status enhances ecosystem resilience and it helps with climate change adaptation and mitigation; it is important to use nature-based solutions for disaster risk reduction, climate adaptation and management of agro-biodiversity; synergies and trade-offs between policies that deal with climate change/biodiversity issues and trade-offs with other sectors (highlighting interlinkages between climate change and biodiversity);

**Finance:** capital lies with private sector and we should reframe the approach so that conservation is seen as investment rather than cost, creating a shift in mind sets which is a key aspect of transformative change. Further, we need to look at different types of return on investment (e.g. disaster prevention, vs financial return) and identify systemic changes in financial systems will require attitudinal changes;

**Land:** the theme should focus on change of land-use and land-use changes, which tackles all drivers (deforestation, agriculture, artificialisation/urbanisation, desertification). But the Congress also needs to address solutions: agro-ecology, food-security, sustainable practices (permaculture, etc.) – production and consumption;

**Oceans:** The oceans theme should encompass pollution (plastics, pesticides, acidification), overfishing (MPA, sustainable fishing, governance of areas beyond national jurisdictions, etc.) and management of coastal areas; management of large MPAs.

The Secretariat and the Host country made it clear that decision on themes is very urgent in view of upcoming deadlines (such as the call for proposals) and should be presented o Council on Sunday. The exact headlines of the themes require further work as they will need to be transformational and attention-grabbing. It was agreed that Secretariat would make a proposal for headline by 11 April to get final approval from CPC by 15 April. A draft, still to be approved by the CPC is attached for information purposes only (Annex3).

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council,

*on the recommendation of the 2020 Congress Preparatory Committee,*

APPROVES the seven themes of the Congress and post-2020 as cross-cutting issue, and

AUTHORISES the CPC to finalise the theme labels by 11 April.

**CPC1/4 Preparations for the Forum**

CPC reviewed the 5 Forum objectives presented by the Forum Manager:

- Showcase that conservation works
- Strengthen engagement with next generations
- Catalyse action and transformative initiatives
- Mobilise the Union as whole
- Mainstream conservation
CPC also reviewed the various proposed event types, as well as the selection criteria and timelines for the Call for proposals. Lessons learnt from the past have been integrated in the design for 2020 including reduced number of sessions overall.

It was clarified that the technical review of proposals would be carried out by volunteers from Commissions, Members and Secretariat. Approximately 350 reviewers will be needed. After the technical review, the strategic review panel will ensure that a high quality and balance of events of events.

CPC suggested to focus the high-level dialogues on visionary and strategic content and that it should target “movers and shakers” as speakers (vs only VIPs). It also suggested considering to change the name of the “High level dialogues” to reflect this visionary objective. The CPC applauded the proposal to host “breakfast with…” events targeted at young people, but proposed that the secretariat considers alternative timing given growing evidence that for many young people mornings are not the most productive time of the day.

The Host Country stressed that the need to make good use of the rooms that will be built to make sure that the investments made are well utilised.

CPC1/5  
**Deadline for receiving nominations for Regional Councillor and for proposals for persons to be nominated by Council as President, Treasurer or Chair of a Commission and recommendation to Council (Regulations 35 and 38)** (C96/CPC1/5)

In accordance with Regulations 35 and 38, the IUCN Council shall determine the deadline for proposals for persons to be nominated for President, Treasurer and Commission Chair and for nominations for Regional Councillor, on the recommendation of the Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC) as per its Terms of Reference. The Senior Governance Manager, in his capacity as Members’ Assembly Manager, explained that according to Regulations 37 and 40 all nominations for Regional Councillor shall be submitted to the Election Officer who will validate the nominations that meet the requirements and authorize their immediate publication. For persons to be nominated for President, Treasurer and Chair of a Commission, the Election Officer will transmit all nominations that meet the requirements to the IUCN Council’s Nominations Committee following the deadline for nominations. As the Nominations Committee needs about four to six weeks prior to the Council meeting to consider the nominations and the 98th Council meeting is scheduled for 8-11 February, the latest date to receive nominations is mid-December 2019. As there are already two statutory deadlines on 11 December, the CPC agreed to recommend setting the deadline for 11 December.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council,

*on the recommendation of the 2020 Congress Preparatory Committee,*

**Decides to set the deadline for receiving proposals for President, Treasurer and Commission Chairs and nominations for Regional Councillors at 11 December 2019, 13:00 GMT.**

CPC1/6  
**Discussion of the appointment of the 2020 Congress Election Officer and recommendation to Council** (C96/CPC1/6)
The **TOR of the Election Officer** were approved by 95th Council. The Election Officer oversees the nominations and elections process. The nominations process will start as soon as the Director General invites Members to submit proposals for elected positions, which will happen in parallel to the Regional Conservation Forums.

The Election Officers validates the nominations for President, Commission Chairs, and Treasurer to confirm that proposals are in conformity with the statutes. During Congress, the Election Officer will oversee the election process and verify that the electronic voting system is accurately recording the votes in line with the statutory requirements. After Congress, the Election Officer makes recommendations on how to improve the voting and election process.

The Chair of the World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL) has proposed Prof Denise Antolini as Election Officer. She currently is the Deputy Chair of WCEL and is law professor at the University of Hawaii. She is national of the United States of America.

The CPC unanimously supported this recommendation and noted that, in case there is a candidate for president from the USA, the CPC will need to recommend another candidate to Council to avoid any perceived conflict of interest as described in the TOR. The Congress Director added that the Chair of WCEL had recommended that Council appoint a Deputy Election Officer in due time on the recommendation of CPC.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the 2020 Congress Preparatory Committee,

APPOINITS Prof. Denise Antolini as Election Officer.

---

**Discussion on Congress registration fees and recommendation to Council**

As per statutes Art. 47 and Rules of Procedure Art. 30, Council is responsible for establishing the registration fees for the World Conservation Congress. The CPC took note and approved the considerations made by the Secretariat, supported by the Host country in proposing the fee structure as follows:

- Simple structure fee structure
- A lower fee for Members, Commission members and representatives of National and Regional Committees to reinforce the value and benefit of Membership plus complimentary registration for Members attending the Assembly only
- A lower fee for youth (up to 27 years) to encourage participation of young people
- A fee for accompanying persons to allow participants to bring their spouse to social events
- Day passes, restricted to a maximum of one day, to enable speakers or academia interested in particular sessions to attend the Congress for one day
- A significantly reduced day pass for French residents to accommodate the request by the Host Country who has launched a national mobilisation effort for the Congress and its national biodiversity plan and wishes to make the
Congress accessible for the general public
- Staggered fees increasing over time to push participants to register as early as possible
- Setting the registration fees in Euros as a significant percentage of participants will come from countries with € currency
- Increasing the fees slightly by about 10% compared to 2016

The CPC took note that the Espaces Générations Nature (a space offered and organised by France inside the Congress venue where citizens and other non-state actors can showcase their mobilisation efforts and other commitments) and the exhibition will be open to the general public at no cost (the earlier only during certain hours of the day).

The CPC agreed that the rationale provided for the fee structure was very good. The CPC therefore recommends to Council to approve the fee schedule as follows:

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

Council,
on the recommendation of the 2020 Congress Preparatory Committee,
APPROVES the registration fee schedule (Table 1) for the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEE in EUR</th>
<th>Early bird (up to 11 Mar 2020)</th>
<th>Standard (from 12 Mar up to 11 May 2020)</th>
<th>Late (from 12 May 2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members, Commission members &amp; National/Regional representatives</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1'050</td>
<td>1'200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying persons</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day Pass (1 day max per Person)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth residents of France</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of France</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents outside of France</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of Council specific objectives linked to the Gender strategy for Congress Assembly and recommendation to Council** ([C96/CPC1/8](#))

CPC was pleased to learn that the Director General had approved and issued an Anti-harassment policy for IUCN events and a Gender mainstreaming strategy for IUCN events.

In discussing the proposed decision, a CPC member noted that the decision
makes reference to anti-harassment policy but this is not sufficiently highlighted. The Secretariat advised that both documents had been developed and should be seen in conjunction and the references to the policy had been included deliberately in the strategy.

The CPC discussed issues with regarding the status of the document and how to effectively include the objectives of the Gender mainstreaming strategy for IUCN events. The CPC noted that Annex 1 of that strategy, which originates from the Secretariat, specifically refers to the World Conservation Congress and proposed to recommend that Council approves the complete Strategy for gender-responsive IUCN World Conservation Congresses to ensure a comprehensive response. The Committee made one change in the strategy which is described in the following proposed decision.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

Council,

On the recommendation of the 2020 Congress Preparatory Committee, **ENDORSES** the strategic objectives of the Gender mainstreaming strategy for IUCN events

“4. IUCN events will
   a. Promote and strive for equal participation of all men and women as well as equitable interventions/speaking time;
   b. Strive for gender parity in selection of speakers and composition of panels;
   c. Put in place measures that allow all attendees to experience an event free from any harassment;
   d. Prevent sexism and combat gender stereotypes to ensure that gender inequalities are not perpetuated;
   e. Ensure that a gender perspective will inform session planning; and
   f. Promote and advance IUCN’s work and policies on gender in conservation and sustainable development.”

and

**APPROVES** the Strategy for gender-responsive IUCN World Conservation Congresses [Annex 2] with the following changes

“[…]The IUCN Council will

40. Submit proposals that promote gender parity in composition of Congress Committees to the Assembly for approval; […]”

**CPC1/9 Discussion on observers who shall have the right to speak during the Members’ Assembly and recommendation to Council** *(C96/CPC1/9)*

The CPC took note of Rule 33, 40 of the Rules of Procedures and of Article 86 of the Statutes which specify the institutions and individuals who have the right to speak at the Congress and that Council is required to define the observers having the right to speak. In line with Rules 8 and 10, as well as past practice from 2012 and 2016, the CPC recommends to Council to give this right to all organisations with which IUCN has formal working relationships established by 30 April 2020. Formal working relationships are defined as contracts, Memorandums of Understandings, Letters of Intent or any other sort of written agreement which
does not need to be legally binding or otherwise enforceable. The CPC took note that this information will be communicated via the Congress website but that no formal invitation will be sent to such organisations as there is no central list of organisations with which IUCN has formal relationships and the number and names are changing constantly.

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

Council,

On the recommendation of the 2020 Congress Preparatory Committee,

DECIDES that all organizations with which IUCN has formal working relationships established by 30 April 2020 be eligible to be observers to the Congress and shall be issued with a recognition card for the right to speak providing they have duly completed the accreditation process.

Update from Host Country representatives

Congress is part of a larger framework for France to enhance its new national biodiversity plan and to put biodiversity high on the national and international agenda and to mobilise the general public on biodiversity issue, that includes several major events including the IPBES plenary in April 2019 and the G7 Environment council in Metz in May 2019. France will host a space “Espace Génération Nature” showcasing projects and success stories on biodiversity issues to educate general public including youth solutions to biodiversity and sustainability issues.

France has set up a governance structure for Congress at local and national level which includes local and regional authorities as well as civil society organisations. An inter-ministerial steering committee which will encompass other key ministries (education, sports, interior, MOFA) to align preparations on all levels.

France is aiming to leave a legacy with the Congress: the event should be transformative and enhance sustainable practices in Marseille including hotels for which France is aiming to get a sustainability certification ahead of Congress. France has started the procurement process to contract the various logistics providers.

The CPC expressed its gratitude and confidence into France’s preparations and assured the Host Country that CPC stands ready to accelerate these preparations.

Discussion and approval of sponsored Members programme criteria including recommendations from the Governance and Constituency Committee (C96/CPC1/11)

The CPC reviewed the decision paper and considered the recommendations by the GCC with regards to the sponsored delegates programme. It took note of the generous contribution by the Host Country France which will provide € 1.5m which would cover around 350 delegates from IUCN Member organizations. The Committee took note that currently about 680 Members would be eligible but that sponsorship should be primarily given to organisations that are actively engaged in the work of the Union.

The CPC approved the following minimum criteria in order to be eligible for
sponsorship at the 2020 Congress:

1. Members coming from countries with low and middle-income economies, as per the 2019 World Bank list of economies.
2. Members in categories A, B and C which are up-to-date in the payment of their membership dues i.e. are eligible to vote.
3. Members having fully complied with the requirements of the Sponsored Members Programme in 2016

In addition, only one delegate per eligible Member organisation should be considered, ensuring adequate geographic representation across all regions.

In the event that funding is not sufficient to sponsor all eligible Members, priority shall be given to:

- Members who have been accepted as event organizers for the Forum
- Members who are candidates for Council or Commission Chairs
- Members who are actively engaged in the National or Regional Committee and programmatic or governance activities of the IUCN (where applicable)

In addition, CPC decided that:

- IUCN should only sponsor Government Agencies that will have the power to vote,
- strive for gender parity in the sponsored delegates composition,
- there is no requirement to have been a Member of IUCN for a specific time prior to being eligible for sponsorship and
- National and Regional Committees should be made aware of any non-compliance of its Members in order to ensure adequate follow-up

The CPC noted that decision on sponsorship will be taken by the IUCN Regional Office in close coordination with the Regional Committee where available or alternatively National Committees, taking into account the above criteria and recommendations and that granting of sponsorship will be dependent on availability of funds as well as other requirements required by donors and that no legal claim to receive sponsorship can be made by any Member.

The Committee took note that in 2016, about 50% of the Members did not comply with at least one of the criteria and approved the following requirements for sponsored organisations for 2020:

- Member organisation (represented by the Sponsored Delegate or another duly designated representative) participates in the electronic voting on motions prior to the Congress
- Sponsored delegate attends the full 9 days of Congress, including participation in Forum events.
- Sponsored delegate is physically present (no proxy given) all days of the Members’ Assembly and exercises voting rights (vote Yes, No or Abstain) on at least 75% of the decisions of the Members’ Assembly, without valid reason.

---

1 Only upon specific donors request, it may be possible to sponsor more than one delegate per Member organisation.
2 Such as serious illness, accident or death of the sponsored delegate or close relative (spouse, parent, sibling, child), visa declined.
CPC also approved the following **consequences of non-compliance**

- Members whose sponsored delegates do not comply with the above requirements without a valid reason\(^3\) will not be eligible for sponsorship to the Regional Conservation Fora in 2023 nor the Congress in 2024.
- Members whose sponsored delegate cancels his/her participation after the cancellation deadline set by the Secretariat or who fail to attend the Congress without cancelling for valid a reason\(^4\) will be invoiced for the cost incurred.

The Secretariat will make these consequences clear in the agreement to be signed by the sponsored delegate and the Head of the Member organisation.

The CPC suggested that the Secretariat should identify a way to monitor participation in the RCF for the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPC1/12</th>
<th>Review the provisional agenda for the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020 as per Rule 23 of the IUCN Statutes (<a href="#">C96/CPC1/12</a>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>According to Article 23 of the IUCN Statutes the Director General shall communicate the “provisional agenda, at least nine months in advance of each session.” (i.e. before 11 September 2019) but the Secretariat envisages sharing an outline of the Members’ Assembly during the Regional Conservation Forums (RCF). The skeleton agenda presented to CPC was largely based on the 2016 Congress agenda but this agenda will evolve over the coming months, following discussions at RCFs and the Secretariat will liaise with the CPC to get their view on these changes prior to send-out by 11 September. It was clarified that the Provisional and Draft Agenda which Council would need to approve at its 98th meeting are focusing on the Members’ Assembly part of the Congress and that other elements of the Congress programme would be published in the online programme. The CPC agreed that the regional Member meetings taking place on the eve of the Assembly were not an efficient or conducive opportunity for candidates’ presentations. The CPC noted that the agenda of these Member meetings should be decided by Members themselves but that CPC has a role to suggest to candidates ways to engage with Members. CPC agreed to have a substantive discussion on candidates’ presentations during its next meeting. The CPC also made a recommendation to GCC to include a short agenda item for the RCFs about consultation of Members on the Members’ Assembly agenda. The CPC also requested the Secretariat to amend the skeleton agenda as follows prior to sharing with RCFs: […] Day 5 – 15 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPC1/13</th>
<th>Outline of communications plans</th>
<th>INF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>The Director of Global Communications gave an update on the communications plans for the Congress which are largely building on the experience and success of the 2016 Congress and focus on a sound strategy that leverages the Union and external events and with a strong emphasis on videos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^3\) Such as serious illness, accident or death of the sponsored delegate or close relative (spouse, parent, sibling, child), visa declined.
Among the lessons learnt from 2016 are to start communications early (RFPs, website and visual identity complete), to invest in a website that matches the profile of event, to consolidate vendors to improve cohesion and to improve participant communication during Congress.

Highlights from the strategy for 2020 include the following:

- Don’t go alone (CEC, CPC, Members, Commissions, Host country)
- Assert global significance (2020 pivotal year, decade to make history, content relevant to global regional and technical audience)
- Lead by example (inclusive Congress: gender, youth, IP), sustainable Congress
- Leverage events with overlapping audiences (external (IPBES, UNFCCC, G7), within Union)

Communications will be organised in the following phases

The **Audiences for Congress** are: Members, regional audiences (media), youth (YP, young journalists, local families), “nexternal” audiences (influencers not in the conservation arena but who have an impact on conservation or can benefit from it), and CBD COP15 negotiators.

The messaging for the Congress will focus on four main points: 1) get nature right to get 2030 right; 2) global challenges/natural solutions; 3) Congress is a powerful mandate buttressed by its unique inclusion of civil society and IP organisations, 4) Lead by the example. Together with the Chair of the Commission on Education and Communication (CEC), the Communications team developed a strapline. France and the year of 2020 provide an unprecedented opportunity where biodiversity will be renegotiated and which gives a call to action. The slogan presented to CPC was:

“**One nature, one future**” – “**Une nature, un avenir**” – “**La naturaleza, nuestro futuro**”

The strapline provides a big bubble that works for different audiences (Members, France, local, global) and it has a people factor and a call to action. It is a strapline in which IUCN has to invest as “One nature” needs to be filled with meaning including breaking this down for each theme so that the messages resonate with
CPC generally endorsed the idea of the strapline with the below changes in French and Spanish and agreed that it is essential to decide this as soon as possible.

“One nature, one future” – “Une nature, un avenir!” – “Una sola naturaleza, un solo futuro”

### Outline of fundraising plans

The CPC asked the Partnerships Coordinator to provide an update on fundraising plans. The overall fundraising target for Congress is CHF 5.2m compared to CHF 3.5m in 2016, out of which CHF 2.5 are high priority. The Secretariat (Congress, SPU, BBP) is collaborating with the Host Country and the French National Committee to maximise synergies.

The resource mobilisation strategy is focusing on three pillars

- Sponsorship opportunities
- Exhibition booths: new concept with thematic villages;
- Grants/donations

The prospect groups are private sector, foundations, high net worth individuals, Governments, NGOs and institutional funders with a detailed strategy for each group. Sponsor benefits in terms of visibility and brand association with IUCN and reach out to decision-makers.

The exhibitions will be a space organised around the Congress themes, which will mirror the 2021-2024 program strategic priorities that will showcase best practices and allow for networking and exchange in a dynamic and informal environment. It will be open to the general public during part of the day.

So far, the Secretariat has worked on the value proposition; KPIs and started the engagement with potential sponsors to build a pipeline.

In the coming weeks, the Congress Unit will engage with Regional Offices and global programmes, finish the design work with the exhibit contractor, and secure meetings with EU and other key framework partners. The Secretariat clarified that the Congress is a non-lucrative event but resources coming from sponsorships and other activities are essential to allow IUCN to break even.

The Secretariat highlighted that fundraising is all about relationships and that the support by CPC and Council is essential to open doors to donors to allow us leverage their networks. The Partnership Coordinator will liaise with Council members to identify prospect funders for Congress and relies on them to provide access to their networks. The Congress Unit will regularly report on fundraising progress to keep CPC engaged.

### Date and place of next CPC meetings

CPC took note that in principle three physical meetings are foreseen prior to Congress, linked to the 96th, 97th and 98th Council meeting. The 2nd meeting would take place in Marseille either back-to-back with the Council meeting in October.
2019 or about one month before. The Secretariat will explore options with the Host Country and the venue and submit several proposals to CPC within the coming weeks. One CPC member expressed preference for a back-to-back meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPC1/15</th>
<th>Any other business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No item was discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2020 Congress Timeline

1st CPC
- Call for Contributions open
- Deadline for Contributions
- May: Pre-2020 Regional Conservation Forums (RCF)
- Consultation Draft IUCN Programme
- Before 18/05/2020
- 18/05/2020 Call for Nominations
- Before 13/06/2020
- 13/06/2020 Provisional Agenda
- Before 18/06/2020

2nd CPC
- Call for Contributions
- Accepted sessions published
- June: Regulations, housing, excursions and exhibition site guidance
- June: Call for contributions for social events
- June: Members’ registration launched

3rd CPC
- 29-30 June: 99th Council
- 11-13 July: 99th Council
- 18-20 July: 99th Council
- 22-24 July: 99th Council
- 27-29 July: 99th Council
- 30 July-1 August: WEC

TBC = To be confirmed by Council

Publication in original language - Presentation - Final versions
- Publication - Final versions
- Publication - Final versions
- Technical Review
- Deadline Submission
- Submission of Motions
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C/96/CPC1
Minutes
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CPC work plan

1st meeting
Council decisions
- Nominations deadline
- Election officer
- Registration fees
- Council specific objectives linked to the Gender strategy
- Observer speaking rights

Other
- Approve sponsored member criteria
- Review Provisional agenda
- Monitor Congress preparations

Via email
- CPC to review process/proposals for three additional CPC members acting as appeals body

2nd meeting
- Process for identifying individuals for Congress Committees
- Visit venue and host city
- Monitor Congress preparations

30/10-27/11 appeals process

3rd meeting
Council decisions
- Approve Draft Agenda for the Congress

Other
- Proposal for members of Congress Committees
- Update on nominations process
- Monitor Congress preparations

CPC acting as appeals body
(Rules 62ter and quarto)
- Decide on all appeals against decisions by Motions Working Group
Annex 2

Strategy for gender-responsive IUCN World Conservation Congresses

Purpose
1. As the highest decision-making body of the Union, the IUCN World Conservation Congress has a pivotal role to play in advancing gender equality, including through participation and governance; agenda, deliberations and decisions; and communications and messaging.

Specific objectives
2. In addition to the strategic objectives of the Gender mainstreaming strategy for IUCN events, the IUCN World Conservation Congress will specifically
   a. Strive for gender parity in participation by
      i. Actively promoting and enabling for gender parity in the number of sponsored delegates;
      ii. Actively promoting gender balance in the composition of Member delegations with more than one person; and
      iii. Encouraging gender balance in the Head of Delegations across all Member categories and regions.
   b. Promote gender as an important issue in the content of the Congress by
      i. Ensuring that gender issues will be included in the design of the Forum; and
      ii. Ensuring that gender issues are reflected in the IUCN draft Programme.
   c. Strive for gender parity in the governance of the Congress by
      i. Aiming for gender parity in the composition of Congress Committees; and
      ii. Striving for gender parity in nominations of candidates for President, Commission Chairs and Regional Councillors and subsequently in the elected candidates.

Specific tools

Pre-event

Congress Unit will
3. Design IT systems in a way that is inclusive for men, women and those with another gender identity and allow to monitor gender parity;
4. Ensure that the gender responsive objective of the Congress is adequately profiled on the Congress website and Congress material. Ensure that the Gender mainstreaming strategy for IUCN events (this document), and other relevant documents, are profiled and easily accessible from the Congress website;
5. Ensure that all staff involved are aware of IUCN gender policies and relevant staff have gender mainstreaming responsibilities specifically included in their Terms of Reference;

6. Publicly share data on gender parity status for the various objectives;

7. As necessary, implement special measures, where feasible, to further gender parity (i.e. special sponsorship programme, seating arrangements in the plenary hall, etc.);

**Membership Unit will**

8. Convey message to Members on targets for the composition of delegations and decision-making bodies;

9. Include gender parity objective in guidelines for sponsored delegates and accreditation and monitor status to trigger pro-active reminders to Members as necessary;

**Communications Unit will**

10. Include gender considerations in planning for communications and messaging;

11. Ensure that presentation of speakers and VIPs on the website is equitable and inclusive.

**Forum team will**

12. Work with the Global Gender Office to include gender issues in content and programme of the Forum;

13. Ensure that composition of panels/speakers in events organised by the Secretariat achieve gender parity;

14. Prepare and promote guidelines for session organisers on how to include gender issues in the programme and how to ensure gender parity in panels/speakers;

15. Event organisers should commit to gender parity in their events and organisers who fail to do so, will not be prioritised;

16. Ensure that session organisers, speakers and participants are aware of gender responsive objective of Forum as well as anti-harassment policy (including through the Forum website; at the Forum venue including with badges and appropriate signage; as well as in relevant written material including Forum schedule);

**It is proposed that the IUCN Council may consider to**

17. Submit proposals that promote gender parity in composition of Congress Committees to the Assembly for approval;

18. Include gender parity objective in guidelines for nomination of candidates and in Terms of Reference of the Election Officer for monitoring of status gender parity in nominations;

19. Actively encourage Members to nominate female/male candidates for Council/Commissions in cases where there is an imbalance in nominations;

**During the event**

20. Plenary Chair to promote Members’ Assembly as a Gender Responsive Assembly;

21. Union Development Group will monitor engagement of attendees in plenary discussions as well as contact groups and, as necessary, suggest to the Steering Committee to apply incentives and/or sanctions (i.e. speaking time, etc.); and

22. Union Development Group will engage with delegations and/or National or Regional Committees in case their organisation/countries lack gender balance.
Post-event

23. Union Development Group will report back publicly on level of achievement of the specific objectives as well as recommendations for future improvement in line with best of class practice.
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THEMES FOR THE IUCN WORLD CONSERVATION CONGRESS 2020

Composed of State and non-State Members, powered by science, and operating at the forefront of the environmental agenda for the past 70 years, IUCN offers a unique platform for change through a combination of knowledge generation, policy influencing and on-the-ground delivery.

Every 4 years, the IUCN World Conservation Congress brings together over 8000 delegates, including conservation experts and custodians, business representatives, academia, as well as other professional stakeholders who have an interest in Nature and in the sustainable use of natural resources. The IUCN World Conservation Congress is a unique platform for democratic decision-making in that it brings together governments and civil society on an equal footing. The decisions, resolutions and recommendations that emerge are the product of a fully inclusive process that widen the support and legitimacy beyond that of any other environmental organisation.

The next edition of the Congress will be held in Marseille, France, from June 11-19, 2020, and comes at a time which will, in many ways, set the environmental agenda for the upcoming decade.

(strapline TBD)

Reversing the state of nature of planet Earth requires unprecedented mobilization and organization on multiple levels. Actions implemented in the decade leading up to 2030 will be crucial for the future of all life on Earth, given the urgent need to correct humanity’s current trajectory, which is incompatible with a healthy natural world and our future. The planetary life support systems upon which we depend are faltering. At the same time, we are now more equipped than ever before, with the knowledge and tools necessary to reverse our impact. And we know that the right policies work for positive outcomes. The IUCN World Conservation Congress in Marseille will be a call to action for all sectors of society, to mobilize and take action.
Addressing environmental issues through innovative, collaborative and integrated approaches that make use of nature-based solutions will be unconditional prerequisites to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. The Congress in Marseille will be rooted in the Sustainable Development Goals – all goals, not merely the ones which focus on nature and biodiversity. Delegates will help shape the future framework for conservation, following on from the Aichi targets, and demonstrate the interlinkages between the climate agenda and nature.

The IUCN World Conservation Congress is designed to highlight thinking, solutions, and decisions which address critical challenges facing our world. The 2020 Forum, which precedes the Members’ Assembly, will focus on showcasing best practices and innovations in nature conservation, building new partnerships, and forging a roadmap for action.

To do so will require heeding all voices – especially those that are often marginalized more so where they are also the environmental custodians as are many Indigenous People and women. Youth and young professionals are our future and must play a lead role in securing the environment. Their voices must be heard and they must be engaged.

The Congress will offer a platform to collect and organize commitments from a broad range of stakeholders.

**Managing landscapes for people and nature**

By 2030, a harmonious balance must be achieved between ecological integrity for natural landscapes, a shared prosperity, and justice for custodians on working landscapes within the limits that nature can sustain. How can we achieve such a balance, delivering needed infrastructure and ensuring necessary economic development, without a significant impact on nature? What are the fundamental shifts required to protect terrestrial landscapes, whilst ensuring adequate food security for over 10 billion people?

Urban environments and cities, often perceived as a part of the problem, should aim to establish a greener, biodiversity-positive urban habitat, with a lowered footprint, and overall enhanced livability. The growth of urban spaces must be in harmony with nature. What are some nature-based solutions to overcrowding and heating cities, which will also increase resilience to floods and climate change?

Economic activities, such as agriculture, tourism, and extractive industries, will continue to thrive only if the resource remains available. What standards and best practices must the world adopt to preserve protected and conserved areas, while respecting cultural heritage and traditional knowledge systems? How can we better engage with all stakeholders to achieve an optimal balance between extraction, consumption and preservation? What are the keys to feeding the planet without losing nature simultaneously? What makes for sustainable land use planning?
The 2020 Congress will address the systems through which humans and nature interact, and where development challenges meet conservation efforts. Nature is under threat from global development, including agriculture, urbanization, and trade. Nature conservation thus remains a tall order: the rates of species extinction continue to be alarming, and good news, though it occurs, is all too infrequent. What are the key policy gaps which must be filled in the decade leading up to 2030 to halt the extinction of life forms? If we are to truly mainstream nature conservation, what tools, incentives, funding - or ambition - do we need to achieve a reversal of current trends? And how can we avoid repeating past errors?

**Guaranteeing water security**

Freshwater is critical for Life on earth. While rivers, streams, ponds and lakes contain only 3% of the total amount of water on earth, these water bodies are integral to the survival of all forms of life on the planet. It is essential that we conserve and restore freshwater ecosystems at all scales if we are to sustain life forms – people, animals, plants, fungi, etc. How can we ensure that water-related and water dependent ecosystems survive and flourish?

Water security continues to be a major challenge. Ensuring adequate quality, availability and accessibility of the resource is therefore vital. How can existing laws, policies, and institutions be strengthened and adapted to ensure more effective and sustainable management of water resources at the local, national and transboundary levels, that at the same time protects these freshwater ecosystems? How can we effectively strengthen governance and stewardship around polluted and contaminated watersheds? How can we manage the water needs of ever-growing cities as well as those of rural communities?

**Restoring ocean and coastal health**

Healthy oceans are at the heart of livelihoods for many, and are key to a stabilized climate regime. Limiting harmful human activities, such as overfishing and pollution, will help build the resilience of coastal communities, as well as coastal ecosystems, such as mangroves and coral reefs. How can we better address pollution, notably plastics and chemicals, and improve marine spatial planning?

Marine protected areas have demonstrated positive effects. What are the conditions for successful protection measures, and how can we strengthen frameworks and collaboration across borders and beyond national jurisdictions?

Climate change directly affects the ocean’s temperature and pH. How can marine organisms and ultimately coastal communities adapt to warmer and more acidic waters? The ocean offers tremendous opportunities for improved livelihoods. Enabling a sustainable blue world economy can open new perspectives. What are tomorrow’s “blue chips” for the blue planet?

Finding new ways to preserve and protect the polar environments in the face of evolving industrial activities will also become increasingly important as economic activities thrive. In many respects,
polar conservation remains a test of international cooperation. What does it take to truly protect essential commons in the face of mounting pressures? How can we harness existing international cooperation efforts on nature conservation to advance the agenda on polar conservation and overcome barriers to cooperation between involved stakeholders?

Harnessing nature-based solutions to climate change

Nature and the climate are intricately connected in a number of different ways/through multiple pathways. Risks posed by climate change to the natural world and human communities are on the rise. The IUCN World Conservation Congress will contribute to raising awareness of climate change impacts, particularly focusing on climate-vulnerable species and ecosystems, as well as on climate-vulnerable people and communities. How can we expand environmental education and knowledge on climate change, reduce pressures, and help people better adapt?

On the other hand, harnessing nature-based climate mitigation and adaptation efforts will be essential. The full potential of the world’s natural carbon sinks and reservoirs to achieve a climate-resilient and biodiversity-rich future, has yet to be unlocked. This will require strengthening institutional capacity for ecosystem planning and management, as landscapes transform and adapt to climate change. How can healthy ecosystems provide effective solutions for climate change mitigation and adaptation? What is the role of protected and conserved areas to meet the goals set out in the Paris Agreement on Climate Change?

Reducing environmental disasters (extreme weather events, floods, etc.) is one of the most critical ways in which to ensure sustainable communities. Successfully mitigating the risks and consequences of environmental disasters requires enhanced policy frameworks and institutional capacity. What are the most effective community-based solutions to ensure the inclusion of the most vulnerable? What kind of natural infrastructure best reduces exposure to natural hazards and increases socio-economic resilience of people and communities by sustaining local livelihoods?

Ensuring rights and equitable governance

Our ability to conserve nature depends on effective and inclusive governance, which cuts across all of nature’s dimensions (water, land, oceans, climate, etc.) Empowering people has a significant positive impact on any sustainable development endeavor. Through good governance of shared habitats and implementation of the environmental rule of law, communities can harness the benefits of healthy and biodiverse ecosystems for the realization of social equity and human rights, and remain resilient in the face of global challenges.

Challenges to the rights upon - and the proper access to - natural resources are multifarious. Social, financial and political equity must be increased, while at the same time, the marginalization and disempowerment of groups or individuals, decreased Half of the world’s inhabitants still do not have access to the same status, protection, or opportunities, as the other half. Decision-making and representation, continue to be unbalanced. How can we improve the representation of women and other underrepresented groups in all governance-related issues? What are some of the avenues to explore in order to guarantee access to opportunities for all? What are the biases that must still be debunked?

Equitable and effective governance requires the implementation of inclusive decision-making, as well as respect for cultural values and traditional knowledge. How can the roles and contributions of
indigenous peoples and local communities be further reinforced? What are the missing pieces of governance that could help reduce tensions linked to conflicting interests around natural resources, and ensure more integrated approaches to knowledge sharing and implementation?

The environmental rule of law including the obligation to protect nature, the rights of nature and the right to nature, will continue to be debated and strengthened. What new principles or instruments are needed in the international environmental law regime? How can the World enforce the current regime, to more effectively root out the illegal trade in wildlife, protect environmental defenders, and ensure non-regression?

Bridging the finance gap

Mobilizing conservation finance remains a challenge, despite the growing consensus of the need to close the current financial gap, both for climate and nature. A shift in understanding conservation of nature solely as a cost, to framing it as an investment, is crucial. How do we change mindsets around the way in which returns are measured?

A portfolio of options is necessary to do so, ranging from financing for conservation outcomes and de-risking investments to enforcing environmental and social standards, and ensuring the financial sustainability of stakeholders invested in conservation.

What is required to unlock untapped financial resources, and provide the private sector with adequate frameworks to incentivize its investment? What do we need to change to ensure equal access to financial resources for nature conservation efforts at all governance levels?

Pushing technological boundaries and improving knowledge

Conservation benefits both from newer and traditional forms of knowledge. The era of big data, however, does not automatically lead to better information and knowledge. Finding new ways to share information, build knowledge and disseminate results and best-practices, is essential for people to commit to a more ambitious conservation agenda.

Technology is changing at a rapid pace and can be harnessed to improve outcomes. Artificial intelligence, remote sensing and the internet of things are becoming mainstream in many activities. What are the next big tools and methods to accelerate our positive impacts? What innovations can we foresee that will be the game-changers in scaling up conservation efforts?

At the same time, technology can be fraught with risk, and potentially highly negative impacts on ecosystems. It therefore must be accompanied by ethical and regulatory safeguards. What policy frameworks do we need to devise in order to harness and guide technology and innovation for the good of the planet? What lessons can we learn from the past?
7.1 Report of the Governance and Constituency Committee
1. Improving IUCN’s governance including proposed amendments to the Statutes, Rules of Procedure and Regulations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.1</th>
<th>Including subnational governments in IUCN (WCC-2016-Res-003)</th>
<th>During its conference call of 11 March 2019, the Working Group reached agreement in principle on a proposal for Council’s consideration. The document is under preparation. [Annex 7]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>Comprehensive gender approach at IUCN</td>
<td>Draft ToR of the proposed GCC TF are attached as [Annex 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>Establishment of elected Indigenous Council position</td>
<td>Draft TORs were prepared. [Annex 8].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>Modify the term “Regional Councillors” etc.</td>
<td>A summary of all options so far prepared for the GCC task force as presented to GCC19 call 20 March 2019 by the Legal Adviser is attached hereafter as [Annex 3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>Commission membership renewal process</td>
<td>See <a href="#">Council document C/96/GCC20/1.2</a> prepared for the adoption in 2nd reading the amendments to the Regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6.b</td>
<td>The status of Commissions in National and Regional Committees</td>
<td>Feedback from the working group on the background documentation is available in this <a href="#">Union Portal page</a>. A proposal for GCC´s consideration is under development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.5</strong></td>
<td>Improvements to the motions process</td>
<td>See <a href="#">Council document C/96/GCC20/1.2</a> prepared for the adoption in 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; reading the amendments to the Regulations.  See <a href="#">Council document C/96/GCC20/3.1</a> for the proposed amendments to the Statutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.8</strong></td>
<td>Improving the scientific and professional independence, transparency and integrity</td>
<td>See <a href="#">Council document C/96/GCC20/3.1</a> for the proposed amendments to the Statutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.11</strong></td>
<td>Council access to information it requires to fulfil its functions</td>
<td>To be examined at the time of the discussion of the External Review of IUCN's governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.a</strong></td>
<td>Procedure to harmonize the intra-Commission nominations process across all Commissions</td>
<td>A draft procedure prepared by the Secretary, revised following GCC at C95, attached as <a href="#">Annex 4</a> will be reviewed by the Commission Chairs during their meeting of 27 March 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.b</strong></td>
<td>Election procedures and inclusiveness of dependent territories</td>
<td>The proposal prepared by the GCC’s working group which received support in Jeju, transcribed as a discussion paper for consultation of IUCN Members, is attached as <a href="#">Annex 6</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.3</strong></td>
<td>Clarification of provisions regarding membership admission and rights</td>
<td>A discussion paper prepared by the Union Development Group is attached hereafter as <a href="#">Annex 5</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1. Including subnational governments in IUCN (WCC-2016-Res-003)
Established in October 2018 during 95\textsuperscript{th} Council meeting in Jeju.

TORs - key milestones:

1. \textbf{96\textsuperscript{th} Council meeting}: Present options for a definition and possible inclusion of local and regional governments in the structure of the Union.

2. \textbf{97\textsuperscript{th} council meeting} (Oct 2019): Present a progress report to Council following RCF discussions.

3. \textbf{98\textsuperscript{th} Council meeting} (Feb 2020): Present final report with recommendations.
**Definition**

No authoritative definition – based on UN and MEA definitions:

*Subnational governments are all levels of government with mandate and authority, below the national level in any given country that is, or can be, a State Member of IUCN.*

Uniform definition for any given UN member state (including cities and municipalities). Inclusion of competencies and powers that are key contributors to achieve IUCNs mission of protecting and restoring nature.
Voting Category

Past concern with proposals: creation of a new category = dilute position of States. Proposal allows for a ratio that ensures States cannot be outvoted. Mathematical formula will be used to ensure this. Proposal has no impact on the NGO house and its voting.
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Res003 Working Group

Government House
- Category A1 States
- Category A2 GAs
- Category A3 Sub-nationals

NGO/INGOs/IPOs
- Category B NGOs/INGOs
- Category C IPOs

Affiliates
- Category D Affiliates
Option 1

States retain 3 votes
GAs and new Category B for Sub-national governments with one vote each
Conclusion and Next steps:

For RCFs - clarify proposal key messages to avoid confusion.

State Members cannot be outvoted by the other categories
Mathematical formula will be applied
 Gives a voice to sub-national governments
Proposal does not affect the voting rights and weights of the NGO category
B1. **Modify the term “Regional Councillors” etc.** (Annex 3)
At this meeting the GCC supported the suggestion to amend the wording of Article 38 as follows:

The members of the Council are:

(a) the President;
(b) the Treasurer;
(c) the Chairs of the Commissions;
(d) the Councillors;
   i. Regional Councillors;
   ii. a Councillor from the State in which IUCN has its seat, appointed by the Council, provided that one from that State has not been elected Regional Councillor; and
   iii. one additional appointed Councillor, chosen by the Council on the basis of appropriate qualifications, interests and skills.
C1a. **Procedure to harmonize the intra-Commission nominations process across all Commissions** *(Annex 4)*
DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

Council, on the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee,

Approves the procedure for the in-commission selection of candidates for commission chairs (Regulation 30bis).
2. Approval of the criteria for the qualities required for the elected positions, to be attached to the Call for nominations (DEC)
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REQUIRED ACTION

The Governance and Constituency Committee is invited to consider the present document and make a recommendation to Council for approval of:

• The qualifications required for the elected positions;
• The IUCN Council’s Guidance for Election Candidates;
• Eligibility for nomination to Council for members of Council and members of the Secretariat staff;

for the purpose of attaching these documents to the Call for nominations.
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Evolution of IUCN Membership

[Graph showing the evolution of IUCN membership from 1948 to 2018, with categories for ST, GA, NGO, INGO, IPO, and AF.]
5. Motions process – approval of the template for the submission of motions and dates for the electronic vote on motions [Rules 54 (b) x. and 62quinto (a)] - DEC

Based on the recommendations of GCC’s Task Force to update the motions process
20th meeting of the Governance and Constituency Committee
Thursday, 28 March 2019 – 09:00-12:30
Friday, 29 March 2019 – 09:00-18:00
Monday, 1 April – 09:00 – 14:00

(If links below don’t work, please click here to access all GCC documents)
https://portals.iucn.org/union/anglist/groupdocuments/13709/20005

Members of the Governance and Constituency Committee: Chair: Jennifer Mohamed Katerere, Deputy Chair: Tamar Pataridze, Members: Shaikha Salem Al Dhaheri, Mamadou Diallo, Hilde Eggermont, Jenny Gruenberger, Masahiko Horie, Sixto J. Incháustegui, Ali Kaka (by skype), Líder Sucre, Youngbae Suh, Ramiro Batzin (supported for interpretation by Ameyali Ramos).

Secretariat Focal Points: Global Director Union Development Group: Enrique Lahmann; Senior Governance Manager: Luc De Wever; Membership Coordinator: Fleurange Gilmour; Communications Manager, Union Development Group: Sarah Over.

Guests:
- Legal Adviser: Sandrine Friedli-Cela (present for governance items on Thursday and Friday mornings;
- Head, Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation and Risk, Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk Management Unit Charles Lor (present for Governance Review)

Agenda Item/Content

The Chair opened the meeting and thanked Jenny Gruenberger for her invaluable help and contribution as Vice-Chair over the past 3 years. She then welcomed the new vice-Chair, Tamar Pataridze. She acknowledged GCC members now sitting on the Bureau, Mamadou Diallo and Jenny Gruenberger and those sitting on the CPC Sixto Incháustegui and Hilde eggermont

1. Governance issues

1.4 External Review of IUCN’s Governance (see C/94/18 for the ToR) DIS

The Chair of GCC introduced the Report on the External Review of IUCN's governance (which was still in draft form and incorporated in Council document C/96/4.1) explaining that it was GCC’s role to provide feedback to the consultant, prepare the discussion in Council on 30 March 2019 and, during an additional GCC meeting on 1 April, organize the preparation of Council’s “Management Response” and of proposals for decision at the next Council meeting taking into account the guidance from Council. The Secretariat clarified that IUCN's Evaluation Policy required that the final version of the Report, once received from the consultant, be published on the IUCN website together with the Management Response.

During a round of discussion of the Report, several GCC members expressed their surprise at the bleak picture of the status of IUCN’s governance reflected in the Report, which did not always correspond with their own perceptions. There was, however, acknowledgement of the important critical issues for strengthening IUCN’s governments and unanimity in GCC to develop a roadmap for change and engage the Council in implementing it without delay. Some GCC members considered the lack of clarity and of understanding of the role of the various bodies in IUCN’s governance as the root cause of the weaknesses identified in the Report. Others pointed to the lack of alignment in IUCN on what kind of organization IUCN wants to be and how it wants to be unique.

In terms of structuring the discussion in Council, the GCC proposed to set up 5 break-out groups to discuss for approximately 60 to 75 minutes “where we want to be 5 years from now’ and “how to get there (short, mid and long-term solutions)” for each of the following five clusters of issues listed in the Report:

1. Relationships between the Union’s governance bodies.
2. Lack of engagement with IUCN membership by the Secretariat and the Council
3. Roles and responsibilities of IUCN Councillors, structure of the Council and its ability to effectively carry out it functions
4. Ethics and independence
5. Nomination, Evaluation and Succession process

Tamar Pataridze, Hilde Eggermont, and Sixto Incháustegui, with the assistance of Sarah Over, accepted to make further preparations for the discussion in Council, including a message from the Chair of GCC to Council members in advance of the discussion in Council plenary.

The Chair of GCC thanked Jenny Gruenberger and Ali Kaka, as well as Charles Lor, Head of Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk who had been designated by the GCC to oversee the external review, ensuring the ToR were fulfilled and a useful consultant report was produced.

1.1 Improving IUCN’s governance including proposed amendments to the Statutes, Rules of Procedure and Regulations: **DEC/DIS**

The Governance and Constituency Committee was invited to consider the proposals made by the Commission Chairs and the working groups established by the GCC on the topics identified in the Table updated by GCC’s 18th meeting of 9 January 2019, and to make a recommendation to Council on the proposals resulting from this work. The numbering of the sections below corresponds with the numbering of the topics in the Table.

**A.1 Including subnational authorities in IUCN**

Amran Hamzah, Chair of the Working Group, presented the two options the group had formulated. Discussion centered around:

Maintaining the balance within Category A, between the government (Category A) and non-governmental house (Category C and D) and the formula and the complexity of the issues, especially option 2.

The key elements of the proposal are that it ensures that States cannot be out-voted by either GAs or sub-national governments.

Clarification was provided to GCC that this proposal in no way affects the voting power or influence of the Non-governmental category.

The group felt that option 2 would be too confusing to explain to Members and so it was decided that the option below would be put forward for discussion at the RCFs:

This proposal would create a new Category for Sub-national Governments within the Government House. State Members would maintain their 3 votes; Each GA member and sub-national Government member would have the right to vote but in the ratio 3:1:1. This would ensure that State Members were not outvoted by either of the two other Government House Categories. A ratio of 3:1:1 would maintained by using a mathematical formula.

Each category in the Government house votes separately and the total number of votes for each category are added together when counting the votes. This is similar to the situation that exists in the Non-Governmental house today – the NGOs and IPOs are separate categories but their votes are added together when reporting the voting results.
The WG agreed to work on a paper to be used for presentation to Members at the RCF which contained clear and crisp messaging. The paper would be presented to GCC by mid-April so that the option could be brought forward to the RCFs during the summer.

The group also addressed some concerns regarding the definition and agreed on the following wording:

Subnational governments are all levels of government with mandate and authority below the national level in any given country that is, or can be, a State member of IUCN

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee,

Approves the proposal of the Working Group established pursuant to WCC-2016-Res-003 for the purpose of consulting the IUCN Members online and during the Regional Conservation Forums to be held in 2019.

**A.3 Developing a comprehensive gender approach in IUCN**

It was agreed to grant the Chair and Task Force more time to work on this issue so that the TORs could be completed, including the proposed composition of the group, and presented to GCC and Council.

**A.4 Proposal to establish an elected Indigenous Councillor position**

The GCC group presenting the draft TORs agreed to add to the ToR the justification for proposing 2 elected Indigenous Councillor positions.

The GCC agreed to request Council to change its decision C/95/12 (paragraph 10) in order to enable it to establish a task force of the GCC, inviting interested Council members who are not members of the GCC to join, instead of a Council working group. The task force will develop a concept paper (key story headlines) for approval of the Bureau by mid-May for the purpose of presenting it as “work in progress” to the IUCN Members online and during the RCF. The task force will develop a more detailed paper for October 2019 taking into account Members’ feedback.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee,

Modifies its decision C/95/12 (paragraph 10) to enable the GCC to prepare a proposal for Council consideration in October 2019 with the assistance of a task force of the GCC;

Requests the Bureau to approve, on the recommendation of the GCC, a concept paper for the purpose of consulting IUCN Members online and during the RCF.

**B.1 Modification of the term Regional Councillor**

Much work and analysis has gone into this matter. The Chair highlighted the fact that the Statutes provide for Regional representation. It is the culture of the organisation. She asked the group to reflect on how they see the balance between regional and global conscience and whether we as IUCN actually want this move towards global councillors. The GCC agreed that there were two sets of functions, at the regional level but in Council to bring the views of their regions, where required, but also to act in their personal capacity and with global perspective as required by the Statutes.

During the last call, the proposal had been to leave the wording of Regional Councillor unchanged as amendments would cause more problems than they solved. At this meeting the GCC supported the suggestion to amend the wording of Article 38 as follows:

The members of the Council are:

(a) the President;

(b) the Treasurer;

(c) the Chairs of the Commissions;
(d) the Councillors;

i. Regional Councillors;

ii. a Councillor from the State in which IUCN has its seat, appointed by the Council, provided that one from that State has not been elected Regional Councillor; and

iii. one additional appointed Councillor, chosen by the Council on the basis of appropriate qualifications, interests and skills.

This gives a definition for the Councillors that clarifies the global and regional roles of Regional Councillors. The Working Group was asked to write paper with the justification of the approach and some brief history with any statutory changes to be agreed after the External Review discussion.

Further, it was agreed that it is the definition of the roles of the Council and Councillors that really needs to be clarified. This has been highlighted in the Governance report and would be the subject of the more detailed conversation during the plenary session on Saturday.

B.3 Commission renewal process

This topic was dealt with below, under agenda item GCC20/1.3.

B.5 Improvements to the motions process

This topic was dealt with below, under agenda item GCC20/1.3.

B.6.b The status of Commissions in National/Regional Committees

An update on the Working Group’s work and their proposal was presented.

To formalise the process, the group propose the following points for discussion:

1) Commission members in a country elect their representative to the National Committee.
2) Commission Steering Committees are asked to confirm this representative.
3) Commission representatives participate in National Committees as observers, without a vote.
4) Small amendment to the Statutes is necessary to establish this process.

Clarifications were sought regarding how the proposal might work at a regional level and it was felt that further discussion with Members and Commission members should take place. GCC asked the WG to discuss with interested parties and to present an updated proposal to GCC.

B.12 – Harmonisation of operational and statutory regions.

In the absence of any tangible problems or complaints raised by IUCN Members, it was agreed that this item should be removed from the table for now pending the presentation of an action point at a future Council meeting by the Council member who raised the issue.

B8 – Improving the scientific and professional independence, transparency and integrity.

During its 95th meeting, as part of its proposals to improve the motions process, Council had approved amendments to the Statutes to ensure that there is no undue influence on IUCN Members or Staff with regard to the scientific work undertaken by IUCN.

No specific comments had been received from the Membership on this during the online consultation. GCC moved to maintain the proposed amendments for the purpose of consulting the IUCN Members online and during the RCF.

C.1.a – Procedure to harmonize the intra commissions nominations process across all Commissions

During their meeting of 27 March 2019, the Chairs of the Commissions had given their support for a version of the procedure in which their comments incl. those provided in October 2018 had been incorporated.
The Secretary to Council highlighted a clarification requested by the Chairs, namely that the words “up to two prioritized candidates” (Regulation 30bis) did not imply any ranking. The GCC confirmed this interpretation of Regulation 30bis.

At the proposal of the Legal Adviser, the wording of paragraph 6 was modified in order to be fully in line with Swiss labor law.

Further, instead of requiring that the additional criteria established by the Commissions’ steering committees be approved by Council, the GCC agreed to modify the Qualifications required for the Commission Chair position by including the mention that the steering committees of the Commissions may adopt a limited number of additional criteria related to the expertise required for the Chair of the Commission concerned.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**
The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the GCC, approves the procedure for the in-commission selection of candidates for commission chairs (Regulation 30bis). (Annex)

**C.3 Clarifying the provisions regarding membership admission and rights.**

A revised paper was sent to Legal Adviser. This matter was postponed to a later date for discussion to allow the Legal Adviser time to make comments on the proposals.

**C.1.b Election procedures and inclusiveness of dependent territories**
While agreeing with the proposed statutory amendment, which was the same as presented to GCC at the 95th Council meeting, the GCC considered it vitally important that the concept be reviewed from a communications point of view in order to ensure that this complex question can be easily explained to Members online and during the RCF.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**
The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the GCC, approves the proposed amendments to the Statutes and the Regulations for the purpose of consulting IUCN Members online and during the RCF. (Annex)

1.2 Adoption in 2nd reading of amendments to the Regulations DEC

Amendments were approved in 1st reading on 8 October 2018:
1. to improve the motions process (decision C/95/11)
2. to facilitate the renewal of the membership of the IUCN Commissions (decision C/95/12.3),

No comments have been received from Members. The electronic vote of the Members on amendments to the Rules of Procedure to improve the motions process closing on 27 March 2019, does not affect the proposed amendments to the Regulations because all amendments have been adopted.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**
The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee, pursuant to Council decisions C/95/11 and C/95/12.3, noting that no comments or objections have been received from IUCN Members following the distribution of the proposed amendments in conformity with Article 102 of the Statutes, adopts in second reading the proposed amendments to Regulations 29 and 40bis aiming to improve the motions process, and to Regulations 72 and 75 aiming to clarify the process for the renewal of the membership of the IUCN Commissions. (Annex).

1.3 Approval of the criteria for the qualities required for the elected positions, to be attached to the Call for nominations, DEC including

- “IUCN Council’s Guidance for 2016 Election Candidates” and
- “Eligibility for nomination to Council for members of Council and members of the Secretariat staff”.

5
These documents need to be approved for the purpose of attaching them to the Call for nominations which will be launched in mid-May, prior to the first RCF.

This item was deferred until after the plenary discussion of the External Review of IUCN’s Governance that would take place on 30 March and the elaboration of the Management response during the GCC session on 1 April.

The documents will be circulated to GCC by 9 April with one week to make comments. It will be then forwarded to Bureau for approval.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council,

*On the recommendation of the GCC,*

Requests the Bureau to approve:

1. The qualities required for the elected positions;
2. IUCN Council’s Guidance for 2016 Election Candidates; and
3. Eligibility for nomination to Council for members of Council and members of the Secretariat staff,

in time to be attached to the Call for nominations to be issued by the Director General in mid-May 2019.

1. **Constituency issues**

2.2 Update on IUCN membership

An update on membership was provided with a split on regional growth over the past four years.

2.1 Members’ feedback on the Membership Strategy – presentation of version 2.0

A draft strategy document that incorporated comments made during the GCC meeting in Jeju in October 2018 was submitted to an online consultation by Members which closed on 22 February 2019. The draft has been further updated to incorporate these comments and shared with Council. A summary of the comments received during the consultation was presented, highlighting the headline issues that had been raised. It was agreed that those headline issues would be further discussed in one of the break-out working groups on members’ engagement that appeared as one of the critical points in the External Governance Review.

Comments gathered during the RCFs will be incorporated into the document and the revised version will be submitted to GCC for comment with the aim of presenting a final version for approval at C97 in October.

2.3 Membership applications, DEC including

2.3.1 (Annual) update of the membership application review process (C/94/13 Annex 7) *(this update will be provided at the end of this item)*

1. GCC considered 21 new membership applications, which have received no objections from IUCN Members and fulfill the requirements of the IUCN Statutes and Regulations;

17 were APPROVED by e-mail correspondence and 4 were proposed for DEFERRAL, due to issues surrounding dues category and the lack of response to additional questions asked.

2. Three (3) membership applications were deferred from the 95th Council meeting

Applicants were requested to provide clarification on their compliance with Article 7 of IUCN Statutes, in particular on their record of environmental work.

Ghazi Barotha, Pakistan and Petra Regional Authority, Jordan provided clarification which is available in the documents put together by the Secretariat. Ghazi Barotha have strong development agenda but many are linked with strong conservation objectives

EarthX provided their clarification during the meeting. Their letter and the recommendation from the Director of the US Washington office and of some of the GCC members, convinced GCC to admit them as a Member.
3. One (1) membership application from Thinking Animals, USA, which received objections from IUCN Members and for which the decision was deferred by the 95th Council to the 96th meeting of Council (March 2019).

Following analysis of the additional information received on Thinking Animals, the GCC approved their admission.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

Approves the admission of 21 organisations and/or institutions applying for membership.

Defers the admission of Fédération Paysanne KAFO, Guinea Bissau, Sustainability for Nature Conservation, Yemen, AIGAE – The Italian Association for Professional Nature and Interpretive Guides, Italy and Commonland, the Netherlands to its next meeting; and

Requests the Secretariat to seek confirmation from these organisations on the dues group corresponding to the annual dues they should pay;

Requests the Secretariat to inform Fédération Paysanne KAFO and Sustainability for Nature Conservation of the deferral of their application pending receipt of the requested additional information.

2.3.1 *(Annual) update of the membership application review process* *(C/94/13 Annex 7)*

**INF**

Following the implementation of a strengthened application review process, Secretariat provided an update on how the process was going.

**Feedback**

The process is working well on the whole. Secretariat is sometimes unsure of whether or not to add a comment (sometimes sensitive) in the assessment form which is circulated to Members with the membership applications and would welcome clarification on this from GCC.

So far, very few Councillors and Committees provide feedback on the applications from their region.

Letters of endorsement are not meeting the criteria agreed by GCC, i.e. the additional questions approved by GCC are not answered through the letters.

It should be noted that the process is more time/cost demanding for the Secretariat. Secretariat recommends continuing with the process because any feedback provided by Councillors and Committees add value.

All Councillors should be reminded to provide feedback to the Secretariat when this is asked. The Secretariat will follow up with Regional offices to ensure all Councillors do receive requests.

GCC recognised that it is the responsibility of the applicants and ultimately of the GCC to decide whether an application is deferred because endorsement letters are not complying.
2.4 Changes of Members’ name or membership category DEC

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION
The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee,
Takes notes of the change of name of five current Member organisations, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member ID</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Previous name</th>
<th>New name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST/567</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Academy of Scientific Research and Technology</td>
<td>Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN25139</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability</td>
<td>ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability - Africa, NPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE/573</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Fondation Internationale pour la Gestion de la Faune (International Foundation for Wildlife Management)</td>
<td>Fondation François Sommer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA/1155</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Bundesministerium für Land-und Forstwirtschaft, Umwelt und Wassernutzung (The Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management)</td>
<td>Bundesministerium für Nachhaltigkeit und Tourismus (Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST/1210</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs of the Republic of Turkey</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 National, Regional and Interregional Committees INF

Incl. the recognition of newly established committees and the revision of the by-laws of existing committees, if any applications are received.

Update of National/Regional Committees to date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory region</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso and South America</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and East Asia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Europe, North and Central Asia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Europe</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Morocco NC submitted its revised bylaws submitted for consideration by GCC. The document needs considerable changes to comply with IUCN statutory requirements and it is being reviewed by the Office of the Legal Advisor. Document will be submitted to GCC by e-mail correspondence when ready.

2.6 Regional Conservation Forums (RCF): INF

An update was given on the RCFs planned for 2019. Latest confirmed dates and the required agenda were discussed to ensure that Councillors fully understand what to expect.

RCFs objective is to prepare IUCN constituents to participate meaningfully in the 2020 Congress.
All regions have to include the following items in their agenda:

- 2021-2024 Programme
- IUCN Governance (review and improvements, proposals for Council nominations)
- Motions process
- Implementations of IUCN Resolutions & Recommendations
- Congress preparations (Members engagement, Sponsored Members Programme)
- Regional aspects (incl. preparations of Regional Members’ meeting scheduled on Congress opening)
- Membership Strategy
- IPBES
- Synthetic biology

It was clarified that the Secretariat is working and will soon come up with the draft suggestion which topic can be best covered by the individual council member from a respective region.

It was also clarified that the Membership fund provides sufficient funding for each Councillor to attend one RCF.

The Chair highlighted the primary roles of Councillors during the RCFs, namely to initiate the discussions and proactively lead the sessions with the support from the Secretariat.

The Chair reminded the GCC that the RCFs are a Members’ forum and asked Councillors and Secretariat to ensure that they be included in preparations.

2.7 Membership dues INF

2.4.1 Progress report of the Joint GCC/FAC working group

Following Congress Decision WCC-2016-Dec-45, the Dues Group was established as requested by the membership at congress in 2016 who requested the secretariat to look at the dues being paid by Members and to update the Dues Guide. The TORs of the Task Force were approved by GCC.

A detailed analysis of current dues was undertaken. Results showed changes in category would be required in many cases with an impact on overall income that is 3-fold. As a result, the Secretariat decided not to issue the invoices for 2019 with these higher amounts.

Next steps: assess how to respond to these issues.

The Group will consider dues bands as they were defined many years ago. Inflation should be taken into account. It was noted that the inflation measure used in Switzerland was low and completely out of line with global inflation. However, during discussions, no solution was found to address this and the Group has been asked to look into this in more detail.

The establishment of a category 0 option was also considered but the range of fees being proposed is often very low (70USD) and this does not cover the cost of processing an application. The idea of a global fund was also discussed and this will be considered by the group in more detail.

The proposal presented by the IPOs was considered and there was a discussion around the creation of separate category of zoos, museums and academic organisations, aquaria, botanical gardens. Difficulties experience by zoos because of their high expenditure were flagged and the dangers of creating separate category and the possibility of creating a trend that others may then demand was also raised.

Further work will be undertaken by representatives of the Secretariat and SSC. The Secretariat will look into improving the method for calculating the opex def. Simulations comparing using OPEX and Total Expenditure have shown only minor differences. One option suggested it to think about the reassessment of dues based on the value that Members receive in relation to what they spend. A paper has been produced on this which is closely linked to the strategy.

The aim of the group is to have a new dues guide ready to be adopted for the 2021-2024 period.
2.7.1 Update on Members whose rights were rescinded by the 2016 Congress and by e-vote in 2018

**2016 RESCISSION PROCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members' rights rescinded by 2016 Congress</th>
<th>161</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members withdrawn post-Congress</td>
<td>130 (out of 161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members withdrawn following rescission (as per Article 13(b), i.e. one year after Congress)</td>
<td>114 (out of 161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members withdrawn voluntarily (between Congress and 10 September 2017 - organisations no longer in existence or asked to be withdrawn with immediate effect)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members no longer in rescission</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members with payment plans</td>
<td>5 (incl. 2 who didn't commit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Members on rescission list</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solomon Islands rejoined after paying their outstanding dues.

The two remaining Members had committed to pay through a payment plan. They made a payment in 2018 but have not paid anything since. Their dues are still outstanding up to and including 2017. Secretariat has tried to contact them without success and it was agreed to withdraw them from IUCN. Regulation 26 will be applied meaning that within three years of withdrawal, they may rejoin immediately if they pay their outstanding dues. These Members are: Les Compagnons ruraux, Togo & Environment Liaison Center International, Kenya.

In total 130 Members were withdrawn following the decision from the 2016 Congress to rescind Members’ rights. A total of CHF 1,127,220.67 was lost (invoiced dues which were unpaid and written off).

6 States lost in Africa (only region with States withdrawn in this process).

---

**2018 RESCISSION PROCESS (e-vote in November 2018)**

77 Members remaining on the list out of 90 initially on the list when the vote took place.

State Members of Burundi, South Africa, Uganda, India and Lao are on the list. Vanuatu paid all its outstanding dues and are no longer considered in rescission.

1. **World Conservation Congress**

3.1 **Motions process – approval of the template for the submission of motions and dates for the electronic vote on motions DEC** [Rules 54 (b) x. and 62quinto (a)]

Based on the recommendations of GCC’s Task Force to update the motions process

Following decision C/95/11 Council submitted its proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure pertaining to the motions process to an electronic vote of the IUCN membership which took place from 13-27 March 2019. The amendments were all adopted during the e-vote, with 375 Members having taken part in the vote.

---

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee,

1. Approves the template for the submission of motions; (Annex)
2. **Decides** that the electronic vote of IUCN Members on the motions shall be open on 29 April 2020 and close on 13 May 2020.

1.2 Approval of guidance for the nomination of candidates for Honorary membership, and the Phillips and Coolidge Medals DEC

The Governance and Constituency Committee is invited to appoint five of its members to form the core Jury for the awards. For the Harold Jefferson Coolidge Memorial Medal, three eminent conservationists shall be added to the jury as required by the terms of reference for the Medal.

A calendar was proposed for the nominations and selection process.

The following GCC members agreed to form the Jury: Lider Sucre (Chair), Mamadou Diallo, Sixto Incháustegui, Shaikha al Dhaheri, Jenny Gruenbeger.

The Chair will work with Secretariat on the timeline and to establish the criteria to ensure sufficient nominations representing geographic gender balance and indigenous people.
Report of the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC)

Agenda item 7.2
1. IUCN Annual Report 2018

The Programme and Policy Committee, takes note of the 2018 Annual Report and requests the Secretariat to take into account the comments made regarding how to improve the quality of information to include in future reports.
2.1. Update on the implementation of 2016 Congress Resolutions and Recommendations

The Programme and Policy Committee welcomes the Secretariat’s report with the update on implementation of the 2016 Congress Resolutions and Recommendations and recommends making good use of the preparations for the next Congress, including at RCFs, to enhance understanding by all IUCN constituencies about the Union-wide effort needed for the implementation of Resolutions and Recommendations.
Status of implementation (1/2)

- **Not started**: implementation not started
- **Initiated**: first stages of implementation
- **Underway**: implementation well advanced
- **Ongoing**: implementation consisting of repetitive, recurrent action (attending meetings, reporting, etc.)
- **Completed**: implementation completed
Actors involved

- Members involved in implementation: 90%
- Commissions involved in implementation: 80%
- Secretariat involved in implementation: 70%
- Non-IUCN entities involved: 60%
- Implemented by only one constituent type: 10%
Akers involved – Members

![Bar chart showing the distribution of members for categories A, B, C, and D. Category B has 11%, Category A has 19%, Category C has 47%, and Category D has 11%.]
2.2. Retirement of Resolutions and Recommendations

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee:

approves the final list of the Resolutions and Recommendations to be retired provided by the Task Force on Resolutions Retirement to be submitted to the Members Assembly at the 2020 WCC for endorsement;

also approves the deployment and launch of the archive prior to the opening of the online motion submission process for the 2020 World Conservation Congress in May 2019.
Resolution classification by Task Force

Step 3
Task Force assessment

- Active, 534
- Inactive, 771
- TBD, 0
- Implemented, 380
- Obsolete, 99
- Elapsed, 65
- Superceded, 207
- Thanks, 20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code 1</th>
<th>Code 2</th>
<th>WCC / GA</th>
<th>English title</th>
<th>TF Recommended</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Keyword 1</th>
<th>Keyword 2</th>
<th>Keyword 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3B</td>
<td>GA 1952 RES 004</td>
<td>1952 Caracas</td>
<td>Preservation of zoological or botanical species endemic in small islands, particularly in the Caribbean Sea</td>
<td>SUPERSEDED</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Environmental Law</td>
<td>Ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3A</td>
<td>GA 1952 RES 003</td>
<td>1952 Caracas</td>
<td>Consideration of the apparent conflict between the requirements of agriculture and of conservation over the problem raised by the use of fire</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Human well-being/development</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Education, capacity building, public awareness, communication, Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>GA 1952 RES 002</td>
<td>1952 Caracas</td>
<td>Preservation of wild fauna in semi-arid regions, with particular attention to specific examples in Central and South America</td>
<td>OBSOLETE</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Ecosystems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>GA 1952 RES 001</td>
<td>1952 Caracas</td>
<td>Hydroelectricity and the Protection of Nature</td>
<td>SUPERSEDED</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>GA 1950 RES 003</td>
<td>1950 Brussels</td>
<td>Proposals by Mr. R. Videsot</td>
<td>SUPERSEDED</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Protected areas</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>GA 1950 RES 002</td>
<td>1950 Brussels</td>
<td>Motion put forward by the French delegation</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTED</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Human well-being/development</td>
<td>International agreements and processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>GA 1950 RES 001</td>
<td>1950 Brussels</td>
<td>Relations with the International Committee for Bird Preservation</td>
<td>OBSOLETE</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>IUCN governance</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>GA 1948 RES 001</td>
<td>1948 Fontainebleau</td>
<td>UNESCO promoting awareness of nature protection</td>
<td>ACTIVE</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Education, capacity building, public awareness, communication</td>
<td>Science, Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4. Progress report from the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Task Force

The Programme and Policy Committee, *takes note* of the progress report from the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Task Force and *encourages* the Task Force to continue developing IUCN position taking into account the suggestions made regarding better focusing on key strategic messages.
5.1. Report from the Chair of the Task Force on Res.086 – Synthetic Biology

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION
The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee, takes note of the report “Genetic Frontiers for Conservation – An assessment of synthetic biology and biodiversity conservation” prepared pursuant to WCC-2016-Res-086, and endorses the draft IUCN Policy on Synthetic Biology and Biodiversity Conservation developed on the basis of the Technical Assessment before it is submitted to the IUCN Membership as a Council-sponsored motion for discussion at the Regional Conservation Fora.
6.1. Urban Task Force

The Programme and Policy Committee, *takes note* of the proposals made by the Urban Task Force on a range of activities for the 2020 World Conservation Congress and

*recommends* the development of a Council-sponsored motion which articulates the imperative of the urban-nature agenda, calls for the development of science-based targets for cities, and implementation of the Urban Nature Index and other key goals of the IUCN Urban Alliance.
6.2. Private Sector Task Force (1)

The Programme and Policy Committee, takes note of the report of the PSTF, including the Operational Framework on Engagement with the Extractives Sector.
DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee,

recommends that the Business and Biodiversity Programme of IUCN should not currently engage with Brumadinho;

encourages IUCN and the Rio Doce Panel to continue to share technical and scientific knowledge on appropriate environmental and social responses to the collapse of tailing dams, both within and outside of IUCN.
6.3. Climate Change Task Force

The Programme and Policy Committee, *takes note* of the following recommendations from the Climate Change Task Force:

1. There is an urgent need for IUCN to strengthen its role in addressing climate change mitigation and adaptation commensurate with the severe nature of the climate challenge. The Union needs to broaden and strengthen its work and impact in global, regional and members’ climate change efforts.

2. IUCN needs to leverage, build on and expand what its members are already doing, and help amplify/add value to those efforts.

3. There is a need for enhanced capacity within IUCN to support the Union on climate change, including through right capacity & resources within the secretariat and the Commissions.

4. The Commissions Chairs have established an Inter-Commission Working Group on Climate Change to consider the need for and modalities of proposing at a later stage a separate IUCN Commission on climate change.
4. Council motions for the 2020 Congress

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee,

Notes that the following subjects for Council-sponsored Motions are proposed to be prepared for the World Conservation Congress 2020:

- IUCN Policy on Synthetic Biology
- Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework
- Nature-based Solutions Standard
- Urban-Nature Agenda
- Conservation and Human Rights
- Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems
- Retirement of Obsolete Resolutions
- Red List of Ecosystems
- UN Decade of Ecosystem Restoration
- IUCN Policy on Natural Capital
- Climate Change and Biodiversity

Subject to formal decision after process.

96th Meeting of the IUCN Council – 28-31 March 2019
8.2. AOB

The Programme and Policy Committee 

*agrees* on the need to form a task force on Human Rights and the Environment and

*decides* that Terms of Reference be developed for consideration at the next PPC meeting.
Thank you
8.2. AOB

The Programme and Policy Committee **agrees** on the need to form a task force on Human Rights and the Environment and **decides** that Terms of Reference be developed for consideration at the next PPC meeting.
Report to Council

PPC members in attendance: Jan Olov Westerberg (Chair), Amran Hamzah, Peter Cochrane, Jonathan Hughes, John Robinson, Natalia Danilina, Michael Hosek, Angela Andrade, Sean Southey, Kristen Walker.
Commission Deputy Chairs: Katalin Czippan

IUCN Staff in attendance: Cyrie Sendashonga, Jane Smart, Stewart Maginnis, Alejandro Iza, Charles Lor, Juha Siikamaki, Tom Brooks, Luc Bas, Aban Marker Kabraji, Luther Anukur

Report writers and support: Sonia Peña Moreno, David Goodman, Victoria Romero, Sandeep Sengupta, Anete Berzina, Raphaëlle Flint, Dao Nguyen, Leonor Ridgway

Opening of the meeting, Thursday 28 March 2019

The PPC Chair, Jan Olov Westerberg, opened the meeting and welcomed members of PPC and staff. He recognized and welcomed in particular new Councillor Natalia Danilina (Russian Federation). After a quick round of introductions of all participants, the Chair recalled the order of the agenda to follow.

A brief presentation on safety and evacuation procedures in the Gland Conservation Campus and on the IUCN anti-harassment policy was made by Cyrie Sendashonga, Global Director for Programme and Policy. The Chair of CEESP observed that it would be important to have the information about safety procedures in general for IUCN Secretariat staff worldwide beyond the focus of the current presentation. The Chair suggested, and members of PPC agreed, that a request can be made to the Director General to present to the whole Council information on safety procedures for all IUCN offices worldwide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPC/1</th>
<th>IUCN Annual Report 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared by the Secretariat and including the implementation of the IUCN Programme by the Secretariat and the Commissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of the agenda item
The Programme and Policy Committee is invited to consider the IUCN Annual Progress Report 2018 and provide guidance and direction as required.

Brief summary of the discussion
Charles Lor (Head of Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk Management) presented the 2018 Annual Report to the PPC. Main highlights from the report included the following:

- Excellent progress is being made against the 2020 IUCN Programme targets, with nearly 50% achieved and a further 30% on track;
• On the couple of targets that are currently red-flagged, the causes for deviation are mostly due to factors outside IUCN’s control (for example, the implementation of Target 19 on new legal agreements is linked to the ECOLEX data source, which is external to IUCN and will show no progress until FAO updates the database);
• Growing engagement with Members can be seen, both through joint project implementation and increased flow of funds to them;
• Membership survey shows that State & government agency Members see a high value-addition from IUCN’s core functions, especially from its convening power and knowledge generation (less so from capacity building);
• IUCN project portfolio is stronger, with increased average value of projects (shift from smaller value to larger value projects), increased spending through members and partners, and its increased role as an implementing agency;
• Overall organisational capacity is healthy due to stable and diverse staffing, improved risk control management, and optimisation of project appraisal and approval systems.

The Chair opened the floor for comments:

Sean Southey and John Robinson enquired about the actual delivery of the Programme compared to anticipated delivery (i.e. burn rate), the implications of a slower project burn rate (currently standing at 75% while it should normally be expected to be around 90%), and the need to properly understand and address the reasons for the same.

Secretariat staff present explained some of the reasons for this, noting, for instance, slow signing of projects, lumpiness of large projects, dependence on external partners for delivery, recent shifts in IUCN budgeting model and management fee structure, and hidden costs of GEF/GCF project development. The need for having a better system and procedures for more accurate and accountable forecasting, baseline setting, and tracking was also highlighted.

Kristen Walker drew attention to the relative weakness of IUCN in fundraising. The need for more exchanges between PPC and FAC on this matter was also noted by several members of PPC.

The Chair agreed and concluded that project burn rate would be an important issue for the PPC to keep track of, also in light of other ongoing discussions on IUCN’s long-term financing model in the FAC.

Angela Andrade highlighted the insufficient reflection of the contributions and results of Commissions work in the annual report and the need to find a better way to address this. Cyrie Sendashongha noted that this issue had already been raised in the past. She observed that the information included in the annual report followed the reporting format that had been developed to capture aggregated results of Commissions and Secretariat work, and one way that had been suggested in a past PPC meeting to address the concern raised by the
Chair of CEM was to provide a space for Commission Chairs to highlight some of their key achievements when they directly to Council.

Following discussion, the Chair concluded that it would be important for IUCN’s annual reporting to show that IUCN is engaging with its Members, noting that the more this can be demonstrated, the greater the value Members will perceive from the organisation, and the better their expectations will be met. He commended the inclusion of practical examples of project implementation in the report, and suggested including a wider range of such examples in future reports, particularly of Member and youth engagement.

The Chair enquired about the quality of data entry into the project portal, with respect to both finance and results, and also the reasons for some of the observed shifts in annual expenditure from SDG15 to SDG14. It was explained that while the financial data entry into the portal was largely accurate, some improvements could be realised with respect to data entry on the results. Some of the current challenges such as the need to use mutually-exclusive and self-identified categories for classifying IUCN results were noted in this regard.

In concluding the discussion, the Chair welcomed the improvements seen in the report overall, especially with respect to the inclusion of better metrics, and noted that availability of 3 years of data on the 2017-2020 Programme implementation next year would make the next annual report even better. He also suggested to have a status update on the development of the Project Portal at a future PPC meeting before the 2020 WCC.

**Conclusion**

The Programme and Policy Committee, takes note of the 2018 Annual Report and requests the Secretariat to take into account the comments made regarding how to improve the quality of information to include in future reports.

**PPC/2**

**Specific Programme and Policy issues**

**PPC/2.1 Update on the implementation of the 2016 Congress Resolutions and Recommendations**

*Based on a report from the Secretariat*

**Purpose of the item**

The PPC is invited to take note of the Report on the progress in the implementation of Resolutions and Recommendations and consider putting in place any necessary actions in order to further enhance their implementation.

**Brief summary of the discussion**

David Goodman, Global Policy Unit, presented on the progress made in implementing the 112 Resolutions and Recommendations adopted in Hawai‘i. He mentioned that an implementation tracking strategy had been put in place with a Secretariat Focal Point, Members’ assigned focal point and Commissions’ focal point(s) who prepare so-called Activity Reports and Progress Reports. For the 2018 period there has been wide participation in reporting, though the total
number of activity and progress reports received was down slightly from the 2017 figures (105 and 120 respectively). Overall there has been good progress in implementation of most Resolutions, with a clear improvement over the progress in 2017. In 2018, the most carried out activities were convening stakeholders/networking, policy influencing/advocacy, and scientific/technical activities. This is similar to last year.

A number of Resolutions specifically identify the Council as one actor required for their implementation. In some cases, this indicates that Council should be kept informed about implementation, while in others it requires specific action by Council.

While 68% of Resolutions are in an advanced stage of implementation or completed, many challenges remain, mainly around lack of funding for implementation.

Some reflections were offered. First, the reporting process is still new and so there is a need to build capacity internally and support communication and coordination. Further reflection is needed on how to address the continuous funding gap. To note, that GCC is reviewing a revised motion submission form, which builds upon the 2016 form to emphasise motion (co-)sponsors should be prepared to contribute toward Resolution implementation, including through financial means. Efforts are being carried out to align Members’ expectations and stimulate critical thinking about resourcing and implementation prior to the submission of motions (e.g. at RCFs).

PPC members welcomed the excellent report prepared by the Secretariat and highlighted the importance of having Members engaged in Resolutions’ implementation, but agreed that reporting and capturing all relevant information to have an accurate picture is a challenge.

The relevance of better communicating the connection between the motions proposed at the World Conservation Congress and the adopted Resolutions and Recommendations’ implementation (full policy cycle) was reiterated by several members of PPC. Some cautioned that we must be careful to not “mislead” Members by communicating on Resolutions’ implementation progress separately from the rights and obligations that come with the development of motions from the outset.

This is linked to the issue of changing the perception of Members about their role in presenting motions and implementing Resolutions. Often, Members understand they are responsible for presenting motions but not for implementing Resolutions which is generally seen as a task for the Secretariat. The Guidance provided throughout the process until the WCC in Marseille must be clear about this.

Highlighting the big gap that exists between the time of the Assembly at WCC and the start of the next “cycle” with the Regional Conservation Forums (RCFs), PPC members emphasised the risk of losing momentum for implementation and recommended to make better use of the RCFs to enhance increased understanding by Members and Commissions.

Consideration of presentation of the report on implementation of Resolutions for the whole quadrennium at the WCC was suggested.
PPC also suggested to present a summary report of Resolutions’ implementation at all RCFs and invite Members from each region who sponsored motions to present their practical experiences and engagement in implementing the subsequent Resolutions. CyrieSendashonga noted that this item (implementation of Resolutions) has indeed been suggested to be on the agenda of all RCFs in a guidance note from Enrique Lahmann (Global Director, Union Development Group) sent to all Regional Directors.

Conclusion

The Programme and Policy Committee welcomes the Secretariat’s report with the update on implementation of the 2016 Congress Resolutions and Recommendations and recommends making good use of the preparations for the next Congress, including at RCFs, to enhance understanding by all IUCN constituencies about the Union-wide effort needed for the implementation of Resolutions and Recommendations.

PPC/2.2 Retirement of Resolutions / Recommendations

Purpose of the item

The PPC is invited to recommend the Council to approve the final list of the Resolutions and Recommendations to be retired provided by the Task Force on Resolutions Retirement, and to approve the deployment and launch of the archive prior to the opening of the online motion submission process for the 2020 World Conservation Congress in May 2019.

Brief summary of the discussion

Peter Cochrane, Chair of the Resolutions Retirement Task Force, introduced the item. He stressed the importance of conveying to Members the need for implementable and reportable Resolutions. David Goodman, Policy Officer, succinctly presented the various steps in the retirement exercise and its outcome: out of the total 1305 Resolutions in the database, 534 were classified as active and 771 as inactive Resolutions. The presentation then turned to the other Task Force functions, namely: i) propose options on how to deal with active Resolutions (such as distinguish actionable from guidance/policy Resolutions and carry out a policy analysis); ii) the review mechanism (should be undertaken every 4 years with a procedure yet to be determined); and iii) create and accessible archive (a test was shown).

After the presentation, Peter Cochrane indicated that the simpler approach going forward would be a ‘sunset provision’ that would trigger a review, and requested the word ‘inactive’ be changed to ‘archived’ in the archive. The Chair of PPC expressed appreciation for the work undertaken by the Task Force and the Secretariat and, related to item 2.1 above, asked to consider indicating the sponsor organisations in the database onwards to facilitate the follow-up of implementation.

Conclusion
DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee:

approves the final list of the Resolutions and Recommendations to be retired (*) provided by the Task Force on Resolutions Retirement to be submitted to the Members Assembly at the 2020 WCC for endorsement;

also approves the deployment and launch of the archive prior to the opening of the online motion submission process for the 2020 World Conservation Congress in May 2019.

(*) As presented in Council document C/96/PPC47/2.2

**PPC/2.3 Consideration of a guidance note for implementing the WCC-2016-Rec-102**

*Protected areas and other areas important for biodiversity in relation to environmentally damaging industrial activities and infrastructure development*

**Purpose of the item**

Council is invited to approve the use of the Explanation of Terms used in IUCN Recommendation WCC-2016-Rec-102 “Protected areas and other areas important for biodiversity in relation to environmentally damaging industrial activities and infrastructure development” as a guide for implementing the Recommendation. Council was further invited to endorse a further process of consultation with IUCN Members, other governments and civil society as a step towards developing practical guidance, including a suite of case studies, to assist implementation.

**Brief summary of the discussion**

Jane Smart (Global Director, Biodiversity Conservation Group) briefly presented the Explanation of Terms used in IUCN Recommendation WCC-2016-Rec-102 and invited PPC to make comments of the document. She stated that we need clarity on those technical terms and asked for PPC to see the explanations of the terms from the recommendation.

The PPC Chair commented that this document brings more clarity for managers, for non-experts, helped to understand the issues.

Some PPC members expressed concerns over the language used in the explanations which might have serious implications if they are not sufficiently clear and thus could lead to misinterpretation. It was also mentioned that, in fact, these terms have been discussed for years and some suggested to have the document checked by lawyers to ensure clarity.

Stewart Magginis (Global Director, Nature-Based Solutions Group) mentioned that there might be a systemic problem in the way the original motion that lead to this Recommendation was drafted and highlighted the importance of ensuring that from the outset motions put forward are clear in the terminology used to avoid misinterpretation in their implementation further on.
The PPC Co-Chair, Amran Hamzah, suggested to have a small working group to look at the language in the proposed text and bring back the item the next day.

A small group supported by Jane Smart worked on the text and some edits were proposed. However, when this issue was brought back to PPC on Friday 29th March, the recommendation from the group was to withdraw this issue from this PPC meeting and proposed its consideration at the next PPC meeting in October in order to leave some time for further reflection and consultation including with the Chair of WCPA and the Director of the Global Protected Areas Programme.

**PPC/2.4 Progress report from the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Task Force**

*Purpose of the item*

The PPC is provided with an update on the activities of the Task Force on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework constituted at the last Council (October 2018). Hilde Eggermont, Chair of the Task Force, and Jane Smart from the Secretariat, made a presentation which focused on the process carried out so far under the leadership of the Task Force and the evolving content of the IUCN position.

*Brief summary of the discussion*

PPC members were very supportive of the work of the Task Force and welcomed the coordination with the Secretariat. Some highlighted the integral relationship between the post-2020 process at large and the discussions in PPC on the IUCN Programme 2021-2024 on the one hand and also in CPC on the themes of the 2020 WCC on the other.

PPC agreed that IUCN is uniquely positioned to contribute to this process and recommended focusing on IUCN’s added value (where IUCN makes a difference) compared to the many actors that are providing inputs to the process. IUCN needs to elevate its thinking beyond the technical details and the contributions from all components of the Union and really distil a number of strategic key messages. Beyond long submissions, IUCN should be aiming at producing a short (3 pages) impactful document that we can share with the CBD Secretariat and others and use in outreach efforts. This short key messages piece must be developed in the coming months so that it can also be used to influence the discussions that will soon start at the UN around progress in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development with the SDGs (noting a number of SDG targets which have a timeline of 2020). It was noted also that there was concern heard from some Governments about the risk of the whole post 2020 process becoming an academic exercise that ends up with the adoption of a series of biodiversity conservation targets which are not implementable in the end.
PPC members stressed that IUCN is in a leadership position in the further development and thinking around the so called “Apex target”, but that the visualisation used so far (pyramid) is not very useful to convey our message as it doesn’t help understand the theory of change. Some suggested to work on better explaining the rationale behind the proposal of “bending the curve” and stressed that the unpublished work by IUCN on this issue could help with that “high-level thinking”.

PPC members agreed that much more clarity and strategic thinking is needed in terms of our contributions to this process.

The Chair of CEM stressed the importance of IUCN promoting the Red List of Ecosystems and the whole restoration agenda.

The importance of connecting with the Chinese government as the future President of CBD COP15 and making good use of our office in China was also highlighted.

**Conclusion**

The Programme and Policy Committee, **takes note** of the progress report from the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Task Force and **encourages** the Task Force to continue developing IUCN position taking into account the suggestions made regarding better focusing on key strategic messages.

---

**Friday 29 March, 2019**

**PPC/3**

**Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24**

Approval of the first draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 for the purpose of consulting IUCN Members online and during the Regional Conservation Forums

**Purpose of the item**

The Council is invited to consider the draft 2017-2020 IUCN Programme and may wish to make comments, as appropriate, to allow the Director General to prepare a revised version to be used for initiating the consultations with IUCN Members and other partners, including through the Regional Conservation Forums.

**Brief summary of the discussion**

The PPC Chair introduced the item and the process for its discussion at this Council as well as the process moving forward at the Regional Conservation Forums and the next Council in the Autumn of 2019. The chair stressed that the discussion now is not the last time the PPC and council will have the opportunity to address the programme before it goes to the Congress for approval. This version is intended to be used at the RCFs, thus generating more input. Council will at its 98th meeting finally adopt the draft which goes to congress.

Charles Lor started by presenting the feedback received from the 32
Members of IUCN that sent comments after the Programme construct was circulated to all Members for initial feedback in December last year. He then explained the approach that is being followed in the Programme whereby the context is provided by using a landmark assessment to show the key challenges we face, anchoring the Programme on the SDGs, making sure linkages are provided with the post-2020 global biodiversity framework discussions and highlighting nature-based solutions.

The draft Programme includes 4 Programme areas with specific results; these four areas are:

1. Healthy and Resilient Landscapes for Nature and People
2. Healthy Oceans
3. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation
4. Inclusive and Equitable Natural Resources Institutions

The Programme concludes with an implementation section highlighting the roles of constituencies of the Union and presents three enabling themes: Technology, data and innovation; youth, media and communications; and investments and financial sustainability.

The PPC Chair invited participants to make comments:

Chair of CEM recalled comments that her Commission had provided. She recommended having a strategic vision clearly spelled out in the Programme and not “transferring” IUCN’s evolving thinking on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework to the Programme document. She also suggested a better reflection on the issues that are highlighted and the role of IUCN in helping “to solve” those issues. CEM had also suggested being much more creative, promoting systemic thinking, and going beyond simply relying on nature-based solutions as the panacea. She referred to some text that the Climate Change Task Force suggested which will be distributed to PPC for consideration.

Comments were made on the need to align the language and lexicon used as well as the articulation of thinking across three key IUCN processes - the Congress, the IUCN Programme development and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. To note that this was highlighted in several occasions throughout the PPC discussions. It was stressed that our main focus is to protect, restore and strengthen sustainable use.

PPC members recommended rethinking the language proposed in Programme Area 4 “Inclusive and Equitable Natural Resources Institutions” which seems to narrow action to the level of institutions and States in detriment of non-State actors (which were not well covered throughout the document). Many agreed on referring back to the language that was used for the current Programme around “effective and equitable governance of natural resources” or maybe change the word “institutions” to “governance”. The Chair of CEESP added that this is the cornerstone of what we are doing and that perhaps
what we need is to adapt this Programme Area to the new conditions in its implementation but not changing completely its naming.

Some PPC members felt that the new version of the draft Programme had evolved in the right direction and were comfortable with the 4 prioritized programme areas. PPC Chair mentioned that he had been aware of the concern from some Council members who are not in PPC that the new draft does not have Fresh Water as a separate Programme Area. However, some questioned the merit of having Fresh Water separately in a 5th programme area given the strong link between water and land in terrestrial ecosystems. Some also questioned the use of the term “landscapes” suggesting referring simply to ecosystems. In the end, PPC did agree on not recommending adding another programme area at this moment but rather having freshwater ecosystems and terrestrial ones alongside. On the use of the term landscapes, some mentioned that it is more appropriate than ecosystems given the concept already includes several ecosystems.

Some suggested considering the use of plain, simple and consistent language in naming the Programme Areas, e.g., ‘Healthy Landscapes’ (or ‘Healthy Land and Fresh Water Ecosystems’, or ‘Healthy Lands and Waters’) for Programme Area 1, Healthy Oceans for Programme Area 2 and ‘Healthy Oceans’ for Programme Area 3. PPC members also mentioned the need for harmonisation of language and use of terms across the document as there is still a mix of outcomes (including governance outcomes) with process oriented names for Programme Areas; using a more inspiring narrative; making clear the theory of change; and reflecting protection, restoration and sustainable use as the three broad strategies we should be focusing our work on in elaborating each Programme Area.

Some expressed concern that a focus on people seem to be missing in all this and that this needed to be corrected in light of the fact that part of the mission of IUCN is precisely reconnecting people with nature.

The Chair of CEM recalled the importance of better reflecting the need for transformation of economies. We are in a different world and there are key concepts and issues which must come out strongly, she added.

The PPC Chair mentioned that there were two further possible amendments to put forward: one was a suggestion by Ambassador Masahiko Horie to add ‘youth’ as a 4.5 under proposed Programme Area 4 “Inclusive and Equitable Natural Resources Institutions”. The other proposal by the Chair was to insert a section on ‘Union inclusion and Union evolution’ (issue of interlinked constituencies of the Union to deliver Programme). Cyrie Sendashoga recalled that it was foreseen that such a section will indeed be added in the later iteration of the draft Programme based, among others, on elements of the draft Membership Strategy currently being finalised by the Union Development Group that can be fit here.
Sean Southey, Chair of CEC, expressed some discomfort with the idea of leaving ‘youth’ only as an “enabler” combined with media and communications as is the case in the current draft. He agreed with the proposal of Ambassador Horie on the need for a coherent inclusion of youth across the Programme and highlighted that CEC is already working on a big youth engagement for WCC.

Kristen Walker added that this issue of youth engagement is something that many of our Members might be already working on and that we needed to consider this issue with a Union-wide perspective rather than considering it would fall only on the Secretariat and Commissions to deliver.

The Chair of CEC stressed the need to give greater emphasis of how our Programme is about people too and suggested the inclusion of some wording (or a section) around “building a people’s movement” (educate, engage, mobilise).

The PPC Chair asked Sean Southey to come up with specific text on this and send it to the Secretariat.

Before concluding discussion on this item PPC members emphasised once again the need for IUCN to come up with one voice and align efforts around the Programme, the themes of the World Conservation Congress and the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Cyrie Sendashonga then explained the process going forward. She said that there would be no new draft prepared overnight to present to Council on 31 March 2019. Rather, the Secretariat will prepare a revised version taking into account the comments and views expressed at this meeting. The revised version will be available in 1-2 weeks’ time. It will then be sent to PPC for final review and endorsement (by email), on behalf of Council, as the draft to be used as a basis for further consultations with Members and other partners during the RCFs and online.

Conclusion
DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee,

welcomes the progress made in the development of the IUCN draft Programme 2021-2024;

requests the Secretariat to prepare a revised version of the document incorporating new feedback received during this Council; and

agrees that, after endorsement by the Programme and Policy Committee, the revised version be used as the basis for further consultations with IUCN Members and constituencies at Regional Conservation Forums and other means of soliciting comments.

PPC/5 Follow-up on assignments

2016 Congress Resolutions requiring action from Council

PPC/5.1 Report from the chair of the Task Force on WCC-2016-Res-086 (Synthetic Biology)

Purpose of the item

Council is expected to take note of the report titled ‘Genetic Frontiers for Conservation - An assessment of synthetic biology and biodiversity conservation” prepared pursuant to WCC-2016-Res-086. The report contains the detailed Technical Assessment as well as a shorter document titled ‘Synthesis and Key Messages’ distilled from the technical assessment.

Council is further invited to consider and endorse the draft IUCN Policy on Synthetic Biology and Biodiversity Conservation developed on the basis of the Technical Assessment before it is submitted to the IUCN Membership as a Council-sponsored motion for discussion at the Regional Conservation Fora.

Brief summary of the discussion

Kent Redford, Chair of the Synthetic Biology Task Force made a presentation highlighting the context in which synthetic biology is used and how it is fast evolving with potential implications, both positive and negative, on biodiversity and human well-being. He recalled the content of the IUCN RES 086 adopted in Hawai‘i and the process set to implement the Resolution first with the development of an assessment on synthetic biology and biodiversity conservation and then the development of an IUCN policy. The draft policy would need to be presented and discussed with IUCN Members at the RCFs alongside a motion calling for its adoption at the next Congress.

Members of PPC welcomed the work carried out so far in fulfilling the Resolution, recognised this incredible piece of work and its thoroughness. Several PPC members asked how to raise awareness about the subject and generate more “pick-up” from the general public about this issue given how massive its potential impacts, good
and bad, are. The question then became “How can we better socialize this?”

Jane Smart suggested that something that might help could be preparing a short and simple piece containing 3 case studies where there is a clear evidence of a good result for conservation and 3 others where there wasn’t a good result. That will help to better inform CBD Parties and others and influence policy decision making.

The Chair of the Task Force mentioned that the information that the general public receives on this issue generally comes from science fiction and dystopia which is precisely why we need better story telling. The Chair of PPC agreed that this is a question about optics and added that this issue is much more divisive than GMOs but one that is extremely interesting.

Some PPC members expressed concern on the implications of the rate in which these issues are moving and whether the risk assessments bodies have the capacity to really “catch-up” with this fast changing scenario.

The Chair of the TF also referred to the existence of several regulatory institutions and policies, both at the global and national levels, but concluded that these regulations vary significantly from country to country and that ultimately what is needed is the evolution of those national level policies to tackle this issue more effectively.

Sean Southey flagged the high polarisation of this issue and recommended working on a communications and “risk measurement” plan. The Chair of the TF reassured him that the Task Force had consulted with IUCN Global Communications on this. PPC members recommended that such a communications plan be developed for the RCFs.

Conclusion

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

The IUCN Council,
On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee,

takes note of the report “Genetic Frontiers for Conservation - An assessment of synthetic biology and biodiversity conservation” prepared pursuant to WCC-2016-Res-086,

and endorses the draft IUCN Policy on Synthetic Biology and Biodiversity Conservation (*) developed on the basis of the Technical Assessment before it is submitted to the IUCN Membership as a Council-sponsored motion for discussion at the Regional Conservation Fora.

(*) As presented in Council document C/96/PPC47/5.1
Jane Smart reported on **RES 018 (standard classification of impact of invasive alien species)**.

The resolution calls for a consultation process involving all relevant stakeholders within the Union to develop the Environmental Impact Classification of Alien Taxa (EICAT) before it is considered by Council for adoption as an IUCN standard. It also calls on all parts of IUCN and the scientific community at large to apply EICAT and publish resulting assessments through the IUCN Global Invasive Species Database.

Since the last Council meeting progress has been made in several areas. IUCN and the SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) members of the newly formed EICAT Authority, recently held a meeting in Cambridge to address the comments and recommendations received through the IUCN-wide EICAT consultation, and through lessons learned from its application. The EICAT Authority members are now making the relevant edits to Version 1 of the proposed EICAT standard, and Guidance document. These edits will be completed over the next few months and a version 2 will be provide to all those who submitted comments through the consultation.

The data infrastructure that will support EICAT, and make the assessments publically available, was also agreed upon and will be implemented this year (with the ISSG Global Invasive Species Database). This is part of a wider data integration process that is bringing all of the IUCN invasive species data into one single database.

She concluded by saying that the finalised EICAT standard, along with the GISD data support, will hopefully be ready to submit to IUCN Council in October 2019.

Kristen Walker, Chair of CEESP reported on progress made in **RES 030 (ICCAas) and RES 075 (Indigenous cultures)**. Since the last report, there has been a re-affirmation of the role of indigenous cultures in global conservation efforts, an IPO Strategy has been put in place and an IPO officer is being recruited for Secretariat. She mentioned that new spaces have been opened for IPO engagement in UNFCCC as well as in the CBD process. She informed PPC of an IPO member meeting in Guatemala in May and about engagement with UNPFII on Conservation and Human Rights Dialogue.

However, she stressed, we need to see further action between conservation and human rights from the Council given the news coming out of allegations and breaches in human rights. She recommended that PPC takes a decision on this important issue.

PPC members mentioned the need to address this topic in Congress perhaps through a dedicated session. The Chair recommended that some text be brought forward for PPC’s consideration.

Stewart Maginnis reported on **RES 045 (Primary Forests)** and the work of the Task Force on Primary Forests. Since the last Council meeting, the Task Force met in Gland and a draft document has been produced covering 16 areas of work identified including rights-
based approach. This has been circulated to the TF for further comments and then a policy will be developed and brought forward to Council possibly at its next meeting.

**Biodiversity and Human Health (DEC C/92/8 Annex 7, PPC report p.5)**

Peter Cochrane reported on progress made on this issue. He mentioned that IUCN prepared a draft policy brief on biodiversity and health as inputs into COP14 which took a decision on the issue (CBD/COP/DEC/14/4). He briefly spelled out the key elements of the CBD Decision. Importantly, the decision requests the Executive Secretary of the CBD and invites the WHO to develop integrated science-based indicators, metrics and progress measurement tools on biodiversity and health; develop targeted messaging approaches on mainstreaming biodiversity for the health sector, including as part of a global communication strategy; and invites the WHO to further support the development and implementation of measures, guidance and tools for promoting and supporting the mainstreaming of biodiversity and health linkages in the health sector.

He highlighted that IUCN has an opportunity to set a platform at WCC 2020 to bring forward the interlinkages between biodiversity and human health. He added that the IUCN Programme 2021-24 and the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework must also address biodiversity and human health issues.

Angela Andrade commented that CEM has been working on this issue, has established a task force and has a working group on systemic pesticides looking at the impacts of pesticide on human health.

Additionally, Sean Southey informed the meeting that over the last year, CEC has been working on a literature review on this topic which resulted in an extensive document accompanied by a summary document for policy makers which is available for Council.

PPC recommended to make the link between biodiversity and human health come up strongly in the IUCN Programme 2021-2024.

**Update on IUCN’s engagement on Food Systems (DEC C/92/8 Annex 7, PPC report p.8)**

Stewart Maginnis started by alluding to the fact that IUCN’s work has many links to agriculture but that we are not yet fully coordinated. The links between biodiversity loss and agriculture are clear but IUCN is working on finding an angle that isn’t already covered by other organisations and efforts. The group working on this topic has produced a draft framing document identifying two areas which need attention and have some scientific foundations to build on. These are: 1. Land health (soil biodiversity and managing the soils that many ecosystems depend on) and 2. Sustainability of supply chains to promote good landscape approaches and improve land productivity.
It was mentioned that the IUCN Brussels office has made progress engaging in dialogues around the EU’s common agricultural policy in particular. Some capacity has been built internally to work on this issue through ESARO and 2 secondments from the Government of France.

PPC members welcomed IUCN’s work on this as agriculture is the biggest driver of biodiversity loss and it is also important to raise the positive message to the sector that working on soil biodiversity will bring back productivity to soil.

PPC/6 Reports from task forces established by PPC:

PPC/6.1 Urban Task Force

_Purpose of the item_  
Jonathan Hughes, Chair of the Task Force updated PPC and presented on the discussions held during the Task Force’s meeting the day before.

_Brief summary of the discussion_  
The Urban Task Force recommended PPC the development and implementation of a package of activities at the World Conservation Congress in Marseille 2020 in order to raise the profile of the vital importance of the urban-nature agenda for the health of people and planet in the 21st century, to include the following elements:

A Congress pre-event for Mayors and city leaders where ‘voluntary commitments’ can be made and pledges to the implement IUCN tools such as the emerging ‘Urban Nature Index’ and ‘Global Urban Manifesto’ (with a view to these being further developed and transmitted to CBD COP15);

An urban or cities themed Pavilion in the main Congress exhibition space where a programme of events can be delivered, coordinated by the IUCN Urban Alliance;

An urban-nature ‘journey’ for those delegates, particularly IUCN members engaged in urban governance, wishing to follow events and presentations related to the urban-nature agenda; and

The development of a Council sponsored motion which articulates the imperative of the urban-nature agenda, calls for the development of science-based targets for cities, and implementation of the Urban Nature Index and other key goals of the IUCN Urban Alliance.

_Co nclusion_

The Programme and Policy Committee, _takes note_ of the proposals made by the Urban Task Force on a range of activities for the 2020 World Conservation Congress and _recommends_ the development of a Council-sponsored motion which articulates the imperative of the urban-nature agenda, calls for the development of science-based targets for cities, and implementation of the Urban Nature Index and other key goals of the IUCN Urban Alliance.
**Private Sector Task Force**

*Purpose of the item*
For the PSTF to provide an update to PPC, including IUCN’s engagement with the extractives sector, particularly including an update on Rio Doce and the Brumadinho tragedy.

*Brief summary of the discussion*
The Chair of the Task Force, John Robinson, reported on the discussions held at the meeting of the PSTF. He summarised the Business and Biodiversity Programme’s (BBP) work on the Operational Framework on Engagement with the Extractives Sector. He then summarised BBP’s separate work on the Rio Doce Panel, highlighting the PSTF’s debate about whether IUCN can engage with the Brumadinho tailings dam collapse.

Councillors took note of the report, and given the prevalence of the issue and its importance as a driver of biodiversity loss, discussed whether there are ways that IUCN can take a more strategic and proactive approach to working on environmental remediation from dam collapses. While there is some interest in environmental impact assessments of new projects, it was discussed that IUCN should avoid involving itself in engineering issues, and that there are legacy issues of existing dams, including potential impacts of key biodiversity areas. IUCN can play an important role in improving practices in responding to dam collapses.

It was also highlighted that it is important for IUCN to continue to engage with the extractives sector. However, there should be due consideration given to appearing to be too close to the industry, given reputational risks.

*Conclusion*
PPC agreed to adopt the recommendations of the PSTF, with some minor modifications, and to forward those recommendations to Council.

The Programme and Policy Committee, **takes note** of the report of the PSTF, including the Operational Framework on Engagement with the Extractives Sector.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council,
On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee,

**recommends** that the Business and Biodiversity Programme of IUCN should not currently engage with Brumadinho;

**encourages** IUCN and the Rio Doce Panel to continue to share technical and scientific knowledge on appropriate environmental and social responses to the collapse of tailing dams, both within and outside of IUCN.
**Purpose of the item**
Update the PPC on the work of the Climate Change Task Force.

**Brief summary of the discussion**
In her report to the PPC, Angela Andrade, Chair of the TF, presented a brief summary of the TF’s discussion which included updates from the Secretariat and the Commissions’ specialist groups on their work on climate change.

She said the TF welcomed the inclusion of climate change as a programme area in the draft 2021-2024 Programme and recommended strengthening section II by referencing the latest IPCC 1.5°C report (note: TF provided wording to this effect). She also reported that given the cross-cutting nature of climate change, the TF had also explored the idea of establishing a new IUCN Commission on Climate Change. She noted that in this regard, the Commission Chairs in their meeting held on 27 March 2019 had proposed that this discussion could be initiated by establishing an Inter-Commission Working Group on climate change that would study the need for this new Commission, the feasibility of such endeavour and the accompanying financial and human resources implications.

The TF further agreed it would provide inputs and help review the different position papers and submissions to the UNFCCC, especially where no IUCN position or policy exists.

In the discussions that followed, some cautioned against providing guidance on matters where IUCN does not have a position premised in the body of IUCN WCC Resolutions and it was noted that IUCN could present options and provide technical support without recommending a particular course of action. Peter Cochrane suggested compiling all Resolutions on climate change into one to have a clear policy on the matter, and retire previous Resolutions.

On the question regarding the feasibility and desirability of a new commission, PPC agreed to follow the course of action proposed by the Commissions Chairs to initiate the discussion by the establishment of an Inter-Commission working group.

**Conclusion**
The Programme and Policy Committee, *takes note* of the following recommendations from the Climate Change Task Force:

1. There is an urgent need for the IUCN to strengthen its role in addressing climate change mitigation and adaptation commensurate with the severe nature of the climate challenge. The Union needs to broaden and strengthen its work and impact in global, regional and members’ climate change efforts.
2. IUCN needs to leverage, build on and expand what its members are already doing, and help amplify/add value to those efforts.
3. There is a need for enhanced capacity within IUCN to support the Union on climate change, including through right capacity & resources within the secretariat and the commissions.
4. The Commissions Chairs have established an Inter-Commission Working Group on Climate Change to consider the need for and modalities of proposing at a later stage a separate IUCN Commission on climate change.

---

**PPC/7 Report from Council’s Global Oceans Focal Person**

*Purpose of the item*

Update to PPC on the progress of oceans in IUCN related efforts.

*Brief summary of the discussion*

Peter Cochrane made a brief presentation. In general, the state of the ocean is poor mostly due to global scale threats like climate change, pollutants, extractive activities and transportation and coastal infrastructure related threats. There are some bright spots in the progress in ocean governance progress with the UN Areas beyond national jurisdiction negotiations. Additionally, MPA coverage is increasing (through easy wins (and effectiveness is in question)) and purportedly minor modifications to the World Heritage convention could allow extension of WH sites to the high seas.

He mentioned that progress is reliant on international cooperation due to the scale of the global threats and in this context, IUCN’s role as a convener and influencer of policy is essential. Other areas where we work well include the compiling and disseminating of science-based evidence and tool kits/standards and capacity building.

IUCN’s portfolio has progressed well over the last few years with much work on plastics and a big focus on mangroves (both of which occur across programmes) and financing. The Commissions are heavily involved in marine efforts as well, in particular with CEESP establishing a specialist group on people and oceans and CEM a task force on plastics and deep sea mining.

He recalled that a new Director will be coming in for GMPP and acknowledged the valuable contribution of Carl Gustaf Lundin to IUCN’s efforts.
For the future of GMPP and IUCN’s work on this area, Peter recommended maintaining global policy presence on major marine issues (especially SDG 14, ABNJ and polar regions). Also, managing a targeted programme of work across regions and Members towards applying our expertise at scale was highlighted.

Given that the proposed draft IUCN Programme 2021-2024 has healthy oceans as one of the prioritized Programme Areas, Council has an opportunity to fit the critical issue of oceans into the post 2020 framework. The significance of oceans is only going to increase with upcoming publications and conferences and indeed ocean science is a theme of the next decade.

Discussions also turned around MPA effectiveness and concern around having them in the right places and under the right category. Emphasis should be on 100% sustainable management of the ocean and MPAs on top of this.

**Conclusion**

The state of the oceans continues to deteriorate but there has been good programmatic progress in specific areas like ocean governance and there is great scope for progress ahead with adequate resources and large scale initiatives.

PPC welcomed the appointment of the new Director of the GMPP, Minna Epps, and extends an invitation to her to participate in its next meeting.

**Council motions for the 2020 Congress**

*Recommendation to Council of the topics for Council motions and a mechanism to prepare and approve them in time to be submitted by 28 August 2019 (Rule 49)*

**Purpose of the item**

To discuss the potential topics of a series of Council-sponsored motions and a mechanism to prepare and approve them in time to be submitted by the deadline for submission of motions on 28 August 2019.

**Brief summary of the discussion**

The PPC reviewed several motion areas of interest to Council based on commitments and obligations from previous Resolutions requiring action from Council, strategic areas where IUCN could make a significant impact, areas that address new products and policies developed by the Union.

PPC observed that while the number of proposed Council-sponsored motions for the 2020 WCC might exceed the number that Council sponsored for the 2016 Congress, given the importance of 2020 as a watershed year for the conservation community, the Council should not be constrained by limiting the number of motions that it proposes as long as they are focusing on key strategic issues for the Union and for the conservation imperative in general.
It was clarified that Council-sponsored motions will go through the same scrutiny and process as all other motions, and further emphasised that great care should be taken in drafting the text to avoid ambiguities and systemic problems later on.

The PPC concluded that it would submit to Council the full list of motions that Councillors felt were important for the 2020 Congress, and noted that a process, with deadlines and allocations of responsibilities for drafting the motions, will need to be put in place to ensure that the texts are drafted within the timeframe for the submission of motions, so that Council can review and approve the final texts.

**Conclusion**

The PPC proposed the following 11 areas to be considered for developing Council-sponsored motions:

1. IUCN Policy on Synthetic Biology (WCC-2016-Res-086)
2. Retirement of Obsolete Resolutions (WCC-2016-Res-001)
3. Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework
4. Red List of Ecosystems
5. Nature-based Solutions Standard
6. UN Decade of Ecosystem Restoration
7. Urban-Nature Agenda
8. IUCN Policy on Natural capital
9. Conservation and Human Rights
10. Climate Change and Biodiversity
11. Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems

The PPC noted that a deadline will need to be set for all Committees to submit their motion areas, and a process will need to be established for developing the actual texts of motions. As Councillors will want to see the full text before the Council-sponsored motions are submitted, a remote PPC/Council meeting will need to take place prior to the end of the motion submission process set on 28 August 2019.
The IUCN Council,
On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee,

**Notes** that the following subjects for Council-sponsored Motions are proposed to be prepared for the World Conservation Congress 2020:

1. IUCN Policy on Synthetic Biology
2. Retirement of Obsolete Resolutions
3. Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework
4. Red List of Ecosystems
5. Nature-based Solutions Standard
6. UN Decade of Ecosystem Restoration
7. Urban-Nature Agenda
8. IUCN Policy on Natural capital
9. Conservation and Human Rights
10. Climate Change and Biodiversity
11. Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems

Other issues announced in advance

**Any other business**
Kristen Walker, Chair of CEESP, had proposed a new item in the agenda concerning IUCN’s response and engagement on the issues of Environmental Defenders, Human Rights and Conservation from now through the IUCN Congress.

She proposed a text outlining the issues at stake which was considered by PPC.

The PPC noted the progress that has been made in *Affirming the Role of Indigenous Cultures in global conservation efforts* (WCC-2016-075) and the engagement of IUCN’s Indigenous members organizations but also recognizes that issues still remain with respect of conservation approaches and human rights, noting the current dialogue taking place in the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues related to conservation and indigenous rights, the ongoing criticism of conservation in academia and popular media and the continue increase in deaths of environmental defenders.

The PPC also agreed with the Chair of CEESP on the formation of a task force to engage the UN Special Rapporteurs on Environment and Human Rights and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other appropriate expertise to formulate a roadmap from now through to Congress that would address the issue around human rights, environmental defenders and conservation. PPC recommended the drafting of specific TORs for this task force.
The Programme and Policy Committee agrees on the formation of a task force on Human Rights and the Environment and recommends that Terms of Reference be developed for consideration at the next PPC meeting.

The Chair closed the meeting at 17:36 p.m.
**Report to Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/1</th>
<th>Approval of the agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Finance and Audit Committee approved the agenda as presented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/2</th>
<th>Review of minutes of previous meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Finance and Audit Committee took note that items carried forward from prior meetings of the FAC were included in the current FAC agenda, namely:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The fact finding mission in relation to C95/19 and C95/21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The joint FAC/GCC working group on membership dues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/3</th>
<th>Report from the Head of Oversight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Purpose and background</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Head of Oversight (HoO) presented her report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The current report was an annual report that looked at work done over the past year and worked planned for the current year. The next report would be an update. This was in line with standard industry practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Governance/Risk/Control (GRC) integrated framework was presented. Good progress was being made on all key elements and additional work was in the pipeline. Cybersecurity was becoming an increasingly important risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The HoO presented the internal control scorecard (based on the COSO framework) and noted that most of the 17 areas were on a positive track and that the report would become more substantive over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A strategic, risk-based approach to oversight and internal audit was being adopted, in line with standard practice and away from the more traditional transactional, compliance approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The HoO recapped work done in 2018, including work done on fraud prevention. She provided a status report on open internal audit recommendations, noting that the backlog had been significantly reduced.

She brought to the attention of the FAC resource concerns. An organisation of the size and complexity of IUCN would normally have a team of 3. Different resourcing options were being explored.

The 2019 workplan for the unit was presented.

**Summary of the discussion**

Members asked if the Oversight Unit had resources at the regional level. The HoO replied that it did not but that this was one possible option.

The Treasurer thanked the HoO for a professional presentation. He noted:

- Risk culture needs to be embedded in the organisation and that this presented a challenge for management.
- In the corporate sector risk management was to a large extent driven by regulators and external requirements. What was the role of FAC in the absence of external requirements? One approach could be to prioritise risks. For example, data protection was now considered a top risk by many organisations.
- In respect of capacity, relooking at the model was important. He considered that a minimum of 2 was required.

Although risk and control was being given more attention by IUCN, culture was probably still a challenge. It was important to continue the good work being done to raise awareness, e.g. on fraud awareness.

In response to a question from the HoO on the committee’s role on reviewing internal audit recommendations, the FAC agreed that it would be good to see some examples of internal audit recommendations in order to assess FAC’s role. A suggestion was made to present high priority items only, though not necessarily for a detailed discussion on each point.

On the internal control scorecard, it was noted that item 16 had a red arrow. Why was this? The HoO replied that this related to evaluation and that IUCN did not have a robust
evaluation process at the organisation level. There were no evaluations of organisation processes and programmes in 2018. There were also weaknesses in M&E at the project level.

The FAC noted that some investigations showed a financial loss and others didn’t. The HoO replied that some investigations were a result of staff not respecting processes, e.g. procurement process, and that this did not necessarily result in a financial loss. Sometimes a potential fraud was stopped due to internal control checks which showed that the internal control framework was working.

The FAC noted that the 2019 plan included an audit of staff time management and that this should be considered a priority.

In wrapping up, the Chair noted that high risk items should be discussed in future meetings, and that the resource issue needs to be addressed.

**Conclusion**
The Finance and Audit Committee **TOOK NOTE** of the report from the Head of Oversight.

---

**FAC/4**

**Follow up of the FAC Report to C95 (section FAC/10 – Supplemental report of the Head of Oversight; Council decisions C/95/19 and C/95/21)**

**Purpose and background**

The 66th meeting of the FAC (October 2018) established a Fact Finding Mission to review the process followed in relation to an investigation carried out in 2018. Antonio Benjamin and Marco Cerizo (acting Chair) had been appointed to carry out the task.

**Summary of the discussion**

The Chair informed the FAC that, due to circumstance beyond his control, he had not been able to complete the work as originally planned, though the ground work had been started. Antonio Benjamin also informed that he had been unable to dedicate the time required and asked to be excused from further work, though he was willing to assist in an advisory capacity.

The Chair asked for clarification of the mandate, expectations and an additional 4 weeks to complete the
work. He also asked for other FAC members to assist him with the work.

The following points were agreed:

- The report should be presented to the FAC which would then report to Council in accordance with C95/21.
- The report should focus on fact: what happened, what should have happened, and what are the lessons to be learnt.
- It was important to bring the work to conclusion quickly and follow due process.
- The work should be done with reference to the relevant rules and procedures.
- If the existing rules and procedures are found to be lacking they should be strengthened.
- It was important to carry out the work in a spirit of learning and improving governance processes.

Rick Bates and Denise Antolini (Deputy Chair of WCEL, representing Antonio Benjamin in the FAC) agreed to participate in the Fact Finding Mission. The group decided to dedicate time during the period of current Council meetings in order to expedite the work.

**Conclusion**

The Fact Finding Mission agreed to report to the FAC within one month.

---

**FAC/5 Report of the Legal Adviser**

1. **Legal actions against or by IUCN**

**Purpose and background**

The Legal Advisor presented an overview of the existing legal actions against or by IUCN, including statistics, a summary description of major cases, and developments since the last meeting of the FAC.

**Summary of the discussion**

The Treasurer asked if IUCN could obtain insurance against fraud? The CFO said that he thought this would be expensive, if at all possible, but agreed to look into the matter. The Treasurer also asked if there was a requirement to disclose contingent liabilities in respect of legal cases. The CFO replied that he did not think so for the cases in
questions as the likelihood of payment was remote, but he would check with the auditors.

A member of the FAC noted that there were several old cases and asked if they could be “struck off”. The Legal Advisor replied that they could not be struck off if still in court, which was the case.

**Conclusion**
The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the update on legal issues pertaining to legal actions by and against IUCN.

### 2. Update on GDPR

**Purpose and background**
The Legal Advisor gave an update on General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) implementation. A Policy had been issued in 2018 and recently updated to cover Commissions and Councillors. She described measures undertaken for the Secretariat and Commissions, and highlighted the importance of compliance by Commissions and Councillors, particularly in the run up to Congress.

In respect of Council she proposed to introduce a change to the Performance Commitment Form to reinforce Council members’ commitment to data protection. If Council agrees, the form would be adapted with the input of GCC and adopted by the Bureau before the October 2019 meeting.

**Summary of the discussion**
FAC raised the following points:
- Are we compliant now? The Legal Advisor replied that all appropriate processes had been put in place. The challenge was to change behaviour. Training had been rolled out to increase awareness.
- Are National Committees also covered? The Legal Advisor replied that they had an implied responsibility and that we should raise their awareness.
- The Chair of the SSC noted that getting 100% compliance across the commissions would be very difficult in view of how commissions worked. It was important to have specific guidance, e.g. on electronic discussions, so that the big areas of risk were covered.
- It would be good for Council to also do the GDPR training.
Conclusion

The FAC took note of the report presented by the Legal Adviser on actions being taken to ensure compliance with the Global Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), including the adoption of the IUCN Data Protection Policy by the Director General on 20 March 2019.

The FAC agreed with the proposal that the Council Performance Commitment Form be revised to include an express commitment to comply with the IUCN Data Protection Policy and, subject to the agreement of Council, requests that the Legal Advisor works with the Governance and Constituency Committee to propose specific wording for adoption by Council or Bureau as soon as possible.

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

Council, on the recommendation of the Finance and Audit Committee, DECIDES that the Council Performance Commitment Form be revised to include an express commitment to comply with the IUCN Data Protection Policy; and requests that a formal proposal be presented to Council or Bureau as soon as possible.

Review of risk register, including review of the risk appetite statement

Purpose and background

The Head of the Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk Unit (PMER) presented an overview of risk management objectives and processes, with specific reference to:

- Establishing a risk management culture
- Review of the Risk Appetite Statement

The Head of PMER informed FAC that a Risk Officer had been appointed and a risk committee had been established as a sub-set of the Leadership Team. Risk workshops were being held across IUCN and all offices will be covered by June 2019. The consolidated risk register and top tier risks will be presented to the FAC at its meeting in October 2019.

The risk appetite statement was presented together with proposed amendments in respect of security risks.

Summary of the discussion
FAC members were pleased to see that Enterprise Risk Management was being implemented.

Members emphasised the need to have a specific person being accountable for risk management as opposed to a committee and that accountability for risk taking and risk management needed to be made clear.

Members raised questions on who is covered by the Risk Appetite Statement as the text is not clear. Given that the Risk Appetite Statement was approved by Council, the assumption was that it covers all constituent bodies of IUCN: Secretariat, Commission Members, National Committees, etc.

Members noted that on top of having high-level guidelines on risk, especially when related to security, risk and security plans need to be established for each office. These should be tailored to specific situations as necessary, i.e. take into consideration project context, country context, or a specific geographical area context.

The CFO informed the FAC that a security policy exists and a security officer based in HQ works closely with focal points in country offices to establish and mitigate security risks across the secretariat.

The FAC requested the Secretariat to address the following points:

- Reflect on the need to have a compliance component, including if possible, a position responsible for compliance.
- Clarify the scope of coverage of the Risk Appetite Statement
- Clearly identify accountability for risk management and risk decisions
- Explore the need to have an emergency fund to deal with emergencies if and when they arise
- Establish a mechanism for incorporating partners into the risk framework given the growing use of implementing partners in IUCN projects.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the report of the review of risk register and the Risk Appetite Statement and was satisfied on the progress being made to implement ERM.
The FAC recommends to Council to approve the revised Risk Appetite Statement in order to give guidance on security management by adding in the following paragraphs:

“IUCN has **zero tolerance** for actions that put employees in positions of unnecessary risk of physical harm and where reasonable alternatives exist.

IUCN has **moderate** risk appetite for undertaking mission-critical field visits in high security risk countries and areas when coordinated and approved in accordance with IUCN’s International Safety and Security Principles and Guidelines and with IUCN’s Travel Policy and Procedures. IUCN will exercise its duty of care by making staff aware of travel related risks, by ensuring outreach and training for staff; and by responding speedily in case of incident.”

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

Council, on the recommendation of the Finance and Audit Committee, **approves** the revised Risk Appetite Statement (doc C96 FAC 67.6).

**FAC/7**

**Review of the draft, unaudited financial statements for 2018**

*Purpose and background*

In accordance with the statutes (46.g), Council (or Bureau acting on behalf of Council) is required to approve the audited financial statements, though final approval rests with Congress (20.d).

The CFO informed the FAC that the audit of the 2018 financial statements was currently in progress and that he would be presenting the draft unaudited financial statements. A meeting of the FAC would be organised in May to receive the report of the external auditors and for the FAC to make a recommendation to Bureau on the approval of the financial statements.

The overall result for the year, before transfers to designated reserves, was a deficit of CHF 0.9m. After transfer to designated reserves for items such as the 2020 Congress and Regional Conservation Fora to be held in 2019, the net result was a deficit of CHF 1.5m vs. an approved break-even budget.

The key reasons for the deficit were:
1. Loss on investments of CHF 0.4m. These were unrealised losses as a result of “marking investments to market” as at 31 December 2018. CHF 0.3m of the loss had reversed as at 28 February 2019.
2. Project expenditure was 24% below budget. This impacted the ability of IUCN to recover institutional costs and overheads through the project portfolio. Consequently, a higher proportion of these costs compared to budget had to be borne by unrestricted funds.
3. CHF 0.6m in write offs related to the Regional Office for West Asia plus additional expenditure of CHF 0.2m on reorganizational measures.

**Summary of the discussion**

Members thanked the CFO for the detailed presentation and discussed the results presented, emphasising:
- The need for increasing efficiencies in both project development and implementation
- The need to continuously monitor and address balance sheet items that could lead to future losses
- The need to regularly monitor project implementation and reforecast budgets for 2019.

The Treasurer gave an overview of IUCN’s financial objectives as detailed in the statutes: having an appropriate level of reserves and having balanced income and expenditure. This defined the capacity of IUCN to absorb risk and invest in the future. The Treasurer emphasised the need to have a long term strategy for financial management to avoid being caught up in short term annual cycles that could deter long term thinking. He opined that given the current global focus on environment issues, IUCN should, ideally, be on an expansionary track and not be contracting, subject to a sustainable financial strategy which supported the mission strategy.

The Treasurer suggested reconsidering the policy on revenue recognition from the current input basis (where revenue is recognised based on expenditure incurred) to an output basis (where revenue is recognised on contract implementation progress) which is in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standard 15. In response, the CFO advised that a change in policy would be complex given the nature, size and variety of IUCN’s contracts and that it would result in significant deficits in the early years of implementation.
Members raised a question on what level of reserves is appropriate for IUCN. The current level of CHF 25m is based on a study carried out about 5 years ago and since the operational environment has evolved, this needs to be reviewed. Members agreed to discuss this further during the retreat of the FAC Task Force on Financial Planning Post 2020 on April 1 2019. They also agreed to include a review of the reserves level in the agenda of the FAC meeting to be held in October 2019 and that this should be supported by an analysis of financial risks.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee reviewed the un-audited 2018 Financial Statements, noting that a meeting of the FAC would be organised to receive the report of the external auditors and to recommend their approval to Bureau.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

Council, on the proposal of the Director General and the recommendation of the Finance and Audit Committee, requests the Bureau to approve the Audited Financial Statements for 2018 once the audit exercise is completed, noting that final approval rests with the 2020 World Conservation Congress as provided under Article 20 (d) of the Statutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/8</th>
<th><strong>Investment update and portfolio performance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose and background</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CFO presented the performance of the investment portfolio from inception in 2013 to 28 February 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The return for 2018 was -2.69% but for the first 2 months of 2019 it has been +2.15%. The loss in 2018 was due to the poor performance of markets across all assets groups in 2018 with a significant fall in December.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While bonds declined in 2018, IUCN bonds are held to maturity and IUCN receives full value at that point, irrespective of interim fluctuations. In respect of asset allocations, equities were introduced into the portfolio in November 2018 with holdings of 3.8% in equities at the end of the year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of the discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members noted that the investment policy currently in place allowed for flexibility but actual investments were conservative to guard against the risk of significant loss. Also, Swiss interest rates are currently negative, making it difficult to obtain a positive yield without taking additional risk. Members, however, considered that a return of 2-3% should be targeted.

The CFO informed the FAC that discussions had been held with the investment managers, with the participation of the Treasurer, and their view was that IUCN would have to significantly increase its investment in equities in order to obtain a higher return. The CFO noted that this would increase risk and potential losses which would be difficult to absorb in the event that they occurred.

**Conclusion**

The FAC asked that the Secretariat, together with the Treasurer, further review investment options with a view to increasing overall yield, while balancing risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/9</th>
<th><strong>Financial results to date and outlook for 2019</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td><strong>Purpose and background</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The CFO presented the 2019 financial results covering January and February in order to update FAC on the latest financial situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The result at the end of February 2019 was an operating deficit of CHF 1.3m. The deficit was largely a cash flow deficit. No framework cash income had yet been received; however, with the exception of CHF 0.6m expected from the US, all amounts were secured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual project expenditure was at 21% of budget for the period. This was partly explained by the fact that no reports from implementing partners had been received which is normal for this time of year. The Secretariat will closely monitor project expenditure over the coming months and will perform a reforecasting exercise following the close of March accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Summary of the discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members expressed the need for the Secretariat to be vigilant on project implementation across the secretariat to ensure income flows budgeted are realised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Chair expressed the need to build financial and implementation capacity of implementing partners. As IUCN expands its use of implementing partners, it is important to ensure that they in turn have the necessary capacities to ensure timely implementation and reporting.

The Treasurer emphasised the need to review project receivables to ensure that they are accurate and collectable and therefore reduce the risk of future write-offs.

Members asked the CFO to provide a paper on the outcome of the reforecasting exercise in May 2019.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee **TOOK NOTE** of the results to end of February 2019 and emphasised that performance against budget be closely monitored and that timely action be taken in the event of an income shortfall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/10 Resource mobilisation update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose and background</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Director of the Strategic Partnerships Unit (SPU) presented a report on resource mobilisation, noting;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growing portfolio and income diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6 Framework Agreements signed to 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High reliance on bilateral and multilateral donors (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased efforts to recruit and communicate with Patrons of Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 external reviews planned for 2018 in order to inform Framework partners for the period 2021-2024, one commissioned by IUCN and Framework partners and one commissioned by SDC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INF Summary of the discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members asked what plans, if any, were being put in place to capitalise on resource mobilization opportunities at the Congress in 2020. Suggestions included having ministerial meetings and involving Patrons of Nature in events that would attract either other possible patrons, or other funding opportunities, including corporate engagements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Director of SPU said a Heads of State meeting is being planned by the host government but no plans are currently in place for ministerial meetings. Events targeting Patrons of Nature will be planned at Congress and opportunities of
working with corporates at and after Congress will be explored.

Members noted the slow process of realising projects and the heavy investment that precedes implementation. Examples were cited of GCF projects taking up to 3 years to materialize due to the heavy processes involved with GCF secretariat, recipient governments and other actors. While this may be a hurdle and a strain on limited resources, this was an opportunity for IUCN to grow and to work with governments to deliver the IUCN programme.

The FAC underscored the importance of having a strong fundraising unit, capable of tapping into traditional and new opportunities, including the need to take full advantage of changing market trends and understanding contextual differences in the fundraising arena.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee *TOOK NOTE* of the report and welcomed the progress made in various areas of resource mobilisation.

**FAC/11 Congress 2020 budget**

**Purpose and background**

The Director of the Union Development Group presented a budget summary to FAC.

IUCN signed a hosting agreement with the Government of France. The host country will provide all on-site facilities. The current fundraising target is estimated at CHF 5.2m of which CHF 2.5m is high priority.

IUCN will cover CHF 1.6m of the total Congress budget from annual budgetary allocations of CHF 250k as well as CHF 580k in core allocations to the Congress Unit.

The host country will provide a cash contribution of CHF 2.3m of which CHF 1.7m will be for sponsored delegates.

Income from registration fees had been budgeted at 75% of the maximum expected amount and income from exhibitions budgeted at 40% of the maximum possible.
Further risks identified were:
- exchange rate fluctuations CHF/EUR
- labour law requirements – staff time, overtime, social security contributions - IUCN was looking at possible exemptions
- Taxes – currently, only registration fees will be VAT exempt

A full risk assessment was presented at the October 2018 FAC meeting and this would be updated as necessary.

An events sponsorship coordinator had been recruited and there is good on-going coordination with the French fundraising team.

**Summary of the discussion**

Members discussed the various risks inherent with the Congress and the mitigation factors being put in place. These included denominating registration fees in EUR, employing more staff than usual to comply with labour law, and hosting the event in June to ensure enhanced security provided by the host government.

Members noted the unique opportunity of using the Congress for fundraising, not only for the Congress itself, but for longer term purposes. The Director of UDG said that various plans are being developed, an example being a CEO summit to take place at the Congress.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the budget estimate for the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020 and the associated risks and was satisfied that these were being satisfactorily managed.

---

**Update on information systems projects**

**Purpose and background**

The Director of Global Information Systems Group (GISG) presented a report covering achievements for 2018 and 2019 plans for the three areas of focus within the Group: ERP, Union Applications, and Technology & Service Delivery.

The Global Information Systems Group (GISG) was working to ensure that systems are compliant with GDPR, external audit and software licensing.
The Director noted the growing risk of cybersecurity to IUCN, noting that attacks are increasing in number and complexity and becoming ever more difficult to police. He noted human error as one of the biggest contributors to this risk and informed members that staff trainings will be carried out to enhance awareness, and that IUCN will cooperate with partners in enhancing detection and prevention measures to cybersecurity.

*Summary of the discussion*

Members expressed appreciation to the Director of GISG for the detailed presentation and noted the growing risks associated with information technology and, specifically, cybersecurity.

It was noted that the Programme being developed for 2021-2024 will have a strong reliance on the group, especially around data management. The Director of GISG informed the members that he is involved in the Programme development and is aware of the foreseen interaction of his team and the programme implementation.

*Conclusion*

The Finance and Audit Committee *TOOK NOTE* of the report of the Director of GISG and were satisfied with the attention being given to IT risks.

**FAC/13 Update from the Joint FAC/GCC Task Force on Membership Dues**

*Purpose and background*

At the 94th meeting of Council (April 2018) the FAC and GCC decided to form a Task Force to look at various issues around the membership fees structure.

The Task Force had already met 3 times. The Task Force had made certain changes to its ToR as a result of these meetings. The revised ToR now needed to be approved by the FAC and GCC.

The CFO presented the draft revised ToR for consideration and approval by FAC.

*Summary of the discussion*
Members expressed the need to have a detailed review of the membership fees structure vis-à-vis the value proposition for members. Members underscored the need to ensure that any changes in fees structure does not result in reduced membership income for IUCN.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee APPROVED the Terms of Reference of the Joint FAC/GCC Task Force.

**FAC/14**

**Financial Planning post 2020**

*Purpose and background*

The CFO presented a draft Terms of Reference for the Task Force on Financial Planning post 2020 which was due to meet following Council.

*Summary of the discussion*

The FAC agreed the ToR and had no proposed changes. The FAC discussed whether the Task Force should provide the FAC with a report ahead of the October FAC meeting. Members of the Task Force said they would discuss the timeline and reporting at the retreat to take place on 1-2 April and inform the FAC accordingly. The FAC noted that the retreat was generously supported by the Swiss Government.

*Conclusion*