
IUCN – The World Conservation Union

Review of IUCN Commissions

**Commission on Ecosystem Management
Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy
Commission on Environmental Law
Species Survival Commission**

Gabor Bruszt and Stephen Turner

23 June, 2000.

Preface

The purpose of this review is to promote and deepen IUCN's thinking about its Commissions, which are one of its most important and intriguing components. In particular, we have been asked to report on the general status of the Commission on Environmental Law and the Species Survival Commission. In greater depth, we are required to evaluate the role and relationships within IUCN of the Commission on Ecosystem Management and the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy. This should lead to recommendations about the future character and structure of knowledge support to the Union with regard to ecosystems and in the broad fields of social and economic sciences.

This has been a challenging task. We have only been able to attempt it because of the sterling support given to us by the IUCN Secretariat, by the Chairs and staff of the four Commissions, and by Saleemul Huq and Thor Larsen (who were requested to work with us on CEESP and CEM issues). Many people have given us valuable time and information. We are grateful to them all, but retain responsibility for any inaccuracies or misinterpretations in this report.

Our special thanks go to Nancy MacPherson for all the data, advice, hospitality and inspiration she has given us in this review.

Gabor Bruszt

Stephen Turner

23 June, 2000.

Contents

Preface	i
Abbreviations	iv
Summary	v
1. Introduction	1
1.1. The reasons for this review	1
1.2. Terms of reference	1
1.3. Methods	1
1.4. Previous and future reviews	2
1.5. This report	3
2. General issues	3
2.1. The intended role and status of Commissions within the Union	3
2.2. The actual role and status of Commissions within the Union	3
2.3. More different than similar	5
2.4. The Commissions and the Union's need for knowledge	5
2.5. The Commissions and the Union's Programme	7
2.6. The Commissions and the Secretariat	7
2.7. Voluntarism and resources	9
2.8. Regionalisation and globalism	10
2.9. Governance issues	11
2.9.1. Five links	11
2.9.1.1. The Commission mandate	11
2.9.1.2. The Commission Chair	11
2.9.1.3. The Commission Operating Fund	11
2.9.1.4. Commission reports to Council	11
2.9.1.5. Reviews of the Commissions	11
2.9.1.6. The weakness of the links	12
2.9.2. Governance of Commissions and governance of the Union	12
2.10. Financial issues	14
3. The Commission on Ecosystem Management	15
3.1. Background	15
3.2. Performance	15
3.3. IUCN and ecosystems: the rationale for CEM	16
3.4. Building on achievements	17
4. The Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy	19
4.1. Background	19
4.2. Performance	19
4.3. IUCN and social science	20
4.4. Commissions and social science	21
4.5. Enhancing the provision of social science expertise and guidance to the Union	21
4.5.1. Provision	21
4.5.2. Facilitation	21
4.5.3. Use	22
5. The Commission on Environmental Law	22
5.1. Background	22

5.2. Rationale	23
5.3. Performance	23
5.4. Financial issues	24
5.5. Leadership, management, structure and style	24
6. The Species Survival Commission	25
6.1. Background	25
6.2. Rationale	25
6.3. Performance	25
6.4. Financial issues	26
6.5. Leadership, management, structure and style	26
Annex 1. Terms of reference	28
Annex 2. Questionnaire	31
Annex 3. Data and contacts requested from Commissions	37
References	39

Abbreviations

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CEC	Commission on Education and Communication
CEESP	Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy
CEL	Commission on Environmental Law
CEM	Commission on Ecosystem Management
COE	Commission on Ecology
COF	Commission Operating Fund
DG	Director General
ELC	Environmental Law Centre
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
KRA	Key Result Area
MAGE	Millennium Assessment of Global Ecosystems
RCO	Regional Conservation Office
RING	Regional and International Networking Group
SG	Specialist Group
SIS	Species Information System
SSC	Species Survival Commission
SUI	Sustainable Use Initiative
SUSG	Sustainable Use Specialist Group
TOR	terms of reference
WCC	World Conservation Congress
WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas

Summary

IUCN wishes to make periodic end-term and in-depth reviews of its Commissions a more routine part of its monitoring and evaluation functions, as required by Resolution 19.2 of the Buenos Aires General Assembly. Council has therefore requested us to carry out **end-term reviews** of the Species Survival Commission (SSC) and of the Commission on Environmental Law (CEL). It resolved that more detailed, **'in-depth' reviews** should be undertaken of the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) and of the Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM).

To meet urgent deadlines associated with preparations for the next World Conservation Congress, we submitted a preliminary draft report to the Bureau of Council in time for its meeting on 27-28 May. The draft was also circulated to Chairs and Steering Committees of Commissions and to staff of the Secretariat. This final version of the report takes into account the comments on the draft that we received from various quarters.

Our analysis covers generic features of all IUCN Commissions, as well as specific observations and recommendations on the four we were asked to review.

Reviewing 'Commissions' is difficult because the differences between them outweigh the similarities. IUCN should no longer assume that the 'Commission' is a generic model that it can apply to new knowledge management needs.

Over time, three Commissions (CEL, SSC and WCPA) have conformed roughly to the original idea of a professional body that develops knowledge and analysis in clearly defined niches and delivers these to the Union. They have developed separate programmes that have not always been closely tied to the Programme of IUCN itself, partly because that Programme has been poorly defined.

The other three Commissions (CEC, CEESP and CEM) have undergone several transformations over recent decades as they and the Union tried to identify clear niches and mandates in broader fields. Like the others, they have not been closely linked to the overall Programme of the Union. Typically, they have found it harder to structure and organise their wide fields of knowledge and action – although CEC has made important progress by identifying limited tasks and sticking to them.

IUCN Commissions have become successful and effective parts of the Union where they have a clearly defined niche in which to operate, and where they have therefore been able to develop a stable and purposeful programme over time.

Overall, the Commissions have become a less integral part of the Union than was intended. Partly this has been because the Union and its Secretariat have not had, or have not provided, the resources needed for an effective interface with the Commissions at the Secretariat. Moreover, although several Commissions have developed regional structures, not all of them have kept up with the rapid regionalisation of the Secretariat or interfaced well with the Secretariat at regional and national levels.

Knowledge management remains the core business of IUCN. But the Union can no longer rely only on Commissions for the delivery of this knowledge. Particularly as it focuses on its new Programme, it will increasingly need flexible, interdisciplinary, sometimes short-term knowledge services of kinds that Commissions are less well equipped to provide. These services will come from advisory groups, task teams and forums like those that are already widespread in the Union.

With the evolution and enhanced focus of its Programme, and in the changing context of global debate about conservation and sustainable development, **IUCN needs two services from specialists in a range of conservation-related fields**. First, it needs focused knowledge delivery to the Programme. Often, Commissions provide this service. Increasingly, more flexible mechanisms will have to be found. Secondly, and at a higher level, it needs questioning, critical, paradigmatic analysis of the Union's approaches and stances – both on natural science issues and, most crucially, on the global socio-political issues dominating its vision and mission. Although the Statutes allow for them to perform it, in practice Commissions are usually unsuitable for this second service. By their nature, they represent stability, consensus and the state of

the art – not the iconoclasm, lateral thinking and fundamental challenges that also form part of scientific and political progress.

Commissions work effectively for the Union when they have efficient **Secretariat** support and when Commission and Secretariat are working together on joint activities that form an agreed part of the IUCN Programme. Secretariat support is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for Commissions to succeed. We recommend that, as the Secretariat works with each Commission to define the contributions that the Commission will make to the Programme for the new quadrennium, they agree what roles Secretariat staff will play at Headquarters and regional levels in facilitating this contribution and sharing in the professional work of the Commission. In some cases, this may require adjustment of staff tasks and resource allocations. Additional posts may have to be created; or the job descriptions for existing posts may have to be amended to specify work to be done with and for Commissions.

The **voluntarism** of Commission members remains a key asset of the Union. But its scope is increasingly constrained by modern institutional and economic realities. To nurture and use it to the Union's best advantage, IUCN needs clearer and better resourced policy on its economic relations with the Commissions. It should provide adequate resources for Commissions to operate the networking infrastructure they need to enable their members to meet and work together. Most crucially, it should develop a uniform and transparent system for payment of sub-commercial honoraria to Commission members who provide specified, targeted services to the Programme. The Secretariat should give priority to using Commission members under this system rather than contracting commercial consultants.

The **governance** links between Commissions and the rest of IUCN need careful revision. They include the Commission mandates; the appointment of the Chairs; and reporting and review arrangements. These ties tend to be weak and ineffective. There is little scope for meaningful governance of the Commissions within the broader Union over the span of years between Congresses. The Council lacks the structure and capacity to exercise the limited governance role that the Statutes give it in this regard. As Council members, Commission Chairs risk conflicts of interest when they vote on Commission matters. The authority and accountability of the Director General with regard to Commissions need to be clarified in the context of a strengthened role for the Council in their governance. Council should be empowered to take decisions about Commissions that are currently the prerogative of the Congress.

Commissions and the Secretariat need to develop **joint funding strategies** that recognise their respective needs and contributions. Commissions' contribution to the delivery of the IUCN Programme should also benefit from the resources that are allocated within the Programme itself. Where Commissions raise their own funds, they should always communicate full details to the Secretariat. Transparency in this regard will be a vital component of joint funding strategies.

The **Commission for Ecosystem Management** is generally praised for its achievements in elaborating and promoting the ecosystem approach. Meanwhile, a different, more focused sort of ecosystem work has been going on within and beyond the Commission. A variety of professional, interdisciplinary groupings work on specific ecosystems or ecosystem themes. Some of their members belong to CEM, or other Commissions. These groups also link the more academic areas of conservation and ecological science with the more practical fields of conservation and sustainable development. They generally reflect the newer kind of technical teams that we have identified as leading the future of the Union's relations with knowledge and scholarship. None of them needs to operate within a Commission in order to prosper.

We recommend that the Union and CEM consider carefully how best to build on CEM's achievements. They should keep in mind that the best way forward might be to step on from those achievements into a different way of working. We do not believe that a young Commission can play an effective role in the sort of detailed, interdisciplinary knowledge delivery that the new Programme's work in different ecosystems will require. Where CEM may still have a substantive role is in the further specification, elaboration and practical piloting of the ecosystem approach. But we doubt whether such tasks would justify the operation of a full Commission in the long run.

We therefore recommend that Council commission a mid-term review of CEM in two years' time. This review should assess the continuing need for a Commission to operate at the paradigmatic level with regard

to ecosystems or the ecosystem approach. It should assess, *inter alia*, whether any of the following options would then form an appropriate course of action for the Union:

- replacing CEM with a senior advisory group on optimising IUCN operations with regard to ecosystems and the ecosystem approach;
- absorbing the mandate and operations of CEM into those of SSC;
- providing CEM with a reinforced mandate that justifies and specifies its continuing value for the Union, in terms of participation in and support for the IUCN Programme.

We further recommend that Council propose a resolution to the forthcoming WCC that, for the coming quadrennium, makes CEM a provisional Commission and thereby delegates to the Council the powers of the Congress with regard to the potential abolition of CEM or amendment of its mandate. This should permit immediate implementation of the recommendations of a mid-term review of CEM.

Despite IUCN's long standing recognition of the centrality of social, economic and policy concerns to its vision and mission, the history of its Commissions in this field is one of instability, shifting mandates and uncertain performance. We believe that this typifies IUCN's experience with Commissions that lack a clear niche. The **Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy** has not been effective in meeting its objectives. Some of its members have done good work and produced thoughtful analysis of socio economic issues pertinent to the Union. But it has had little impact on the broader activities of the Union, and its work is unlikely to have long term consequences inside or outside IUCN.

Overall, IUCN's need for social science expertise and guidance is greater than ever before. We urge a much stronger commitment to social science expertise and delivery as a paramount feature of the new Programme and character of the Union. Despite the paramount importance of many of CEESP's concerns to the Union, a Commission is not the right structure with which to tackle these issues.

We therefore do not recommend renewal of the mandate of CEESP. Instead, we recommend that social science expertise should be deployed in a number of interdisciplinary advisory groups, task forces or similarly focused structures that address particular results, or combinations of results, in the IUCN Programme. It is also essential that social science guidance be provided at the highest policy levels in the Union, through a senior advisory group on social and economic policy. This group should report to the Council.

We recommend that a senior applied social scientist of international standing and proven management ability in the conservation or environmental fields be appointed to the Secretariat in Gland. This person should report directly to the Director-General, but operate in close collaboration with the Programme Coordinator. She/he would have two roles:

- to facilitate and promote optimum use of the resources of IUCN Commissions in delivering knowledge to the Programme;
- to facilitate the formation and promote the optimum use of interdisciplinary advisory groupings that maximise the input of appropriate social science knowledge to the Programme.

Furthermore, there is an urgent need to restructure and reinforce Secretariat capacity – at Headquarters and RCOs - to facilitate the socio-economic elements of the Programme. At the level of overall Union policy, it will be necessary for Council and (if it deems fit) a reinforced Policy Committee to provide firm leadership. If this is not done, IUCN's international, regional and national stances on these policy issues will remain unconvincing, especially to the peoples of developing countries.

The **Commission on Environmental Law** has been able to maintain a convincing rationale and profile within the Union, and to focus on a niche within which it delivers effective and valuable services to the Programme. It has been largely successful in achieving its objectives and mandate. Despite its reputation and record, continuing achievement is not assured if CEL and the Secretariat do not successfully implement an intensified joint fund raising strategy. It will also be necessary to strengthen the interface between the Commission and the Union's programme.

The **Species Survival Commission** continues to be the flagship of much of the Union's work in the natural sciences. The rationale for its mandate and goal is sound. Its wide ranging scientific work on the conservation status of species continues to have significant positive effects. But SSC and the Union need to maintain careful attention to the relationship between its goals, objectives and programme and those of IUCN as a whole. The Union should give firm support to SSC's efforts to build a Species Information System that enhances the structure, accessibility and dissemination of the Commission's knowledge.

1. Introduction

1.1. The reasons for this review

At its 51st meeting on 7-9 February 2000, the IUCN Council decided that, in accordance with Resolution 19.2 of the 1994 Buenos Aires General Assembly, triennial end-term reviews should be carried out of the Species Survival Commission (SSC) and of the Commission on Environmental Law (CEL). It resolved that more detailed, 'in-depth' reviews should be undertaken of the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) and of the Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM).

This exercise is therefore part of the response by the Council and the Commissions to the obligations laid down for them by the Buenos Aires General Assembly. The World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) and the Commission on Education and Communication (CEC) had already taken the necessary action by arranging their own reviews in 1998 and 1999 respectively (Crofts and Lahmann, 1998; Romijn, 1999).

Each Commission should be subject to a triennial end-term review, to be prepared by an independent evaluator, nominated by the Director General and confirmed by Council, and undertaken in consultation with the Chair or his/her nominee; regular mid-term reviews should not be required but Council may commission a mid-term review of any Commission if special circumstances require it.

There should in future be an in-depth review every six years of the role, structure, mandate and operation of each Commission, carried out according to a schedule providing for three Commissions to be reviewed during each three-year period.

The conclusions of the [above] reviews... should be reported to each succeeding session of the General Assembly.

High priority should be given to defining performance indicators and ensuring that the mission statements and objectives are drafted in terms that enable such definition.

Extracts from Resolution 19.2 of the IUCN General Assembly, Buenos Aires, 1994

1.2. Terms of reference

The terms of reference for this assignment are set out at Annex 1. They include a set of generic review categories and questions that were developed early in 2000 by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of the Secretariat, again in response to the Buenos Aires resolution. These categories and questions are meant to help lay foundations for the identification of performance areas for the Commissions and for the Union as a whole. We were asked to apply the standard questions, as far as possible, to each of the four Commissions we reviewed. In this way, IUCN hopes to lay the foundations for more systematic comparative monitoring of the Commissions over time.

1.3. Methods

Our methods in these reviews had to be adapted to the available time and resources. Statutory requirements for submission of recommendations to the World Conservation Congress (WCC) meant that the Bureau of Council would have to consider our recommendations at its meeting on 27-28 May, 2000. Arrangements for our inputs to the process were only finalised in March. This left very little time for us to review four Commissions, two of them 'in depth'. Even if we had been free to devote all the intervening eight weeks to the task, neither the Secretariat nor the Commissions had the resources to fund more than a few days' work on each Commission. Travel possibilities were similarly limited. We recommend that the next round of Commission reviews be planned further in advance, that the reviews be managed more proactively by Commissions themselves, and that adequate provision for the work be built into Commissions' budgets.

SSC was able to make some funds available for its review. Partly to use the learning opportunities provided by attendance at five days of SSC strategic planning and Executive Committee meetings in March, Stephen Turner was contracted separately to undertake the end-term review of this Commission, and produced a separate report on it (Turner, 2000). This work has fed into our overall review of the four Commissions, and is summarised in section 6 below.

Gabor Bruszt had the opportunity to attend a meeting of the Steering Committee of CEL in Bonn in April. This provided useful information and insights for our review.

Because of our limited time and resources, and because a number of generic issues arise from these reviews that are of broader importance for IUCN, we have agreed with the Bureau of Council that we will submit a single report that covers the two end-term reviews and the two 'in depth' reviews.

Given the constraints under which we were working, we adopted the following principal methods for this review:

- review of documentation supplied to us by the Commissions and the Secretariat (see Annex 3);
- face-to-face and telephonic interviews with key Secretariat staff, with the Chairs and some support staff of the four Commissions; with a limited number of Commission members (particularly members of Steering Committees) and with some other key informants (see Annex 3);
- a questionnaire (Annex 2) that was sent to members of Commission Steering Committees or Executive Committees and, in some cases, to Chairs of Specialist Groups. Only a limited response was received.

As provided for by the Buenos Aires resolution, Chairs of the four Commissions were asked to nominate individuals to work with us. CEM nominated Dr T. Larsen, with whom it was possible to hold one meeting in Oslo. CEESP nominated Dr S. Huq. We were able to work with him for two days in London, and to ask him to supply us with information and analysis on several issues pertinent to the review.

We made it clear to the Bureau and the Secretariat that we would only be able to submit a preliminary draft, indicating our main findings and recommendations, in advance of the 27-28 May Bureau meeting. That draft was also sent to the Chairs and Steering Committees of Commissions, and to staff of the Secretariat. In preparing this final report, we have taken into account the comments that we received on the draft from various quarters.

1.4. Previous and future reviews

An overall review of the IUCN Commissions was made by Gabor Bruszt and David Munro in 1993 (Munro and Bruszt, 1993). Comparison of the 1993 report with this one will indicate that many issues identified then remain important seven years later, and that a number of the 1993 recommendations, which are still valid, have yet to be acted upon.

Our participation in the 1999 External Review of IUCN (IUCN, 1999) has helped to guide and inform us in this review of the Commissions. The External Review focused mainly on programmatic issues, although it included a short chapter on the Commissions. That chapter made a number of recommendations that we believe remain valid.

We hope that this review lays a useful foundation for future, more systematic monitoring of the Commissions, and that it will help in the further specification of 'performance areas' to guide the monitoring process. While the generic questions set out in our terms of reference (Annex 1) are a useful guide, we suggest that further work be done on them to enhance their structure, content and flow. We have tried as far as possible to adapt and respond to these questions with regard to each Commission reviewed, although it has not been possible to provide a comprehensive set of answers in each case.

It is important that Commissions join with the rest of the Union in developing a more evaluative culture. The Commission review process leading up to the 2000 WCC has been rushed because only CEC and WCPA launched their own reviews in a timely manner. We hope that, in the coming quadrennium and in accordance with decisions of the Congress and Council about which Commissions should undergo mid-term, end-term or in-depth reviews, the Commissions will take more positive ownership of the review process. In the

coming quadrennium they should institute, manage and fund the reviews themselves as part of the Union's regular cycle of reviews. Similar initiatives should be expected of all other programmatic units of IUCN.

1.5. This report

This report falls into two main parts. First, we present a number of general observations and recommendations about Commissions. Amongst other things, this analysis leads us to some comments about the broader governance of the Union – a subject to which we believe IUCN will have to devote focused attention during the coming quadrennium.

Secondly, we present our observations and recommendations on each of the four Commissions that we have been asked to review.

2. General issues

2.1. The intended role and status of Commissions within the Union

The Commissions form one of the three pillars of IUCN, along with the membership and the Secretariat. They are meant to provide the knowledge and authority on which the Union's policies and activities are based. As the structures within which qualified individuals can express their commitment to IUCN's vision, Commissions are also instruments of the Union's Programme.

IUCN depends on three kinds of commitment. Members, which are institutions, express their commitment by working in support of the Union's vision and mission and, specifically, by contributing to the Union's budget. Individuals express their commitment by working for members and strengthening members' inputs to the Programme. If they are capable specialists, they can contribute by joining IUCN Commissions, whose members are expected to work on a voluntary basis.

As a core part of the Union, the Commissions are accorded an important role in its governance. Their Chairs are elected by the WCC and are answerable to it. They sit alongside representatives of the membership on the IUCN Council. In turn, the Union gives Commissions their mandates by resolutions of the World Conservation Congress. These mandates should allocate a clearly defined part of the Union's total need for knowledge to each Commission.

The Statutes and Regulations of the Union set out a standard format for the structure and procedures of Commissions and their relations with the rest of IUCN.

As approaches to conservation evolved over IUCN's early decades, and as the Union's commitment to sustainable and equitable development grew, the number and scope of the Commissions expanded. During its second quarter century, IUCN has applied the Commission concept to develop knowledge and analysis in broader, more paradigmatic fields such as ecosystems and social and economic policy. Meanwhile, although the actual number of Commissions has remained at six since the 1970s (despite various proposals to close some or to create new ones), the number of Commission members has increased substantially.

2.2. The actual role and status of Commissions within the Union

In practice, the six current Commissions deviate in various ways from the standard concept outlined above.

Some of the older Commissions – CEL, SSC and WCPA - operate much as originally envisaged, developing knowledge and analysis in clearly defined niches. But even these relatively conventional Commissions deviate from the original model in operating separate programmes. In recent years, these Commission programmes have not always been closely linked to the overall Programme of the Union – partly because the Union's own programme was not clearly defined.

WCPA focuses on operational knowledge in the management of protected nature conservation areas. It functions as an important and effective union in its own right, linking protected area managers around the world.

The other three Commissions – CEC, CEESP and CEM – have undergone several transformations over recent decades as they and the Union tried to identify clear niches and mandates in the broader areas of ecosystems, communication, education and socio-economic policy (see sections 3 and 4 and Romijn, 1999). Like the others, they have not been closely linked to the overall Programme of the Union (which has itself been difficult to define during the 1990s). Typically, they have found it harder to structure and organise their broad fields of knowledge and action – although CEC has made important progress by identifying a niche and sticking to it.

Overall, the Commissions have become a less integral part of the Union than was intended. Partly this has been because the Union and its Secretariat have not had, or have not provided, the resources needed for an effective interface with the Commissions at the Secretariat. This problem is compounded by the rapid expansion of the Secretariat into Regional Conservation Offices (RCOs) around the world.

Despite these uncertain links with the rest of the Union, Commissions retain a central role in its governance through their Chairs' seats on the Council. Here, they are meant to provide the authority base of knowledge for IUCN decision-making, and to represent the thousands of volunteer Commission members on whom the Union depends.

While some Commissions have developed a depth of structure and purpose that assures them of a certain stability over time, others have been less consistent in their direction and performance. Partly this is because of the breadth and blurred boundaries of their subject matter. Partly, it is because their lack of depth makes them more vulnerable to a universal feature of these voluntary organisations. Commissions' character, priorities and performance are strongly influenced by the personalities and the associated politics that happen to dominate them at any one time. This inevitably introduces a stochastic element into the many deviations of Commissions from the standard concept outlined above.

In general, it is clear that IUCN Commissions have become successful and effective parts of the Union where they have a clearly defined niche in which to operate, and where they have therefore been able to develop a stable, purposeful and adaptive programme over time (Holdgate, 1999, 247-248). This was recognised in resolution 18.4 of the 1990 Perth General Assembly (see box), which set out 'nine basic conditions that need to be met if Commissions are to be effective'.

...the need for Commissions to have a clear focus; to relate to a distinct constituency of users of their products, and to have a clear idea of what they are trying to achieve. The mission and objectives of each Commission must be supported wholeheartedly by the entire community that comprises its members...

Extract from Resolution 18.4 of the 18th General Assembly of IUCN, Perth, 1990

We recommend that IUCN incorporate these conditions into its generic terms of reference for future monitoring of Commissions.

In their 1993 review of the Commissions, Bruszt and Munro again emphasised the need for a clear niche and purpose (see box). The ability of Commissions to conform to such criteria depends in large degree upon the kind of professional

- 1. The most important criterion for the existence of a Commission is that it must be able to meet a clearly defined need. There must be a widespread demand for the products of its work which must be central to the mission of the Union.*
- 2. ...a Commission should be the main and preferably the only source of that which it produces. A Commission should not be a minor player in its field; if it is not a major player now, the likelihood and the cost of its becoming one should be very carefully considered.*
- 3. ...it should be possible to give its work a clear and limited focus...*
- 4. The fourth criterion is the existence of a critical mass of members with some homogeneity of interest and commitment to common objectives.*

Munro and Bruszt, 1993, 10.

and institutional environment in which they operate, and on the depth of historical experience from which they can draw.

2.3. More different than similar

The Commissions are thus more different than similar. In addition to the wide variation in their size, they differ significantly in their degree of focus, their internal structure, the character and scale of their programmatic operations, their degree of regionalisation and their relationships with the Secretariat.

This makes it difficult to review them against some standard model of what a Commission is meant to be. More fundamentally, it raises questions about whether the 'Commission' is an appropriate general instrument for marshalling knowledge and commitment among the world's experts on conservation and related issues. Furthermore, the assumption that the Commissions should all be treated the same in managerial and governance terms threatens to become dysfunctional for the Union.

At the same time, despite their deep differences, Commissions should all be expected to meet uniform standards and performance criteria with regard to relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

We shall argue that mechanisms other than Commissions are gradually becoming more appropriate in achieving the vision and mission of the Union.

2.4. The Commissions and the Union's need for knowledge

As recently restated in the Union's draft quadrennial Programme, 'IUCN's core business is generating, integrating, managing and disseminating knowledge for conservation' (IUCN, 2000, 11). Traditionally, the Commissions have been expected to provide most of this knowledge. A number of trends now challenge this expectation:

- as it increasingly acknowledges the complex interactions within ecosystems and societies that frame its conservation challenge, IUCN has a growing need for interdisciplinary knowledge services. Overall, Commissions have not proved very successful in providing interdisciplinary knowledge to the Union. They have certainly recognised the need for interdisciplinary work, and have made various efforts to develop this mode of operation. SSC's Sustainable Use Specialist Group has strengthened the Commission and the Union by providing regional information on the sustainable use of resources. WCPA has developed a number of interdisciplinary task forces and other initiatives. Despite the success of some of these efforts, Commissions' overall interdisciplinary performance has tended to be weak. Alternatives to the Commission delivery structure need to be identified for this sort of work;
- the pace of change in human knowledge is accelerating. Disciplinary boundaries are dissolving. Paradigms, concepts and approaches move in and out of focus and relevance more quickly. New technology enables ideas to be communicated and reshaped much faster. It permits groupings and alliances of scholars to form quickly and to dissolve without trace. Much of the new knowledge management that IUCN requires involves broadening knowledge. Conversely, Commissions have traditionally been associated with specialist knowledge. Commissions can embrace much of the change currently occurring in the character, structure and management of knowledge, but they are not the only or necessary instruments for IUCN in the new modes of operation that the change implies. In particular, they do not match the sort of flexibility, adaptability, impermanence and interdisciplinary character that much of IUCN's new knowledge management will require.;
- partly because of a general failure by some Commissions to deliver the needed services, and partly because Commissions were not succeeding in providing interdisciplinary inputs, the Secretariat has made increasing use of other groupings to provide knowledge and advice. With varying degrees of formality and life span, these include advisory groups and consultative networks that support specific sectors or projects within the Programme. Some are global, some

are regional or national. Some bring in expertise from more than one Commission, as well as from other sources;

- the development of IUCN's new Programme increases the demand for timely, coordinated knowledge management efforts, and creates potential and need for more interdisciplinary, joint action in this regard. The voluntary networks of the Commission system will find it difficult to cope with the more rigorous knowledge service requirements of this kind of Programme.

We believe that in future, IUCN's knowledge delivery system – of which Commissions will be only a part - will need to be Programme-driven; effectively resourced with funding and the best expertise the world has to offer; professionally managed; interdisciplinary; and routinely and thoroughly evaluated.

We anticipate that the Union will not be able to rely solely on Commissions as instruments of knowledge management over the coming decades. Where Commissions have an assured niche, reputation and role, gradual organic change may enable them to perform some of the new functions that IUCN needs.

We recommend that, for areas of knowledge in which Commissions currently lack this assured status, early action be taken to broaden the range of knowledge management formats that the Union can use. Overall, the role of Commissions as the dominant sources of the Union's knowledge will decrease.

Over time, two broad roles have emerged for specialist expertise and knowledge in relation to IUCN and its work:

- in assessing the challenges of conservation and sustainable development, and in designing and delivering a Programme that responds to these challenges, the Union (primarily the Secretariat) needs a range of focused inputs of information and advice. Commissions can provide many of these programmatic inputs, if they structure and direct their efforts accordingly. As the nature of these inputs becomes more interdisciplinary, IUCN is increasingly likely to source them from other advisory and consultative structures, which may or may not overlap with Commissions or include their members;
- at a higher level, IUCN needs expertise to play a questioning role. Partly, this is a scientific questioning: testing current assumptions, paradigms and methods, and proposing new ones. Partly, and most crucially for the global reputation and standing of the Union, this is a social, economic and political questioning: exploring and explaining the stances that IUCN should take with regard to the increasingly complex global challenges of trade, pollution, equity, underdevelopment, the socio-economic drivers of environmental degradation, etc.

Article 75 of the IUCN Statutes provides for Commissions to play a questioning role. But in practice, Commissions are less appropriate for the policy focused, 'think tank' sort of service that IUCN needs to guide it through the myriad ethical and socio-political issues that confront it at the global level. They lack the stature, the inclusiveness and the flexibility that this function requires. By their nature, they represent stability, consensus and the state of the art – not the iconoclasm, lateral thinking and fundamental challenges that also form part of scientific and political progress.

Commissions can contribute to this type of questioning. But IUCN would be unwise to restrict its questioning to that provided by its Commissions. International science and thinking are ranging too widely and evolving too fast.

We recommend that, for this sort of guidance, the Union should develop a different kind of advisory structure.

2.5. The Commissions and the Union's Programme

In recent years IUCN has been mired in existential debate about the character and purpose of its Programme. In this confusion, some Commissions went ahead with their own contributions towards the Union's mission, designing and executing their own programmes. Early in 2000, a new clarity emerged with the publication of a draft Programme for the 2001-2004 quadrennium. All the Commissions except CEESP contributed to the preparation of this Programme by submitting proposals and commenting on drafts. Although the effectiveness and impact of the new Programme are still far from assured, it does give IUCN more purpose and direction than it has recently had.

Who will implement the IUCN Programme? In recent years the Secretariat has often been accused of equating the Programme with its own activities. The new document says that the Programme will be executed by the Secretariat and the Commissions. (The role of IUCN members is less clearly specified.)

We commend CEM for its detailed response to the new Programme, in which it identifies Programme components to which it can directly or indirectly contribute. SSC timed its programme development more carefully than the Secretariat did for the Union's Programme, and therefore had its programme ready some time before the Union's one emerged. It now has to retrofit its programme to the new IUCN Programme. It is tackling this task positively. CEL's programme has traditionally been well integrated with that of the Environmental Law Centre (ELC) and we do not anticipate problems in that regard. Indeed, the CEL Steering Committee has endorsed the new IUCN Programme and expressed its active support for it.

The Chair of the SSC does not believe that there should be a 100% overlap between the Commission's activities and the IUCN Programme. He thinks a 75% overlap would be about right. We endorse this view.

We recommend that Commissions should not have their own, separately designed programmes. Instead, their programmes should comprise tasks derived from the Programme of the Union as a whole. But, while Commissions should not have their own programmes, they should have the space to be creative and flexible in identifying new work areas and tackling them (as long as this work does not conflict with key Programme areas). This is how they can generate much of the intellectual stimulus that Commissions should give the Union.

As we explained in section 2.4, much of the Commissions' work should comprise structured inputs of knowledge and analysis that are needed for specified activities in the Union's Programme. But the Commissions' dominance of this role is decreasing as other, more flexible and interdisciplinary modes of knowledge management and delivery are adopted.

In addition, some Commissions can directly execute parts of the IUCN Programme. SSC and CEL, for example, have played this role for some time. Commissions' ability to do this depends on their securing adequate resources and on their volunteer members' having the time and the motivation to make the considerable sacrifices that such work demands (section 2.7).

2.6. The Commissions and the Secretariat

Article 81 of the IUCN Regulations states that 'the Director General shall ensure that the Secretariat provides reasonable support to the work of each Commission'. In their 1993 review, Bruszt and Munro recommended that a basic level of support, to be provided to each Commission, should be 'one full time professional staff member at headquarters' (Munro and Bruszt, 1993, 10). Article 84 says that 'staff working directly for the Chair of a Commission and those working in the Secretariat in collaboration with the same Commission, shall follow a work plan agreed between the Director General and the Chair of the Commission'.

The actual levels and effectiveness of the support provided to Commissions in the Secretariat have varied according to the nature of the working relationships between the two; the resources that have been available (which have partly depended on these programmatic relationships); and the personalities involved (which have not always been compatible):

- SSC and WCPA work well with their Secretariat colleagues. The latter do not have separate programmes, but work seamlessly with the programmes of their Commissions;
- CEC has developed a useful relationship with the one Secretariat officer responsible for its sector. At that level, the integration of Secretariat and Commission programmes is productive, although the relationship between CEC and the Secretariat's Communication Division needs to be improved;
- CEL and the Environmental Law Centre have long had a particularly close relationship, working on a single environmental law programme for IUCN. Communications between the two parties are not currently optimal, however. It would appear that the ELC is not always fully informed of or involved in the initiatives of the Commission;
- For CEM, relations with the Secretariat have been more difficult. When the Commission was reborn, Secretariat staff (although already fully involved in ecosystem-specific projects on wetlands and forests), made an effort to develop a systematic relationship with it. However, this did not work. Since then, programmatic relations and communications between the two sides have been weak. Matters were not improved by the lack of a Secretariat post specifically dedicated to CEM focal point work. The Chair of CEM has used the Commission Operating Fund to employ his own support staff (section 3.2);
- CEESP does not have a productive working link with the Secretariat either. The socio-economic components of the Programme have been hard to define, and integration of the programmatic work of the Commission and the Secretariat was not achieved. Staff turnover, the uncertain structure of the social programme within the Secretariat, and poor or non-existent relations between CEESP and the Secretariat aggravated the situation.

A major failing in the current management and governance systems of the Union is that, when dysfunctional relations arise between Commissions and the Secretariat – for structural or personal reasons - there is no effective way of resolving the problem. Frictions and tensions drag on, and the Union's performance and reputation are compromised.

Overall, we find that Commissions work effectively for the Union when they have efficient Secretariat support and when Commission and Secretariat are working together on joint activities that form an agreed part of the IUCN Programme. Secretariat support is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for Commissions to succeed. The Secretariat and the Commissions should work as partners in a joint Programme effort. A further challenge is to structure Commission-Secretariat relations in a way that links the Commissions to the growing capacity of RCOs, as well as Headquarters.

However harmonious the intentions, there are bound to be practical difficulties when a Commission Chair has to work with Secretariat colleagues who are based far away in Gland (or Bonn). CEM's arrangement, where these colleagues are based in the Chair's own institution, certainly makes working relations more efficient. But there are significant disadvantages in such an arrangement. First, staff based in the Chair's institution are obviously cut off from the rest of the Secretariat (which is also a problem for the ELC in Bonn). Secondly, when the Chair changes, there are bound to be difficulties in maintaining Secretariat staff continuity. If staff are based in the Chair's office, they should be complementary to capacity in the Secretariat, rather than replace it.

It is important to distinguish Secretariat staff who support Commissions in their substantive work from staff who are employed to help Chairs with the more administrative, networking and logistical parts of their task. It clearly makes sense for these administrators to be based in the Chair's office. Occasionally, as with SSC, IUCN is fortunate enough to have the Chair's institution fund the administrator's position.

We recommend that, as the Secretariat works with each Commission to define the contributions that the Commission will make to the Programme for the new quadrennium, they agree what roles Secretariat staff will play at Headquarters and regional levels in facilitating this contribution and sharing in the professional work of the Commission.

In some cases, this may require adjustment of staff tasks and resource allocations. Additional posts may have to be created; or the job descriptions for existing posts may have to be amended to specify work to be done with and for Commissions. In all cases, developing the necessary working resources and relationships will require clear management and direction from the Director General and the Programme Coordinator.

2.7. Voluntarism and resources

IUCN continues to depend heavily on the sacrifices that volunteer members of Commissions make in order to deliver knowledge to it and to perform parts of its Programme. Voluntarism continues to be a core resource and a practical operating principle for the Union, and is still the basis for an enormous amount of practical work by Commission members. As is well known, however, voluntarism has its limits as an appropriate or feasible driver for the Union's professional work:

- fewer and fewer specialists enjoy the congruence between the work for which their institutions pay them and the work that their Commissions need them to do. Tighter funding and management regimes in institutions around the world mean that fewer and fewer Commission members do for their Commissions what their employers are paying them to do anyway;
- especially in developing countries, specialists' institutions lack the budgets to support the sort of work they would like to do for their Commissions;
- as Commissions have spread into the social sciences, they have engaged with professions where voluntary commitment is less common and/or where the institutional space and resources for voluntary action are lacking. To maintain adequate standards of living, scholars in some disciplines – especially in developing countries – must devote any spare time to income generating consultancy work rather than voluntary effort for IUCN;
- taken together, these factors reinforce the dominance of 'developed' countries in the active membership and work of IUCN Commissions (except CEC). The knowledge and commitment of experts in developing countries are under represented. This threatens the political credibility and the relevance of IUCN.

For all these reasons, there have been many calls for voluntarism to be reconsidered or qualified in the work of the Commissions. SSC has commissioned a review of voluntarism, which will be presented to its Steering Committee at the World Conservation Congress in Amman in October, 2000.

We recommend that its findings be considered carefully by the Union as a whole, as they are likely to be pertinent to at least some of the other Commissions.

To help identify a way forward, we recommend that IUCN distinguish three levels at which Commission members may work. Each has different implications for voluntarism and resourcing:

- depending on the circumstances of individual members and their Commissions, there continue to be areas of work that require no remuneration or other financial support. These are likely to include the basic, ongoing scholarship and conservation commitment that led an individual to be accepted as a Commission member in the first place; as well as general networking and debate. (Internet technology has substantially reduced the costs of such networking.) In some cases, there is still an adequate overlap between a Commission member's paid work and the tasks she/he undertakes for the Commission as part of the IUCN Programme;
- to operate effectively, Commissions must be provided with the necessary infrastructure. Much more value can be added when resources are provided for Commission members to meet and work together. Many scholars are willing to give time to Commission work if their travel and other expenses can be paid. Much existing Commission work is done on this basis. Core funds or project budgets are used to bring experts together for meetings or to support their field work. Commission Chairs play a key role in mobilising these infrastructural resources, and need

Secretariat support if they are to play this role successfully. Again, much of the Commission work supported by these infrastructural resources can contribute directly to the IUCN Programme. But, typically, it is of a broader, more informative or supportive nature. Timely delivery of specific outputs is not critical;

- in the third scenario, specific deliverables are required by specific dates in performance of precise tasks identified by the Secretariat as required for effective delivery of the IUCN Programme. (These tasks may be identified by the Commissions themselves when they have undertaken direct responsibility for execution of parts of the Programme.) This is the sort of work that many organisations contract to consultants. Too often, IUCN does the same. Instead, it should make more use of the expertise that Commission members can provide. It should contract them according to the same performance and timing criteria as commercial consultants. But it should pay them according to a globally uniform rate that is lower than that typically charged by consultants. This lower rate should recognise both the commitment that Commission members have to the vision and mission of the Union, and also the economic need that they have to maintain an adequate standard of living. SSC already has a standard policy of paying its members a sub-commercial rate when it needs to contract for consultancy services. Each Commission should also establish a development fund, to be held at headquarters. Members who wish to waive the consulting fees offered to them by IUCN can deposit them in this fund. In consultation with each other and the Secretariat, all Commissions should take steps to develop such a standard system. The Secretariat – at headquarters and at RCOs - should commit itself to giving priority to Commission members in contracting consultancy work, without compromising the quality or punctuality of the services received.

We recommend that systems be adopted for compensating Commission members for specific, targeted inputs to the Programme, according to clear global criteria and a single global standard. At the same time, the voluntary principle and the ongoing commitment of thousands of Commission volunteers should be nurtured and cherished as one of the Union’s strongest assets.

2.8. Regionalisation and globalism

By the very nature of its commitment and concerns, IUCN recognises that we live on one small planet and that global awareness and action are therefore a central part of its cause. But it also recognises the need for effective local action in pursuit of the global cause. In its Commissions, IUCN has traditionally emphasised the need for global networking. Partly this is because of the global interconnectedness of biodiversity and conservation issues. Partly it is because the highly competent specialists the Union needs are few and scattered across the continents. Partly it is because Commission members in more isolated or developing countries find the global linkages especially valuable.

However, several Commissions have regionalised their operations. This reduces the costs of some forms of networking. More significantly, it enables Commissions to undertake locally relevant and effective programme activities.

We endorse this regionalisation, provided that the global character of Commissions and of Commission membership is also affirmed and that the allocation of Commission resources to regional structures does not inhibit the performance of global functions. It remains essential for Commissions clearly to define roles and relationships for the global and regional elements of their networks, and to avoid fragmentation into small regional ‘cells’.

Local and regional operations provide another opportunity for Commissions to enhance their relevance for the Union. In some parts of the world, each Commission has only a handful of members. Yet the conservation and sustainable development challenges in these areas are immense, and the need for interdisciplinary action particularly pressing. Much can be gained if Commissions and their members can

identify joint activities in such areas in pursuit of the Union's Programme – addressing local environmental challenges from their various disciplinary perspectives.

We recommend that, as they perform these inter-Commission, interdisciplinary activities, IUCN experts should actively engage other competent professionals – recognising that Commissions are not the only way for IUCN to work with today's committed specialists.

2.9. Governance issues

2.9.1. Five links

A number of weaknesses in the governance of Commissions and the Union are likely to become more urgent problems for IUCN as it tries to streamline and focus its operations in delivering an effective Programme. Before we spell out these key governance issues, it is worth looking at the kinds of link that currently tie Commissions into the Union.

2.9.1.1. The Commission mandate

Each WCC receives a proposed mandate for each Commission. These mandates are couched in rather general terms. In practice, they allow the Commissions rather free choice of strategy, focus and mode of operation. Not surprisingly, we have found that Commission Chairs and members do not consider their activities to be determined – or sometimes even guided – by the wording of their mandates. Some senior Commission members are not even sure what their mandates say.

2.9.1.2. The Commission Chair

The WCC appoints the Chair of a Commission. The IUCN Council appoints the Steering Committee of the Commission. The Chair plays an important – in some cases a dominant – role in the direction and operations of a Commission. How influential the Chair is depends upon the strength of the Commission's institutional roots and structure. Although the character and style of the Chair are still important for deep rooted Commissions like SSC, Commissions such as CEC, CEM and CEESP depend much more heavily upon the capacity and ideas of their Chairs. The selection and appointment of the Chair do not necessarily relate to the mandate of the Commission, which may have been drafted by a Chair who leaves the Commission at the WCC that adopts the mandate (section 4.2). The process of selecting Chairs remains rather ad hoc, as IUCN has not adopted the recommendations made in this regard by its 1993 review of the Commissions (Munro and Bruszt, 1993, 14-15).

2.9.1.3. The Commission Operating Fund

The current value of this annual subvention to Commissions ranges from CHF 150,000 to CHF 250,000. Its significance in the financial affairs of Commissions ranges much more widely. It is a fraction of the total budgets of some Commissions, which are able to use the COF for its intended purpose of administrative, general networking and logistical costs while using funds raised elsewhere to execute their programmes. For others, the COF represents almost all the resources at their disposal – not counting the substantial monetary value of their members' voluntary work inputs. These Commissions' activities are correspondingly constrained.

2.9.1.4. Commission reports to Council

Each Commission Chair submits an annual report to the IUCN Council. These are not detailed documents. Even so, Council usually fails to give them careful attention. They are not effective instruments in the governance, monitoring or oversight of the Commissions or in communication between the Commissions and the rest of the Union.

2.9.1.5. Reviews of the Commissions

Having adopted the recommendations of the 1993 review of Commissions in this regard, the WCC now requires a cycle of end-term and more detailed reviews of the Commissions, to which the current exercise is

contributing (section 1.1). Sometimes these reviews are voluminous and detailed, which is likely to limit their interest to those in the Secretariat and the Commissions who are most intimately associated with their work. In most cases, such reviews are retrospective in nature and may only be used by the WCC in reviewing the proposed Commission mandates for the following period.

In launching the current review exercise, IUCN has taken its first steps towards developing a more systematic and thorough evaluative culture for the Commissions and the rest of the Union. As is indicated in our terms of reference (Annex 1), it hopes to adopt a more systematic and comparative approach over time and across Commissions and all operating units of the Union, through the use of a generic set of evaluation points that facilitate such comparison.

We recommend that, for this to happen:

- **the performance areas be further refined. As can be seen in Annex 1, they are not yet ideally structured or worded, although they represent a much needed beginning;**
- **as we have argued above, more effective governance arrangements be made for reviews of Commissions to feed into decision making about their structure, plans and operations. Unless these changes are made, even the most professional of monitoring and evaluation systems for the Commissions will not make much difference to their performance or their support to the rest of the Union.**

2.9.1.6. The weakness of the links

It can be seen that, although these various governance links do join the Commissions to the rest of the Union, they tend to be weak and ineffective. Fundamentally, these voluntary networks are what their Chairs and Steering Committees decide they should be. When there is a good fit between what these people decide and what the broader Union is trying to do, they are an asset – sometimes a leading asset – for IUCN. Where there is less of a match, or where their activities are poorly coordinated or of dubious quality, they become insignificant parts of the Union. Sometimes, they can become a significant liability.

2.9.2. Governance of Commissions and governance of the Union

The Statutes and Regulations of IUCN set out the delicate structural arrangements that permit Commissions to be statutory bodies of the Union that participate in its governance and deliver services to it but are at the same time largely autonomous.

This autonomy is reflected in the status of Commission Chairs, who are elected officers of the Union and members of its Council. The Statutes and Regulations authorise the Chair to appoint the members of the Commission, to act in the name of the Commission, to lead its work, to raise and manage funds for it, to authorise expenditure for its activities and to account properly for its financial affairs. The Chairs are thus elected executive officers of the Union, responsible for the appropriate and accountable work of the Commissions.

As Article 73 of the Statutes stipulates, the Commissions are meant to serve the other parts of IUCN by delivering knowledge that assures the quality of its Programme. As this and other Commission reviews show, problems often arise and this mandatory role is not satisfactorily fulfilled. What does the Union do then? How are such problems assessed? To whom are Commissions accountable? Who has the capacity and the authority to assess Commissions' performance in the context of the Union's Programme and mission? Who takes the initiative when things go wrong?

The Director General (DG), who is not a member of the Council, is the chief executive of the Union. She is responsible for the execution of the Union's Programme, which of course includes the contributions of the Commissions. She is responsible for the finances and accounting of the Union, and must coordinate the work of the Secretariat with that of the rest of IUCN. But the responsibility and authority of the DG with regard to the Commissions is not clear. Is she accountable for Commissions' performance with regard to the

Programme? Is she responsible for the finances and auditing of the Commissions? Is she supposed to coordinate the Commissions' work?

Commission Chairs clearly answer these questions in the negative. From the Secretariat perspective, a DG is unlikely to wish to extend an already full work load to include supervision of the Commissions. But, in the interests of good governance, it is important that the relationships and the question of Commissions' accountability be clarified.

According to the Statutes, the only organ of the Union that can exercise any practical control over the many functions of the Commissions is the Council. But the Council lacks the structure and the capacity to exercise this sort of governance role. Moreover, the special status of Commission Chairs as members of Council sets up obvious potential for conflicts of interest. This cannot be regarded as good governance, as the 1993 review of the Commissions pointed out when it recommended that Chairs' voting rights in Council be restricted with regard to decisions about Commissions (Munro and Bruszt, 1993, 14). That recommendation has not been adopted.

We recommend that the status and governance of Commissions within the Union should be carefully examined, as part of a broader effort to review and modernise the governance of IUCN and redress the growing number of inadequacies in the current arrangements.

Although the 1999 IUCN External Review's recommendation that the interval between WCCs be extended was made for good reasons, that period is too long to leave Commissions to their own devices. Even a triennium would be too long a gap between the only governance events in the lives of the Commissions. If serious problems arise in a Commission, the rest of the Union cannot leave them unsolved for two or three years until the next WCC.

A notable weakness at present is the apparent inability of the Union's leadership structures to address problems of poor communications or working relationships between Commissions and the Secretariat. If a Chair and the corresponding Secretariat staff fail to operate a successful working relationship, there seems to be little that anyone can or will do about it. Years of dysfunctional relations can result. There is an urgent need for the Director General and the Council to find ways of identifying and redressing such problems.

We recommend that the authority of the Council over the Commissions should be reinforced. Council should be empowered to take decisions about Commissions that are at present the prerogative of the WCC. The role of the DG in this regard, as the executive agent of the Council, should be assessed.

We recommend in this review that IUCN give more thorough, high level, professional attention to the growing number of global socio-political issues that affect its vision and mission (section 4.3). We urge that the necessary review and action be coordinated by the Policy Committee of Council. This means that the governance of the Union must link more actively into the monitoring and direction of its conservation and development work. Most immediately, it means that the Policy Committee should be reinforced and committed to playing this crucial role in maintaining the international credibility of the Union.

The 1999 External Review of IUCN gave strongest emphasis to the problems then surrounding the Union's programme. Good progress has been made since then in addressing those problems. However, in the light of the changing operating structure of the Union, that review also pointed out several important issues regarding the governance of IUCN.

Although the current review is restricted to four of the Commissions, our work on this subject has led us to recommend that a deep reappraisal of the governance of the whole Union, including the Commissions, may now be an important priority.

2.10. Financial issues

The voluntary commitment and efforts of Commission members remain an enormous asset to IUCN. But, as we point out in section 2.7, they cannot be properly used if resources are not provided for the infrastructure that the Commissions need in working with their members. We also envisage that knowledge delivery by the Commissions to the Programme should take place through specifically designed delivery mechanisms that will often include monetary compensation to Commission members according to a uniform system. These arrangements for infrastructure and sub-economic remuneration will have a major leverage effect in the context of Commission voluntarism. Fuelling such clearly defined and targeted Commission involvement in the delivery of the Programme will be a highly profitable investment for IUCN.

The Commissions basically have two sources of finance: the Commission Operating Fund (COF), and the resources that they raise themselves from elsewhere. It is unrealistic to expect any early increase in the COF. The only available strategy is for Commissions to intensify their own fund raising efforts. This approach was strongly endorsed by the recent reviews of CEC and WCPA. The potential for Commissions to raise money for activities that are specifically targeted to support the Union's programme is high, provided that the Secretariat provides the necessary technical support.

However, our discussions with Commission Chairs and members suggest that, instead of supporting such Commission fund raising initiatives, the Secretariat has viewed them as competing with its own ambitions. Proposals for joint fund raising have been rejected or ignored.

This must change. We recommend that Commissions and the Secretariat develop a joint fund raising strategy that recognises their respective needs and contributions.

Commissions' contribution to the delivery of the IUCN Programme should also benefit from the resources that are allocated within the Programme itself. At both Headquarters and RCO levels, knowledge support to Programme activities should be planned in active consultation between the Secretariat and the relevant Commissions, including the latter's regional representatives. In a growing number of cases, of course, the Programme's knowledge support requirements will exceed available Commission capacity, and more extensive, interdisciplinary delivery mechanisms will be more appropriate (section 2.4).

However, we recommend that the Secretariat make it standard practice to assess the availability and suitability of Commission members for the provision of the required services, and give priority to their engagement over the contracting of commercial consultants.

In widely varying degrees, all the Commissions have managed to raise funds or other resources in direct support of their activities. Sometimes these funds have been contracted and channelled through institutions associated with the Commission – typically, the institution where the Chair is based – and have been administered directly by the Commission. Such arrangements are practical and preferable for funding agencies, which like to keep their audit lines short.

However, we recommend that Commissions always communicate such funding arrangements to the Secretariat. Transparency in this regard will be a vital component of joint funding strategies.

In a world where voluntary contributions are harder and harder to mobilise and where competition for scarce resources is intensifying, the financing of operating infrastructure for Commissions and of compensation for some services by Commission members is a major challenge for IUCN. Coordination and harmonisation of fund raising and financial administration by the Secretariat and the Commissions are therefore essential.

3. The Commission on Ecosystem Management

3.1. Background

The Commission on Ecology was established in 1954 and was responsible for many IUCN achievements in the following two decades. But even in the 1950s, there were concerns about the breadth of its efforts and about overlap with the work of the predecessors of the SSC and WCPA. In later years the Commission lost its way. Many of the thematic groups that worked in the Union on specific ecosystems loosened their ties with it. '[The] very breadth of COE may help to explain why it went into decline when its most conservation-oriented spearheads became attached to the lances of other voluntary networks as IUCN evolved' (Holdgate, 1999, 68).

By the time of their 1993 review of the Commissions, Bruszt and Munro found that 'during recent years the Commission on Ecology has had difficulty in defining a role and specific tasks for itself that are appropriate to the circumstances of the times and in establishing productive relationships with other Commissions' (Munro and Bruszt, 1993, 20). They recommended its abolition. But the 1994 General Assembly at Buenos Aires rejected such a radical move. Delegates argued 'that ecology was so fundamental to the Union that a Commission *must* be retained' (Holdgate, 1999, 221). Instead, the General Assembly established a new Commission on Ecosystem Management, whose mandate was to be defined within one year. Council later stated that CEM should 'provide expert guidance on integrated approaches to the management of natural and modified ecosystems, to further the IUCN mission' (IUCN, 1996).

The objectives and strategic plan of the CEM were elaborated during 1994-95 and resulted in a 1996 WCC mandate for the 1997-99 triennium that focused on support to the ecosystem management components of the Union's Programme. A number of global themes were quoted in the mandate as having priority for the Commission's work. They included the development of participatory methods of ecosystem management; ecological economics; and dryland degradation. In practice, the Commission has focused on the elaboration and promotion of the 'ecosystem approach' as a framework within which these other themes could be tackled.

The history of IUCN's use of Commissions to address the concept of ecosystems and the practice of ecology is thus tied closely to the issue of niche definition that we outlined in section 2.2 above. It highlights a specific aspect of this issue. Can focus on a concept or paradigm constitute a workable niche for an IUCN Commission?

3.2. Performance

CEM has been effective in achieving its objectives and in fulfilling the core of its mandate. It has made useful progress in elaborating and promoting the ecosystem approach, for example through the agreement and publication of the 1996 Sibthorp and 1998 Malawi definitions and principles of the approach (Maltby *et al.*, 1999). This has helped governments and environmental agencies to sharpen their understanding and their practice of ecosystem management, as indicated by the May 2000 submission of a CEM-inspired statement on the ecosystem approach to the Fifth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. This is likely to have beneficial long-term consequences for achievement of the Convention's objectives. But, as we shall argue in section 3.3 below, these achievements may bring the continuing need for the Commission into question.

CEM has been able to collaborate with the Secretariat on certain specific initiatives, such as the tenth and 13th Global Biodiversity Forums and the recent preparation of policy recommendations on the ecosystem approach for the CBD. Overall, however, it has had major difficulties in working productively with the Secretariat. As explained in section 2.6, Secretariat staff tried to develop a systematic working relationship with the Commission. These efforts were unsuccessful. With the approval of the CEM Steering Committee, the Chair then arranged to use a substantial part of the Commission Operating Fund to pay the salaries of two

support staff. These staff were posted within the Chair's institution, which pays the overheads for their positions.

CEM has operated within budget, but has had only modest success in raising additional funds for its operations. Some money has recently been raised from a number of sources to fund three regional 'pathfinder workshops' on the ecosystem approach during 2000.

Overall, the interface between CEM, the Secretariat and the IUCN Programme over the last triennium has been limited and inefficient. The CEM web site, accessed through a link from the IUCN site, consists mainly of material dated 1998. Partly because of CEM's paradigmatic focus on the ecosystem approach, and partly because of its difficult working relations with the Secretariat, CEM has made little detailed input to the ecosystem-specific areas of the Union's work. CEM did play a leading role in stimulating the inter-Commission meeting held in Montreal in January 2000. That meeting, attended by all the Commissions except CEESP, laid important ground for the interdisciplinary collaboration between Commissions that must be a growing part of these bodies' future if they are to retain their relevance for the Union.

The leadership and management of CEM have operated according to the conventional format and practices of IUCN Commissions. However, membership of the Commission has remained comparatively limited, particularly in some regions. We endorse the Chair's view that there is no point in CEM growing for the sake of numbers. He correctly argues that CEM, as a small, young body, cannot compete with larger, better established professional networks in the ecosystem field. But we also concur with those who say that greater care should be taken to ensure global representation in the Commission's membership and Steering Committee. Specialists in the field have also informed us that the Commission needs to do more to attract the highest international ecosystems expertise into its ranks. Only a small fraction of the current membership are truly active, and we have the impression that much of the Commission's core output is the work of only a handful of people.

At the end of its first substantive term, CEM's achievements are modest but significant. The brevity of a succession of documents on the ecosystem approach conceals the lengthy effort that went into their preparation and adoption by the various international bodies that have now approved them. The Commission has developed a limited number of specialist groups, notably those on tropical peatlands (Safford and Maltby, 1998) and Sahelian floodplains. The former has helped develop the Global Action Plan for Peatlands. The latter has produced a manual and guidelines on the sustainable management of Sahelian floodplains. CEM's intention to develop a red listing process for ecosystems was less successful, but the Commission is now collaborating in the Millennium Assessment of Global Ecosystems (MAGE) that is coordinated by the World Resources Institute. It also continues to promote the concept of an Ecosystem Management Information System that would be a major IUCN input to MAGE.

3.3. IUCN and ecosystems: the rationale for CEM

Having offered an outline assessment of CEM's performance over the last triennium, we return to the basic question of how IUCN should adopt and promote the ecosystem approach. For those of us who are not ecologists, but who have some insight into biodiversity and conservation issues, this is a difficult question to unravel. At first sight the ecosystem approach seems almost intuitive. Much of its content appears to be the accepted wisdom in IUCN and other conservation and sustainable development agencies. The basic principles of the approach do not seem to be significantly different from those of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Nevertheless, CEM has worked hard over the last three years to specify the ecosystem approach more precisely and to promote the adoption of this more precise formulation at various key points in the biodiversity world – most notably at the fifth CBD Conference of the Parties in May 2000. The current Chair argues that more needs to be done to promote the concept and to elaborate its implications for biodiversity practice at the regional and local levels.

In general, we have found that CEM is praised for its achievements with regard to the ecosystem approach. A useful job has been done, and in the process this young Commission has built itself a respectable, if modest, profile.

Meanwhile, a more focused sort of ecosystem work has been going on within and beyond the Commission. A variety of professional groupings work on specific ecosystems or ecosystem themes, such as forests, wetlands and tropical peatlands. Some of these, such as the first two just mentioned, were established to support the Secretariat with guidance on key programmes of the Union. Others, such as the peatlands group, have emerged within CEM and reflect the interests and commitments of its members. Most of these groups are interdisciplinary, combining natural and social science specialists. Some of their members belong to CEM, or other Commissions. These groups also link the more academic areas of scholarship with the more practical fields of conservation and sustainable development. They generally reflect the newer kind of technical groupings that we have identified as leading the future of the Union's relations with knowledge (section 2.4). None of them needs to operate within a Commission in order to prosper.

As IUCN steps into the new millennium, ecosystems continue to be the air that it breathes. The effective management and restoration of ecosystems is Key Result Area 1 of the new quadrennial Programme, and is a recurring theme in most of the other KRAs. Ecosystem management dominates the content of the Union's current projects around the world. SSC makes increasing reference to ecosystems. Its vision and goal, as proposed to the forthcoming WCC, both refer to conserving the biodiversity of ecosystems. WCPA continues to specialise in a particular kind of ecosystem management. The question, therefore, is whether the Union needs to maintain a Commission on ecosystems, ecosystem management or the ecosystem approach – particularly when that Commission has focused on the last topic with much less reference to other areas of general ecology or to specific ecosystems.

With the limited time and technical insight that we are able to apply in this review, we can only offer a qualified answer to this question. We have acknowledged (in section 2.4 above) that IUCN needs specialists and their expertise to play a questioning role, testing and developing paradigms. We believe that a paradigm can form an appropriate niche for a Commission – but only as long as there is meaningful value to be added in specifying and promoting that paradigm. In the case of CEM and the ecosystem approach, we suspect that much of the value has already been added, and that this role for this Commission may only have a limited life span ahead of it – although, as we explain in section 3.4 below, there is important practical work to be done during the remaining period. What is certainly clear is that the Commission is not needed for the focused, interdisciplinary delivery of knowledge on various ecosystems to the many points in the IUCN Programme that require such inputs. These inputs will be organised in other formats and delivered through other mechanisms.

3.4. Building on achievements

In the few years since it received its mandate in Montreal, CEM has made commendable progress, most notably through its useful contribution in elaborating and promoting the ecosystem approach. But, on the basis of the analysis just outlined above, we recommend that the Union and the Commission consider carefully how best to build on these achievements. They should keep in mind that the best way forward might be to step on from those achievements into a different way of working.

As we have noted, CEM has made a careful and positive response to the draft IUCN Programme for the new quadrennium. It proposes that 'CEM should be a lead or lead Commission partner with WCPA in Key Result Area 1, *Effective management and restoration of ecosystems*' (CEM, 2000, 2). It gives a detailed tabulation of the results in this and other KRAs where it feels it can make the most useful contribution.

We do not believe that a Commission can play an effective role in the sort of detailed, interdisciplinary knowledge delivery that the new Programme's work in different ecosystems will require (section 2.4) – although CEM can certainly suggest names for the various advisory structures that will be needed. Where CEM may still have a substantive role is in the further specification and elaboration of the ecosystem approach, and particularly in the practical piloting of this approach in the Union's field projects.

In other words, we recommend that CEM maintain its focus at the paradigmatic level of operations (section 2.4). It should seek multiple contacts with the advisory groups and task teams that support IUCN's work on specific ecosystems. It should explore means of demonstrating the practical value of the ecosystem approach in selected field projects

that are identified within the quadrennial Programme. This, broadly, is what CEM has itself proposed to the forthcoming WCC as its mandate for the next four years.

We also recommend that IUCN intensify its use of other ecosystem-related knowledge networks, such as advisory groups and task forces, for the more detailed, interdisciplinary knowledge delivery that the new Programme will require. This more focused ecosystem work should complement the paradigmatic contribution made by CEM.

We argue elsewhere in this review that the period between Congresses is too long for IUCN to leave Commissions to their own devices; and that the governance arrangements need to be revised to permit a closer and more frequent integration of the Commissions' affairs with those of the rest of the Union. This is particularly true in a case like CEM, where the value of the current mandate may not extend for another four years. Recognising that the WCC may introduce various changes to the current draft CEM mandate, we endorse the ideas that it contains - although we doubt whether priority (4), on achieving a regionally-based understanding of ecosystem status and the nature of management strategies, is appropriate or feasible in the light of our recommendations about the future of the Commission. Nor is priority (5), about leading IUCN in interdisciplinary approaches to conservation, an appropriate role for CEM.

We recommend that, while CEM should proceed with its proposed mandate at the paradigmatic level of the ecosystem approach, Council should commission a mid-term review of CEM in two years' time (in accordance with Resolution 19.2 of the Buenos Aires General Assembly). This review should consider more closely the questions that we have raised here about the continuing need for a Commission to operate at the paradigmatic level with regard to ecosystems or the ecosystem approach. It should assess, *inter alia*, whether any of the following options would then form an appropriate course of action for the Union:

- **replacing CEM with a senior advisory group on optimising IUCN operations with regard to ecosystems and the ecosystem approach (see our similar recommendation on the social sciences in section 4.5.1 below). Such an advisory group would report to the Programme Coordinator. A variant of this option would be for IUCN to develop strategic alliances with two or three key institutions that function as global centres of excellence on ecosystem management;**
- **absorbing the mandate and operations of CEM into those of SSC – which, as we have already pointed out, is increasingly committed to an ecosystem focus in its biodiversity assessments and action programmes;**
- **providing CEM with a reinforced, focused mandate that justifies and specifies its continuing value for the Union, in terms of participation in and support for the IUCN Programme. To recommend this, the review would need to satisfy itself and IUCN that CEM remains able to attract the top scientists in its field; and that it can broaden its membership to give adequate representation to all the IUCN regions.**

We further recommend that Council propose a resolution to the forthcoming WCC that, for the coming quadrennium, makes CEM a provisional Commission and thereby delegates to the Council the powers of the Congress (in terms of Article 74 of the Statutes) with regard to the potential abolition of CEM or amendment of its mandate. This should permit immediate implementation of the recommendations of a mid-term review of CEM.

4. The Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy

4.1. Background

Over the years, IUCN has had a range of Commissions in the social science field. These have focused primarily on planning and policy issues, with particular emphasis on the Union's growing commitment to sustainable development. The Commission on Environmental Planning was succeeded by the Commission on Sustainable Development, which in turn became the Commission on Environmental Strategy and Planning. This was transformed into the Commission on Economic, Environmental and Social Policy at the WCC in Montreal in 1996. Members felt that the previous emphasis on planning had become less appropriate to contemporary concerns with participatory approaches, and felt that 'the new title underscores the importance of economic and social sciences in the conservation agenda...' (Banuri, 2000, 1).

Despite IUCN's long standing recognition of the centrality of social and economic policy concerns to its vision and mission, the history of its Commissions in this field is one of instability, shifting mandates and uncertain performance. We believe that this typifies IUCN's experience with Commissions that lack a clear niche. However important their subject matter, they cannot take root, achieve stable direction or perform convincingly if their mandates range across too many fields and sectors.

4.2. Performance

In this section, within the constraints of available time and information, we attempt a response to some of the specific questions asked by our terms of reference (Annex 1) about each Commission.

Overall, CEESP has not been effective in meeting its objectives. It has not interacted usefully with the rest of the Union, partly because the Secretariat was not structured or resourced to facilitate such contacts and partly because its own outreach has been more to like-minded scholars than to other parts of IUCN. In some sectors of its work – for example, on governance, ethics, collaborative management and climate change, it has stimulated high quality scholarship and debate. Albeit on a small scale, this work has been well received in many parts of the world – especially in developing countries, as the warm reception for CEESP's *Policy Matters* newsletter has demonstrated. The Commission established Regional Policy Networks in South Asia and Central America (and, more recently, in West Africa), although we have not seen any substantive reports on their activities. CEESP operates a comprehensive and well-designed web site. But there has been little impact on the broader activities of the Union, and the Commission's work is unlikely to have long term consequences inside or outside IUCN.

As we argue throughout this review, the limited value of CEESP for the broader mission of IUCN is linked to the fact that the rationale for a Commission of this nature is not sound. CEESP has addressed a number of socio-economic concerns that are vitally important for IUCN and its global policy positions, and many stakeholders inside and outside IUCN recognise the centrality of these concerns. But to tackle them through a Commission structure is an ineffective way to proceed.

CEESP has had little success in raising other money than the annual CHF 150,000 Commission Operating Fund it receives from Headquarters. Partly this is because it is a new Commission, lacking an established reputation. More fundamentally, it is because the style and content of its operations – discussions and documents on broad socio-economic issues – appear insufficiently practical to funding agencies. More resources would be forthcoming for this sort of work if it were more explicitly tied to the practical outputs of the IUCN Programme.

In the planning for its past triennium, CEESP experienced a disconnect that periodically afflicts IUCN Commissions, especially those with shallower roots. Its mandate was prepared under a Chair who was replaced by the WCC that endorsed it. Not surprisingly, the new Chair and Steering Committee chose their own working directions. These were briefly set out in a draft document dated August 1997 that emphasised the roles to be played by six Working Groups (CEESP, 1997). A number of these Working Groups later set out more detailed working plans. In practice, the Commission and the Working Groups have undertaken

varying amounts of work – in some cases very little – without following the original plans closely. No formal triennial or annual work plans exist against which progress or delivery can be monitored, and the Commission has undertaken no such monitoring of its own.

Overall, CEESP has had little impact on the broader IUCN membership. Its relations with the IUCN Secretariat have been poor, and it has had little or no impact on the Secretariat's policies and practices. While some of its work has been of good professional standard and has been well received by those who have seen it, CEESP has had little overall impact on its field of endeavour. It has had few relations with donor agencies, and has had no influence on the relationship between donors and IUCN.

4.3. IUCN and social science

IUCN's experience with its social science Commissions highlights a long-standing problem: how its natural science and conservation professionals interact with the social sciences. There have been many personal successes in this regard among IUCN workers, and the Union's achievements in the field of sustainable development suggest that the organisation as a whole can convincingly integrate these two areas of scholarship and practice. Yet resistance to social concerns within IUCN is an undeniable part of its history. Social scientists in the Commissions and in the Secretariat have often perceived this resistance and ascribed some of their operational difficulties to it.

Related to these concerns are the continuing fears in some parts of IUCN's constituency – especially in developing countries – that the Union's stance on issues of poverty and global equity damages its credibility. 'Neutral' positions on the growing range of urgent issues in global environmental and development politics are often interpreted as conservatism: an institutional compulsion to tilt the balance of conservation and development in favour of the former. Many of these concerned voices argue that a strong socio-economic Commission is needed to guide the Union in directions more sympathetic to the world's poor.

By its very nature, the sort of social science that IUCN needs to use is likely to be interdisciplinary. Some of it will also address issues that, by their nature, are contentious and subjective. These features do not match easily with the strengths and style of Commission structure and operations. As it steps into the new millennium, the Union needs two kinds of social science support:

- focused input, typically drawing on an interdisciplinary range of sources and skills, that delivers knowledge to specified elements of the IUCN Programme. The many points at which the new quadrennial Programme will require such input are clearly identifiable in the document, notably in Key Result Areas 1,2,3,4 and 5;
- strategic advice on global socio-economic issues, delivered to the policy level of the Union to help it adopt progressive stances that integrate conservation with equitable development. This is the questioning role that IUCN needs scholars and their expertise to perform, as we argued in section 2.4 above.

Overall, IUCN's need for social science expertise and guidance is greater than ever before. In recent years, despite its achievements in promoting the concept of sustainable development, it has tended to marginalise the social sciences in Commissions with which the rest of the Union has had insufficient contact; and to fragment its headquarters capacity in a variety of unconvincing dispositions of staff. Meanwhile, the rapidly expanding RCO programmes have moved ahead with the integration of social and conservation sciences, and have employed a growing number of social science professionals.

There may be a tendency at IUCN Headquarters to feel that the awkward social sciences need to be tidied up so that the Union can get on with its business.

We recommend a much stronger commitment to social science expertise and delivery as a paramount feature of the new Programme and character of IUCN. If IUCN does not give higher and more effective priority to socio economic concerns and skills in all its operations, it will be relegated to the sidelines of international conservation and development effort.

4.4. Commissions and social science

In many ways, CEESP and its predecessors have been expected to serve as IUCN's Commission for the social sciences. That is analogous to having an IUCN Commission for the natural sciences. While cross-cutting, multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary work are essential for the Union's progress, the experience in the social sciences suggests that Commissions are not the best way to achieve this. For the variety of reasons to which we have alluded above, IUCN has never had sustainable success with a social science Commission. Nothing is likely to change this structural mismatch between what the Union needs and what a Commission can offer.

At both the levels of social science support identified above, contributions need to come from institutional sources as well as from individuals. Conventional Commissions, of course, only offer scope for contributions by individuals. CEESP has experimented with an institutional networking format. It set up collaboration with the RING (Regional and International Networking Group), a global alliance of research and policy organisations committed to sustainable development. (Most of these organisations are IUCN members.) There was useful collaboration and resource sharing between CEESP and the RING in publication of the CEESP newsletter *Policy Matters*, and a number of other joint initiatives were undertaken. But these activities have been limited by a lack of funds, and they have had little impact on the rest of IUCN. Although this has been a useful initiative, the CEESP-RING collaboration does not suggest that Commissions are a feasible vehicle for developing joint ventures and networks with institutional partners.

4.5. Enhancing the provision of social science expertise and guidance to the Union

4.5.1. Provision

We have argued that IUCN's need for social science expertise and guidance is greater than ever before; and that the Commission concept does not provide an effective means of meeting this need.

To resolve this urgent problem, we do not recommend renewal of the mandate of CEESP. Instead, we recommend that social science expertise be deployed in a number of interdisciplinary advisory groups, task forces or similarly focused structures that address particular results, or combinations of results, in the IUCN Programme.

Delivery of these advisory services may take place at RCOs, at Headquarters, or both. Some of these groups, for example the advisory group on forests, already exist and include social science capacity that may or may not need to be reinforced. Some groups may only be needed for a year or two. Others are likely to persist for a decade or more. To launch and maintain this arrangement, it will be necessary to map out the social science knowledge needs of each Programme component and to determine what mechanisms can best meet these needs. Clear leadership and direction will be needed if these groups are to be appropriately defined, efficiently formed and vigorously operated. These guiding roles should be played by the senior applied social scientist whose appointment we recommend in section 4.5.2 below.

We further recommend that social science guidance be provided at the highest policy levels in the Union, with regard to the Union's stand on major socio-economic issues related to conservation. This guidance should be provided through a senior advisory group on social and economic policy. This group should report to the Council.

Although we do not feel that continuing CEESP is the best way forward, we urge the Union to be aware of the good work done by some CEESP members and Working Groups over the past triennium (for example, in the fields of governance, climate change and collaborative management). As soon as possible after the Amman WCC, outgoing members of the Commission and Chairs of the CEESP Working Groups should be approached for discussions about the contributions they could make at either of the levels proposed above.

4.5.2. Facilitation

Putting these recommendations into practice will require purposeful action at several levels in the Union.

We recommend that a senior applied social scientist of international standing and proven management ability in the conservation or environmental fields be appointed to the Secretariat in Gland. This person should report directly to the Director-General, but operate in close collaboration with the Programme Coordinator. She/he would have two roles:

- **to facilitate and promote optimum use of the resources of IUCN Commissions in delivering knowledge to the Programme. This will include promotion of inter-Commission cooperation;**
- **to facilitate the formation and promote the optimum use of interdisciplinary advisory groupings that maximise the input of appropriate social science knowledge to the Programme.**

It may take many months before this post can be created, funded and filled. In the interim, effort in the above two areas should be promoted by the Programme Coordinator in consultation with the Director General. An early priority in this regard will be liaison with outgoing CEESP members and Working Group Chairs, as proposed in section 4.5.1 above.

4.5.3. Use

Even if the above recommendations on two levels of social science guidance to the Union are put into effect, IUCN is not well equipped to profit from the knowledge and advice it will receive.

Although they fall outside our immediate terms of reference, we recommend two initiatives that we believe are urgently needed:

- **Secretariat capacity for coordinating the socio-economic elements of the Programme should be restructured and reinforced under the leadership of the senior social scientist proposed in section 4.5.2 above. The terms of reference of the current Social Policy Division need to be reconsidered in the light of the new Programme's need for effective social science knowledge and policy guidance within a framework of interdisciplinary advisory structures. The current laudable work on environmental economics is being linked into a Web-based network that serves as a useful forerunner of the kind of flexible networking and joint action that the Union's new Programme will require. But it, too, will need to be reappraised and repositioned for optimal support to the new Programme;**
- **high level strategic advice to the Council on socio economic policy issues will need to be converted into a range of actions by the Union. The advice is likely to be ineffective if the Policy Committee is not reinforced to this end. Council will have to provide firm leadership in this regard. If this is not done, IUCN's international stance on these policy issues will remain unconvincing, especially to the peoples of developing countries.**

5. The Commission on Environmental Law

5.1. Background

The Commission on Environmental Law has its roots in the formation of an IUCN Committee on Legislation in 1960, which led to the establishment of the Commission on Environmental Policy, Law and Administration in 1968. For many years it has worked in close integration with the Union's Environmental Law Centre (ELC), a part of the Secretariat that is located in Bonn. The progress made by the Commission and the Centre over the years in implementing the IUCN Environmental Law Programme has been due in large part to the efforts and dedication of Wolfgang and Francoise Burhenne as Chair of CEL and Director of

the ELC respectively. Their partnership played a critical role in the successful integration of the voluntary network of the Commission and the resources of the Secretariat. Their successors have continued to build effectively on these foundations.

When it started, CEL represented a unique association of young specialists in the emerging field of environmental law. It succeeded in attracting the most capable professionals in the field, and established a reputation for excellence that it has been able to maintain. At least as important has been its ability to sustain a focus on a niche whose continuing relevance has been repeatedly proven by the Commission's role in developing international agreements on conservation and sustainable development. Although many other environmental law agencies have been established over the years, CEL has maintained its leading position – while actively promoting networking and further development among this growing family of institutions.

CEL presents itself now as 'a network of environmental law and policy experts from all regions of the world who volunteer their knowledge and services to IUCN activities, especially to those of the IUCN Law Programme. CEL functions as an integral part of the IUCN Environmental Law Programme, which consists of the Commission and the Environmental Law Centre.'

5.2. Rationale

We argue in this review that the principal rationale for Commissions' existence within IUCN must be their ability to focus on a niche within which they can deliver relevant knowledge in support of the Union's Programme. CEL has been able to maintain a rationale of this nature and to perform accordingly. Its 1996 mandate provides for maximum integration between the work of the Commission and the IUCN Programme. Through joint planning, complementarity between the work plans of CEL and the ELC is assured. CEL members participate in many Programme activities, notably by advising governments and the secretariats of international agreements on legal aspects of conservation and sustainable development. Unlike some other parts of the IUCN Secretariat, the ELC draws on Commission members for all aspects of its work. A data base that codifies the different skills and expertise of members facilitates their deployment to relevant parts of the Programme.

5.3. Performance

CEL has been largely effective in achieving its objectives and fulfilling its mandate. One significant achievement has been the development and maintenance of unique environmental law databases: the Environmental Law Information System and ECOLEX. CEL cooperates with other networks and institutions to optimise data input and access to these systems. ECOLEX, which was developed and is operated in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme, has become an invaluable asset for environmental lawyers around the world. More generally, CEL's collaboration with UNEP has proved fruitful for both agencies. They have developed a symbiotic relationship which benefits both IUCN and the broader cause of conservation.

In close collaboration with the ELC, CEL is extending its environmental law network, its competence and its capacity. It is doing this in two main ways:

- first, the Commission has substantially expanded its regional membership. This is not done uncritically. CEL is sharpening its member selection criteria and reviewing its procedures for assessing and renewing members;
- secondly, CEL has entered into cooperation agreements with a number of 'Centres of Excellence' around the world. The development of these centres has been a major field of effort for the CEL over the past triennium. The commission contributed to the creation of the Asia Pacific Centre of Environmental Law, which is now an important player in the sector in that region. It established cooperation with the Moscow Institute for Environmental Law. Through an Asian Development Bank funded Programme for Promoting Environmental Law in China, CEL and the ELC entered into a cooperation agreement with the Research Institute for Environmental Law at the University of Wuhan in China. At present, CEL is working with the University of Kuwait to establish a Centre of

Excellence for environmental law in IUCN's West Asia Region. A similar initiative is under way with Lawyers for a Green Planet in Brazil.

CEL and the ELC have focused their activities in South America and South and South East Asia. In particular, they have focused on capacity development in Brazil and China. The Commission has also worked with IUCN RCOs and country offices to support the development of environmental law capacity. Through the RCOs, CEL contributes to various activities of the IUCN Environmental Law Programme, such as national environmental law reviews and environmental law training in such countries as Bangladesh, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Sudan, Yemen and Panama. Similar support is provided at a regional level to the Southern African Development Community.

Overall, therefore, CEL's work permits a positive response in many of the performance areas in our terms of reference. Its operations are efficient and well managed, representing the state of the art in international environmental law. In the case of environmental law and the CEL, the concept and format of a Commission remain valid for the achievement of IUCN's vision and mission.

5.4. Financial issues

Although CEL has been administratively efficient in its budgetary management, it has not had many successes in raising money for its operations and has had to rely heavily on the Commission Operating Fund subvention from the Union. It has fared somewhat better in its fund raising with partner agencies for joint ventures such as the Centres of Excellence in Hong Kong and Moscow (section 5.3). Despite CEL's reputation and record, continuing achievement is not assured if the Commission and the Secretariat do not successfully implement an intensified joint fund raising strategy.

5.5. Leadership, management, structure and style

The current leadership of CEL has continued in the effective tradition established by the founders of the Commission and the ELC. But the scope of the Commission's internal and external relations is expanding; key actors in the Commission and the ELC have changed, and issues of communication and collaboration therefore need more careful attention.

We recommend (section 2.6) that communication and collaboration between the Commission and the ELC be improved. Furthermore, the interface between CEL and the overall IUCN Programme needs to be strengthened.

The ELC participated actively in the formulation of the Programme for the coming quadrennium, and, as we have noted, CEL has fully endorsed it. At a recent meeting the Commission agreed to work further to specify the contributions it can make to the many areas of the Programme that will require environmental law inputs. But the amount of practical support it can provide will depend heavily on the amount of resources that can be made available for this sort of collaboration between the Commission and the Programme (section 5.4).

We emphasise in this review that IUCN must depend more and more on interdisciplinary knowledge delivery to its Programme – which is likely to decrease the role that Commissions can play in the Union's overall knowledge management. However, CEL has anticipated this trend by pioneering inter-Commission collaboration. In particular, it has worked with WCPA in preparing for the 2002 World Parks Congress. Together, they have done important work on trans frontier parks. Elsewhere, CEL has collaborated with CEM in work on wetlands for the Biodiversity Conservation Information System. With SSC, CEL has collaborated on a Global Invasive Species Programme, producing a number of guidelines and project proposals. At regional level, some CEL members participate in inter-Commission programme activities. As IUCN strives to enhance its use of Commission inputs and to make the most of inter-Commission collaboration (section 4.5.2), it should carefully assess the experience of CEL in this regard.

As in most other Commissions (sections 2.7, 6.5), voluntarism is an increasingly pressing issue for CEL. The Chair and Vice Chairs of the Commission, in particular, have far exceeded the limits of what might reasonably be considered voluntary levels of effort. Unless there is some increase in the infrastructural

support they receive, and some form of compensation to the institutions that employ them, the output of these CEL officers will have to be curtailed.

Perhaps even more than some other Commissions, CEL stands to benefit from the new communications potential offered by computers and the internet. Although many CEL members already participate in the building and use of the knowledge network through this technology, significant numbers are still unable to access it – particularly in developing countries. The Commission will have to devise and fund innovative ways of addressing this constraint.

6. The Species Survival Commission

6.1. Background

Founded one year after IUCN, SSC has just celebrated its 50th anniversary. It has long been regarded as the model of what an IUCN Commission should be, and as being in many ways the backbone of the Union's operations. In fact, as we argued in section 2.3 above, the Commissions are so different from each other that it makes little sense to consider any one of them as a template for the others. Nevertheless, SSC continues to be the flagship of much of the Union's work in the natural sciences – and to an increasing extent, works in the social sciences too.

SSC's membership of some 7,000 outnumbers the members of all the other Commissions combined. Most work as members of Specialist Groups (SGs) that are dedicated to particular species or groups of species. But a growing number belong to the Sustainable Use Specialist Group, which is regionally structured and has combined a socio-economic with a natural science agenda.

Our comments on the SSC in this report are drawn from the separate review of the Commission that has just been undertaken (Turner, 2000). As far as possible, they respond to the questions on each Commission that are set out in our terms of reference.

6.2. Rationale

The rationale for the SSC's mandate and goals is sound. Its commitment to the conservation of species threatened with extinction and of those important for human welfare is centrally important for the future of this planet's biosphere and of human life within it. Through a major strategic planning effort during 1999 and 2000, SSC has developed an enhanced and streamlined statement of vision, goal, objectives and targets that enhances its prospects of fulfilling its mandate and of maintaining its relevance.

SSC and the Union need to give careful attention to the **relationship between SSC's goals and objectives and those of IUCN as a whole**. Both have recently been restated for the 2001-2004 triennium, in SSC's draft Strategic Plan and IUCN's draft Programme. There is little doubt that SSC is expected to be a major contributor to the implementation of the Union's new Programme. In general terms, the SSC's Strategic Plan is relevant to the IUCN's Programme. Its successful implementation will help the Union achieve its goals for the triennium. In detail, however, much needs to be done to reconcile the two sets of targets and intended results. Senior Commission members and Secretariat staff are currently making good progress with this task.

6.3. Performance

To date, it has not been easy to gauge the **effectiveness of SSC**. Although its Strategic Plan for the 1997-1999 triennium had started to take on programmatic form, the Commission did not have the **monitoring and evaluation** capacity or process to provide this review with data on which to base an assessment of its performance. As a more focused Programme is prepared for the coming 2001-2004 triennium, this M&E challenge becomes more urgent. It is not yet clear how SSC will meet it. Upgrading SSC M&E is a clear opportunity for collaboration with the rest of IUCN.

Overall, expert opinion is that **SSC's wide ranging scientific work on the conservation status of species continues to have significant positive effects**. However, the effect of the Commission's scientific work remains limited by its necessarily partial coverage of the world's biodiversity. Furthermore, despite the quality and importance of its data on species survival, SSC acknowledges that **the information it generates is not as effective as it should be because it is not adequately structured, accessible and disseminated**. It has taken various steps to remedy this situation, most notably by developing a **Species Information System** that promises to be a major new global resource.

We recommend that adequate funding be provided to exploit the full potential of the SIS.

SSC is active in a number of global biodiversity **policy** fora, and deploys its expertise there to significant positive effect. Through its Sustainable Use Specialist Group and the IUCN Sustainable Use Initiative, SSC has achieved a useful impact on local and international action to promote the **sustainable use** of natural resources. SSC's **Wildlife Trade** Programme remains highly effective as a key provider of scientific advice to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, and some of the Specialist Groups play a leading and positive – because perceived as impartial - role in CITES debates and decisions. **Action Plans** on many endangered species have been a key SSC output over recent years.

However, we recommend that the effectiveness and the continuing value of this sort of product be assessed.

Beyond the significant challenges of corporate responsibility for SSC within IUCN, there are pressing issues of **SSC relevance** to the broader population of conservation stakeholders around the world. While most of these people still support the work of the Commission, SSC certainly has no room for complacency in this regard. With its now 50 year old roots in a very different world of collegial relations between post-war scientists, SSC clearly has an ongoing obligation to prove its relevance and competence for 21st century conservation endeavour.

There are a growing number of sectors and initiatives in which the Commission should accept a constructive but minor role. Indeed, key advice from a leading southern African member of SSC is that IUCN (and, by extension, SSC) generally does best in a supportive, rather than a proprietary, role.

6.4. Financial issues

At the time of this review, the Gland Secretariat **budget** for Species Programme operations was in a healthier position than usual. But some of the Commission's key projects – notably the Red List Programme and the SIS – still had substantial funding shortfalls. There is wide variation among the SGs with regard to current finances. Because of the recent emphasis on fund raising for large grants to key SSC projects, operational grants to the smaller and poorer SGs have dwindled. This threatens the character and viability of parts of the network.

While SSC appears to manage its resources responsibly and enjoys a measure of support from a range of funding agencies, its **financial sustainability** is not assured. Its challenge over the next quadrennium, as it works on a more focused strategic plan within a revitalised IUCN Programme, will be to demonstrate the continuing quality and effectiveness of its work and thereby to persuade donors that they should increase their allocations to it.

6.5. Leadership, management, structure and style

While not everyone in SSC endorses the more centralised, structured and programme-driven **management** style of its current leadership, many have appreciated the way it enables the Commission to fulfil more of the roles that they feel the Union as a whole should be playing.

In its current transitional circumstances, while SSC still lacks most of the features and resources of a conventional programme-focused organisation, it is being managed at least as effectively as might be

expected. Considering how little time and money they have for the task, SSC's leadership are making commendable progress in focusing the Commission's efforts on a specified set of objectives through the new Strategic Plan. This focusing of effort represents a substantive upgrade on the planning and management of the Strategic Plan for the previous triennium.

SSC is notable among the Commissions for the central role played by its **Specialist Groups**. These groups, some of them large organisations with their own projects and staff, are solidly rooted in their (mostly) taxonomic focus areas, and form the backbone of the Commission.

SSC Specialist Group Chairs are in the forefront of IUCN's delicate task of combining scientific impartiality with environmental and social commitment. At the same time they must contribute both upwards and downwards in the governance of the Commission, linking up to the Steering and Executive Committees and down to the membership of their respective SGs. At present, SSC lacks the resources to support and guide them in these tasks. It needs particularly to find a more thorough way to orientate new Chairs after they are appointed.

As the Commission evolves towards a more centralised, programmatically managed mode of operations, there is a real risk that the rank and file of SSC members feel left out and lose enthusiasm. Already, SSC management faces a major challenge in achieving Specialist Group buy in to the strategic planning process. Performance over the coming quadrennium will show whether SSC can efficiently maintain and marshal the commitment of its membership while achieving reasonable levels of programmatic performance.

Despite its importance to IUCN and its strong working links with its Secretariat staff in Gland, **SSC does not have adequate ties with the rest of the Union** – at global or regional levels. It is working on reconciling its programme with that of the Union as a whole, but there are very few links between SSC programmes and those of other Commissions. Meanwhile, as it expands its social science capacity and takes on project management and programme execution, there is a risk that SSC takes on too many roles that other parts of the Union can or should perform.

We recommend that the Secretariat and the SSC leadership consult more closely on how to build synergy and avoid duplication.

Voluntarism (section 2.7) remains a vexed issue for SSC. So far, however, the scientific and environmental attractions of volunteering to work as an SSC member outweigh the costs in the perception of thousands of leading specialists around the world. A more immediate problem with voluntarism concerns the Chairs of its Specialist Groups. Volunteers with full time jobs are unlikely to cope much longer with the management of increasingly complex SGs, with their multiple programmes and staff.

We endorse SSC's current investigation of voluntarism in the Commission through a small task force, which will report at the October 2000 WCC.

A key challenge now is for SSC to respond positively to the major **changes in the IUCN context** that are embodied in the Union's change of leadership and the newly focused character of its forthcoming Programme. The response can be supportive or questioning, but it should at all times be proactive and committed.

We recommend that, in response to the changing institutional context within which it works, and its growing realisation of the enormity of its task, SSC adopt a more collaborative stance as one partner among many.

In sectors such as plant and marine conservation, it is clear that SSC is not going to play the leading role as repository of species data or leader of conservation action. While there are signs that this realisation is spreading among the Commission's leadership, SSC needs to give higher priority to the challenge of forming working alliances over the coming quadrennium.

Annex 1. Terms of reference

Background:

In accordance with Resolution 19.2 of the 19th General Assembly, Buenos Aires, 1994, the IUCN Commissions are required to undertake triennial end of term reviews, and in-depth reviews every 6 years. (for specific wording see attached Council note).

The consultants are required to undertake end of term reviews for the Commissions on Environmental Law (CEL) and the Species Survival (SSC) and in-depth reviews for the Commissions on Environmental Economics and Social Policy, and the Commission on Ecosystem Management.

Specific scope of work:

1. Assist in finalizing the key areas performance questions / categories provided by the Director General based on feedback from the Commissions. (due March 15, 2000) This is to be done with the DG, the Coordinator of the M&E Initiative and the senior evaluation advisor to IUCN in Delhi at the Asia Regional Conservation Forum, March 27, 2000.
2. Assist in setting up the interview schedule for the Reviews by communicating with the Chairs. (Chairs and focal points responsibility to assist in setting up interviews.) (From March 15 onwards)
3. Adapt the key questions to the needs and specific circumstances of each Commission.
4. Undertake a review of existing information and data available from each Commission. This information to be provided by the Commission Chairs offices / focal points to Dorothy Bright at HQ by the end of March.
5. Carry out interviews and attend key meetings of the Commissions, the secretariat and recommended key informants to obtain data on the key performance areas / questions for the Review.
6. Complete the Review of CEESP and submit a report to the Director General and Bureau by May 23, 2000. (Bureau meeting is 26, 27 May). The report is to address the performance areas, as well make specific recommendations on the future of CEESP.
7. If at all possible complete the other reviews by the Bureau meeting, however if this is not possible complete the reviews for submission to the Director General by June 15, 2000.
8. The key performance areas and key questions for the Review are as follows:

(Generic categories and questions – to be adapted to the specific needs of each Commission)

1. Effectiveness (To what extent is the Commission meeting its objectives?)

- To what extent has the Commission achieved its objectives/fulfilled its mandate?
 - What has happened as a result of the Commission's work?
 - What are the unplanned effects of the Commission's work?
 - What are the probable long-term consequences of the Commission's work?
- What lessons can be learned from the Commission's experience of the past three years?

2. Rationale / Relevance (Is the Commission relevant to its context, to IUCN and to its stakeholders?)

- How well has the Commission been able to stay relevant in the changing context of global environmental issues generally and IUCN more specifically?

- Does the area of professional work of the Commission make sense for IUCN to be involved with?
- Is the Commission's mandate and goals based on a sound rationale?
- To what degree will the achievement of the Commission's goals contribute to the achievement of IUCN's mission and goals?
- Are the Commission's mandate and objectives still relevant?
- Do stakeholders inside and outside IUCN support the work of the Commission?
- What impact have any changes in the conservation world related directly to the content of the Commission had on the Commission performance?
- How relevant is the work of the Commission to the forward looking Quadrennial Programme of IUCN?

3. Efficiency (Does the work of the Commission provide good value (results) for the resources it utilises?)

- Has the Commissions used its resources in a cost-effective way? (Resources = money, volunteers, staff)
- Are there better ways for the Commission to achieve the same results at less cost?
- Are there better vehicles than a Commission to achieve the same results?

4. Financial viability (Is the Commission financially viable for IUCN?)

- Is the Commission financially sustainable?
- Has the Commission been able to generate funds outside of IUCN to support the work mandated by Congress?
- Does the Commission have the appropriate external controls and audits to manage its resources responsibly?

5. Strategic leadership (Is the commission led in a strategic fashion?)

- To what extent has strategy and leadership affected the Commission's performance?
- Does the Commission have a strategic plan to guide its work? Is it participative? Transparent? Aligned with the Union? Is it used?

6. Structure

- Is the governing structure of the Commission effective and efficient?
- Does the governing structure of the Commission support good management practices?
- Is the operational structure of the Commission appropriate for creating an effective and efficient commission?
- Are the various components of the Union able to coordinate their work with commissions in order that the Union increases its performance?
- Is the Commission and the Secretariat able to coordinate and integrate their respective work in order to improve the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the Union?

7. Management (Is the commission well managed?)

- Is the Commission able to plan, implement, and monitor its programme and projects?
- Does the Commission projects and programmes represent the state of the art work in their areas of expertise?
- Are the programmes and projects linked to the Programme of the Union at global and regional level and to the work of other Commissions?

- How has the Commission planned, implemented and managed the human resources, finances and inter/intra institutional linkages available to it impacted the Commission's performance?
- Does the volunteer membership of the Commission represent the state of the art in global expertise in the field of the Commission?
- Is there an appropriate level of staff and financial resources available to the commission in order for it to carry out the mandate given to it by Congress?
- Are the Commission's monitoring and evaluation processes adequate to improve its performance?

8. Commission's voluntary spirit (How does the voluntary spirit of the commission affect its membership and IUCN?)

- To what extent does the Commission have a clear mission/mandate and history that motivates the voluntary spirit of its members to share their time and knowledge?
- Does the work of the Commission drive / motivate IUCN to perform better.
- Does the Commission attract volunteers how are the leading figures in the area of work?

9. Impact

- What impact has the Commission had on the broader IUCN membership?
- What impact has the Commission had on the policies and practices of IUCN Secretariat?
- How has the Commission impacted its field of endeavor?
- What has been the impact of donors on the Commission and the Commissions presence on the donors response to IUCN?

Reporting:

The Review Team reports directly to Bureau of Council.

Annex 2. Questionnaire

IUCN – The World Conservation Union

Review of IUCN Commissions, 2000

Dear Sir/Madam,

As you probably know, the Council of IUCN has requested reviews of four of the six Commissions this year. We have been asked to carry them out. The four Commissions are:

- Commission on Ecosystem Management;
- Commission on Environmental Law;
- Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy;
- Species Survival Commission.

To help us in this task, we are contacting key informants who work with these Commissions and asking you whether you can kindly take the time to give us your views on the following points. Please include explanations or recommendations wherever it seems appropriate. We shall treat your responses in confidence.

We appreciate how busy you are, and will be very grateful if you are able to give us your views on these questions. We need as much expert opinion on the Commissions as we can get in the short time available for these reviews.

Thank you in advance for your input. We suggest that you enter your responses directly into this file and e-mail it to Dorothy Bright who will collect the responses for us. (dob@hq.iucn.org) If you prefer to contact us by other means, please do so through Dorothy Bright at IUCN Headquarters. (fax: 41 22 999 0025; phone 41 22 999 0292)

If we have not heard from you by 18 May, we shall assume that pressure of other work has made it impossible for you to reply.

With best wishes,

Gabor Bruszt and Stephen Turner.

(gbz@iafrica.com sdtturner@iafrica.com)

1. With which Commission are you most directly involved? (We shall assume that this is the Commission about which you give your views below.)

2. What is your position with regard to this Commission? (e.g. member of Steering Committee, member of Advisory Group...)

3. What should be the overall function of a Commission within IUCN?	
4. What are the general strengths and weaknesses of your Commission relative to the function you have just outlined?	
5. Commissions are often described as networks. How important is the network of your Commission for its performance of the function you outlined in (3) above?	1 (low) ----- 5 (high)
What should be done (if necessary) to improve the networking of your Commission? Please elaborate:	
6. Commissions are sometimes expected to deliver products and contribute to the Union's programme.	
How important are the delivery of products and the execution of programmes for your Commission's performance of the function you outlined in (3) above?	1 (low) ----- 5 (high)
What should be done (if necessary) to improve the delivery of programmes and products by your Commission?	

7. Your commission has a mandate given by the Congress of the Union.		
How relevant is the mandate of your Commission to the vision and mission of IUCN?	1 (low) ----- 5 (high)	
8. How effective is your Commission in performing the tasks set out in its mandate?	1 (low) ----- 5 (high)	
9. Does your Commission achieve other positive results that are outside its mandate but pertinent to the vision and mission of IUCN?	Yes	No
If yes, please describe these other results.		
10. How far is your Commission guided by its mandate in its strategy and operations?	1 (low)5 (high)	
11. What attracts people to be members of your Commission and offer their voluntary work for the Union?		
12. How are members of your Commission recruited or selected?		
Does the membership in your Commission reflect the “crème de la crème” of your profession?	Yes	No
If not, how can the quality of the membership be enhanced?		
13. On what basis is membership of individuals in your Commission maintained or discontinued?		
Should Commission members be assessed and evaluated after each term of mandate?	Yes	No

If yes, can you suggest how?		
14. Should voluntarism remain as the driving force for work by Commission members?	Yes	No
15. How effectively do members of your Commission network and communicate with each other?	1 (low) ----- 5 (high)	
Do you have any ideas on how to improve communication?		
16 How does your Commission decide what to do?		
17. How focused efficient and effective are its work programmes? (please answer for each) a) Focused b) Efficient c) Effective	1 (low) ----- 5 (high)	
18. Do you feel that the work of your Commission is adequately directed and managed?	Yes	No
Should it receive more or less direction and management than it does at present?	More	Less
19 Productive networks need some kind of supporting “infrastructure”.		

Do you feel that your Commission has a supporting infrastructure?	Yes	No
<p>What are the main components of the support?</p> <p>If you feel that such infrastructure is not adequate, what would you suggest to improve/introduce in order to boost the performance of the Commission members for the mission of the Union?</p>		
20. Are the activities of your Commission adequately monitored and evaluated?	Yes	No
21. Does your Commission have a productive working relationship with the IUCN Secretariat in Gland/ELC in Bonn?	Yes	No
<p>Are there ways in which this relationship should be improved? Please elaborate:</p>		
22. Does your Commission have productive working relationships with the Regional Conservation Offices of IUCN?	Yes	No
<p>Are there ways in which these relationships should be improved? Please elaborate:</p>		
23. Does your Commission have productive working relationships with IUCN members?	Yes	No

Are there ways in which these relationships should be improved?
Please elaborate.

Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions.

Annex 3. Data and contacts requested from Commissions

The following is the list of data and proposed interviewees that was requested from Chairs of the Commissions included in this review.

1. STANDARD BACKGROUND DOCUMENTATION:

The following reports should be standard documentation for Commissions obtainable from your files or from your focal point offices:

1. Mandate, vision and strategic plan:

- Mandate approved at the Montreal Congress. (I have your recent mandates as approved for submission to the Amman Congress.)
- Vision statement
- Strategic plan.

2. Membership and constituency of the Commission:

- Membership profile of the Commission - number of members, by region, globally. More profile info if known.
- Stakeholder analysis or documentation of constituency profile - the users and recipients of service of the Commission.
- Donor involvement
- Key partner organizations

3. Workplans and budgets:

- Triennial and annual workplans since Montreal. (96-2000)
- Triennial and annual budgets 96-2000.
- Annual expenditure statements as submitted to Council.(96-99)
- Annual audited statements - if funds were not spent through IUCN offices.

4. Progress reports 96-99 as submitted to HQ for inclusion in donor progress reporting, and to Council.

5. Project documents, progress reports to donors on project, reviews or evaluations of the projects. (if applicable - some Commissions have projects, others do not).

6. Financial strategy / fund raising strategy.

7. Management /governance reporting:

- Reports, minutes of Steering Committee and/or Advisory Committee meetings.
- Procedures for staffing, review and evaluation of Commission staff.

8. Lessons learned reports.

9. Any other reports that the Chairs feel would be useful for the Reviewers to read relating to the focus, purpose, direction, performance of the Commissions.

II: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES:

Chairs are invited to provide a list of approximately 10 key informants whom the Review Team should interview by telephone or in person if possible. Key informants should cover three areas:

- a) internal - people who have played a role in the work of the Commission - such as Steering Committee members.
- b) external - people who know the 'state of the art' in the area of the work of the Commission - and who know of the Commission.
- c) users /stakeholders - people who should benefit from the existence of the Commission (users from national govts, institutions, NGOs, communities).

The Secretariat was requested to suggest additional key informants.

References

- Banuri, T., 2000. *Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy. Triennial report.* Boston: Office of the Chair, CEESP.
- CEESP, 1997. *CEESP: an introduction.* London: CEESP Secretariat. Draft for discussion.
- CEM, 2000. *Statement on quadrennial programme to Council from CEM Steering Committee.* Egham: CEM.
- Crofts, R. and Lahmann, E., 1998. *Protected areas into the 21st century: for people and the environment. An external review of IUCN's Programme on Protected Areas and World Commission on Protected Areas.* Gland: IUCN.
- Holdgate, M., 1999. *The green web. A union for world conservation.* London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.
- IUCN, 1996. *World Conservation Congress Paper CGR/1/96/7, Annex 1.* Gland: IUCN.
- IUCN, 1999. *External review.* Gland: IUCN.
- IUCN, 2000. *Stepping into the new millennium. IUCN's quadrennial programme 2001-2004.* Gland: IUCN. Draft approved by the IUCN Council.
- Maltby, E., Holdgate, M., Acreman, M.C. and Weir, A. *Ecosystem management: questions for science and society.* Egham: Royal Holloway Institute for Environmental Research, Royal Holloway, University of London.
- Munro, D.A. and Bruszt, G., 1993. *Review of IUCN Commissions.* Gland: IUCN.
- Romijn, B., 1999. *Breaking barriers and bridging gaps. Review of the Commission on Education and Communication of IUCN.* Gland: IUCN.
- Safford, L. and Maltby, E. (eds.), 1998. *Guidelines for integrated planning and management of tropical lowland peatlands with special reference to Southeast Asia.* Gland and Cambridge: IUCN.
- Turner, S.D., 2000. *Review of the Species Survival Commission.* Gland: IUCN.