

Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group 2 (ELG 2) Review

Review Report

**Prepared by Alejandro Imbach and Kent Jingfors,
ELG 2 Review Team**

May 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORs)	1
3.	METHODOLOGY	2
4.	KEY FINDINGS	3
4.1	OVERALL SITUATION	3
4.2	MANDATE	4
4.3	INTERNAL INTEGRATION	5
4.4	INTEGRATION ACROSS ASIA WITH COUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND ELG	5
4.5	PROGRAMMATIC FIT	6
4.6	PROGRAMME DELIVERY AND USE	7
4.7	CO-LOCATION	7
4.8	CONSTITUENCY	8
4.9	OTHER OPERATIONAL ISSUES	8
5.	DETAILED FINDINGS	8
5.1	MANDATE	8
5.2	PROGRAMME FIT	10
5.3	PROGRAMME DELIVERY AND EFFICIENCY	12
5.4	CO-LOCATION	14
5.5	CONSTITUENCY	15
5.6	OTHER OPERATIONAL MATTERS	16
6	RECOMMENDATIONS	17
Annex 1.	Terms of Reference	20
Annex 2.	Review Matrix	24
Annex 3.	Information Sources Matrix	27
Annex 4.	Questionnaires	30
Annex 5.	List of persons interviewed	37
Annex 6.	Review Agenda	38

ACRONYMS

ARO	IUCN Asia Regional Office
CO	Country Office
CP	Country Programme
CR	Country Representative
ELG	Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group
IUCNSL	IUCN Sri Lanka Country Office
RBP	Regional Biodiversity Programme
REEP	Regional Environmental Economics Programmes
RMP	Regional Marine Programme
RTP	Regional Thematic Programmes
SPT	Strategic Planning Team

1. INTRODUCTION

The Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group 2 (ELG2) was established in late 2002 as a result of the first stage of the reorganization process undertaken by the IUCN Asia Regional Office (ARO). This process was in response to the rapid growth of the Asia Programme. ELG2 resulted from the clustering of three existing Regional Thematic Programmes (RTP): Regional Biodiversity Programme (RBP), Regional Environmental Economics Programme (REEP) and Regional Marine Programme (RMP). ELG2 started its operation in January 2003 in Colombo, Sri Lanka, simultaneously with its analog, the ELG1, based in Bangkok, Thailand.

In the year following its establishment in 1998, the IUCN ARO began a process of conducting regular reviews of its different units, at a pace of two or three every year. Before the 2002 reorganization, these reviews were focused on the Country Programmes and the Regional Thematic Programmes. After reorganization, both ELGs were added to the list of units to be reviewed. Over the last couple of years, several reviews took place as part of this regular process, such as the Pakistan Programme Review, the Regional Forest Programme Review, the Vietnam Office Review, the Regional Finance Unit Review, among others.

As part of this process, a Review of ELG2 was scheduled to take place in late 2003 or early 2004, following the meeting of the Regional Conservation Forum (Colombo, Sri Lanka, December 2003). A number of different problems caused delays of this particular Review, which finally took place in late April 2005 (see detailed Review Agenda attached as Annex 6).

The Review Team consisted of Alejandro Imbach (an external consultant, and former Regional Programme Coordinator, who acted as Team Leader) and Kent Jingfors (current IUCN Asia Regional Programme Coordinator).

This Report summarizes and presents the key features and results of the ELG2 Review.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORs)

The TORs for this specific review were developed by IUCN ARO in March 2005 and they guided the entire process.

The TORs defined 6 major focus areas for the Review:

- Mandate and integration
- Programmatic fit
- Programme delivery
- Co-location
- Constituency
- Other operational aspects

These six major areas were subdivided in 26 more specific aspects.

The complete TORs for the ELG2 Review are included as Annex 1 of this Report.

3. METHODOLOGY

The methodology used for this Review is presented in this section (including several complementary Annexes) as established by the IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Standards.

Basically the ELG2 Review had 4 components:

- Review Design: drafting of the TORs, preparation of the Review and Information Sources matrixes and development of information gathering tools (lists of documents, questionnaires, interview guidelines, etc.);
- Information gathering and analysis: collecting and reading the documents, interviewing people, organizing the information and having short Review Team meetings and conversations to develop both a common understanding of the situation and an agreed set of issues for discussion and recommendations;
- Feedback and discussion with ELG2: presenting and discussing with the staff the key findings of the Review in order to have a joint reflection about success stories, problems, challenges and new directions; and
- Reporting: preparation of the Review Report for the Regional Director and ARD, as a basis for review, follow-up and decision making.

In other words, the Review is an exercise aiming to open discussion and reflection at the reviewed unit level about their performance, and also an input for the decisions of the senior management level of the organization regarding performance aspects of the reviewed unit.

Methodologically, the Review proceeded along the following steps:

- a) Preparation of TORs. These were developed by the Asia Regional Office, as explained in the previous section. Complete TORs are included as Annex 1 to this Report.
- b) Preparation of the Review Matrix. Based on the TORs, the questions to be answered by the Review were developed. This Matrix served as the main guideline for gathering information. The complete Review Matrix is attached as Annex 2.
- c) Sources of information. In addition to written materials and reports, it was decided to carry out personal and phone interviews with IUCN staff from all relevant units, including those from IUCN Headquarters relevant to the Review. Depending on their function in IUCN, these persons were clustered in groups as follows:
 - Regional Programme Coordination (RPC)
 - Regional Corporate Units (Finance, Human Resources, Constituency Development and Strategic Planning Team)
 - Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group 1 (ELG1)
 - Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group 2 (ELG2)
 - Country Programmes (Country Representatives and/or Programme Coordinators)
 - IUCN Sri Lanka Office
 - IUCN Headquarters (Asia Senior Coordinator, select Programme Heads)
- d) Because not all the issues were relevant to all these clusters, a matrix was developed identifying whose issues were relevant to what clusters (see this Information Sources Matrix attached as Annex 3).

In this way, the relevant sources of information for each issue were identified.

- e) Development of questionnaires / interview guidelines. Based on the previous step matrix, specific questionnaires / interview guidelines were developed for each cluster. The complete set used in the Review can be found in Annex 4.
- f) Interviews. The following step was the identification of staff available for interview during the Review period. The information collected was used to prepare the list of persons to be interviewed (see list as Annex 5). Some of these interviews were made face-to-face in Bangkok and Colombo, while others were done by telephone calls (e.g. Country Offices, SPT and IUCN Headquarters). Persons interviewed by phone received the pertinent questionnaire one or two days before the interview.

The interviews were done, in person or by phone, during the period April 20 to May 01. Some were done individually by the Review Team members and others were done jointly.

- g) Information organization and analysis. The information collected from documents, reports and interviews was analyzed and organized in key and detailed findings.
- h) Key findings were summarized in a Power Point presentation and presented to a meeting including the ELG2 staff and the IUCN Sri Lanka Country Representative. After the presentation, a 2-hour session was conducted to open the discussion and collect the reaction of the participants to the findings. This information was then incorporated in the findings (see next Report Section on Key Findings).
- i) Recommendations. Based on all the collected information and the discussions, the Review Team prepared its Recommendations (see Report Section on Recommendations). A basic version of these Recommendations was also presented to the ELG2 staff before the departure of the Review Team from Colombo.

4. KEY FINDINGS

This section is organized along the main headings of the TORs, preceded by a short assessment of the current overall situation.

The content of the section is presented in bullet-type format to make it shorter and easier to read.

4.1 OVERALL SITUATION

- a) ELG2 was created in late 2002 and started its activities in early 2003, clustering existing Regional Thematic Programmes on Biodiversity, Marine and Environmental Economics.
- b) After more than two years of operation it is evident that significant progress has been made regarding the consolidation of the Group and each of its Programmes
- c) Several aspects can be mentioned to support the previous “significant progress” statement for ELG2, including:
 - impressive capacity to respond to the post-tsunami restoration needs;
 - re-establishment of the Marine Programme on a stable basis following its temporary and then complete closure for several months;

- excellent relations and joint work on environmental economics with the co-located Sri Lanka Country Office, and growing joint work with this Office on coastal and marine issues despite the relatively short period of active operation of the reactivated Marine Programme;
 - financial consolidation of the ELG2 Coordination through self-funding and contributions from all Programmes;
 - an expanded portfolio that cuts across both country programmes and regional ELGs, and contributes effectively to the overall regional and global programme;
 - increased level of team work within ELG2. While this level of team work still has room to improve, there is a visible difference between the current situation and the initial one when ELG2 was established;
 - remarkably positive perception about the ELG focal point role played by the ELG Head by the served Country Offices (Nepal and Sri Lanka);
 - recognition by the global constituency for its work during the WCC and for taking the technical lead in developing and coordinating post-tsunami project proposals.
- d) This progress was achieved through the intensive efforts of the ELG2 staff and its Head. All of them should be commended for the overall good performance of the Group.
- e) At the same time, performance hindering issues were identified during the Review and they are addressed in the following Key and Detailed Findings and the following Recommendations.

4.2 MANDATE

- a) The ELG mandate is understood differently across the Asia Region. Some understandings are conceptually clear (e.g. to ensure the integration of ecosystems and livelihoods) but operationally vague, while others are purely operational (e.g. to build capacity of the countries, to secure funding for the countries, to achieve the 60/40 in-country/regional portfolio targets, and similar)
- b) Consequently, there is a need to develop a common understanding of the ELG mandate across the Region.
- c) Interestingly, there is also a significant level of heterogeneity about the issue of the ELG Constituency. This aspect emerged when dealing with constituency issues, but its immediate effects are related to mandate.
- d) In other words, if the constituency identification tells who are going to be “served” by the ELG, the mandate tells how. And both cannot be separated.
- e) Both issues, ELG constituency and mandate, require a broader process of analysis and consensus, involving the other ELGs as well as the Country Programmes and some regional units. Therefore, these issues escaped significantly the scope of the ELG2 Review.
- f) Nonetheless, a brief initial probing within ELG2 showed that the key elements perceived by the ELG2 staff are:
- Constituency: Country Offices, Governments, partners and donors, Commission members and members. In all cases (excepting the first) the relationship should be channeled through the respective Country Office (where they exist) or, else, keeping the Regional Director and Country Representative informed.
 - Mandate:
 - capacity building, using a variety of methods and approaches;

- provision of a regional platform connected with the global ones for networking, intelligence gathering, exchange of experiences and other similar aspects;
- proposal development and fund raising at both national and regional level, jointly with the Country Programme and beneficial for both
- access to information, expertise, regional and global institutions and similar

4.3 INTERNAL INTEGRATION

- a) Perceptions from both outside and inside ELG2 suggest that integration and joint work within ELG2 has not been fully achieved yet.
- b) There are just a few joint programmatic activities among the three Programmes and these joint activities are not very visible.
- c) Proposal development has stayed confined within each Regional Thematic Programme (as seen from the current OABC list).
- d) There are internal difficulties to get consolidated information, copies of proposals, and project documents from the different units.
- e) There is also a noticeable record of conflicts affecting some of these thematic units.
- f) While the Review Team did not make major efforts in further exploring those conflicts, their mere existence appears to have taken considerable time and energy away from working as a coherent team and actively developing new project concepts and proposals in an integrated fashion. Regardless, of who is right or wrong something needs to be done to address this situation.
- g) Several different explanations were provided for these problems, ranging from personality to structure.
- h) In terms of structure, a number of individuals interviewed felt the RTP-based structure favors isolation and tribalism and fosters competition rather than cooperation among Programmes.
- i) The Review Team shares that view and makes specific recommendations about dissolving the Regional Thematic Programmes and turn ELG2 into an integrated team of thematic experts. Detailed recommendations on this issue are in the pertinent section of this Report.

4.4 INTEGRATION ACROSS ASIA WITH COUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND ELG

- a) The perceptions are heterogeneous between “weak” and “average”. Country Offices (COs) feel, in general, that it is weak. Obviously these perceptions are influenced by the different understandings of constituency and mandate mentioned initially.
- b) Some of the aspects mentioned to support these perceptions are:
 - ELG2 develops their projects and activities and then inform the countries reducing the opportunity for country ownership of Projects;
 - ELG just subcontracts COs to fulfill their own Projects;
 - COs are rarely involved in the stage of proposal preparation; therefore, those proposals are not always aligned with Country priorities.
- c) At the root of these problems are 2 basic elements: the first are the constituency and mandate issues mentioned before. The second is attitude. The integration of regional ELGs and CO programmes needs a clear commitment and a clear understanding that none of the parts take precedence over the other. As two halves make a whole, ELGs and COs make the IUCN Programme in Asia.

- d) The first can be addressed through a short process of meetings, reflection and refining. The second needs an organizational review that looks for structures that promote synergy, team work and close collaboration. Impediments to those attributes need to be removed. That may sound drastic, but the integration required both within and between ELGs and COs is so central to the cohesion of the ONE IUCN Programme that other considerations should necessarily take second place.
- e) Integration between ELG2 RPTs with their HQ counterparts has generally been good (e.g. Marine and Economics) whereas the regional “ELG” construct is still not widely understood by HQ staff.

4.5 PROGRAMMATIC FIT

- a) **Regional Biodiversity Programme (RBP)**. There are concerns about the RBP fit within IUCN Asia in the sense that Biodiversity is the business of the entire IUCN, not just a single Programme within a Group (such as ELG2).
- b) Having a Programme with the same scope of the organization leads almost inevitably to overlap and frictions. Initially, when RBP was the only Regional Thematic Programme in Asia, it was not a problem; but the multiplication of RTPs with clear focus on different issues related to biodiversity has become increasingly problematic.
- c) Having said that, it is also necessary to recognize that RBP deals with a number of very relevant lines of work, ranging from global conventions and global and regional partners to other activities closer to the field.
- d) Therefore, it seems that there is room for splitting the RBP work and maintaining the more field-related aspects within the ELG structure (e.g. Species, TRAFFIC) and to shift its global and policy components to a regional programmatic level that facilitates the networking links between the global and regional biodiversity processes with COs in IUCN Asia.
- e) **Regional Environmental Economics Programme (REEP)**. There is a broad consensus across the Asia region that the programmatic scope of REEP fits the needs of the region and countries pretty well. In fact, economics is seen as the quintessential cross-cutting programme that everybody needs and that gradually is getting to all parts of the system (even if not all of them have been reached yet). The previous work on valuation studies and PA financing was cited as areas of particular strength for REEP.
- f) In addition to what REEP is currently doing (which includes an increasing post-tsunami portfolio), there are new potential areas of work emerging globally, including national level green accounting and fiscal reforms to provide added incentives for maintaining or enhancing ecosystem services. There is an inherent risk for REEP in not setting its priorities clearly and in becoming over-extended and essentially swamped. While there is no evidence that this is happening, the risk is there and the Review Team simply wants to flag this for future consideration.
- g) **Regional Marine Programme (RMP)**. Thanks to the joint efforts between the Global IUCN Marine Programme, an external partner (CORDIO funded by SIDA) and ELG2, the RMP was essentially revitalized after a brief hiatus.
- h) While its importance and relevance are widely recognized, especially in the post-tsunami environment, some issues emerged regarding the scope of RMP - should it be marine, coastal or both (i.e. more along the lines of ICZM)?
- i) If the coastal piece is incorporated, it means that we are no longer talking about a type of ecosystem but about a landscape with several terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems included. In other words, the marine ecosystem is closer to the forest or wetland ecosystems, while the coastal landscape is closer to the mountains landscape (i.e. both have

forest and wetland ecosystems as components). This has implications on scope, staffing, and programmatic fit but we believe those implications also present opportunities for expanding the ELG2 work into new countries, such as Indonesia, India and the Maldives particularly in the post-tsunami context.

- j) **Programmatic Focus of an Integrated ELG2.** If the recommendation of dissolving the RTPs and creating a single ELG2 integrated team is followed, then a question emerges quickly: what may be the programmatic focus of ELG2 if the integrated team approach is adopted? Will it become integrated around coastal areas as the piece of territory that will provide sites for coalescence? Will it be integrated with the other regional ELG on other ecosystems and landscapes? Will it be integrated with Country ELGs on their particular landscapes? Or all the above?
- k) These are not simple questions and the Review Team did not spend too much time in trying to answer them. Suffice to say these are important considerations in defining a programmatic focus if ELG2 moves towards an integrated team model.
- l) Furthermore, how will a truly integrated ELG model relate to the global thematic programmes (e.g. by maintaining thematic counterparts or scaling up to “ELG counterparts”)?
- m) Finally, there have been recent discussions in the IUCN Asia Region on where to locate Environmental Assessment (EA) either as a thematic programme or an area of competence. While ELG2 has expressed a willingness to also take this on, it does not appear to be a “natural fit” but, rather, it may distract from the more coherent move towards an integrated coastal/marine - livelihoods focus. For the time being, we believe that EA should stay with Emerging Programmes until the programme focus of ELG2 has been further defined.

4.6 PROGRAMME DELIVERY AND USE

- a) There is a broad consensus about the good performance of the entire ELG2 in terms of timely delivery of outputs.
- b) In terms of use, the perceptions from the countries is that the ELG2 deliverables are concentrated in the Knowledge part of the Knowledge-Empowerment-Governance strategy.
- c) There are different perceptions regarding the use of ELG2 products. Again, this is attributable to different perceptions about constituency:
 - Those who see their constituency closer to governments appreciate the RBP-type of products (guidelines, briefs, short workshops);
 - Those who see it more in terms of COs (and their strengthening) appreciate the REEP-type of products (mentoring, working together, helping to resource COs).

4.7 CO-LOCATION

- a) In overall terms, co-location of ELG2 in Sri Lanka is perceived by both sides as a positive decision. There are pluses and minuses on both sides but the overall balance is positive
- b) The pluses are on the side of the development of IUCNSL capacities in some areas addressed by ELG2 (mostly Environmental Economics and Marine).
- c) Minuses are about small conflicts on services, concerns about ELG not always involving IUCNSL in contacts and relations with Government of Sri Lanka, some issues regarding funding, etc.
- d) All these aspects can and should be addressed properly, and they were most of the times. On the other hand, and despite all precautions, there always are issues emerging from this relationship. Therefore, the efforts in this area should be focused more on developing and maintaining fluid mechanisms to cope with them.

- e) There is a good interpersonal relationship at the top of both units, and excellent integration in some technical areas (e.g. Environmental Economics) that should be extended to all common technical areas.

4.8 CONSTITUENCY

- a) A surprisingly complicated issue emerged here as a result of the low level of consensus about who the key constituencies of COs and ELGs are? In other words, who are they serving?
- b) This issue and its implications were already addressed at the initial section, as well as its connection with mandate and other issues.
- c) Given all these connections, it is not difficult to understand that the perceptions about how well ELG is serving its constituency is not homogeneous. As this issue did not emerge as a key one, it is treated in more detail in the next section on Detailed Findings.

4.9 OTHER OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- a) There are some concerns from Regional Finance about the financial health of ELG2.
 - They expect that the small projected deficit for 2005 will be covered by consulting-type work contracted during the year.
 - They are concerned by the complete lack of secured (C) income for 2006 and afterwards
- b) On the other hand, it seems that all current Programmes are working on Project proposals. Several of these proposals (Especially from RMP and REEP) are related to post-tsunami rehabilitation, therefore it is expected that the approval process will be faster than usual. For example, there are currently at least two tsunami related proposals totaling USD 1.7 million that have the potential to engage both ELG2 and IUCNSL/IUCNT and extend beyond 2005, if approved (both factored at 80%).
- c) There is also a concern about the short-term nature of most ELG2 projects, as they convey the idea that most of the ELG2 work is consulting.
- d) While consulting is just a form of contracting work, some efforts should be made to demonstrate that all these pieces of short-term work are tied up together and point to the same direction. This is not obvious at the moment.
- e) Related to the previous point, getting some medium and long term projects (3 years and beyond) needs to be considered as a priority.
- f) It should be noted that the emphasis is on medium and long term projects more than large ones. Medium and long term projects increase stability and if they are large, even better. Large short-term projects increase vulnerability because they lead to growth in the structure without time to develop sustainability.
- g) It is believed that if ELG2 becomes a single team, working in an integrated way focusing on coastal landscapes in a post-tsunami environment, getting these medium to long term projects will be considerably easier.

5. DETAILED FINDINGS

This section presents short and specific comments about the complete set of points defined in the TORs of the Review. Some issues were already presented in the previous section, and despite efforts to keep both sets separated, there may be some repetitions.

5.1 MANDATE

(a) An analysis of the clarity of the mandate of ELG2 vis-à-vis its previous component RTPs to the staff, and the common understanding thereof, including perceptions, at all levels of staff on the mandate;

The mandate of ELG2 is clear to its members, as well as to the Country Offices staff interviewed. The problem is that everybody seems to have a different (and clear) idea about what ELG should be doing. As mentioned in the previous section, this heterogeneity is linked to different ideas about who are the key constituents of ELG. In fact, these issues are not restricted to ELG2, they encompass the entire ELG system. Section 6 includes Recommendations about this aspect.

(b) Assessment of the achievements of ELG2 against the original objectives and internal reviews undertaken so far.

As far as the Review Team knows, there were no previous reviews of ELG2 or their Programmes up until now. In terms of the original objectives, there are some mentioned in the reorganization process papers from 2002, but most of the task of thinking and strategizing about ELG was left to the groups themselves and the initial and most comprehensive document produced was the “ELG Manifesto” from February 2003, or “ Building and Managing the Ecosystems and Livelihoods Groups: A discussion paper on operationalising Stage 1 of the reorganization (Regional Thematic Programmes)”, by Andrew Ingles and Lucy Emerton.

This document sets a high threshold for ELG and, overall speaking, they have progressed significantly towards this threshold. It seems that the progress is uneven and a quick assessment shows that there is very significant progress on the areas related to the internal operation, consolidation, staffing and integration within and between ELGs. There is less progress on the integration with Country Programmes; however, several steps have been taken and good and strong links are already established with some countries (mostly South Asian) while the integration with SE Asian, while existing, is much less developed. There is even less progress on the communication aspects, particularly the external ones, but this is also a general weakness in Asia and other regions (even considering the significant progress made over the last couple of years).

Summarizing, ELG2 has made significant progress over the last couple of years towards achieving the original objectives set for the ELGs. This should be a good reason for pride and also an energizer to face the remaining challenges.

(c) A critique on the level of integration amongst the component RTPs, their fit in this particular ELG, and the relevance or otherwise of continuing with the regional thematic programmes;

The integration within ELG2 is uneven. There are signals of growing integration between REEP and RMP, but this integration is not reflected yet in joint Project proposals (based on the existing OABC list). These 2 Programmes have only become fully functional in recent months and they have so far been largely focusing on the post-tsunami efforts. In brief, there are encouraging signals and lots of opportunities for enhanced integration.

RBP is a separate problem and it remains more isolated, as it was before the clustering of the Programmes in ELG2. There are differences in scope, management style and history that seem to be keeping RBP in relative isolation. RBP maintains its own website, listserver and annual progress reports with no acknowledgement of being part of the larger ELG2.

The issue of fit in this particular ELG seems less relevant as the basic concept is that there is one single ELG in Asia, with groups sitting in different locations. In that sense, all RTPs belong to the

ELG and they are assumed to fit into this larger structure. There is also an issue with the name of RBP; biodiversity is the business of the entire IUCN and all its units regardless of the level; therefore, having one unit within a Group carrying that name is somewhat misleading. Moreover, many activities fit under “biodiversity” and that situation has led to a number of conflicts due to overlap between RBP and the other RTPs in Asia. Section 6 includes Recommendations about this aspect.

(d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.

Again, the situation here is heterogeneous. The new RMP is too new to have had significant interactions, but the early signs are encouraging. Both REEP and RBP have a good record of cooperation with the Country Offices. There are different perspectives about the depth of this cooperation. That means that, even recognizing the efforts and activities implemented by RBP in the countries, the COs seem to attach more value to the interaction with REEP on the basis that this interaction has helped them more in developing and strengthening their capacities and skills.

5.2 PROGRAMME FIT

(a) An analysis of the development of the OABC list for ELG2 during the last two years to advise on the fit of the work programme within the overall IUCN Asia programme;

While there is an OABC list for ELG2, this list reflects the activities of its Thematic Programmes more than an integrated ELG2 effort. The OABC list of the RMP currently only has secured income (C projects) from CORDIO related activities funded by SIDA and managed in close cooperation with the Global Marine Programme. However, RMP has been actively developing project proposals in support of post-tsunami restoration efforts and when coupled with good potential for expanding CORDIO activities in the region, the RMP should be well on its way towards financial sustainability.

In the case of RBP and REEP, both seem to have one mid-term project supporting the entire RTP and then a long list of small and short-term activities that look basically as consulting work. Some of this work is contracted internally (mostly in the case of REEP). In principle, there is nothing wrong in doing consulting work if consulting is taken just as a form of contracting work. To make a convincing case of the previous statement it is necessary to develop a good case explaining how these pieces of short work are linked and articulated consistently towards clear goals. This is not evident in the case of ELG2.

It can be argued that by providing internal services they are helping the overall work of IUCN in Asia. It can also be argued that by serving international processes in which IUCN is an actor also helps to forward the cause of conservation embedded in the IUCN mission. Both arguments have a valid side, but they lead immediately to the question why IUCN should have structures that consume time and efforts just to provide services? Would it not be easier just to hire consultants? The balance between having to secure income for the programmes through consultancies while also having to develop a longer-term strategic focus to implement the overall IUCN programme remains a challenging one. In all fairness, two programmes (RMP and REEP) were depopulated and repopulated over the last couple of years, so most probably the basic signals that can be perceived are really going to crystallize soon in the adoption of some strategic areas as the focus of the ELG2 work (e.g. coastal areas). The case of RBP is different because RBP is the oldest Thematic Programme in Asia and it had a remarkable stability in terms of staff. The problem of the lack of

strategic focus is that the work of the global policy component is conceived mostly as providing services to others (meaning that they are the ones with the strategic initiative) while the work closer to the ground is suffering from friction with other parts of IUCN due to overlaps and weak collaboration and joint work.

In summary, while there is still work required to ensure the financial sustainability of ELG2 in terms of secure income (C projects), a number of good proposals (mostly related to tsunami work) are in the pipeline. The programmatic focus of ELG2 on economics and marine has been particularly relevant in responding to the post-tsunami reconstruction needs. The role of RBP in developing these large, joint tsunami proposals has been negligible, not because of a lack of programmatic fit, but, rather, as a consequence of largely working outside the ELG construct.

(b) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work for ELG2 within the overall programme;

Part of this issue was addressed in the previous section. In terms of thematic fit, the opportunities for programmatically well-fitted work on coastal and economics issues are enormous. The huge coastline extension in Asia and all the human and natural resources issues related to this coastline provide enough justification for the work in coastal areas for a long time.

Similarly, there is an increasing demand for environmental economics work to help mainstream environmental issues in both national and global agendas. This demand will generate needs to design and use economic tools to merge those environmental issues with the existing concepts, systems and tools used as a base for decision making at governmental and private sector levels.

The case for maintaining a strong competence in biodiversity is obvious as an integral part of the global Union. When a single group or entity is organized to “represent” the biodiversity theme, it becomes problematic and suggests a need to divide the theme into fewer, manageable parts such as the broader policy issues related to CBD implementation, the more practical, on-the-ground issues related to biodiversity assessments, and the species listings and subsequent recovery efforts required to maintain biodiversity. The recommended shift of ELG2 towards an integrated team will allow it to retain or further develop some of these areas of expertise, while challenging other Thematic Programmes (as forests, wetlands, protected areas, marine, etc.) to mainstream biodiversity aspects into their own fields.

(c) The degree to which this programme has addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme).

Similarly to other questions, this one is tainted by the problems already mentioned about the inconsistent definitions of constituency across the system. So, for those that believe that Governments are the key constituency, they feel that the RBP-type products (such as publications, briefs, short workshops, etc.) were useful for that constituency. It should also be stated that this usefulness has been short-lived, particularly in the cases of Convention-COPs related issues. It is useful to help countries to prepare better for COPs (and there is no dispute about that) but given the high rotation of personnel within some Governments these capacities do not remain in place, so it is necessary to start over and over again. Obviously this is not a criticism of RBP but it is something that needs to be analyzed more deeply.

For those believing that Country Offices are the main ELG constituency, they like more the type of supporting, working together, sustained efforts that REEP tends to provide. Obviously this is more time demanding and REEPs delivering capacity is not enough to cope with the need of all Country Offices and Projects. This fact should lead to a deeper discussion on how the ELG knowledge is

going to reach the entire organization. Thinking in terms of the ELG just doing that implies significant increases in staff and costs that the COs seem not to be ready to support while just asking the ELG to fund themselves through Projects increases their workload and has the potential to generate significant conflicts with the COs. So, a more sophisticated model needs to be reinforced that links Regional ELG to Country ELG to projects, partners, members and other national constituencies. In other words, an alliance between Regional and Country ELG is formed so the latter can be the key recipients of ELG capacity and knowledge transfers and, at the same time, act as an amplifier to have this knowledge and capacity reaching the constituents and other stakeholders. This is, fundamentally, the basis for the ELG model that needs to be uniformly understood across the system.

Another important part of the constituency is the IUCN Global Programme, and at this level, relationships to the individual RTPs were generally considered good. It seems that the exchange and relationships with both RMP and REEP are positive and productive. The close relationship between RMP and the Global Marine Programme is further strengthened by the funding support provided by the latter.

5.3 PROGRAMME DELIVERY AND EFFICIENCY

(a) A critical review of the implementation of the 'APDG' (Asia Programme Development Group) process, including programme planning, project design and implementation, including monitoring and evaluation systems, and timely delivery and quality assurance of outputs;

The PDG process has not worked very well. Initially, it was decided to have it jointly with the Sri Lanka Office but the good intentions were never really implemented. Most recently, after the hiring of the ELG2 Programme Coordinator, a specific PDG process for ELG2 has been designed and very recently set in operation. Its principles and operation are consistent with the Regional system and guidelines, so it will be necessary to wait for a few months to be able to assess how it is working.

There are still apparent difficulties in compiling complete project proposals and approved project documents from the RTPs in order to organize a complete filing system for ELG2. It is expected that the renewed, more integrated structure will help address this problem.

In terms of the other planning and quarterly reporting tasks, ELG2 was always among the better performers in complying with regional deadlines for products. The addition of a Programme Coordinator should help ensure that ELG2 can maintain that good standing.

(b) A KEGO-wise analysis of outputs during the last two years;

There is some consensus that most of the work generated by ELG2 since its creation can be classified under the K (Knowledge) aspect of the KEGO. Even when products were developed aiming to have effects on governance, their basic nature still seems to be K. However, if, as some believe, the ELGs should be considered as the IUCN Asia think-tank, then it makes sense that their products are K type. Again, this issue is biased by the different perceptions about constituency and mandate already presented.

(c) A short analysis of the highlights of outputs of ELG2 in the last two years, including their 'Reach' and 'Expected Use', and how these have been used in influencing the 'conservation agenda';

The Review Team did not have time to probe on these issues deeply. The overall perception about the reach and expected use of the ELG2 products is that they are still somewhat limited although most respondents agreed that ELG2 has done a good job in achieving its results and producing good products (see below). The outputs related to supporting Governments attending COPs are considered as good but limited, with very small or no follow-up. The outputs related to studies, publications and seminars on different aspects of environmental economics are considered good, but limited to too few countries.

(d) Effectiveness of ELG2 in achieving its own Results, and their contribution to those of the Union;

There is a generalized perception across the IUCN Asia Region that the delivery effectiveness of ELG2 and its Programmes is quite good.

(e) An analysis of resource (HR, Finances) constraints, if any, in programme delivery;

There is a generalized perception that ELG2 has not suffered from resource constraints different from those affecting other units. However, it is necessary to emphasize that one of the Programmes (Marine) was completely closed for several months, with an empty OABC List, because of staffing issues (two persons left for different reasons within a year of so) and the lack of capacity during that time to develop a portfolio for this Programme. Thanks to a joint effort between the Global IUCN Marine Programme, an external partner (CORDIO) and ELG2 it was possible to re-establish this Programme very recently. This new phase seems to be going better as new interns and staff have now been recruited and there is a visible effort to develop a portfolio for the Programme.

REEP also went through two replacements of its Programme Head (first when Lucy Emerton was moved to the ELG2 Head position, and second when her replacement (Rina Rosales) left IUCN. So, while the continuity of REEP was not drastically affected, these comings and goings definitively had effects on the Programme.

In comparison RBP has been stable, in staff terms, since the creation of ELG2. RBP has also, until recently, been well-resourced and has had stable programme funding for a number of years. It is in a deficit position for 2005 with no secure income for 2006. However, there are a number of prospects that may move from the B to the C list, including an agrobiodiversity conservation project (ADB).

(f) An Analysis and recommendations on the emerging “task team” approach to programme planning, development and delivery;

The “task team” approach seems to be embraced quite enthusiastically by those who tested it during the recent post-tsunami efforts and also by others who used it occasionally for other purposes. The Review Team considers that this concept is quite appropriate for an organization like IUCN. It is believed that if IUCN wishes to maintain or even improve its competitive advantage over other organizations in Asia (international, governmental and/or non-governmental) one way to achieve this is to improve its flexibility and capacity to bring together different specialists and specialties into fully integrated teams, able to think and act across disciplinary barriers and to create truly integrated solutions. The task-team approach seems a good mechanism to foster this flexible and multi-disciplinary approach.

Moreover, in the next Section, the Review Team is recommending ELG2 to organize itself as a single team with task teams, leaving aside the Regional Thematic Programme structure. The same

approach seems to be in the process of adoption by the Sri Lanka ELG. So, in a year or so, it is going to be possible for IUCN Asia to assess the benefits and constraints of this model using the actual experience of some of its own regional and country units.

- (g) Development of new areas of work to provide a ‘Centre of Excellence’-type status.

The basic finding is that this concept is still too new, most of the interviewed staff have not heard about it, and for those that have, they have different (and sometimes contradictory) notions. The prevailing view in Asia seems to be that this is (or should be) an academic institution and not really used in the context of an IUCN programme or capacity.

What does seem clear is that ELG2 has in a very short period of time developed considerable, high quality experience (together with the IUCN Sri Lanka country office) on disaster recovery issues after the tsunami.

5.4 CO-LOCATION

- (a) A short situational analysis in regard to locating ELG2 in IUCN Sri Lanka, and recommendations for addressing constraints, obstacles etc., if any;

As mentioned in the Key Findings, there is a good level of consensus that co-locating ELG2 in Sri Lanka was a good decision. There were (and there will be) issues arising from this co-location but in general they were managed and the relationship and collaboration between these two units remains quite good in general. The imminent addition of TRAFFIC to this mix will create a “cluster” whereby ELG2 will also act as a host organization in addition to being co-located with the Sri Lanka country office.

- (b) A critical commentary on advantages and disadvantages of continuing ELG2 in Colombo;

The advantage of continuing ELG2 in Colombo is to provide continuity to the joint efforts and to the process of supporting IUCNSL to develop its core capacities in the areas of ELG2 expertise.

There are no evident disadvantages when comparing Colombo with other locations of Country Offices.

There is always a question about whether or not all the ELGs should come together to a single location and become a single team. This issue was already raised and analyzed in 2002 during reorganization and the basic rationale at that time was the need to keep a balance in the deployment of technical capacities across the different parts of Asia. This rationale seems to be still valid.

Obviously the second stage of reorganization and the clustering of Country Offices is going to reverberate across the entire IUCN system in Asia. Whether or not that will impact on the current rationale for ELG locations remains to be seen.

- (c) An analysis of the degree of ‘fusion’ between ELG2 and IUCN SL in programme planning, delivery, staff interactions;

There is not such a thing as fusion between ELG2 and IUCNSL. There is no evidence that IUCNSL has become dependent on ELG2 or that ELG2 is focusing too much of its work on Sri Lanka. There is a temporary focus of the marine work on post-tsunami issues but this is a relatively short-term

period and this work has also been extended to Thailand (another country hit by tsunami where IUCN has a country programme).

Therefore, it seems that the relationship between these units is quite healthy (despite occasional grumblings from both sides) and mutually beneficial.

(d) A commentary on the corporate services provided by IUCN SL to ELG2, and recommendations for improving these services, as appropriate.

IUCN SL provision and delivery of corporate services to ELG2 is one of the areas where small friction seem to happen from time to time. While these issues need to be resolved (and they have been mostly addressed and solved), it is fair to say they do not carry significant weight in the overall large picture of the IUCNSL / ELG2 relationships.

Moreover, it may be naïve to assume that this kind of relationships can be maintained without glitches. Therefore, besides taking the necessary steps to solve the problems, it is necessary to develop some mechanisms to deal with them in a more structured way.

Today, most of the problems are solved through the good personal relationships between the IUCNSL CR and the ELG2 Head. Personalities aside, it would be useful to establish some formal mechanisms that would facilitate and encourage this type of cooperation to continue (e.g. through sharing corporate services and reporting relationships).

One area of corporate services that could be integrated better is that of communications and knowledge management. Currently, IUCN Sri Lanka has their own communications and library resource person in addition to a strong IT section. RBP also has their own communications strategy while ELG2 appears to have neither. Sharing these resources between ELG2 and the CO would result in efficiencies and better integration between the two programmes.

5.5 CONSTITUENCY

(a) An analysis of the involvement of Members and Commission Members in the ELG2 programme;

This appears to be quite limited. RBP, and to a lesser extent REEP, makes efforts to keep members and Commissions informed about what they do. But actual participation by members in either the planning or the delivery of ELG2 activities does not seem to commonly occur. One contributing factor may be the general difficulty in using membership databases (particularly for Commission members). Another, more significant, factor is likely that this outreach has largely depended on the country office (and Constituency Development) initiating this involvement. As ELG2 matures, it needs to directly reach out to members, particularly Commission members in the relevant technical areas it focuses on.

(b) A commentary on networking with global or regional institutions;

Networking is probably the most salient feature of RBP. A combined effort of reaching its constituency through a website (www.biodiversityasia.org), and an e-mail list server (BIOPLAN) that reinforce each other has been run by RBP for a few years. In addition to that, the RBP staff makes real efforts in attending regional and global meetings, particularly in the subjects related with the Biodiversity Convention (CBD).

The ELG2 Head, and REEP through her, also maintains active networks and contacts with colleagues from the same discipline area in the region and around the world. The RMP coordinator is partially hired by a network (CORDIO) and through that he is linked to other networks related to coastal and marine issues. Neither REEP nor RBP maintain similar e-mail lists or websites as does RBP.

Needless to say, all these networks are extremely useful for the type of work that ELG2 is doing, therefore these activities should be encouraged and, hopefully, integrated into a larger networking and communications effort for IUCN Asia as a whole.

(c) A commentary on the capacity building of the constituency through joint work, training programmes, etc.

See previous sections.

5.6 OTHER OPERATIONAL MATTERS

(a) A brief review of ELG2 financial situation, and its contribution to the Asia programme;

The ELG2 financial situation seems to have improved significantly in relation to its first year of operation. The unit is now able to cover all its costs and the flow of incoming work for the next few months seems more than enough to cover any deficit for 2005 projected currently on the basis of the existing OABC list. Compared with 2004, the expenditure budget for 2005 has risen significantly (from USD292,863 to USD469,270) largely as a result of recruiting a REEP Coordinator and a Programme Coordinator for ELG2 - both of these positions are considered to be sound, long-term investments in moving towards financial sustainability for the unit.

In the medium term, there are valid concerns about the lack of any secure income (C Projects) for 2006 or later. On the other hand, the window of opportunity created by the tsunami seems to be well capitalized by ELG2 and several proposals are under elaboration and preliminary discussion. Therefore, there is room to be optimistic about the potential of ELG2 to get some medium-term projects soon and to be able to get out of the short-term project modality. This income will also help support country programmes, particularly in Sri Lanka and Thailand.

(b) A brief review of the human resources capacity of ELG2 vis-à-vis its mandate and the programme, and any broad recommendations for strengthening HR capacity;

There are no obvious problems regarding the technical capacity of ELG2 staff, even recognizing that this is an issue difficult to assess during a short mission. There are different management styles within the unit and they create tensions within it, but this is an issue of concern for the next level of senior management and decisions should be taken at that level.

In that sense, the opinion of the Review Team is that those styles that are more open, collaborative and less hierarchical should be favored, especially in the context of a collegial organization such as IUCN and in the more specific context of an integrated ELG conducive to sharing and building technical expertise.

In terms of staff strengthening, it seems advisable for ELG2 to reinforce its technical capacities by hiring staff with strong social sciences background on poverty and livelihoods issues and with proven field experience. This is an obvious gap to be filled if the Group is going to work seriously

on integrated coastal zone managements issues. Needless to say, financial room needs to be created before considering such expansion.

(c) Identification of new and emerging areas that would strengthen the ELG2 programme;

This is a difficult question that is perhaps better answered by other programmes in IUCN that have the “pulse” on these areas (e.g. Global Programme at HQ, Emerging Programmes in Asia). What was collected from the interviews was a recommended focus on integrated coastal zone management (including Coastal and Marine Protected Areas) as a natural continuation of the post-tsunami recovery efforts; expanding the environmental economics theme into areas of National Green Accounting, Fiscal Reform and how to use these as incentives for maintaining or enhancing ecosystem services; and expanding efforts on species and collaboration with TRAFFIC.

(d) Identification of needs to reformulate or re-focus existing programmes and activities within ELG2;

This issue was already addressed in previous questions. In summary, the re-focusing should include:

- *Adding coastal zone management to the mandate of ELG2*
- *Keeping the REEP management within manageable limits. There is a risk of over-extending REEP due to the growing intensity and variety of demands involving environmental economics aspects.*
- *Adding a more specific mandate on species assessments and recovery actions, as part of a more narrowly focused biodiversity theme in ELG2.*
- *Moving the global biodiversity policy component (one position) out of ELG2 to improve team work and the programmatic focus of ELG2.*

(e) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme.

None.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

- a) The progress achieved by ELG2 (staff and ELG2 Head) in terms of consolidation of the Group, relations with country offices and initial steps of internal integration should be commended. There are differences of approach, style and opinion within ELG2, but regardless of that, the strong commitment of the staff to the organization should also be highlighted.

CONSTITUENCY AND MANDATE

- b) Internal exercises on identification of constituents for Country Offices and ELGs (both at country and regional level) should be done. Once they are completed, they should be harmonized at each level (ELG and CO) and shared across the region.
- c) It is recommended that the Country Offices should be taken as one of the key constituents for ELGs and vice versa.
- d) Once the constituency identification is finished, it should be used to refine the pertinent mandates of the different units.

- e) The ELG mandate, in relation to Country Offices, should include at least:
- Developing COs capacity in the areas of ELG expertise
 - Provide mentoring as well as global and donor intelligence to COs
 - Develop project proposals jointly with COs, to be implemented by COs and writing themselves (ELG) into those proposals.

INTERNAL INTEGRATION

- f) It is recommended to dissolve all three Regional Thematic Programmes belonging to ELG2 and to replace the RTP-based structure by an integrated team composed of specialists.
- g) Some key aspects to be highlighted in relation to this new approach are:
- The key elements of the new model are flexibility, less hierarchy and more team work.
 - This team will be integrated by senior and junior experts in different areas, under the leadership of the ELG2 Head.
 - Depending on work demands, the overall team will be divided in temporary task teams, under the coordination of a staff person appointed by the ELG2 Head
 - Each task team will be dissolved as soon as the task assigned to it is completed and the task team coordinator position will also disappear.
 - Every ELG member can belong to different task teams.
- h) The single budget and single OABC List approach should be maintained and adjusted to reflect the disappearance of the RTPs and the single team structure.
- i) Other mechanisms and incentives to foster internal integration should be put in place (e.g. joint work planning, proposal development and sharing of knowledge and intelligence).

PROGRAMMATIC SCOPE

- j) It is recommended to maintain Environmental Economics within the ELG2 scope and with a strategic focus that moves away from small, short-term consultancies towards integrating the economics theme into longer term, multi-disciplinary livelihoods initiatives, particularly in coastal areas. New areas should be explored, but with caution, to ensure growth does not occur at the expense of delivering on existing commitments.
- k) It is recommended to extend explicitly the mandate on coastal areas to ELG2, in addition to marine ecosystems. That extension may have implications on the range of technical specialties required in ELG2 (e.g. new livelihoods expertise coming from the social sciences; existing wetlands expertise shared by ELG1).
- l) It is recommended to move the global biodiversity policy component (one position) out of ELG2 to enhance team work and to focus the ELG2 contribution on biodiversity to areas more closely tied to field implementation (e.g. species assessments and recovery, TRAFFIC).

- m) Environmental Assessment (EA) should stay with Emerging Programmes for now and not be added to the current programmatic scope of ELG2.

INTEGRATION ACROSS ASIA

- n) The general pattern followed by REEP in terms of helping to set specific EE capacities in the countries and allocating substantial time and resources to develop them should be taken as a model to be followed by the new integrated team.
- o) Integration among regional and country ELGs is an issue that remains to be addressed and this Review does not have more specific recommendations in this regard.

OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- p) Current efforts to improve Programme Coordination systems and procedures should be maintained.
- q) Additional efforts should be made to develop a portfolio of medium to long term (2-5 years) integrated projects that draws on the multi-disciplinary expertise both from within ELG2 and between ELG2 and ELG1.
- r) Projects (especially those requiring field implementation) should involve the pertinent Country Offices from the early planning and design stages, and include CO staff and other partners (particularly Members) during implementation.

ANNEX 1. REVIEW OF ELG 2 AND ITS COMPONENT THEMATIC PROGRAMMES - Terms of Reference

Introduction:

As a part of restructuring of the IUCN Asia Programme, the Ecosystem and Livelihood Groups (ELG) were established on 1 January, 2003 by bringing together Regional Thematic Programmes (RTPs). Accordingly, ELG 1 was set up in Bangkok (ARO Office) with the Regional Forest Programme (RFP), Regional Wetland and Water Programme (RWWP) and the Regional Environmental Law Programme (RELPA). ELG 2, with the Regional Environmental Economics Programme (REEP), Regional Marine Programme (RMP) and the Regional Biodiversity Programme (RBP) was instituted in Colombo, co-located in IUCN Sri Lanka Office. The Regional Protected Areas Programme, co-located in IUCN Vietnam Office became the base for ELG 3 during 2004.

There were several underlying reasons for clustering of RTPs. The main reasons being: providing integration and synergy into the diverse programmatic work, providing a stronger linkage and technical assistance to the country programme development, particularly in the areas of expertise available within RTPs, providing a forum to voice this expertise collectively, strengthening networking and partnerships, and enhancing financial viability of IUCN Asia.

ELGs have now been in existence for just over two years. To a large extent the major staffing, programmatic and system changes that needed to be set in place have been implemented. Programme Coordinators have also been appointed for both ELG clusters. In the light of ELG having reached this stage of evolution, and as IUCN begins implementing its new quadrennial programme 2005-08 it is a useful time to review the ELG programme, so as to generate lessons learned, to point to concrete directions for future work and to suggest programmatic changes that could improve the ways in which ELG operates as part of IUCN Asia.

The proposed review, as a part of the ongoing programme review cycle in Asia, aims at generating an in-depth discussion on the past and the future of the Programme. It is not meant to pass a judgment on its performance. The outputs of this review are expected to be useful to the Asia Regional Directorate and staff in ELGs in general, in reviewing the programme for its contribution and providing new directions.

Terms of Reference:

The review is expected to address programmatic issues, and will not address financial, human resources and administrative matters in-depth, aside from those general matters that are germane to the overall performance of the Programme.

This review is expected to examine and provide an analytical commentary and recommendations on the mandate, consequential programme fit (within overall Asia concepts), programme delivery, engagement of the constituency in its activities, co-location, and the Programme's overall contribution to the development of IUCN Asia programme. Other important considerations for the

review are the current management arrangements, internal structuring of the ELG2 and the working of each of the component regional thematic programmes, the extent to which integration (within ELG, with Country Programmes) has improved and is directly supported by ELG's functioning, the need for adaptation of existing programmes and activities, and for ELG 2 to incorporate new programmatic areas. The broad Terms of Reference to achieve these outputs is given below.

1. *Mandate:*

- (a) An analysis of the clarity of the mandate of ELG 2 vis-à-vis its previous component RTPs to the staff, and the common understanding thereof, including perceptions, at all levels of staff on the mandate;
- (b) Assessment of the achievements of ELG 2 against the original objectives and internal reviews undertaken so far;
- (c) A critique on the level of integration amongst the component RTPs, their fit in this particular ELG, and the relevance or otherwise of continuing with the regional thematic programmes; and
- (d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.

2. *Programme Fit:*

- (a) An analysis of the development of the OABC list for ELG 2 during the last two years to advise on the fit of the work programme within the overall IUCN Asia programme;
- (b) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work for ELG 2 within the overall programme; and
- (c) The degree to which this programme has addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme).

3. *Programme Delivery and Efficiency:*

- (a) A critical review of the implementation of the 'APDG' process, including programme planning, project design and implementation, including monitoring and evaluation systems, and timely delivery and quality assurance of outputs;
- (b) A KEGO-wise analysis of outputs during the last two years;
- (c) A short analysis of the highlights of outputs of ELG 2 in the last two years, including their 'Reach' and 'Expected Use', and how these have been used in influencing the 'conservation agenda';
- (d) Effectiveness of ELG 2 in achieving its own Results, and their contribution to those of the Union;

- (e) An analysis of resource (HR, Finances) constraints, if any, in programme delivery;
- (f) An Analysis and recommendations on the emerging “task team” approach to programme planning, development and delivery; and
- (g) Development of new areas of work to provide a ‘Centre of Excellence’-type status.

4. *Co-location:*

- (a) A short situational analysis in regard to locating ELG 2 in IUCN Sri Lanka, and recommendations for addressing constraints, obstacles etc., if any;
- (b) A critical commentary on advantages and disadvantages of continuing ELG 2 in Colombo;
- (c) An analysis of the degree of ‘fusion’ between ELG 2 and IUCN SL in programme planning, delivery, staff interactions; and
- (d) A commentary on the corporate services provided by IUCN SL to ELG 2, and recommendations for improving these services, as appropriate.

5. *Constituency:*

- (a) An analysis of the involvement of Members and Commission Members in the ELG 2 programme;
- (b) A commentary on networking with global or regional institutions; and
- (c) A commentary on the capacity building of the constituency through joint work, training programmes etc.

6. *Other matters:*

- (a) A brief review of ELG 2 financial situation, and its contribution to the Asia programme;
- (b) A brief review of the human resources capacity of ELG 2 vis-à-vis its mandate and the programme, and any broad recommendations for strengthening HR capacity;
- (c) Identification of new and emerging areas that would strengthen the ELG 2 programme;
- (d) Identification of needs to reformulate or re-focus existing programmes and activities within ELG 2; and
- (e) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme.

Methodology:

The review will be undertaken by Kent Jingfors (Regional Programme Coordinator, Asia) and Alejandro Imbach (Consultant) in April/May, 2005. The duration of the review in Colombo will be about seven days. The team will adopt ‘discussion and elucidation approach’ together with review of pertinent literature, and information and data collection through a questionnaire and/or other tools for remote access in this task. Ideally, the Reviewers are expected to interact with the constituency and other IUCN staffers, but due to constraints of time, discussions will be limited to Sri Lanka-based and Bangkok-based staff (and any telephonic interviews).

Useful Reference Material:

- Intersessional Programme, 2005-2008 for Asia and ELG 2 (and other programmes as desired);
- Background papers on Restructuring, including the paper by Don Gilmour to the ARD in mid-2002.
- Quarterly Reports, particularly Annex A and the annexes on Constituency Matters;
- Sample publications from ELG 2;

IUCN Asia Regional Office
Bangkok

21 March, 2005

ANNEX 2. ELG2 REVIEW MATRIX

MANDATE	QUESTIONS
(f) An analysis of the clarity of the mandate of ELG 2 vis-à-vis its previous component RTPs to the staff, and the common understanding thereof, including perceptions, at all levels of staff on the mandate;	Do you know the ELG2 mandate? How clear is it for you? What are the key differences between ELG2 and the RTPs?
(g) Assessment of the achievements of ELG 2 against the original objectives and internal reviews undertaken so far;	
(h) A critique on the level of integration amongst the component RTPs, their fit in this particular ELG, and the relevance or otherwise of continuing with the regional thematic programmes; and	How well is your RTP integrated into ELG2? Why? Problems, constraints and potential? Are all ELG2 RTPs relevant? What is the RTP with whom your RTP has the better joint work? Why?
(i) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.	How good is the integration between your unit and ELG2 and its RTPs? Why? Problems, constraints and potential? Are all ELG2 RTPs relevant to your unit? Why? What is the RTP with whom your unit has the better joint work? Why? Can you see room for improvement? How? What constrains the improvements?
PROGRAMME FIT	QUESTIONS
(j) An analysis of the development of the OABC list for ELG 2 during the last two years to advise on the fit of the work programme within the overall IUCN Asia programme;	
(k) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work for ELG 2 within the overall programme;	What are the opportunities that you envisage for the long term work of ELG2 (and its RPTs) in Asia?
(l) The degree to which this programme has addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the	How well has ELG2 RPTs addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme)? Why? Problems,

Programme).	constraints and potential? Has it helped your unit?
-------------	--

PROGRAMME DELIVERY AND EFFICIENCY	QUESTIONS
(m) A critical review of the implementation of the 'APDG' process, including programme planning, project design and implementation, including monitoring and evaluation systems, and timely delivery and quality assurance of outputs;	How ELG2 has performed in this regard?
(n) A KEGO-wise analysis of outputs during the last two years;	How ELG2 has performed in this regard?
(o) A short analysis of the highlights of outputs of ELG 2 in the last two years, including their 'Reach' and 'Expected Use', and how these have been used in influencing the 'conservation agenda';	How ELG2 has performed in this regard?
(p) Effectiveness of ELG 2 in achieving its own Results, and their contribution to those of the Union;	How ELG2 has performed in this regard?
(q) An analysis of resource (HR, Finances) constraints, if any, in programme delivery;	Has ELG2 (& RTPs) faced resource constraints over the last couple of years? Why? If yes, could it have been avoided?
(r) An Analysis and recommendations on the emerging "task team" approach to programme planning, development and delivery; and	How do you understand the task team approach to programme planning, development and delivery? How does it fit with ELG2 (& RTPs)? Potential advantages, problems?
(s) Development of new areas of work to provide a 'Centre of Excellence'-type status.	How do you understand this concept? What are the ELG2 Areas with potential to apply the concept? What will be the added value? Does ELG2 have the necessary expertise for that? If not, should IUCN try it anyway?
COLOCATION	QUESTIONS
(t) A short situational analysis in regard to locating ELG 2 in IUCN Sri Lanka, and recommendations for addressing constraints, obstacles etc., if any;	How good was the decision to locate ELG2 in Sri Lanka? Why? Is there room for improvement? How?
(u) A critical commentary on advantages and disadvantages of continuing ELG 2 in Colombo;	Should ELG2 continue in Colombo? Why? Advantages and disadvantages?
(v) An analysis of the degree of 'fusion' between ELG 2 and IUCN SL in programme planning, delivery, staff interactions; and	Is there any particular fusion between IUCNSL and ELG2 regarding programme planning, delivery and/or staff interactions? How do they work?

	<p>Are they benefiting IUCNSL? Is IUCNSL becoming too dependent on ELG2? Is ELG2 too focused on Sri Lanka?</p>
(w) A commentary on the corporate services provided by IUCN SL to ELG 2, and recommendations for improving these services, as appropriate.	<p>How adequate are the corporate services provided by IUCNSL to ELG2 (&RTPs)? Why? Is there room for improvement? How?</p>

CONSTITUENCY	QUESTIONS
(x) An analysis of the involvement of Members and Commission Members in the ELG 2 programme;	How adequate has been the involvement of ELG2 (&RTPs) with Members and Commission members? Why? Can it be improved? How?
(y) A commentary on networking with global or regional institutions; and	How adequate has been the involvement of ELG2 (&RTPs) with global and regional institutions? Why? Can it be improved? How?
(z) A commentary on the capacity building of the constituency through joint work, training programmes etc.	What is the constituency of ELG2? Why? Is this adequate? How adequate has been the work of ELG2 in building the capacity of its constituency?
OTHER MATTERS	QUESTIONS
(aa) A brief review of ELG 2 financial situation, and its contribution to the Asia programme;	How good is the financial situation of ELG2 (&RTPs)? What are the trends? Are they contributing as expected to the Asia Region funding?
(bb) A brief review of the human resources capacity of ELG 2 vis-à-vis its mandate and the programme, and any broad recommendations for strengthening HR capacity;	How good is the HR situation of ELG2 (&RTPs)? What are the trends?
(cc) Identification of new and emerging areas that would strengthen the ELG 2 programme;	What are the new and emerging areas that can be addressed by ELG2 (&RTPs)? Can IUCN go into those areas with its current structure and staff?
(dd) Identification of needs to reformulate or re-focus existing programmes and activities within ELG 2; and	What are the needs to reformulate (or re-focus) existing Programme and activities within ELG2? Why?
(ee) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme.	

ANNEX 3. ELG2 REVIEW - INFORMATION SOURCES MATRIX

MANDATE	ELG2	ELG1	CP / HQ	RPC	ARO	SL
(ff) An analysis of the clarity of the mandate of ELG 2 vis-à-vis its previous component RTPs to the staff, and the common understanding thereof, including perceptions, at all levels of staff on the mandate;	X	X				
(gg) Assessment of the achievements of ELG 2 against the original objectives and internal reviews undertaken so far;	X					
(hh) A critique on the level of integration amongst the component RTPs, their fit in this particular ELG, and the relevance or otherwise of continuing with the regional thematic programmes; and	X					
(ii) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.		X	X	X	X	X
PROGRAMME FIT						
(jj) An analysis of the development of the OABC list for ELG 2 during the last two years to advise on the fit of the work programme within the overall IUCN Asia programme;	X			X	X	
(kk) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work for ELG 2 within the overall programme;	X		X	X	X	
(ll) The degree to which this programme has addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme).	X		X	X		
PROGRAMME DELIVERY AND EFFICIENCY						
(mm) A critical review of the implementation of the 'APDG' process, including programme planning, project design and implementation, including monitoring and evaluation systems, and timely delivery and quality assurance of outputs;	X			X		

(nn) A KEGO-wise analysis of outputs during the last two years;	X			X		
(oo) A short analysis of the highlights of outputs of ELG 2 in the last two years, including their 'Reach' and 'Expected Use', and how these have been used in influencing the 'conservation agenda';	X	X	X	X		
(pp) Effectiveness of ELG 2 in achieving its own Results, and their contribution to those of the Union;	X					
(qq) An analysis of resource (HR, Finances) constraints, if any, in programme delivery;					X	
(rr) An Analysis and recommendations on the emerging "task team" approach to programme planning, development and delivery; and	X	X		X	X	
(ss) Development of new areas of work to provide a 'Centre of Excellence'-type status.	X	X	X	X	X	
COLOCATION						
(tt) A short situational analysis in regard to locating ELG 2 in IUCN Sri Lanka, and recommendations for addressing constraints, obstacles etc., if any;	X					X
(uu) A critical commentary on advantages and disadvantages of continuing ELG 2 in Colombo;	X				X	X
(vv) An analysis of the degree of 'fusion' between ELG 2 and IUCN SL in programme planning, delivery, staff interactions; and	X				X	X
(ww) A commentary on the corporate services provided by IUCN SL to ELG 2, and recommendations for improving these services, as appropriate.	X					X
CONSTITUENCY						
(xx) An analysis of the involvement of Members and Commission Members in the ELG 2 programme;	X		X		X	
(yy) A commentary on networking with global or regional institutions; and	X				X	
(zz) A commentary on the capacity building of the constituency through joint work, training programmes etc.	X		X		X	
OTHER OPERATIONAL MATTERS						
(aaa) A brief review of ELG 2 financial situation,	X				X	

and its contribution to the Asia programme;						
(bbb) A brief review of the human resources capacity of ELG 2 vis-à-vis its mandate and the programme, and any broad recommendations for strengthening HR capacity;	X				X	
(ccc) Identification of new and emerging areas that would strengthen the ELG 2 programme;	X	X		X		
(ddd) Identification of needs to reformulate or re-focus existing programmes and activities within ELG 2; and	X	X		X		
(eee) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme.	X	X	X	X	X	X

ANNEX 4 - ELG2 REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRES (ASIA REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF)

MANDATE		QUESTIONS
(d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.	SPT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How good is the integration between your unit and ELG2 and its RTPs? Why? Problems, constraints and potential? • Are all ELG2 RTPs relevant to your unit? Why? • What is the RTP with whom your unit has the better joint work? Why? • Can you see room for improvement? How? What constrains the improvements?
(e) An analysis of the development of the OABC list for ELG 2 during the last two years	SPT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the opportunities that you envisage for the long term work of ELG2 (and its RPTs) in Asia?
(f) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work for ELG 2 within the programme;	SPT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the opportunities that you envisage for the long term work of ELG2 (and its RPTs) in Asia?
(l) An analysis of resource (HR, Finances) constraints, if any, in programme delivery;	FIN HR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has ELG2 (& RTPs) faced resource constraints over the last couple of years? Why? If yes, could it have been avoided?
(m) An Analysis and recommendations on the emerging “task team” approach to programme planning, development and delivery; and	SPT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you understand the task team approach to programme planning, development and delivery? • How does it fit with ELG2 (&RTPs)? Potential advantages, problems?
(n) Development of new areas of work to provide a ‘Centre of Excellence’-type status.	SPT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you understand this concept? • What are the ELG2 Areas with potential to apply the concept? • What will be the added value? • Does ELG2 have the necessary expertise for that?
(p) A critical commentary on advantages and disadvantages of continuing ELG 2 in Colombo;	ALL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should ELG2 continue in Colombo? Why? Advantages and disadvantages?
(q) An analysis of the degree of ‘fusion’ between ELG 2 and IUCN SL in programme planning, delivery, staff interactions; and	SPT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any particular fusion between IUCNSL & ELG2 regarding pro-grammme planning, delivery and/or staff interactions? How do they work? • Are they benefiting IUCNSL? • Is IUCNSL becoming too dependent on ELG2? • Is ELG2 too focused on Sri Lanka?
(s) An analysis of the involvement of Members and Commission Members in the ELG 2 programme;	CDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How adequate has been the involvement of ELG2 (&RTPs) with Members and Commission members? Why? • Can it be improved? How?
(t) A commentary on networking with global or regional institutions; and	CDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How adequate has been the involvement of ELG2 (&RTPs) with global and regional institutions? Why? • Can it be improved? How?
(u) A commentary on the capacity building of the constituency through joint work, training	SPT CDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the constituency of ELG2? Why? • Is this adequate? • How adequate has been the work of ELG2 in building

programmes etc.

(v) A brief review of ELG 2 financial situation, and its contribution to the Asia programme

(w) A brief review of the human resources capacity of ELG 2 vis-à-vis its mandate and the programme, and eventual strengthening

(x) Identification of new and emerging areas that would strengthen the ELG 2 programme

(y) Identification of needs to reformulate or re-focus existing programmes and activities within ELG 2

(z) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme

the capacity of its constituency?

- | | |
|-----|---|
| FIN | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How good is the financial situation of ELG2 (&RTPs)?• What are the trends?• Are they contributing as expected to the Asia Region funding? |
| HR | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How good is the HR situation of ELG2 (&RTPs)?• What are the trends? |
| SPT | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the new and emerging areas that can be addressed by ELG2 ?• Can IUCN go into those areas with its current structure and staff? |
| SPT | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the needs to reformulate (or re-focus) existing Programme and activities within ELG2? Why? |
| ALL | |

ANNEX 4 (cont.) REGIONAL PROGRAMME COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

MANDATE

(d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.

(e) An analysis of the development of the OABC list for ELG 2 during the last two years to advise on the fit of the work programme within the overall IUCN Asia programme;

(f) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work for ELG 2 within the overall programme;

(g) The degree to which this programme has addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme).

(h) A critical review of the implementation of the 'APDG' process, including programme planning, project design and implementation, including monitoring and evaluation systems, and timely delivery and quality assurance of outputs;

(i) A KEGO-wise analysis of outputs during the last two years;

(j) A short analysis of the highlights of outputs of ELG 2 in the last two years, including their 'Reach' and 'Expected Use', and how these have been used in influencing the 'conservation agenda';

(k) Effectiveness of ELG 2 in achieving its own Results, and their contribution to those of the Union;

(m) An Analysis and recommendations on the emerging "task team" approach to programme planning, development and delivery; and

(n) Development of new areas of work to provide a 'Centre of Excellence'-type status.

QUESTIONS

- How good is the integration between your unit and ELG2 and its RTPs? Why? Problems, constraints and potential?
- Are all ELG2 RTPs relevant to your unit? Why?
- What is the RTP with whom your unit has the better joint work? Why?
- Can you see room for improvement? How? What constrains the improvements?
-
- What are the opportunities that you envisage for the long term work of ELG2 (and its RPTs) in Asia?
- How well has ELG2 RPTs addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme)? Why? Problems, constraints and potential
- Has it helped your unit?
- How ELG2 has performed in this regard?
-
- How ELG2 has performed in this regard?
- How ELG2 has performed in this regard?
- How ELG2 has performed in this regard?
- How do you understand the task team approach to programme planning, development and delivery?
- How does it fit with ELG2 (&RTPs)? Potential advantages, problems?
- How do you understand this concept?
- What are the ELG2 Areas with potential to apply the concept?
- What will be the added value?
- Does ELG2 have the necessary expertise for that?

- If not, should IUCN try it anyway?

(x) Identification of new and emerging areas that would strengthen the ELG 2 programme

(y) Identification of needs to reformulate or re-focus existing programmes and activities within ELG 2

(z) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme

- What are the new and emerging areas that can be addressed by ELG2 (&RTPs)?
- Can IUCN go into those areas with its current structure and staff?
- What are the needs to reformulate (or re-focus) existing Programme and activities within ELG2? Why?

ANNEX 4 (cont.) ELG1 STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

MANDATE

- (a) An analysis of the clarity of the mandate of ELG 2 vs. its previous component RTPs, and the common understanding thereof, including perceptions, at all levels of staff on the mandate;
- (d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.
- (f) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work for ELG 2;
- (g) The degree to which this programme has addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme).
- (j) A short analysis of output highlights of ELG 2 in the last two years, including 'Reach' and 'Expected Use', and how these have been used in influencing the 'conservation agenda';
- (m) An Analysis and recommendations on the emerging "task team" approach to programme planning, development and delivery; and
- (n) Development of new areas of work to provide a 'Centre of Excellence'-type status.
- (t) A commentary on networking with global or regional institutions; and
- (u) A commentary on the capacity building of the constituency through joint work, training programmes etc.
- (x) Identification of new and emerging areas that would strengthen the ELG 2 programme
- (y) Identification of needs to reformulate or re-focus existing programmes and activities within ELG 2
- (z) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme

QUESTIONS

- Do you know the ELG2 mandate? How clear is it for you? What are the key differences between ELG2 and the RTPs?
- How good is the integration between your unit and ELG2 and its RTPs? Why? Problems, constraints and potential? Are all ELG2 RTPs relevant to your unit? Why? What is the RTP with whom your unit has the better joint work? Why? Can you see room for improvement? How? What constrains the improvements? What are the opportunities that you envisage for long term work of ELG2 (and its RPTs) in Asia?
- How well has ELG2 RPTs addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme)? Why? Problems, constraints and potential? Has it helped your unit? How ELG2 has performed in this regard?
- How do you understand the task team approach to programme planning, development and delivery? How does it fit with ELG2 (& RTPs)? Potential advantages, problems?
- How do you understand this concept? What are the ELG2 Areas with potential to apply the concept? What will be the added value? Does ELG2 have the necessary expertise for that? If not, should IUCN try it anyway?
- How adequate has been the involvement of ELG2 (&RTPs) with global and regional institutions? Why? Can it be improved? How? What is the constituency of ELG2? Why? Is this adequate? How adequate has been the work of ELG2 in building the capacity of its constituency?
- What are new and emerging areas that can be addressed by ELG2 (&RTPs)? Can IUCN go into those areas with its current structure and staff? What are the needs to reformulate (or re-focus) existing Programme and activities within ELG2? Why?

ANNEX 4 (cont.) COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES, PROGRAMME COORDINATORS and HQ QUESTIONNAIRE

Phone Interviews (30 minutes each)

MANDATE

- (d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.
- (f) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work for ELG 2 within the overall programme;
- (g) The degree to which this programme has addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme).
- (j) A short analysis of the highlights of outputs of ELG 2 in the last two years, including their 'Reach' and 'Expected Use', and how these have been used in influencing the 'conservation agenda';
- (n) Development of new areas of work to provide a 'Centre of Excellence' -type status.
- (s) An analysis of the involvement of Members and Commission Members in the ELG 2 programme;
- (u) A commentary on the capacity building of the constituency through joint work, training programmes etc.
- (z) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme

QUESTIONS

- How good is the integration between your unit and ELG2 and its RTPs? Why? Problems, constraints and potential
 - Are all ELG2 RTPs relevant to your unit? Why?
 - What is the RTP with whom your unit has the better joint work? Why?
 - Can you see room for improvement? How? What constrains the improvements?
 - What are the opportunities that you envisage for the long term work of ELG2 (and its RTPs) in Asia?
 - How well has ELG2 RTPs addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme)? Why? Problems, constraints and potential
 - Has it helped your unit?
 - How ELG2 has performed in this regard?
-
- How do you understand this concept?
 - What are the ELG2 Areas with potential to apply the concept?
 - What will be the added value?
 - Does ELG2 have the necessary expertise for that?
 - If not, should IUCN try it anyway?
 - How adequate has been the involvement of ELG2 (&RTPs) with Members and Commission members? Why?
 - Can it be improved? How?
 - What is the constituency of ELG2? Why? Is this adequate?
 - How adequate has been the work of ELG2 in building the capacity of its constituency?

ANNEX 4 (cont.) SRI LANKA OFFICE QUESTIONNAIRE

MANDATE

(d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.

(o) A short situational analysis in regard to locating ELG 2 in IUCN Sri Lanka, and recommendations for addressing constraints, obstacles etc., if any;

(p) A critical commentary on advantages and disadvantages of continuing ELG 2 in Colombo;

(q) An analysis of the degree of 'fusion' between ELG 2 and IUCN SL in programme planning, delivery, staff interactions; and

(r) A commentary on the corporate services provided by IUCN SL to ELG 2, and recommendations for improving these services, as appropriate.

(z) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme

QUESTIONS

- How good is the integration between your unit and ELG2 and its RTPs? Why? Problems, constraints and potential?
- Are all ELG2 RTPs relevant to your unit? Why?
- What is the RTP with whom your unit has the better joint work? Why?
- Can you see room for improvement? How? What constrains the improvements?
- How good was the decision to locate ELG2 in Sri Lanka? Why?
- Is there room for improvement? How?
- Should ELG2 continue in Colombo? Why? Advantages and disadvantages?
- Is there any particular fusion between IUCNSL and ELG2 regarding programme planning, delivery and/or staff interactions? How do they work? Are they benefiting IUCNSL?
- Is IUCNSL becoming too dependent on ELG2?
- Is ELG2 too focused on Sri Lanka?
- How adequate are the corporate services provided by IUCNSL to ELG2 (&RTPs)? Why?
- Is there room for improvement? How?

ANNEX 5. ELG2 REVIEW - LIST OF IUCN STAFF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

GROUP	NAME
ARO	Nande Palihakkara
	Zakir Hussain
	Udaya Kaluaratchi
	Nikhat Sattar
RPC	Ranjith Mahindapala
ELG 1	Patricia Moore
	Tejpal Singh
CP. CRs	Ainun Nishat
	Shiranee Yasaratne
	Sagendra Tiwari
CP. PCs	Dhunmai Cowasjee
	Channa Bambaradeniya
	Julia Robinson
Sri Lanka Office	Shiranee Yasaratne
	Channa Bambaradeniya
ELG 2	Lucy Emerton
	Asheem Srivastav
RBP	Pisupati Balakrishna
RMP	Jerker Tamelander
	Gayathri Sriskanthan
REEP	Usman Iftikhar
HQ	Joshua Bishop
	Carl-Gustav Lundin
	Sue Mainka

ANNEX 6. ELG2 REVIEW AGENDA

DAY	TASKS
April, Wednesday 20	Briefing and interviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assistant Regional Programme Coordinator, Human Resources Director
Thursday 21	Interviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Finance Director Regional Constituency Development Director ELG1 Programme Coordinator
Friday 22	Phone Interviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country Offices and SPT ELG1 Regional Environmental Law Programme
Saturday 23	Information processing and analysis
Sunday 24	Information processing and analysis
Monday 25	Interviews and Phone Interviews with Country Offices Travel to Colombo
Tuesday 26	Interview: IUCNSL Country Representative and ELG2 Head Introduction of the Review to the ELG2 staff
Wednesday 27	Interviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Marine Programme staff ELG2 Programme Coordinator Meeting with IUCNSL staff on Country ELG and ELG2
Thursday 28	Interviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Biodiversity Programme Regional Environmental Economics Programme
Friday 29	Interviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HQ Senior Economics Advisor Presentation and discussion of Key Review Findings with the ELG2 staff and IUCNSL CR. Presentation of Review Team key recommendations
April, Saturday 30	Report preparation
May, Sunday 1	Report preparation Interview: Regional Marine Programme Coordinator
May, Monday 2	Travel to Bangkok Interviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HQ Global Marine Programme Questionnaire returned by HQ Senior PC Report preparation
May, Tuesday 3	Draft Report submission