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This Management Response

This narrative is intended to be read alongside the tabular presentation of IUCN’s Management Response, dated 01.11.16 (attached), which was discussed in the Annual Framework Partners’ Meeting held at IUCN-HQ on 2-3 November 2016.

The tabular Management Response addresses grouped recommendations on the topics of Knowledge Products, Commissions and Organizational Fit-for-Purpose. For each topic, the tabular format outlines key actions, expected completion date, directly responsible individual, implementation stage, actions take and supporting documents and will be used to track progress in implementing the External Review.

This narrative has been produced at the request of the IUCN Framework Partners, in order to increase understanding of IUCN’s intentions in addressing the External Review.

The Process

The External Review of IUCN is conducted once every four years and is jointly commissioned by IUCN’s Framework Partners and the IUCN Director General.

As per the signed agreements between the IUCN and each of the Framework Donors, the scope and Terms of Reference for the Review is mutually agreed by the IUCN Secretariat and its Framework Partners. The Review normally covers topics related to the IUCN Programme, organizational performance and another topic that is mutually agreed.

Preparations for the 2015 Review commenced at the Annual Framework Partners’ Meeting in 2014 with broad agreement on the scope. IUCN’s Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit prepared the draft Terms of Reference for discussion and eventually agreement.

Universalia Management Group was contracted to undertake the Review after a global competition, as specified under IUCN’s Procurement Policy. Universalia won the contract over six other competitors.

The Review was supervised by an External Review Steering Committee, comprised of Lynda Mansson (MAVA), Flemming Olsen (DANIDA), Grethel Aguilar (IUCN) and Gillian Holmes (IUCN) who reviewed both the Inception Note, various drafts of the Final Report. The Director General also reviewed a number of drafts, requesting a report with greater strategic direction and a clearer organization of the report’s recommendations. After a number of such attempts, it was concluded that the consultant would not be able to respond to the requests and the report was therefore accepted.

The contract started in June 2015. The draft report was received in November 2015 and revised subsequently until it was accepted by the Steering Committee and IUCN in March 2016.
Strengths of the Report

The report focused on knowledge. As IUCN prides itself on being a knowledge organization, this focus – which was decided in 2014 – was useful. The report seeks to identify IUCN’s niche as well as explore IUCN’s role in knowledge creation. The report provided thought-provoking analysis on how IUCN generates and promotes use of its knowledge, from supporting research, influencing policy and supporting action.

The report highlighted IUCN’s convening role. Well-known globally for convening a vast Membership and volunteer Commissions, the report highlighted other forms of convening that include multi-stakeholder dialogues, knowledge sharing, brainstorming, problem-solving and new knowledge creation. The potential for engaging other actors under the Sustainable Development Goals is attainable under the IUCN’s approach to convening.

The report compared IUCN with other convenor organizations. For the first time, IUCN was analysed in comparison to other organizations which carry similar functions. The group of comparison organizations contained not only conservation organizations, but also organizations undertaking applied research, policy influencing and development.

The report served as an input into the organizational change process underway. More than sixty IUCN Secretariat staff were organized into seven work packages to think through a number of challenges related to creating a relevant and stable IUCN. This report provided input to that thinking on how the Secretariat is organized, how the Commissions are engaged and the challenges of resourcing IUCN in a rapidly changing donor landscape.

Challenges Posed by the Report

The report had a number of challenges, which have limited its immediate utility.

The recommendations are too numerous, some are unstrategic, and therefore not easy to operationalize and track. With nearly 110 recommendations, there were far too many recommendations to address meaningfully. Recommendations were pitched at different levels – some highly strategic, some focused on tactics – with considerable overlap and some repetition, adding to the challenge. Further, it is observed that a number of recommendations were based on perceptions without sound evidence base.

The value in the report lies in its rich analysis. The report is particularly strong in comparing IUCN to other organizations that share some but not all of the same characteristics as IUCN. The report, however, fell short in making operational recommendations about the organization that are really germane to the current organizational development process.

IUCN’s understanding of the Report and its Recommendations

The Review focused on the topics of knowledge, the IUCN Commissions, the IUCN niche and the organization’s fit-for purpose. Within each topic, the Review team gathered data, drew conclusions and made recommendations.
The Review found that IUCN’s unique niche lies in its ability to convene different stakeholders. Other organizations share similar assets, such as policy influencing, generating and using scientific evidence and setting standards. This is also largely how IUCN understands itself. The Appendices to the report contain many useful analyses comparing IUCN to other organizations that share some of the same assets.

The Review examined a wide range of IUCN’s knowledge products and raised several fundamental issues related to knowledge generation and use. Useful insights on quality, consistency and branding, data concerns, integrating indigenous knowledge, outcome pathways, integration of knowledge and knowledge product governance provide a roadmap for IUCN’s future knowledge work.

The review of the IUCN Commissions was the second major comparative study of Commissions in IUCN’s history. And while much progress has been made in serving a range of knowledge-based functions and Commissions are highly valued, there is still the opportunity to improve the functioning of Commissions, facilitate Commission members and ensure that they are well-supported by the Secretariat.

In reviewing IUCN’s organizational fit-for-purpose vis-à-vis the issues above, the Review examined a range of issues, including fragmentation and siloing, Member engagement, communications, human resources, fundraising and monitoring and evaluation. Overall, the Review concluded that progress has been made by the Secretariat, but with some specific areas of concern.

As IUCN embarks in a process of organizational change, some of the conclusions and recommendations will be of considerable value. Certainly, the diagnosis of IUCN in comparison to other organizations and observations regarding breaking down silos will be useful in the immediate term. Other findings and recommendations, particularly around knowledge products will fit into longer term programmatic strategies.

IUCN’s Response

The headlines

1. Advancing on our niche – capitalizing on IUCN’s unique value proposition, we are continuing to strategically find and exploit opportunities to convene and mobilize disparate parts of society to meet the challenges of the Sustainable Development Goals through our specialization on biodiversity conservation.

2. Defining the value proposition for Members – as a means of accelerating mobilization of Members in delivering real world results and policy influencing under the IUCN Programme and the new Membership Strategy.

3. Optimizing the power of volunteer Commissions – by consolidating a standard and comprehensive approach to supporting their work.

4. Integrating our knowledge – to create the most complete tools, datasets and evidence base for business, development and conservation decision making and action.

5. Consolidating our effectiveness and efficiency – through matrix management that creates global teams with clear purpose, economies of scale and
team-oriented attitude, with a clear focus on measurable results, metrics, outcomes and impact at all levels of the organization.

In order to meaningfully deal with nearly 110 recommendations, they were grouped into a number of categories organized around the three objectives of the Review. For the first two objectives of the Review, the recommendations are grouped by Knowledge Products and Commissions. For the third objective on niche and fit-for-purpose, the recommendations are grouped into the categories of Communications, Private Sector Engagement, Resource Mobilization, Membership and One Programme, Niche and Role, UN Observer Status, Human Resources and Monitoring and Evaluation.

IUCN found that some recommendations nested neatly with others and that in some cases, a single set of actions could meet multiple recommendations. In the tabular format, the nesting of recommendations and response can be seen clearly.

In this narrative, the key actions that IUCN will undertake to meet the findings and recommendations of the report are described.

Knowledge Products

IUCN has recently completed a major planning exercise for 2017-2020. The IUCN Programme 2017-2020 was approved at the World Conservation Congress in September and between October and November 2016, each programme of IUCN produced a workplan. The workplans respond concretely to global targets related to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems, the Green Lists of Protected Areas and Species, the Key Biodiversity Areas Standard, People in Nature and the Natural Resources Governance Framework (and associated tools). The workplans speak to knowledge development and use, both in terms of policy influence and creating conservation action. Overlaying the knowledge products is a working group that focuses on ensuring integration across knowledge products by ensuring that standards are compatible and the data and knowledge being mobilized under these standards can “cross-talk” to one another. This set of actions responds to eight recommendations in the report that speak to better planning for knowledge development and use, uptake and integration.

The report also highlights that not all Flagship Knowledge Products are appropriately based on IUCN approved standards. This observation resonates with IUCN staff and, accordingly, the oversight of IUCN Flagship Knowledge Products will be significantly enhanced. The Flagships (RLTS, RLES, Protected Planet, Green List, PIN, HRGF), while still nested in the various Commissions and Secretariat substantive units, will be under the overall oversight of the Director for the Global Species Programme, such that these databases and the associated published reports and assessments can meet the highest standards expected and required by IUCN.

The report stresses the imperative of IUCN knowledge influencing policies, processes, actions and financial resource allocations. This observation is extremely helpful and has spurred a number of initiatives. During the 2017-2020 programme period, IUCN will work with partners to establish platforms for significantly greater integration of the IUCN species and ecosystem based datasets with socio-economic datasets held by other institutions. This should enhance the ability to identify potential correlations and links between ecosystems, on the one hand, and socio-economic well-being on the other.

IUCN will continue to track the development and uptake of IUCN Knowledge Products. As IUCN’s knowledge becomes more embedded in the wider world, IUCN will continue to track the ways and means by which its knowledge influences policy regimes, is used to
measure change under environmental conventions, is used to guide investments and action in conservation action, is used by different stakeholder groups, such as the private sector or international financial institutions and how it is used by the research community. The data is compiled into the annual progress reports produced for a variety of audiences. This set of actions responds to seven recommendations which speak to branding and positioning, leveraging knowledge for influence and engaging end-users.

**Resourcing for knowledge products is clearly embedded in the IUCN Financial Plan 2017-2020.** Funding for development and maintenance of the knowledge and data sets remains an ongoing challenge, one which IUCN is meeting by ensuring that its knowledge is highly relevant and used by the world and by targeting non-traditional donors for support.

**Strengthening Science and Economic Knowledge in the IUCN Secretariat.** In response to the report recommendations and further to strengthen IUCN’s relevance, influence and resonance beyond the conservation sector, the Director General has taken measures to further strengthen the Science and Knowledge Team, establishing the Science and Economic Knowledge Team within the Secretariat. A new Chief Economist will be appointed, who will work in tandem with a Chief Scientist. An IUCN Secretariat Knowledge Committee will be established to – initially – provide oversight and quality review of the Secretariat produced publications and products.

**Commissions**

**The Commission Chairs prepared a joint response to the Review.** This is the first time in IUCN’s history that the Commissions have responded to any External Review of IUCN.

**The Commission Chairs were largely in agreement with the recommendations;** however, actions to respond to most recommendations were underway at the time of the report’s receipt and are of an ongoing nature.

**IUCN is examining how the Secretariat supports Commissions as part of its organizational change work.** This will cover recommendations related to Commission communications, joining Commissions, resources for Commissions, covering nine recommendations in the report. The overall aim is to rationalize Secretariat support to Commissions to ensure that administrative support to Commissions is more efficient overall and more effective to Commissions.

**Specific measures have been enacted to support the recruitment and orientation of Commission Chairs.** In the response, the Commission Chairs noted that the recruitment of Chairs now follows a fairly rigorous procedure and that a major effort has been made in the orientation of new Commission Chairs in the latter half of 2016. Everyone agreed that the orientation of new Commission Chairs was a major gap and this has been corrected.

**The Commission Chairs noted and agreed with the recommendations related to Commission functions and structures.** As the recommendations did not suggest anything new, more to continue doing what was already working; the Commissions will continue to provide a platform for collaboration, align with the IUCN Programme, integrate new themes, while recruiting specialists and structuring within Commissions to best reflect the work.

**The Commissions are now fully integrated into the Council approved planning and reporting framework.** The preparation of a more inclusive organizational planning and reporting framework was happening as the External Review was underway.
Communications

IUCN has updated its Communications Strategy and many of its standards and tools. With the overall aim of strengthening the overall IUCN brand, focusing messages and improving reach, the specific standards and tools related to website governance, media relations, writing for the web, social media, use of photos and IUCN style are intended to create a more standardized approach to communications across the Secretariat.

Similar to other corporate functions, communications officers worldwide now fall under matrix management, so that the distributed communications officers can now work as one team. IUCN sees this as an important step in ensuring high quality communications services and messages.

IUCN continues to revamp its communications content. The IUCN website was completely redone in 2015-16, updating all content and strengthening the organization of the site. The global communications team, while focused mainly on corporate communications works closely with programmatic communicators to ensure that IUCN standards are followed, that the IUCN brand is promoted properly and that all communications are of high quality.

Private Sector Engagement

IUCN will continue to implement the existing Business Engagement Strategy, noting that it enables all of the private sector engagement that IUCN currently seeks. IUCN has updated the Operational Guidelines for Business engagement, covering a range of engagements, including transforming business practices, sponsorship, licensing, donations, commercial use of IUCN data and procurement.

IUCN will continue to seek opportunities to facilitate Independent Scientific and Technical Advisory Panels, both as a means of filling the convening niche and transforming business practices.

Resourcing

Resource Mobilization will continue under the IUCN Council approved fundraising strategy and the Congress approved Financial Plan 2017-2020. Key parts of the resourcing strategy include moving from “retail to wholesale” in terms of programmatic oriented project fundraising and grantmaking to increase the size of the project portfolio, the average size of individual projects and improve alignment across the Secretariat and Commissions. This set of actions responds to eight recommendations.

The grantmaking portfolio is projected to grow from CHF50m in 2017 to CHF174m in 2020 based on projected fundraising with the Global Environment Facility and the Green Climate Fund. As an implementing agency, IUCN will then make grants to executing agencies to do large scale conservation, co-financed by governments.

Similar to other corporate functions; fundraising focal points fall under matrix management and now work as one team. IUCN sees this as an important step in ensuring highly coordinated fundraising efforts.
Membership and One Programme

A new Membership Category for Indigenous Peoples’ Organizations was created at the World Conservation Congress in 2016. Supporting work will be undertaken by IUCN Council in 2017 to start to invite interested organizations to apply for Membership in that category.

The proposal to create a Membership Category for Local and Regional Authorities was not approved by the World Conservation Congress in 2016, although the notion can be considered at a future Congress. To start, Council will establish a working group in 2017.

A new Membership Strategy will be developed in 2017, and will include a clear value proposition for different categories of Members.

Our understanding of One Programme engagement continues to improve with new data in the Project Portal. With guidance going back to 2012, the individual programmes have been planning for and providing data on engagement of Members, Commissions and National and Regional Committees. In 2016, the new Project Portal was activated and more than 700 project records entered, with a more complete picture of how Members and Commissions are engaged in delivering the Programme. All of the project data is cross-referenced with the Sustainable Development Goals. In the intersessional period, IUCN will enable voluntary reporting for Members within the Portal.

Other Niche and Fit-for Purpose

There were a small number of recommendations that did not fit the other categories:

- **Niche:** IUCN continues to fulfil its unique niche of convening through a range of specific actions, for example, through Congresses and Regional Conservation Fora, through Independent Scientific and Technical Advisory Panels, through a range of policy influencing efforts and through the generation and use of knowledge, all of which bring together Members, Commissions and other key partners.
- **Human Resources:** the review recommended a skills audit to support the evolution of IUCN, however, the upgrades to the Human Resources function well exceed that recommendation, focusing on a wide range of HR functions.
- **Monitoring and Evaluation:** IUCN is continuing to upgrade its ability to monitor the Programme through the development of a set of global indicators and baseline, against which all projects will report in the new Project Portal.

Areas of Disagreement

There were very few areas of disagreement, which are noted below.

**Knowledge products and IUCN Standards:** IUCN did not completely agree that all knowledge products should be tied to an IUCN Standard. In the response, we note that there are currently four knowledge products mobilized under an IUCN Standard, which include the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, the Key Biodiversity Areas standard, the IUCN Red List of Threatened Ecosystems and IUCN’s work on Protected Areas. Two other areas of knowledge work – People in Nature and the Natural Resources Governance Framework do not currently fall under an IUCN Standard and it is difficult to imagine when and if they will.
Commission Chairs as employees: the Commission Chairs disagree with the recommendation to support the Chair full-time, thereby making the Chair an employee of IUCN, preferring to maintain the independence of the Chair.

Commission Mandates and Statutory Change: the Review recommended a major statutory change to end the practice of approving Commission mandates as part of a discussion on the continued existence of the Commissions. Quoting the response by the Chairs: “This recommendation includes a misconception. Under the present rules, 90 days after the close of each Congress the membership elapses but not the Commission itself. To stop a Commission, Congress has to dissolve it. We believe that the focus of the Congress should indeed be on the Mandate as this is the higher level strategic statement of each Commission. The oversight by Council should be on the annual workplan and budget of each Commission.

A new Private Sector Strategy: IUCN does not agree to develop a new strategy, but instead to implement the existing one, as it provides an adequate framework within which to work. Instead, IUCN has focused on operational guidelines across different types of engagement.

More effective use of the UN Observer Status: while more can always be done, IUCN disagrees with the recommendation as it implies that IUCN has not effectively used the UN Observer Status. There are numerous examples of where IUCN has effectively used the UN Observer Status (influence in the Sustainable Development Goals process) and plans to do so in the future. IUCN has recently appointed a new Permanent Observer to the UN and plans to increase visibility with the UN in Geneva.

Situating the Management Response to the External Review in wider Organizational Change

IUCN is having to respond to fundamental shifts in donor resource allocation modalities, most notably with respect to framework funding. Since 2008 this funding source, which historically has been used to underpin IUCN’s core programmatic activities, has declined by 40% and is set to be reduced by another third by the end of 2017. This means that framework funding will have gone from contributing almost 25% of IUCN annual turnover to less than 10% over the course of two intersessional programming periods.

To address this situation, IUCN’s senior management carried out a detailed analysis of its corporate, thematic and regional structures. Presented in August 2016 at the 90th meeting of Council, this sets a course for exploiting opportunities for meaningful efficiency gains. Individual working groups have since been established to further explore how to make IUCN more efficient, effective and impactful as well as to find cost savings. Working groups have been tasked with identifying, by the end of the year, concrete recommendations regarding:

- the provision of corporate services to global programmes
- the provision of corporate services to regional programmes
- support to Commissions
- continuous process improvement and priority IT investments
- cost recovery management
- programme design and implementation
- organisational design
A comprehensive package of changes will be rolled out, starting in Q1 2017. The objective of this package is to help IUCN respond effectively to shifts in the financial outlook caused by reductions in unrestricted framework funding as well as ensure increased value to IUCN Members and delivery of conservation results.

As in all such exercises, the process matters greatly. Every effort has been made to ensure that the process is as transparent, inclusive and fair as possible. This includes, open communication with staff, active participation of staff -- from across all levels and locations of the Secretariat -- in the working groups, and the establishment of a third-party confidential mechanism for staff to voice concerns, questions and suggestions. This architecture should ensure the best chances of building a relevant and stable IUCN.
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Overall response to the External Review of IUCN

IUCN welcomes the findings and recommendations of the External Review of IUCN 2016. This important review contributes to the organizational development of IUCN and confirms to IUCN’s framework partners the continued relevance and effectiveness of IUCN as an agent of change for sustainable development and conservation.

This Review arrived at a time of great change for IUCN, as a significant proportion of core resources declined. This has necessitated a process to create a more Stable and Relevant IUCN. As such the findings and recommendations of this Review do not directly address those changes, but are complementary to the future of

A note on reading this Management Response

Strategic recommendations are implemented through the Operational Recommendations. The focus of this management response is on the operational recommendations, which allows us to show the specific reactions and proposed actions to address the recommendations.

As there are well over 100 Operational Recommendations, many of which overlap, these have been grouped: by knowledge products, Commissions and Fit-for-Purpose of the Organization, including Communications, Private sector engagement, Resource mobilization, Membership & One Programme, and Other – niche & role, UN Observer Status, Human Resources, in order to simplify the response. There are also many examples of where multiple recommendations can be addressed with one specific action.

This management response is issued by the Director General. Recommendations directed at the Commissions, however, are responded to by the Commission Chairs.
The recommendations can further be grouped as:

1. Planning for and implementing the development of knowledge products (3.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3) - all AGREED
2. Use of knowledge products (3.1, 3.2, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10) - all AGREED
3. Fundraising for knowledge products (3.6, 6.4) - AGREED
4. IUCN Standards and knowledge products recommending that all knowledge products should be based on IUCN Standards and peer reviewed (3.3, 4.4) - PARTIALLY AGREED (3.3), AGREED (4.4, 6.1)
5. Monitoring uptake and use of IUCN knowledge products (5.4) - AGREED
6. Inclusion of Indigenous and Traditional Knowledge in IUCN knowledge products (3.5, 4.3) - AGREED
7. Publication of knowledge products in all three official languages (5.11) - PARTIALLY AGREED
8. Support and oversight of the development of the Natural Resource Governance Framework (6.5) - AGREED

General response:

- The IUCN Programme 2017-2020 will deliver areas of knowledge development around the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, Protected Planet and other protected areas knowledge, including the IUCN Green List of Protected Areas, the Key Biodiversity Areas Standard, the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems, natural resource governance tools and People in Nature (formerly known as Human Dependency on Nature).
- As of 2017, the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems, the Key Biodiversity Areas Standard and Protected Planet are fully developed under agreed IUCN standards. Development of natural resource governance tools and People and Nature is likely to be ongoing.
- IUCN has a multi-department working group on “products and data mobilized through IUCN standards” that meets regularly to coordinate and sort issues. A part of the work of this group will be focused on end-user, both internally and externally.
- Based on work since the review IUCN has determined that "Flagship Knowledge Products" will refer to finalized products, including the two Red Lists, KBAs, and PP, which are "data and knowledge products mobilised against IUCN standards", and we differentiate the PIN or NRGF, as not yet completed. What is meant by a "programmatic knowledge product" will require discussion and definition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions planned</th>
<th>Covers recommendations</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Directly Responsible Individual</th>
<th>Implementation stage</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning for knowledge products - the IUCN Programme and unit level workplans have all specified plans for the development, use and intended uptake of the Red Lists, Protected Planet, the Green Lists, Key Biodiversity Areas, People in Nature and the Natural Resource Governance Framework</td>
<td>3.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 6.2, 6.3</td>
<td>Various - the Red List of Species is an ongoing process, the Red List of Ecosystem is projected for completion by 2015, the Key Biodiversity Area designation by 2020. The Green Lists, People in Nature and the NRGF are just starting</td>
<td>Directors, Biodiversity Conservation Group, Nature-based Solutions Group</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>1. Red List of Species standard agreed and assessments ongoing with use in conservation planning, conservation investment, policy formulation and monitoring, conservation action 2. Red List of Ecosystem standard agreed and assessments underway 3. Key Biodiversity Areas Standard agreed and designations underway 4. Green List, PIN and NRGF work initiated</td>
<td>IUCN Programme 2017-2020, numerous scientific publications related to the knowledge products, individual programme workplans 2017-2020, outputs of interdepartmental working group on &quot;Products and Data Mobilized through IUCN Standards&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of IUCN knowledge products this is an ongoing area of work, well described in the IUCN Programme 2017-2020 and unit level workplans</td>
<td>3.1, 3.2, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>PM&amp;E and Directors, Biodiversity Conservation Group, Nature-based Solutions Group</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>1. Integration of knowledge and data into key policy processes - SDGs, CBD, Aichi Targets, CITES, CMS, Ramsar, IPBES are examples - often guiding decision making and monitoring 2. Promotion of use of knowledge for conservation investment - Global Environment Facility 3. Private sector decision making - through IBAT (Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool) covering 50+ major corporations 4. Protected Areas establishment, governance, management effectiveness by national parks agencies 5. Conservation researchers</td>
<td>IUCN Programme 2017-2020, work programmes, indicator sets and monitoring reports of SDGs, CBD, Aichi Targets, CITES, CMS, Ramsar, IPBES, etc.; GEF work programme, citations of knowledge products in the scientific literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fundraising for knowledge products -</td>
<td>3.6, 6.4</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Various - as above (2)</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Fundraising for knowledge products included in the IUCN Financial Plan 2017-2020</td>
<td>IUCN Financial Plan 2017-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key actions planned</td>
<td>Covers recommendations</td>
<td>Expected completion date</td>
<td>Responsible unit</td>
<td>Implementation stage</td>
<td>Actions taken</td>
<td>Supporting documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Monitoring uptake/use of knowledge product</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Annually, 2017-2020</td>
<td>PM&amp;E</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Annual reports are compiled each year based on the Programme from reports provided by each unit. From 2017, this will be significantly supplemented by data from the Project Portal</td>
<td>Annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inclusion of Indigenous and Traditional Knowledge in knowledge products</td>
<td>3.5, 4.3</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>See (2) above</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>ITK is already being included under the RLS with data on species use; ITK will feature prominently in work on PIN and NRGF</td>
<td>Red List of Threatened Species database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Publication of knowledge products in three official languages</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>This recommendation is only partially agreed. Resource contraints and practical concerns (e.g. the sheer amount of rapidly changing data under the RLS)</td>
<td>See (2) above</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Many major publications have been translated in to French and Spanish, but resources are a contraint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Support and oversight of the NRGF</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2016 and ongoing</td>
<td>Director, Nature-based Solutions Group</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Leadership of the NRGF was changed in 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recommendations can be grouped as such:

1. Commission functions (7.1, 7.2, 7.3) - AGREED, although already done
2. Commissions communications (8.3, 8.4, 8.5) - AGREED
3. Joining Commissions (8.2, 8.6) - PARTIALLY AGREED, Commissions do not see that a standard process for joining a Commission is possible, although a unified online platform would be useful
4. Structure of Commissions (8.1, 10.1) - AGREED, already happening
5. Resources for Commissions (9.1, 10.3, 10.4, 10.5) - DISAGREE that Commission Chairs should become employees of IUCN (9.1), AGREE on how Commissions should be supported by the Secretariat
6. Commission Chairs' recruitment and orientation (9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5) - AGREED, as this is already happening
7. Planning and Reporting for Commissions (10.6) - AGREED
8. Statutory change on WCC approval of mandates (10.7) - DISAGREED, this recommendation is based on a misunderstanding of WCC rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions planned</th>
<th>Covers recommendations</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Directly Responsible Individual</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commission functions - providing platforms and forums, integrating new issues, aligning to the IUCN Programme</td>
<td>7.1, 7.2, 7.3</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Commission Chairs</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Commissions routinely provide a platform for collaboration, align with the IUCN Programme through joint workplanning and implementation and integrate new themes (recent examples include systemic pesticides, sustainable use, access and benefit sharing, key biodiversity areas)</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commission communications</td>
<td>8.3, 8.4, 8.5</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Commission Chairs</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>CEC has agreed to develop a communications strategy for all Commissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Joining Commissions</td>
<td>8.2, 8.6</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Commission Chairs</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Designing a unified online platform to guide prospective Members through the process of joining would be a joint responsibility of the Chairs, the Union Development Group and the Information Systems Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Structure of Commissions</td>
<td>8.1, 10.1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Commission Chairs</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>As this is already done, no new actions anticipated in terms of membership and specialist groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Resources for Commissions,</td>
<td>9.1, 10.3, 10.4, 10.5</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Commission Chairs, Director General</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Pending actions (1) agree on reasonable support (2) ensure that Secretariat focal points have TORs which reflect &quot;reasonable support&quot; (3) Reorganization of Commission support pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation recommendation #
### Communications: 1.1, 1.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3, 13.4, 13.5, 13.6, 13.7, 13.8, 13.9

This set of recommendations covers:
1. Branding (1.1, 5.7 and 13.8)
2. Communications strategy and tools (1.3, 13.1, 13.8)
3. Content of communications (7.4, 13.4, 13.5, 13.6, 13.7, 13.9)
4. How IUCN's Communications will organize itself (13.2)

### Management response
(Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree). If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons.

IUCN is in agreement with all recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions planned</th>
<th>Covers recommendations</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Responsible unit</th>
<th>Implementation stage</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Branding: IUCN has revamped its website content and published the new IUCN Programme 2017-202</td>
<td>1.1, 5.7</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Update to website, niche statement</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communications strategies and tools: IUCN will publish its revised Communications strategy in 2017</td>
<td>1.3, 13.1</td>
<td>End 2016</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Strategy revised</td>
<td>Global Communications Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. con't: Many communications standards and tools have been revised: website governance policy, media relations policy, writing for the web, IUCN style guide, social media policy, photo policy</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>Mid 2017</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>All except photo policy have been updated</td>
<td>Various communications standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content of communications: this encompasses a variety of daily work of Global Communications to strengthen its communications to various audiences and the accuracy of its content</td>
<td>7.4, 13.4, 13.5, 13.6, 13.7, 13.9</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How Communications will organize itself</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Matrix management of all corporate communications staff enabled in 2016</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evaluation recommendation #**

**Private sector: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3**

1. Private sector engagement strategy (2.1)
2. Technical Advisory Panels (2.2)
3. Engagement with industry representatives (2.3)

**Management response** (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree). If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons.

IUCN fully agrees with 2.2 and 2.3, partially agrees with 2.1 (see below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions planned</th>
<th>Covers recommendations</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. While IUCN will not update its Private Sector Engagement Strategy, it will continue to implement the Strategy. IUCN has also recently updated its Operational Procedures for Business Engagement covering transforming business practices, sponsorship, licensing, donations, commercial use of IUCN data and procurement</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Business &amp; Biodiversity</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panels</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2016 and ongoing</td>
<td>Business &amp; Biodiversity</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation recommendation #

**Resource Mobilization (11.3, 15.1, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7, 15.8, 15.9, 15.10)**

**Management response** (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree). If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons.

The recommendations can be grouped as such:

1. Fundraising strategy, covering from whom IUCN will seek resources and the overall strategy) (11.3, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, 15.7, 15.8, 15.9) - AGREED
2. Grantmaking (15.6) - AGREED
3. Role of Strategic Partnerships (15.1) - AGREED (although resources to fund this function are scarce)
4. Improving client orientation as a resourcing strategy (15.10) - AGREED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions planned</th>
<th>Covers recommendations</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. IUCN's resource mobilization operates under a Council approved fundraising strategy and a Congress approved Financial Plan for 2017-2020. Key parts of the resourcing strategy include moving from &quot;retail to wholesale&quot; in terms of programmatic oriented project fundraising and grantmaking to increase the size of the project portfolio, the average size of projects and improve alignment across the Secretariat and Commissions</td>
<td>11.3, 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5, 15.7, 15.8, 15.9</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Director General</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Approval of IUCN Financial Plan 2017-2020; implementation of Council approved Fundraising Strategy, specific actions to engage potential new framework partners, US Foundations, high net worth individuals, international financial institutions; seeking international organization status under the European Union</td>
<td>IUCN Financial Plan 2017.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grantmaking</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>GEF Coordination Unit</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Continued engagement with the GEF and GCF; projected portfolio growth from CHF50m in 2017 to CHF 174m in 2020</td>
<td>IUCN Financial Plan 2017.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Role of Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Matrix management of fundraising focal points; coordination of key engagements with international financial institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improving client orientation</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Director, Biodiversity Conservation Group</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Next generation of IBAT in preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key actions planned</td>
<td>Covers recommendations</td>
<td>Expected completion date</td>
<td>Responsible Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Local and Regional Authorities</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2021?</td>
<td>Union Development Group</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>WCC did not vote to create a new category for local and regional authorities, but will reconsider a new proposal at the 2020 WCC, which would then be ratified in 2021 if the vote is positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop a new Membership Strategy</td>
<td>12.2, 11.4</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Union Development Group</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Just starting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Delivering on the One Programme Charter through the IUCN Programme</td>
<td>11.1, 11.2, 11.3</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Director General</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>The IUCN Programme and unit workplans specify how Commissions and Members are to be engaged. Data on actual engagement is captured through the Project Portal</td>
<td>IUCN Programme 2017-2020, Project Portal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation recommendation #

**Management response** (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree). If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons.

**AGREED**, IUCN has taken several recent actions to strengthen convening aspect (see below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions planned</th>
<th>Covers recommendations</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Implementation stage</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Conservation Congress and Regional Conservation Fora</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Union Development Group</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Convened Members in WCC and RCFs in all regions</td>
<td>WCC documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Scientific and Technical Advisory Panels - various - bring together scientific expertise and private sector (e.g. Western Gray Whale Advisory Panel, Niger Delta Panel)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Business &amp; Biodiversity</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Convened Commission members and other scientists with private sector on different issues</td>
<td>Business &amp; Biodiversity website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy influencing - IUCN's strategy convenes Members and Commissions in influencing a range of policy processes such as the SDGs, CBD, UNFCCC, WHC, CITES, etc</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Directors, Biodiversity Conservation Group, Policy and Programme Group</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>As described</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge- IUCN convenes Commission Members in the development of knowledge and data under IUCN standards</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Directors, Biodiversity Conservation Group, Nature-based Solutions Group</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Includes the RLS, RLE, KBA, PP, NRGF and PIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Evaluation recommendation #

**UN Observer Status (1.4)**

**Management response** (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree). If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons.

While there could always be more use of the UN Observer Status, this recommendation is **DISAGREED**, as there are numerous examples of effective engagement - e.g. the SDG process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions planned</th>
<th>Covers recommendations</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Unit responsible</th>
<th>Implementation stage</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building on SDG engagement, UN Permanent Observer has planned for many new events in and around the UNGA</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>UN Permanent Observer</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation recommendation #
### Human Resources (14.1)

**Management response (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree). If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons.**

AGREED, although actions go well beyond the recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions planned</th>
<th>Covers recommendations</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Unit Responsible</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade of HR policies and tools</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Review of various HR policies and tools: talent acquisition, compensation, international mobility, expatriates, end of employment &amp; retirement, internships, leaving HQ, maternity leave &amp; adoption, JPOs; updated approach to performance management, skills audit underway</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Evaluation recommendation #
### Monitoring & Evaluation 16.1-16.6

**Management response (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree). If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons.**

Recommendations can be grouped as such:
1. Monitoring (16.1, 16.3, 16.4) - AGREED
2. Learning (16.2, 16.5) - AGREED, but dependent on resources (specific actions not planned)
3. Increasing the M&E budget - AGREED, but unlikely (specific actions not planned)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions planned</th>
<th>Covers recommendations</th>
<th>Expected completion date</th>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Monitoring - links to IUCN Programme, collaborative monitoring</td>
<td>16.1, 16.3</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PM&amp;E</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Based on the 30 targets of the IUCN Programme 2017-2020, have engaged 60 experts from the Secretariat and Commissions to guide the process of indicator development, baselines and then monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Monitoring - engaging Members</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>PM&amp;E</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Future phase of the Programme/Project Portal will include an area for IUCN Members to provide voluntary reporting, linked to the Programme Results and Targets (which are in turn, linked to the SDGs and Aichi Targets)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>