REVIEW OF IUCN'S INFLUENCE ON POLICY

Phase I:

Describing the Policy Work of IUCN

Review Team Leader: Zenda Ofir

February 2005

.

IUCN
The World Conservation Union

Summary Report

Overview

Influencing policy frameworks is one of the most powerful methods through which change can be effected in the world. It is therefore no surprise that a very large portion of IUCN's work during the past decades has been dedicated to influencing policy, initially mainly at global level and more recently also at regional, national and sub-national levels. Its unique comparative advantage has given it the capacity to be a leader in the conservation policy arena. It has fulfilled this role admirably over decades since its inception, leading conceptual thinking on conservation through seminal initiatives such as the *World Conservation Strategy* and *Caring for the Earth*; steering the evolution of conservation to include dimensions such as sustainable development and the sustainable use of biodiversity; guiding the development of many international agreements; and assisting with translating international policies into strategies at regional and national levels.

IUCN today remains very active in the policy arena, using its convening power, offering ideas and advice, facilitating debate and developing instruments and methods for policy implementation. The 2003 External Review of IUCN notes that "rapid growth, substantial achievements and a series of change processes have helped the Union to adjust to new challenges and an evolving world scene". It continues to make strong contributions to sustainable development and environmental governance.

But this Review has found that over the past decade the Union's profile as a leading influence in the conservation arena has been diminishing in a complex world driven by many competing forces, demands and priorities. It faces the threat of becoming marginalised in important areas at a time when its guidance is needed more than ever, unless it can reposition itself using its core expertise in biodiversity to work effectively in new domains impacting upon conservation, and can reach new audiences who are powerful forces in shaping the future of conservation in the world.

Stakeholders acknowledge the excellent work done by the Policy, Biodiversity and International Agreements (PBIA) unit in mobilising and coordinating IUCN's policy expertise to inform and support international policy initiatives, as well as the significant efforts by PBIA and the Policy and Global Change Group (PGCG) under guidance of the Director Global Programme to streamline frameworks and procedures for policy work. Yet in spite of this we have found many similarities between the current status of IUCN's policy work and the programming crisis of 1999. These similarities include fragmentation in planning and implementation, inadequately formulated desired results and theories of change, a lack of coherence across the system and insufficient focus on strategic leadership to shape and guide the policy work.

We believe that this situation is not the result of a lack of capacity or interest in IUCN, but rather the result of the very strenuous effort that was required to establish and implement the impressive IUCN Programme during the past four years, coupled to the effects of IUCN's regionalisation and decentralisation as well as the increased complexities in the policy arena in which IUCN has to operate. Yet if IUCN is to fulfil its mission, it will need to focus very strongly during the 2005-2008 Intersessional period on managing the internal change needed to address the challenges within as well as those posed by the external policy environment. IUCN will have to work purposefully to ensure its position as undisputed leader towards policy change for the good of conserving the earth's resources and biodiversity. Its admirable legacy, unique character and vital expertise demand no less.

Purpose and Nature of the Review

Its move towards results-based management as well as an increasingly competitive and demanding environment, has led to pressure on IUCN to demonstrate the outcomes of its work and the impact it has on the world. The planning of its work in the 2005-2008 Intersessional period is now moving beyond the articulation of results to the identification of outcomes and impacts, providing programme managers with a "results chain" that can help them to evaluate and subsequently improve the outcomes and impact of their work.

As part of its focus on meeting its new challenges, IUCN aims to improve its grasp of policy work and the factors shaping it within and outside the organisation. This Review is thus part of a longer term vision aimed at improving the impact of IUCN's work in influencing policy around the world. Phase I, which has resulted in this report, is a description and examination of the main interventions and some key issues in the policy work of the Secretariat and Commissions. Exploratory in nature, it was designed to synthesise issues across the organisation rather than develop an in-depth understanding of the policy work in each programme. Instead of giving definitive and final answers, it raises issues for reflection and debate as IUCN plans its policy work for the next four years. Phase II on the other hand will be evaluative and will use a series of case studies to determine the effectiveness of selected key efforts of IUCN to influence policy.

Phase I has therefore concentrated on trying to understand the conceptualisation of IUCN's policy work, its planning approaches, the contextual and other factors shaping the policy work, the key policy initiatives, their intended outcomes and main mechanisms used for policy influence. It raises issues of coherence, method and direction, and makes some recommendations for consideration, using the inputs of more than 130 interviews conducted with 88 key people in and outside IUCN, as well as an extensive document review and consultation with relevant external and internal experts.

The focus in this study on the *improvement* of IUCN's policy influence obviously implies a greater focus on those aspects that need improvement than on what is working well. The Review findings should not detract in any way from the fact that IUCN has been doing very significant work in influencing policy over the past decade – but much can be improved.

Findings

Direction and focus in IUCN's policy work

Influencing policy is not a clearly delineated field of work in IUCN. Although more than half of the Secretariat and Commissions programmes[1] regard influencing policy as the major component of their work (more than a third indicate that they spend nearly all their time on policy related work), there is considerable confusion about IUCN's policy directions, priorities, methods and expectations. This situation is partly the result of the process of regionalisation and decentralisation, which although offering much broader scope for policy influence at regional, national and sub-national level, demands greater central coordination to ensure coherence and focus - something which IUCN has just recently started to address. The focus on the programming crisis of 1999 also shifted the spotlight away from IUCN's policy efforts, resulting in a lack of concerted effort and strategic focus in leading and directing the policy work, and clarifying priorities and approaches.

---

[1] All Commissions' programmes of work were part of the Review, together with the component programmes of IUCN, and are thus included when the term "programmes" is used in this context.

IUCN has many dimensions and the reach and scope of its work never ceases to surprise. In fewer than 100 key policy initiatives, the Secretariat and Commissions are working to influence more than 60 specific policy targets as well as a large number of unspecified audiences. Two key factors in the increasing scope of IUCN's policy work are the proliferation of global agreements and the presence of regional and national offices. The majority of targets remain at global level, but regionalisation has shifted a significant part of the policy work to regional, national and sub-national levels, where it focuses strongly on helping to establish and review government frameworks, convene diverse stakeholders and build capacity among governments and civil society.

A significant number of programmes work on the same policy targets, but seldom in a coordinated way. There is little evidence of purposeful efforts by programmes to collaborate in influencing strategically identified policy targets and outcomes, leading to a perception that IUCN's policy work is "scattered, trying to be all things to all people". A notable exception is the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which was mentioned by half of the responding programmes as one of their most important policy targets. There is general concern about the level of effort and resources spent on the CBD in the absence of a critical assessment of the effectiveness of its conceptual framework and implementation. Recent efforts by PBIA to provide guidelines and to coordinate and streamline the influencing processes linked to the CBD and other conventions have been timely, effective and are highly valued by those involved. It is a path of influence that informants agree works very well. Now more effort needs to go into a critical assessment of these agreements and conventions, in particular the CBD, to determine whether they are indeed the best vehicles through which to effect the changes that IUCN strives to make in the world.

Conceptual shifts

The vast majority of the key policy initiatives of the Secretariat and Commissions remain in IUCN's "heartland" fields of expertise and focused on influencing its traditional conservation audiences. Around a quarter of programmes have experienced or noted shifts in the way in which policy work is conceptualised and done in IUCN. There is a stronger focus on governance and working with governments at all levels and increased targeting of non-conservation frameworks and audiences such as key Ministries in Planning and Finance, the private sector, influential frameworks outside the conservation sector, non-conservation networks influencing conservation, indigenous peoples, and others. The efforts to influence these "non-traditional" targets and audiences are growing, but still relatively small in scope. Programmes are also embracing new approaches to conservation that integrate environment and development ("conservation for the people"), focus on service and market-based approaches, and/or include social, economic and legal issues in a cross-cutting manner. Again these approaches remain limited in scope, but are receiving growing attention.

Several factors have brought about these shifts. IUCN's presence in the regions has improved its understanding of realities on the ground. The focus on poverty reduction in development efforts has highlighted the need to make a stronger case for environmental management as part of poverty reduction strategies. There is a growing awareness of the need to reach new audiences who exert a powerful influence on conservation. External trends such as changes in donor funding and the devolution of power to local authorities have also served as driving forces for changing priorities and approaches.

Around a third of programmes have been experiencing a gradual evolution to more, and more strategic and systematic, policy work. More programmes are realising the importance of influencing policy to bring about change. IUCN's increasing profile and credibility in the regions are enhancing their role in supporting governments and convening diverse stakeholders. Internal factors in IUCN are also playing a role, including the improved

Intersessional programme, better relations between Secretariat components, the use of strategic reviews and the increasing focus on policy work promoted by IUCN's leadership.

Planning for policy influence

The growing realisation among programmes of the importance of influencing policy to achieve maximum change with limited resources has increased their desire for clarity on direction and method. There is overwhelming support for more purposeful and explicit planning of policy work, as well as a general acknowledgement of the importance of remaining flexible in order to grasp opportunities offered by opening policy windows.

However perceptions among those leading planning processes are that they are weak. This is confirmed by other findings. There are very few systems in place to track or help assess the policy influence of individual programmes or of IUCN overall and thus only very informal feedback loops which can help to improve policy work. Few programmes use systematic scoping and analysis of the external environment in which they operate, although the extensive internal and external expertise available to IUCN is occasionally mobilised for this purpose, albeit in a somewhat ad hoc manner.

Linking policy and practice

Another critical weakness exists in the important area of linking policy and practice, raising concerns about IUCN's capacity and commitment to making the most of its unique comparative advantage. Programmes confirm that their mechanisms to obtain and synthesise information to reach policy conclusions are weak, especially when taking findings from project to policy, from country to regional and from regional to global level (and vice versa). Few programmes have developed case studies with policy objectives in mind, or have designed project frameworks to test hypotheses. Programmes most frequently link their practice to policy through sharing of experiences and lessons, usually holding meetings between project and programme staff and sometimes including external stakeholders, but a significant number of programmes do not follow this up with systematic documentation, synthesis and use of the results. The implementation of this important mechanism is therefore considered to be weak, often failing in systematically translating practice to useful policy input.

Factors facilitating and inhibiting policy work in IUCN

The credibility and importance of the findings noted above are confirmed by the programme informants' own analysis of obstacles to effective policy influence. A very small portion of factors were related to external contexts; most were to do with internal dynamics, in particular the lack of capacity in policy work; the lack of clarity on policy roles and processes; the tendency to work in silos; the sense of inadequate technical expertise in areas which traditionally have not been well represented in IUCN, yet which now require attention; and concern that divergent views within the Union on policy engagement with "non-traditional" audiences such as the private sector are impeding its movement into important new domains.

The most frequently mentioned obstacle to effective policy work in the Secretariat and Commissions was the lack of financial resources, yet increased funding was not, according to programme informants, the most popular intervention strategy. Instead, informants suggested improved policy planning through provision of a clearer vision and focus for policy work, better plans and planning processes, and more systematic intelligence. Other frequently mentioned interventions also correlate very well with the Review findings – improving general policy expertise as well as specific technical capacities needed to influence policy; more integration and coherence across IUCN; greater capacity and leadership in new domains

in which IUCN has to work; improved institutional systems; and stronger partnerships, alliances and relationships[2].

Factors that have facilitated the policy work of the Secretariat and Commissions also confirm some of the Review findings as well as the significance of IUCN's comparative advantage. Most useful assets were its capacity to produce and apply appropriate and timely technical knowledge; its credibility; its partnerships and alliances; and the commitment of its staff and volunteer networks. Factors such as effective planning and collaboration (in some cases); its agility and capacity to grasp opportunities, the availability of financial resources; and the freedom to experiment also aided policy work.

Issue / purpose-driven versus event-driven approaches

Another issue requiring attention is the role that events play in policy influence efforts. A very considerable portion of IUCN's time and resources goes into the convening of events that stimulate networking and serve as platforms to bring diverse groups together towards a common goal. This convening function is central to IUCN's operation and has been remarkably successful in building its visibility and credibility among diverse constituencies. IUCN also participates in many events organised by others, such as COPs and other meetings which serve as forums for policy planning and influence at global, regional and national levels.

While the importance of events in the work of IUCN cannot be disputed, there is a distinct risk that the organisation can be driven by events rather than by purpose or issue, and that it can convene, facilitate and participate in events without necessarily providing leadership. It tends to neglect systematic follow-up activities that can form part of strategic directions for policy work. Thus while policy related events have increased substantially over the past decade, it is not clear whether IUCN has a *longer-term, strategic, issue-driven* approach that justifies the very substantial time and resources spent on some of these events, or a grasp of the price of being diverted from other important priorities for significant periods of time.

Institutional systems underpinning policy work in IUCN

The Review did not include a focus on the institutional systems governing, managing and facilitating policy work in IUCN, but certain weaknesses were noted. There is inadequate articulation between the different parts of the Union carrying responsibility for setting and executing IUCN policy. In particular, in view of the large number of Resolutions and the need for clarity on policy positions and priorities, Council's role versus that of the Secretariat needs to be clarified and processes streamlined in practice. There is also still a perceived disconnect between those programmes and bodies specifically responsible for policy, and the rest of the programmes, in spite of some recent improvements in this regard through the work of PBIA and PGCG. Some notion still remains that there is an "exclusive" group who does policy work while others feel excluded from this role.

An important challenge lies in optimising the obvious synergies and complementary expertise and experiences between the Regional Programmes, Commissions and the coordinating and guiding policy groups at Headquarters. Furthermore, the role of Corporate Strategies (or Global Strategies in the new management structure) as well as that of the cross-cutting functions such as social policy, economics and gender needs clarification. Findings have also shown that Commissions have played important roles in influencing policy, but the extent to which their structures and management systems interface with the Secretariat to optimise the use of this important resource, is unclear. The "One Programme" approach demands that

---

[2] Examining this aspect was to be an important focus for the Review, but could not be explored in any depth due to lack of systematic data – a weakness in the data collection process.

urgent attention be given to this aspect. Similarly, systems facilitating the mobilisation of Members' policy expertise and political power in the policy arena require further study and attention. The Review notes that the recently adopted IUCN Membership Strategy also highlights this need.

Vertical integration

This Review has confirmed that disconnects still exist between those groups responsible for policy coordination at global level and the Regional Programmes. With the exception of a few thematic areas, regional and global programmes usually do not plan together, monitor and ensure action to influence a specific set of policy targets towards common outcomes over an extended period.

More importantly perhaps, as IUCN seeks to find its most effective footprint in relevant regions and countries, the real strength and expertise of the Union as a global organisation has not yet been brought to bear on its positioning at regional and national levels. Regional programmes have been shown to be somewhat more responsive than proactive in their approach to policy influence. A rigid approach which does not allow programmes to take advantage of opening policy windows would be counter-productive. On the other hand more systematic work with governments is needed, especially at national level where IUCN can do much more to make use of its unique comparative advantage as global organisation with local presence across the world. Its extensive expertise at regional and global levels can be brought to bear much more thoughtfully and effectively at national level where more concerted impact is needed. Its national *and* global experts can in turn be mobilised to inform regional trans-boundary work.

This is *the* key asset of IUCN which gives it a comparative advantage beyond anything that other organisations can mobilise at national or regional level. It has to be used to its full potential.

IUCN and the policy cycle

While Phase I of the Review did not set out to develop a detailed model of the policy cycle, it was found to be a useful model for illumination of IUCN's approach to its policy work and in developing a framework for IUCN's policy influence efforts. Programmes have different emphases on the policy cycle, but tend to work mainly at the front end, helping to set agendas and develop policy frameworks. This focus is driven by the need to influence policy-making as early in the cycle as possible, by its capacity to generate new ideas, its comparative advantage in convening, networking and providing technical advice and by its traditional strengths in fact-finding, collating and publishing. Programmes furthermore support policy implementation mainly through the provision of tools and guidance and the building of capacity.

Very limited work is done at the back end of the cycle, severely limiting IUCN's opportunity to be a critical commentator on the effectiveness of policies and to effect change through monitoring, evaluation and review. This Review considers this area to be a major opportunity for future policy work. IUCN is very well positioned with a decentralised structure to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of policies at regional, national and local levels. This is a major comparative advantage that few other policy organisations and 'think tanks' have in the conservation arena.

Theories of change for policy influence

As can be expected, there is a strong link between the mechanisms and intended outcomes of policy work, and the IUCN Programme. Many of the Programme results, especially but not

exclusively in Key Result Area 4 relates directly or indirectly to policy influence. In essence the IUCN Programme is a framework for IUCN's policy work, and any effort to establish new policy goals and streamline theories of change has to recognise this. On the other hand, as the 2003 External Review of IUCN points out, the Programme provides a broad framework that is "permissive rather than directive", and more work is needed to bring focus to policy influence efforts. The Programme itself is also not explicit enough in articulating theories of change for each Key Result Area, nor is it clear on how it intends to influence major global development initiatives such as the Millennium Development Goals.

The key mechanisms used by the programmes to influence policy are in line with IUCN Programme expectations. Thirteen of the 14 main categories of mechanisms used to influence policy can be grouped to reflect IUCN's Knowledge, Empowerment and Governance (K-E-G) strategy, while one focuses on positioning IUCN in the policy arena. The mechanisms used most frequently to influence policy emphasise the importance of IUCN's comparative advantage - providing technical advice, mobilising and synthesising knowledge from different sources, convening stakeholders and using networks.

The intended programme outcomes are also clearly linked to the K-E-G strategy and as noted above, broadly reflect results under the KRAs. When the intended programme outcomes are synthesised into a set of outcomes pursued by the Secretariat and Commissions, their broad nature becomes apparent. Coupled to the many diverse policy targets pursued by each programme, they present a picture of work of tremendous scope, yet unfocused in what it is trying to do and unclear about the best strategies to bring about desired change.

This situation highlights the necessity to have a symbiotic approach between those responsible for directing and guiding IUCN's policy work, and those leading and implementing the IUCN Programme. For successful policy work it will be crucial to have a *close, strategic* collaboration between the stakeholders such as PBIA, PGCG and PPG, with the work of the one supporting and influencing the other under the guidance of the Director Global Programme.

Recommendations

IUCN's policy work and the contexts within which policy targets are to be influenced are multi-dimensional and complex. We make our recommendations based on our findings in this Review while being cognisant of the fact that there are many layers of IUCN's policy work which this short phase in the Review have not uncovered, and with which IUCN's own staff and volunteer networks might be more familiar. Our recommendations have therefore been developed to sensitise IUCN to critical issues for the future, to stimulate reflection about the best possible approaches to policy and to persuade IUCN to take a more strategic focus to policy work in the 2005-2008 Intersessional period, similar to the focus on the IUCN Programme during the past Intersessional period.

In general we recommend that **IUCN use the 2005-2008 Intersessional period to focus and streamline its policy work and manage the strategic change needed for a more extended and effective leadership role in the policy arena towards fulfilment of its mission.**

More specifically with respect to the following, we recommend:

Strategy and Approach

1. That in the 2005-2008 Intersessional period IUCN aims to move dynamically and strategically into those critical policy domains which are proven to impact forcefully on conservation, directing its efforts to important "non-traditional" audiences and key

players that may include non-conservation government bodies, the private sector, multilateral institutions and non-conservation networks.

2. That IUCN in this process focuses on deploying its "heartland" expertise strategically to influence these new policy domains, building the necessary internal capacities as well as partnerships and alliances for long-term engagement in critical areas.

3. That IUCN increases its impact by focusing its policy work, and considers to what extent it can do this through (i) development of a purposeful organisational and programme theories of change based on systematic intelligence and situation analysis; (ii) identification of key "policy levers" (powerful frameworks, processes, forums, audiences or champions essential to the changes IUCN wants to bring about towards its mission) and (iii) concerted teamwork, including joint planning *from the beginning* between programmes, IUCN components and other partners in order to influence a particular "policy lever" or set of policy levers over time; monitoring; and ensuring progress towards common goals.

4. That IUCN re-considers its emphasis on the CBD as part of a more critical approach to the global policy regime for conservation through greater involvement in policy monitoring, evaluation and review of conventions and their implementation at regional and national levels.

5. That IUCN explores how its theories of change are aligned with, or could be aligned with, powerful global agendas and action plans for change.

6. That IUCN pays more strategic attention to vertical integration aimed at strengthening its policy influence, with the specific objectives to (i) improve joint planning and targeting of "policy levers" between programmes and within programmes working on a similar theme or biome; (ii) use global and national expertise to inform regional trans-boundary work; and (iii) bring its global expertise and reputation more effectively to bear to support proactive and systematic work with governments at national level.

7. That IUCN develops an approach that uses events as instruments for change only when they are an essential part of purposeful, longer-term, priority strategies to influence policy, in other words, events should become instruments or steps in purpose-driven strategies for policy influence.

8. That IUCN develops strategies to ensure optimal use of events, among others through planning and management of processes that promote follow-up and strengthening of its leadership role.

Governance, leadership and management

9. That IUCN strengthens its policy profile, leadership and focus through consultation with a high level advisory panel consisting of external policy experts well versed in the current complexities in the conservation policy arena; or the appointment of a distinguished policy expert who can regularly advise and guide IUCN's overall policy directions and champion its policy work.

10. That the Director Global Programme, the PPG and the PGCG work purposefully during the 2005-2008 Intersessional period to shape IUCN's strategy for greater focus and impact in its policy work, as was done with the IUCN Programme during the last Intersessional period.

11. That a review of the institutional systems underpinning IUCN's policy work be conducted to ensure that they support effective governance, management and operation of IUCN's policy work, and that its comparative advantage is fully used in the process.

12. That IUCN considers the implications of the shifts in conceptualisation of its policy work for its change management strategies, in particular its human resources strategy, its engagement of Members and its mobilisation of Commission members and structures.

Resourcing – funding

13. That IUCN considers adjusting its funding model in line with the 2003 External Review recommendations to mobilise funding for more concerted and strategic policy work.

Moving towards integration and synthesis

14. That IUCN explores the possibility of expanding its Secretariat capacity to play an integrating and synthesising role using Members' fieldwork, rather than moving even further towards becoming an organisation implementing projects at field level in competition with its Members. This means that its (limited) footprint in the field should be directly aligned with and inform its policy work.

Strengthening IUCN's policy capacity

15. That IUCN adopts a strategy to strengthen its capacity across the Secretariat and Commissions' programmes in at least five areas: (i) understanding of general concepts, models and mechanisms for policy influence; (ii) understanding and streamlining of its own approaches to policy work; (iii) nurturing of policy entrepreneurship, advocacy and synthesis; (iv) policy planning, monitoring and evaluation; and (v) developing appropriate policy expertise to work in interface with new domains.

    Specific attention can be paid to the following:
    - Exposing IUCN Secretariat and Commissions to general theories, models and experiences related to policy influence, illustrated by case studies from IUCN's long history of policy involvement and by connecting to external research on policy influence effectiveness;
    - Engaging in developing a clear policy framework (as an integral part of the Programme) similar to what was done for the IUCN Programme – and ensuring wide dissemination and buy-in from key players across the organisation;
    - Strengthening policy planning processes to be systematic and include consultation with IUCN Members;
    - Developing plans for policy influence based on robust theories of change, yet using adaptive management with the flexibility to take into account changing contexts and opening policy windows;
    - Establishing self-reflection and feedback mechanisms through which IUCN's effectiveness in influencing policy can be assessed and used for improved policy work;
    - Exploring the implications of IUCN's strong focus on policy, and its mainstreaming across the organisation, for the appointment and deployment

of human resources and for the effective mobilisation of such expertise by the Commissions.

13. That the case studies selected in Phase II to determine the effectiveness of IUCN's policy influence, at the same time be used to provide deeper insight into specific critical issues that can help to improve IUCN's policy work.

Moving into Phase II

Phase II of the Review will focus on assessing the effectiveness of IUCN's policy influence through the use of selected case studies. We also propose that the set of case studies should dissect and illuminate specific aspects of IUCN's policy work. We have therefore not developed a set of criteria for selection of case studies, but rather aspects that need more careful study (i-viii below) from which examples can be selected to demonstrate that specific aspect. One particular case study can be used to demonstrate more than one of these aspects.

We furthermore propose that at least two aspects are investigated as *integral parts of all* case studies, namely
- The generation, synthesis and flow of knowledge into, within and out of IUCN;
- The role of relationships, alliances and partnerships within, and with parties outside, IUCN.

Based on our Review observations those aspects of IUCN's policy work that we believe warrant closer attention are given in order of priority from i to viii below, from the most to the least critical:

i. The conceptual approaches and strategies used to link policy influence and practice;

ii. Work based on vertical integration, for example within a specific biome where cascading collaboration is promoted from global to regional to national level and vice versa (e.g. the Green Thread approach);

iii. Collaborative efforts aimed at optimising the potential presented by the unique structure of IUCN – component programmes, Members and Commissions - focusing on the value and dynamics of such partnerships;

iv. IUCN's movement into "non-traditional" domains, for example trade;

v. Interaction with new audiences necessitated by changing societal, economic and/or political dynamics such as
- the private sector or networks that include powerful private sector actors
- increasingly powerful arms of government affecting the environment, for example Finance and Planning Ministries, Trade and Industry, etc.;
- the decentralisation / devolution of power to local authorities;
- powerful multilateral agencies, e.g. The World Bank;
- increasing civil society and other "non-traditional" stakeholder involvement in policy-making;

vi. Work done to influence national policy and strategy in a changing political, social and economic environment at national level (Uganda will be a useful example).

vii. The difference between purpose/issue-driven and event-driven approaches to influencing global or regional policies;

viii.   Work on a specific policy target by different IUCN components over a significant period (not necessarily in collaborative mode) to determine how they have supported (or detracted from) one another.

We also recommend that case studies be selected *mainly* where policy influence efforts are perceived to have succeeded, but in some cases also where they might have failed. Important lessons can be learnt from both types of experience.