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Four years ago the International Union for Conservation of Nature set out to show where, how and why conservation efforts simultaneously address social, environmental and economic concerns.

As strategists, we identified the many ways in which sustainable development rests on a firm and robust ecological foundation. As facilitators, we bridged the geographical and sectoral differences between members in board rooms and conference halls and at multilateral negotiating tables. As implementers, we worked with a wide range of stakeholders to take practical action in the field.

Time after time, in rivers, on landscapes and across oceans, we emphasized how the common ground for the Earth’s most vital challenges – poverty reduction, climate change, economic growth, social stability and international cooperation – remains the conservation of nature.

This report provides detailed results of the 4-year Programme approved by our Members in Bangkok in 2004. As such, in contrast with the glossy report Building the Future1 distributed at the Barcelona Congress, it consists less of breathtaking photos and success stories than a more precise assessment of policies translated into pragmatic outcomes.

The role of the Union, as a collective entity, is to strengthen the capacity of its Members and partners to achieve common goals and promote excellence. By uniting Members in a common endeavour, IUCN provides a stronger and more authoritative voice for conservation than they could achieve separately: the whole must be greater than the sum of its parts. But is it?

The answer lies in the following pages. The hard truth is that there is room for improvement, for tapping IUCN’s nascent potential, and for supplying a programme that more closely aligns with what its Members demand. In response to that diversified demand, IUCN has begun to develop, promote, monitor and evaluate the bridges it builds between governments and non-governmental organizations, between science, policy and practice and with the private sector.

The results are not always pretty, warm or polished. Then again, neither is nature. Indeed, it helps to remember that all life remains a work in progress, constantly adapting to rapid change, filling new ecological niches, evolving into a state of more complexity. As nature’s ambassador, IUCN is learning to evolve right along with it.

---

1. **Introduction: “The Shifting Imperative to Measure What We Value”**

*By Julia Marton-Lefèvre, Director General*

We measure what we value, but for half a century IUCN led the world only in measuring nature.

Our science-based Union has, for most of its life, counted birds, assessed vegetation, catalogued insects, followed sea turtle migrations, tracked predators, and mapped the evolving habitats. Over time, however, we developed increasingly ambitious agendas and sophisticated modelling devices to measure the rising protection or (all too often) weakening health of entire ecosystems. From African deserts and Amazon rainforest to Asian steppes and Antarctic ice shelves, few biodiversity hotspots escaped IUCN’s attention. With time and disciplined rigour our open library documented the precarious state of the planet until it became the most comprehensive and trustworthy foundation upon which governments and civil society organizations built conservation action.

We became the very best at what we did, but there was more to be done.

Despite all the documentation something critical remained missing. The environmental picture was incomplete. The data revealed only the health of ecosystems as if nature existed in a depopulated vacuum, separated from humankind. Worse, by focusing so intently on the state of, say, aquatic ecosystems, IUCN excluded its most vital and fastest growing constituency: the billions of marginalized people who fish in that river and work on its banks.

By the dawn of the 21st Century it was time for a shift in direction. IUCN Members at the 2004 World Conservation Congress in Bangkok approved a new Programme that aimed to simultaneously strengthen the Union’s heartland work on conservation of biodiversity in nature while developing more effective and strategic interventions linked to the global agenda for sustainable development of people who are inseparable from nature.

We recognized natural and human communities as interdependent. Accordingly we began to measure the value of community access, social stability, national security, economic efficiency and the inclusiveness of trade.

Changing course can be daunting and unsettling. To know where the Union was headed, IUCN Members first set compass readings that would indicate when we arrived. And to know where, whether or how fast the Union was making progress, our Members had to set benchmarks. This report shows that in order for our institution to evolve, IUCN will continue vigilantly to monitor and evaluate, constantly improving its methods and tools. We still excel at measuring what is valuable in the world, people and nature. Only in this case, it is not simply the techniques of measuring but also what we measure that are the essential parts of our work.
As decision makers gravitated toward the 2004 World Conservation Congress they left behind home landscapes with median temperatures rising, rivers desiccating, forests burning, glaciers melting, extinction waves growing, habitat declining and invasive species expanding. By then earth scientists were joined by Wall Street analysts, military strategists, development banks, aid agencies and trade negotiators in warning of dire consequences unless civil society and governments worked together to address these risks.

Emerging from Bangkok, IUCN Members gave the Union a clear and explicit mandate to reverse the symptoms – species loss and ecosystem degradation – by addressing the underlying causes of environmental sickness. The direct threats to biodiversity are not moral, scientific or technocratic. They are emphatically political, social and economic. The Union had to shift its focus to address the link between environmental health and human livelihoods.

To be sure, precious few marine ecologists and forestry biologists had been trained in economics, sociology or business administration. But the logic was inescapable, and the Union as a whole took to its goal with gusto, delivering tangible results over the next four years.

The 2005–2008 Programme’s three ‘pillars’ of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental – are inextricably linked but not exactly equal: the first two rested on the secure integrity of the third. The economy exists within society, so human activity must not exceed the capacity of the biosphere. The complex foundation of waters, soils, plants and animals provided the natural capital on which even the most complex economies ultimately depend. Destroy ‘nature’s emporium’, and you undermine human development.

This paradigm shift exposed the fallacy of “trade-offs,” in which quick economic growth today could somehow offset tomorrow’s, resulting in permanently ruined ecosystems or long term income inequality. There is no time or room for six billion people to destroy the planet trying to “get rich enough to care about the environment”, now wasted for generations to come.

IUCN’s challenge was to show how that old mindset was not only unacceptable, but unnecessary. Yes, people must prosper; society must be enhanced. But this can happen without sacrificing the resources from which all material richness derived. Was the Union up to the task? This outcome-driven report offers one comprehensive answer, and first reveals the rationale behind it.
Right after election at the Bangkok World Conservation Congress in 2004, IUCN’s 36 Councillors began to tackle the role of conservation in everyday society, reaching out to broad constituencies, encouraging participation through traditional and novel online fora. Councillors fundamentally explored, articulated and redefined “the environment” for the conservation movement to invigorate that simple but all-encompassing concept.

During the period covered in this report, Council reviewed and adjusted aspects of our current governance structure, statutes and regulations to respond to the recommendations from reform-minded task groups. It developed and approved a Code of Conduct for IUCN’s Council, as well as Model By-Laws for the Commissions.

The Council also oversaw the departure of Director General Achim Steiner to head the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and appointed the Union’s current Director General, Julia Marton-Lefèvre, who started on 1 January 2007.

Over four years, the Council has re-positioned the Union to better reflect the world’s evolving priorities, to integrate people and nature and encompass both conservation and sustainable development. Expansion involved admission of 180 new Members; extension of formal recognition to National Committees of Members in Chile, Denmark, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Paraguay and Turkey; and endorsement of Regional Committees in South America, Central Africa and Southeast Asia.

As part of its statutory duties, Council ensured that gender equality and equity were effectively and efficiently mainstreamed within the Union according to the IUCN Gender Policy, and it also endorsed the Private Sector Strategy. It reviewed and approved the audited accounts, progress and assessment reports, annual work plans and budgets, evaluations of various kinds, and regular reports from the Director General, Commission Chairs and the President. Council internalized, prioritized, guided and tracked the Bangkok Congress decisions and resolutions. It clarified IUCN’s brand and identity and approved a new logo.

Looking ahead, Council chose Barcelona as the venue for the 2008 Congress and provided input on the theme, aims, objectives, outcomes and “greening” of the event, whilst preparing the Programme and Strategy for the 2009–2012 period.
IUCN does more than unite Members; it represents their interests at high-level forums. For four years the Union articulated and promoted the inextricable links between biodiversity conservation and economic development to shape and influence policy decisions:

- **The 2007 Red List of Threatened Species** reported the sobering status of 41,415 species, with 16,306 of them at risk. One in four mammals, one in eight birds, one in three amphibians and seven in 10 assessed plants are in jeopardy.
- With the **Alcoa Foundation** IUCN launched twenty **sustainability fellowships** for mid-career scientists to research: indigenous peoples in protected areas; the economics of biodiversity; eco-agriculture; computer-prioritized conservation.
- **China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development:** Through this platform, IUCN informs strategies that influence how a large and important country aligns itself in sustainability debates, such as climate change.
- **Arab League:** Since 2005 the Union’s privileged presence in this organization has enabled us to foster a conservation approach to 22 Arab nations and coordinate our members’ policy forum.
- **Group of Eight:** Starting in 2005 we have been invited to join, inform and address key meetings with ministers of environment from the G8 plus other countries, in preparing for the G8 summits.

**Unlocking the Latent Potential of Our Membership**

Members wanted a stronger part in the work of global conservation, providing the conduit, tools and stage to:

- enhance communications and interaction through online portals and newsletters;
- broaden the role, capacity and geographic voices of Member Committees;
- modify governance structures to open up the opportunities requested; and
- strengthen our Constituency support staff at Headquarters and in the regions, and committed staff members to act as focal points for each National Committee.
As I write, a cloud still hovers over Wall Street, London and Tokyo as banks and big businesses remain jittery, even gloomy, about the future. By contrast, the following pages illustrate how, despite the global economic crisis, our vigorously upbeat conservation Union continues to offer steadfast value for the money by delivering brisk returns on a relatively modest investment.

Traditional roles have reversed, for two reasons. The first is our understanding of how ecological and economic needs are interdependent. We recognize pollution, watershed degradation, habitat fragmentation, invasive alien species, reckless harvesting, and climate change threaten not only “the environment,” but job security, social stability and human life itself. Second, we have shifted from focusing on sick symptoms to exploring healthy options and lasting remedies.

Unconstrained by any framework, we sent a task force into conflict-ridden Lebanon. We answered the post-tsunami cry for help in the Andaman Sea. We built resilience into post-hurricane Stan in Guatemala. We showed industries how their cement, mining, food, hydropower and pharmaceutical growth could help, rather than undermine, local and natural communities where they operated. Each stress made us more responsive and effective.

As we link economic development and biodiversity conservation, IUCN further adds value to our Members and Commissions. Our proven global ability to transcend projects and affect policy range from Mesoamerica’s regional “Alianzas” programme or Asia’s “Mangroves for the Future,” to the Livelihoods and Landscapes or Water and Nature Initiatives in Africa.

Efforts succeed when they enhance existing institutions rather than start from scratch. The influence may be quietly effective, such as internal measures to expand gender considerations. Or it may increase institutions’ ability to respond to an external crisis as menacing as radical climate change. By developing the rationale and understanding to promote nature-based solutions, we ensure that constituents can address social, economic and climate considerations while preserving ecosystem values. All this work has paved the way to the development of the “One Programme” approved in Barcelona.

Our Knowledge-Empowerment-Governance (KEG) concept has proven both useful and effective in delivering results, even as the strategy has, itself, evolved with changing needs. For example, the Union’s foundation of scientific Knowledge recognizes that no individual or group has a monopoly on the truth. Traditional wisdom of past fire behavior, local grasp of fisheries, institutional memory of effective approaches all deserve equal respect, promotion and integration.

Our democratization of science leads to democratization of decision making, and the devolution of authority to local levels. Empowerment is another word for capacity building, but it is less a benefit to extend than a sense of responsibility to kindle. Through incentives, ownership and motivation IUCN enables broader constituencies to manage resources as true shareholders.

For conservation to work, IUCN’s democratic knowledge builds democratically empowerment toward democratic Governance. This includes voluntary codes of conduct for private businesses, professional procedures within sectors, or partnerships across geography, institutions and time. Effective governance is mutually reinforcing. We create new opportunities for innovative collaborative partnerships while recognizing the sovereign rights of nation-states.
6. **Getting Pragmatic Results in Five Key Areas**

2005–2008

As the Union conveys knowledge, people who use it are empowered, and they more effectively take part in decisions that improve the laws, policies, instruments and institutions of governance. The integrated knowledge-empowerment-governance strategy anchors the core of IUCN’s programme. To see how guidelines work in practice, principles must be translated into action, manifest in clusters of five ‘Key Result Areas’ (KRAs).

The first three KRAs reflect IUCN’s aim and ability:

- to generate and disseminate knowledge about natural systems and the species that inhabit them;
- to promote better understanding of the role of social equity in biodiversity conservation; and
- to share knowledge of incentives and financing mechanisms for supporting effective biodiversity conservation.

The fourth KRA uses this knowledge in an integrated manner to build the capacity of individuals and institutions that can influence environmental governance at regional and global levels, including through intergovernmental fora and corporate social responsibility processes.

The fifth KRA will use the knowledge from KRAs 1–4 to build capacity and influence environmental governance at local, national and trans-boundary levels.

**Key Result Area 1: Understanding Biodiversity**

**KRA 1.1 Improved understanding of species and ecosystems as well as of ecological processes and ecosystem functions**

By carefully documenting the status and trends of biodiversity in sixty scientific publications, the Union helped others appreciate what drove extinction… or recovery. IUCN inventories, databases and case studies illustrated links between conservation and development.

Eleven books linked biodiversity with the private sector, agriculture, human health and energy. The Forest Programme produced a grand overview that bound conservation and poverty reduction. The Marine Programme’s two ‘coffee table’ books – *Adrift: Tales of Ocean Fragility* and *Planet Ocean* – highlighted human impacts, both good and bad, in marine conservation, habitats and ecologies.

The Species Survival Commission (SSC) increased assessments on the IUCN Red List by ten percent, over four years, to 44,838 taxa. Regional Red List species assessments informed status in Europe, the Mediterranean region, the Eastern Arc of Africa, and the Caucasus. IUCN added or enhanced the conservation status of 5,500 mammals, 800 reef-building corals, and 5,800 marine species. The Red List website’s 13,000 daily visits manifest the hunger for this knowledge.

IUCN completed three science-based strategic action plans on selected high priority species, including plant conservation in the Altay-Sayan region and sea turtles in Sri Lanka.

New Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM) case studies assessed the extent to which IUCN’s Ecosystem Approach principles – endorsed by the Convention on Biological
Diversity – had been useful and robust. In Northern Pakistan, *Disaster Risk, Livelihoods and Natural Barriers*, identified which land use strategies make communities more or less vulnerable.

IUCN conducted comprehensive **inventories and analyses** of:

- Sri Lanka's Welpattu National Park's biological and archaeological resources;
- the Transboundary Wetlands of the San Juan River Basin in Costa Rica and Nicaragua, and the Medio Queso River Basin, Costa Rica;
- invasive alien species in Nepal;
- fisheries, papyrus and soils of the Zambesi Basin in the Barotse Flood Plains of Zambia and the Delta in Mozambique;
- medicinal and aromatic plants and their traditional usage in Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia; and
- Watersheds of the World on a CD that provided easy access to 20 global maps and 154 river basin profiles.

IUCN programmes produced 40 technical **reports and research papers** concerning:

- Climate Change – marine resilience and coral-related threats; vulnerability of indigenous and traditional peoples; Mozambique adaptation; legal liability in the Pacific Islands;
- Species – threats to terrestrial and marine mammals and reef-building corals; alien invasive species in the Mediterranean islands;
- Deep and High Seas – publications; working groups; international fora statements;
- Wetlands – status in Vietnam 15 years after joining the Ramsar implementation; Hanoi Declaration for Action on Wetlands; sustainable management of wetlands in Central and West Africa;
- Ecosystems and Livelihoods – *Applying the Ecosystem Approach in Latin America*; status and actors on medicinal plants in villages around protected areas in Burkina Faso; a compilation of example principles, frameworks and tools for bioenergy production; *Agricultural Ecosystems: Facts and Trends*; and
- Indigenous Peoples – the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy released two papers with policy recommendations for the protection of the lands of isolated indigenous peoples in the Amazon.

IUCN equipped policy makers and practitioners with **management plans and implementation guidelines**. These tools conserve nature's integrity and diversity in:

- San Pond Sak Wetland in Panama;
- Hon Mun Marine Protected Area in Vietnam;
- forest concessions in nine countries of Central Africa;
- invasive alien species control in Southern Africa;
- Limpopo, Zimbabwe, with a flood early warning system;
- forest fire management in Vietnam;
- establishing resilient Marine Protected Areas networks; and
- producing technical guidelines for Gap Analysis of Key Biodiversity Areas.

To shape, effect and influence national **policy**, IUCN helped top decision makers in:

- Vietnam refine and develop the country’s protected area system;
- Nepal protect its wetlands through national policy;
- Egypt establish Gilf Kebir as its newest and one of the world's largest protected areas;
- Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru develop biodiversity loss indicators and communication efforts to meet the 2010 Biodiversity target.

IUCN developed modelling and forecasting **toolkits and interpretation materials**, to explore potential scenarios that address the:

- forest health of the Tri-National de Sangha National Park of Central Africa;
- risk of drought and floods and political decision making in Mozambique;
- link between species and human livelihoods, on integrated wetland economies;
- implementation of resilience principles for reef and Marine Protected Area managers, trainers and policy makers; and
- language interpretation needs for six national parks in Sri Lanka.

**KRA 1.2 Tools and methods are available to assess status and trends of species and ecosystems at all levels**

Sound decisions demand new approaches and the ability to implement them. By providing the right tools and methods to assess ecosystems, IUCN enabled restorative action on the ground. The Union’s work did more than generate knowledge on the status of biodiversity; it showed how to conserve species, manage protected areas, deliver ecosystem goods and services, and sustainably manage landscapes. In short, it systematically translated the knowledge into pragmatic solutions that improved governance aimed at ecosystem integrity.

IUCN Mediterranean Office **assessed** the region’s endemic amphibians, reptiles, freshwater fishes and saltwater fisheries and Cetaceans in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. Argentina and Paraguay **evaluated** freshwater fishes in the La Plata Basin, emphasizing how local communities can sustainably use aquatic resources.

Nations can’t conserve natural systems unless they first take into account social needs and economic realities. IUCN **produced 100 case studies** of cost-effective restoration efforts that simultaneously benefit both people and biodiversity, whether in forests or on wetlands.

The Union **documented** the 50 most threatened plant species, freshwater systems, and forests at risk in the Mediterranean, then detailed the measures needed for their conservation and recovery.

IUCN’s tools keep making a difference for **implementing policy** on the ground. For example:

- Morocco used the Red List process to train its national experts and use it in conservation;
- Tunisia is testing the Rapid List methodology for plant preliminary evaluations;
- Lebanese authorities and NGOs collaborated with IUCN on policies to reverse the 2007 trend of catastrophic forest fires;
- Egypt used our technical and managerial oversight to develop healthy ecotourism;
- West African states adopted our Regional Strategy for Elephant Conservation;
- Brazil relied on us to help develop an environmental services national policy as a way of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation; and
- Spain relied on the Union to elaborate a strategy for Mediterranean invertebrates and aquaculture.
To move beyond passive tracking of extinction, IUCN generated indicators to address, reduce or prevent biodiversity loss. Red List Indices are in place for birds (1998–2008), mammals (1996–2008), amphibians (1980–2004), and food and medicine (forthcoming). The European Environmental Agency and later the G8+5 countries adopted the Red List Index in the pan-European framework for monitoring biodiversity in relation to the 2010 target. The Union also developed indicators for forest health and river basin scenarios regarding climate, infrastructure, and land use for the Guadiana, Rhine and Orange river basins.

The forest conservation and water programmes of IUCN developed toolkits linking natural resources to local economies. Some demonstrate how forests can be harnessed to improve livelihoods in China, Ghana and West Papua. Others help project planners integrate climate change adaptation into community-level projects in Mesoamerica, Zambia, Mozambique and Tanzania. Still more toolkits help value wetlands in Sri Lanka, pay for ecosystem services in Ecuador, or harmonize the economic and ecosystem impacts of malaria mosquito insecticide spraying in rural Uganda.

IUCN developed community management plans and methods to restore habitats degraded by the influx of invasive species. Two dozen of these plans are taking root in Uganda, Kenya, Sudan, Ethiopia and Tanzania. On a larger scale, IUCN enhanced its system of protected area management categories, then launched it at the World Conservation Congress in Barcelona, 2008.

**Key Result Area 2: Social Equity**

**KRA 2.1 Improved understanding of the interdependent nature of social equity and biodiversity conservation**

To embrace the Millennium Development Goals, IUCN’s poverty-focused approach ensured the integrity of biodiversity while helping the poor improve their livelihoods. This meant incorporating the needs and interests of indigenous and traditional peoples. It meant addressing gender equity, poverty, tenure and natural resource rights, and ecological vulnerability under cross-cutting themes. These included health, access to benefit sharing, pastoralism, and ecosystem services. The inextricable link between natural resources and poverty reduction drove the Union to equip local decision makers with the tools and incentives to collaborate on conservation.

Thematic studies were the most explicit way of demonstrating the implications of social equity and livelihood security for effective biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management. National studies in Somalia, Sudan, Eritrea, Djibouti, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania underscored how drylands are conserved only when pastoralists can observe and manage variations in vegetation and precipitation. Similar studies in that region revealed the linkages between HIV/AIDS and the environment. In Kenya a review showed how the survival of “sacred natural sites” depends on whether surrounding communities can generate income from them.

IUCN publications showed how human health and economies relate to coastal ecosystems, environmental flows assessment and traditional resource access rights. Published links between social equity and sustainable development include: “Risks to people of losing medicinal species”; “The Millennium Project: The positive health implications of improved environmental sustainability”; “The future of medicinal biodiversity”; and “Emerging challenges: nanotechnology and the environment.”
Critical assessments in post-war Liberia and post-tsunami Sri Lanka showed how and where natural resources help vulnerable communities adapt to physical and economic shocks.

E-Platforms such as IUCN’s Latin American Clearinghouse on Social Equity and Conservation enhanced natural resource management and environmental governance by engaging the regional environmental community, Members, community leaders, and the academy. Over four years it conducted two dozen e-fora on a web platform that tallied 2,000 hits per day.

IUCN influenced conservation and social policy at the national and regional level.

- We showed the potential and the limits of decentralized and devolved forest conservation policy in Russia, leading to the most inclusive participatory process related to forests ever undertaken in that country.
- Our policy review of Botswana’s Okavango River Delta emphasized how equitable access to and control of resources could help eradicate poverty, protect biodiversity and enhance the economy.
- In arid Africa, we shaped dryland policies by showing how the economic value of nomadic pastoralism went beyond milk, meat, transport, wool, manure, hides and skins, to benefit species conservation and tourism – adding 80 percent to the agricultural GDP.

Two sets of guidelines and action plans clarify how protected areas can reduce poverty through access and benefit sharing from the swampy wetlands of Southern Africa to the volcanic and forested highlands of Central America. First, protected landscapes can serve as living models of sustainable use of land and resources. Second, best practices brought experience up to date in recognizing, planning and managing sacred natural sites.

Toolkits highlighted the interdependence of social equity and watershed conservation. To mitigate the effects of flood and drought, as well as reduce livelihood risks for poor people, IUCN developed environmental flows methodology and restoration of ecosystem services in five basins: Tacana; Komadugu Yobe; Limpopo; Pangani; and the Mekong.

Capacity building and awareness raising activities helped strengthen local and regional understanding of alternative livelihoods, natural resource management and gender equity.

- A series of consultations and training workshops with country representatives, indigenous peoples and local community leaders brought El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, Chile, Guatemala, Mexico and Ecuador to integrate gender considerations into their environmental management in watersheds, biodiversity and drylands.
- The Forest Programme’s Strengthening Voices for Better Choices trained residents of 12 pilot villages in Tanzania in natural resource management laws and how to prepare, review and enforce village environmental by-laws. As a result, village scouts established regular and effective patrols of their village forests.
- In East Africa, workshops and parliamentarian tours led the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development to establish agreements on sub-regional policies for trans-boundary resource management.

Mechanisms for participatory management brought equitable sharing of costs and benefits of wetlands and water resources. Dialogues on basin development brought together diverse local communities, civil society, basin organizations and national economic decision makers to collaborate on water resource management. People secured new assets to reduce poverty in seven basins in 11 countries. These demonstration sites utilize better management of ecosystem services to improve income, food security, water supply, health and nutrition.
KRA 2.2 Tools and methods are available to mainstream social equity in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use policies and practice

IUCN integrated social equity into its policies and practices through policy support, technical assistance and capacity building. It helped people renegotiate the costs and benefits of conservation among different groups. By providing the management tools for participatory environmental management, the Union empowered communities and local users to reform existing governance structures for the benefit of people and nature alike.

One route to reform and empowerment involved publications that ranged from fishing rights and responsibilities to the economic value of pastoralism. Another tool lay in widespread dissemination of information materials such as factsheets on the linkages between gender and climate change, agro-biodiversity or biosafety.

When people want parks and conservation programmes, but aren't yet equipped to run them, IUCN bridges the gap through creative ways of building capacity and raising awareness.

- In South America, local communities were seeking to establish their own protected areas under the emerging political conditions, so IUCN invested in training managers and decision makers to establish and manage Community Conserved Areas.
- In Asia, we brought training sessions and technical support to link natural resource conservation with improved coastal livelihoods.
- In East Africa, we engaged parliamentarians to restore the critical condition of water sources from Mt Elgon down the Pangani ecosystems.
- In Suva, Fiji, we built a societal conscience and galvanized action in Pacific island communities to respond to the menace of climate change.

In South America, the Union brought a portfolio of harmonizing policy tools to the negotiating table of the International Regime on Access and Benefit Sharing. Drawing on experience from El Salvador, IUCN produced a manual and advocacy guide for integrating gender equity in municipal and regional environmental management throughout Latin America.

By providing the assessment tools for collaborative management, IUCN enhanced local and regional participation while supporting governments in negotiations with stakeholders. Nowhere was this approach more effective than in watersheds of Africa, Asia, Central and South America, where multi-stakeholder platforms reformed river basin management. In Africa, we helped negotiate new charters and integrated codes of conduct in:

- an agreement among six states to guide the newly formed Volta Basin Authority;
- a collaborative Water Charter for the Komadugu-Yobe River Basin in Nigeria; and
- the formation of a four-nation management authority in Lake Tanganyika.

Similar successes grew from this approach in protected area management. IUCN translated management guidelines into Arabic and also translated community-based participation models into action for Mozambique, Sudan, Mesoamerica and the Northern Mountain Areas of Pakistan.
IUCN strengthened its own project development policies and methods to fully support and integrate the social policy dimensions of its work. It developed strategic plans for conservation and poverty reduction in West Africa, Latin America, West Asia and the Middle East.

**Key Result Area 3: Conservation Incentives and Finance**

**KRA 3.1 Improved understanding of how markets, institutions and socio-economic forces create incentives or disincentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity**

IUCN came to appreciate both the essence and the details of how markets engage conservation. Dozens of books, studies, assessments and reports explored the relevance and application of economic instruments both for conservation and poverty reduction. The Union created analytical tools that could assess how markets, trade and finance could support rather than undermine biodiversity. To do so IUCN: built stakeholder capacity; helped formulate policy; engaged the private sector; and brought all actors together in an inclusive approach that enhanced understanding and brought a sense of shared responsibility and local ownership for the issues.

Key books and reports ranged from payment for ecosystem services and economic incentives for protected areas, to below-ground biodiversity and local forest rights and tenure. In some cases, managers were failing to account for or harness gate fees, permits for recreational activities, and indirect charges on hotel accommodation, airport departures and others. Elsewhere, through IUCN’s work:

- Pakistan’s Environment Ministry recognized the implications of oil spills on biodiversity;
- Lao PDR came to see investment trends in rubber and their effect on biodiversity; and
- Sri Lanka’s mangrove ecosystems formed the basis for economic well-being on the coast.

Several IUCN assessments and studies appraised the economic values of drylands in Kenya, economic diversification in the Okavango Delta, the Halaki Haor wetland system in Bangladesh, and pastoralism in Eastern Africa. Knowledge of the impacts of macro-economic policy and practice on natural resources was boosted with the release of environmental economic studies on water and fisheries resources in Mozambique.

IUCN’s Observer Status at the UN did not prevent it from stepping forward when called upon to help guide policy. The Union intervened on several occasions at the UN General Assembly, the UN Working Group on Marine Biodiversity, and the UN Fish Stocks Agreement on issues related to the management of marine and coastal ecosystems, including financing mechanisms. Efforts helped reform Regional Fisheries Management Organizations, assess the consequences of removing large fish from the food chain and the impacts of noise on marine mammals.

In Central and Southeastern Europe, IUCN developed guidelines and methods on collecting wild medicinal and aromatic plants; on mountain birds; on the region’s first eco-village. Flexible micro-funding schemes for small business support programmes protected Kenozerski National Park. Finally, the Union helped policy makers and national experts in Hungary, Georgia, Germany, Belgium and Norway integrate biodiversity considerations in tourism and forestry.

Intensively managed planted forests (IMPFs) provide 40 percent of the world’s industrial wood supply; they also provide some degree of biodiversity habitat. IUCN initiated the ‘Forests Dialogue’ to understand how the growth in demand for forest products, the depletion of the world’s natural forests, and the increase in forest protected areas fuelled IMPF expansion on the one hand, and how through best practices they might best be structured and implemented to deliver environmental, social and economic benefits.

Since people only protect forests if they benefit from doing so, IUCN helped develop vital tools to help communities capture more forest-derived revenue.
In Acre, Brazil IUCN helped implement a Modular Implementation System to enable forest companies to attain certification. Communication tools on business and biodiversity now draw attention to the global economic benefits of biodiversity and the costs of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation.

Because a tool is only as good as the person trained to use it, IUCN engaged in a constant series of capacity building processes to link markets with biodiversity conservation. The workshops ranged from improving rural tourism income in Southeastern Europe to enhancing the economic value and conservation benefits of marine protected areas worldwide.

As always, IUCN played a strategic role in convening stakeholders to discuss and agree on issues related to the economic and social benefits that flow from biodiversity conservation. As a start, IUCN endorsed the development and implementation of a Private Sector Knowledge Network, which later informed issues related to improving the performance of mining industries or the development of sustainable biofuels. Finally, IUCN organized a Business and Biodiversity roundtable at the World Conservation Congress in Barcelona to engage decision makers at the highest level of government, private sector and civil society in a discussion of the 2010 Biodiversity Target.

**KRA 3.2 Tools and methods are available to assess trade-offs between economic, social and environmental values**

Economic valuation of biodiversity can prove a decisive tool for improving environmental management. But there was very little current and reliable information on what ecosystems were worth. IUCN set out to fill that vacuum, put a price tag on nature, and ensure that biodiversity resource values were included in public and private decisions. That’s never easy. But through diverse strategies and approaches the Union could begin to assess the costs and benefits of alternative uses of resources in economic decisions, trade and investment, including environmental impacts and dependence on ecosystem services. A series of studies, environmental assessments and research reports brought critical scientific data and analysis on the use of natural resources, data which had previously been ignored.

IUCN’s comprehensive economic valuation studies of natural resources in parts of Africa and Latin America measured both their market and non-market worth. These include direct use value (food, fodder and timber), indirect use value (watershed protection and soil fertility) and non-use value (existence value of biodiversity). Only then could stakeholders appreciate the true flow of benefits from forests and wetlands, and understand who benefitted most. Such critical analysis shapes policies and investment plans, and show how wild resources contribute to poverty reduction.

- The Zambezi River floodplains confirmed the wetland’s value in absolute terms, but also ascertained its significance as a key component of local livelihoods. The ecological-economic modelling demonstrated that any management scenario which omitted wetland values, and did not allow for the local-level use of wetland resources, would jeopardize the economic livelihoods of almost a quarter of a million people.

- In Eastern Africa a study of the marketing of niche dryland products showed that the poorest of the world deserved a better account for the value dryland ecosystems contribute to national and international economies.

- The Economic Value of Wild Resources in Senegal assessed the dependence of rural populations on wild harvests and the economic value of wild resource use: in non-timber forest products, game and freshwater fisheries. The analysis suggested that a full accounting of the harvests would add at least US$ 2 million to national income.
A study of Djoudj National Bird Park in Senegal discovered that recreational ecotourists were willing to pay a considerably higher price to visit the wetland.

In Mauritania, an examination of the coastal zone uncovered the mullet’s major economic importance for the country’s national economy.

Similar studies were also conducted on the economics of Mozambique protected areas as well as on the value of trans-boundary wetlands in Costa Rica and Panama.

IUCN equipped local communities with reference materials for taking informed decisions in planning and management. Conservation innovations in southern Africa ranged from game ranching in Zimbabwe and the creation of Cape Peninsula National Park South Africa to trans-boundary conservation areas and community-based natural resource management in Botswana.

IUCN’s exploration of the legal aspects of conservation invariably led to changes in policy. One effort forged an international instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of soil. Another brought different approaches to valuation and restoration of damage to biological diversity. Our analysis even altered the legal status of glaciers in the Andes Mountain range.

Several guidelines and management tools assessed the trade-offs between economic, social and environmental values. These ranged from Central America’s construction and tourism industries to East Africa’s plans to integrate and enhance the importance of forest conservation and natural resources at the landscape level. Value, a practical guide to the economic valuation of rivers, explained, step by step, how to generate persuasive arguments for more equitable development decisions. In Lao PDR, the Department of Roads and the Asian Development Bank integrated a number of IUCN recommendations into their environmental management plan.

**KRA 3.3 Improved approaches to integrate environmental and economic values in decision making, including methods for mobilizing new and additional finance for biodiversity conservation**

IUCN’s Quadrennial Programme sought innovative financing mechanisms to maintain an optimal value of environmental goods and services. To do so, the Union helped governments to create enabling frameworks and incentives that would stimulate sustainable investment in biodiversity conservation or generate funds for protected areas. The Union also developed tools that encourage private resource users to provide ecosystem services – carbon sequestration, watershed protection, habitat conservation – as a good business practice, thus correcting perverse market incentives and transforming businesses into agents of sustainable development.

IUCN studies and publications enhanced the understanding of decision makers of approaches and mechanisms that let local communities access, compete in, and benefit from emerging markets for natural resources and services.

- Studies in eight Liberian forest landscapes demonstrated and informed policy makers on the value of forest resources to local communities.
- A study of options for Allanblackia improved standards for wild picking by community-based and private sector producers in Ghana; it helped shift beyond oil extraction to move toward a commercial scale, with equitable sharing of the benefits for local livelihoods.
- To overcome the ‘resource curse’ of oil, our study recommended West African governments embrace a comprehensive regional convention for offshore development, ensuring preservation of the marine environment while engaging in oil exploitation.
- Other studies – Burkina Faso wood energy, Mediterranean maritime traffic, Mesoamerican forest management – demonstrated new methods for mobilizing funding for biodiversity conservation while supporting environment ministries.
As a secretariat for Countdown 2010 and the European Habitats Forum, IUCN provided policy input and advice to DG Environment of the European Commission and EU Member States’ Nature Directors on the implementation of the Birds and Habitats Directives and the establishment of the Natura 2000 Network. In addition, the Union’s Regional Office for pan-Europe acted as a lead broker for launching the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) Study at the G8 Ministers of Environment Meeting in Potsdam, Germany.

In West Asia, audio-visual materials like the film Waqf for Water promoted innovative funding that could address the water crisis in the region. A Waqf (endowment) is an Islamic model by which one makes a voluntary, permanent and irrevocable dedication of a portion of one’s wealth – in cash or kind, for a certain purpose for certain beneficiaries. Once created, Waqf funds collected will be invested and the income used for sustainable development.

In addition to generating knowledge on alternative financing mechanisms, IUCN continuously worked to increase the available funding for protected areas and ecological networks.

- The US$ 10 million Mountain Areas Conservation Fund supported community-based conservation in the Northern Areas of Pakistan.
- We raised funds for ecological networks and protected areas in Albania, the Western Balkans, Northwest Russia, the European Green Belt and the Southern Caucasus.
- The German EU Presidency in 2007 collaborated with Countdown 2010 to advance the designation and funding of Marine Protected Areas adding to the number of MPA sites.

To tap incentives and market-based mechanisms for wetland and water resources conservation, IUCN developed the toolkit PAY to help water resource planners, river basin managers, non-governmental organizations and private sector operators develop payments for watershed services. PAY seeks to reward or reinvest in ecosystem services related to water security, and has been used in training workshops in collaboration with the Global Environment Facility.

Water audits developed by IUCN in the Volta and Komadugu-Yobe river basins are used by national institutions as a useful tool in decision making. And in Pakistan we made positive overtures with the Environmental Section of the Planning Commission in a final workshop to support environmental fiscal reforms.

As a result of IUCN’s alternative income generating mechanisms, local communities on the periphery of the Arly Park in Burkina Faso established breeding units for non-timber forest products. Similarly, Imraguen communities in Banc d’Arguin National Park, Mauritania, especially women, benefited from the increased value-added of traditional fisheries products.

IUCN enhanced the capacity building of decision makers, practitioners and local communities to drive policies and practices promoting conservation incentives. In workshops we trained:

- Pakistan district officials on how to develop and implement fiscal instruments;
- Mediterranean managers and students on protected area management challenges;
- regulators on how to overcome international corruption in fisheries;
- South Africans on how to value and pay for marine ecosystems; and
- Mozambique partners on advocacy for forest conservation and sustainable development.
KEY RESULT AREA 4: INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS, PROCESSES AND INSTITUTIONS FOR CONSERVATION

KRA 4.1 Improved understanding of how international arrangements can support more efficient, effective and equitable biodiversity conservation and sustainable development

The ‘international environment’ is governed by a mish-mash of bilateral binding treaties, soft multilateral legal instruments, incentive-driven voluntary initiatives, and informal codes of conduct. As a key player in the arena of biodiversity-related conventions, IUCN clarified, advanced and implemented the link between conservation and sustainable development through spreading the knowledge it generated and empowering all parties with the methods and tools to acquire it on their own. Indeed, IUCN strengthened multilateral policy through policy statements at 15 top level meetings such as the UN Law of the Sea, fish stocks, and marine biodiversity.

Many of the Union’s key publications dealt with water governance, from the status of property rights in South America to customary water rights in West Africa.

IUCN issued policy papers on multilateral governance, from UN reform and international environmental governance to strategies for how trade-related intellectual property rights could reduce the likelihood of armed conflict.

A wide spectrum of IUCN reference materials provided up-to-date information on important policy developments, legal instruments, and governance structures and processes such as:

- ECOLEX, a user-friendly global database with the world’s most comprehensive information on environmental law;
- International Water Governance, a review of the best evolving arrangements for the preservation of freshwater ecosystems; and
- “Goverance of the Mediterranean Sea,” a CD on the relevant international processes in designing an integrated legal system for the conservation of marine biodiversity.

IUCN made major national policy strides in shaping: China’s Nature Reserve Law; Bhutan’s National Biosafety Framework; Lao PDR’s legal and economic documentation for accession to the Ramsar Convention; Libya’s integration of biodiversity conservation and tourism policy.

When it comes to management tools for democratic decision making on wetlands and rivers, IUCN wrote the book. Actually, seven books – some translated into nine languages – clarifying the integration of ecosystem services, economics, incentives, governance reform, and empowerment under such titles as FLOW, CHANGE, PAY, VALUE, SHARE, RULE, and NEGOTIATE. European stakeholders used another IUCN tool, TEMATEA, to assess and close gaps in international biodiversity agreements, while Eastern African and Central American managers used a Union guide to share responsibility over the governance of wetlands. Environmental tools had advantages for conflict prone regions like northern Pakistan, where IUCN helped provinces develop integrated strategies for solid waste, water management and sustainable development.
IUCN convened stakeholders ranging from legal scholars and business people to politicians and environmental NGOs, to improve the enforcement of conservation legislation and build capacity for national compliance with multilateral environmental agreements.

Technical assistance on biodiversity indicators helped commissions and conventions cover everything from Antarctic marine mammals and tropical wetlands to migratory species and CITES plant listings.

**KRA 4.2 Enhanced capacities of decision makers to understand and promote the relevance and effectiveness of international arrangements that impact on biodiversity conservation**

Decades of growth in multilateral agreements, national legislation, ‘soft law’ documents and policy literature filled a large reservoir of environmental legal tools and mechanisms. But it was largely off limits or too obscure for most people to access. IUCN changed that. Through training sessions and workshops, the Union helped marginal communities and developing nations effectively participate in and make informed decisions about international processes that support and impact the conservation agenda.

Capacity building helped public officials and civil society develop and better utilize environmental law through legal workshops. These governed everything from Mesoamerican waters and Middle Eastern drylands; Eastern African pastoralists and EU forest policy; to China’s protected areas and Guatemala’s climate resilience. Our process helped high-level decision makers to better understand and govern marine ecosystems and helped multilateral donors formulate Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD) policies.

IUCN raised awareness on forest protected areas, forest landscape restoration, community involvement in forest management, forest fires, and forest law enforcement and governance. All this elevated “forest landscape restoration” to become a top priority among donor agencies and policy makers alike. Likewise, IUCN helped the European Commission and China agree on how to fight illegal logging; verify certification; share information on trade; and cooperate on Congo Basin forestry.

The world’s largest conservation network fostered dialogue during high-quality, multi-faceted debate and built partnerships through multi-stakeholder platforms. These ranged from signing treaties for trans-boundary cooperation in nine African basins to laying the basis for the development of a regional Latin American climate change strategy.

**KRA 4.3 Enhanced participation of all relevant actors in the development, implementation, review and adaptation of international arrangements that impact on biodiversity conservation**

IUCN believes broader participation of stakeholders – including women and indigenous people – in natural resource management will translate into better implementation of international conservation agreements. By enhancing trust and cooperation between governments and NGOs, the Union offered a unique, neutral forum where different interest groups could come together and develop balanced, fact-based environmental proposals that carry weight around the world.

To advance participatory policy in international conventions, IUCN first consulted its Members, encouraged regional staff to participate in relevant delegations, and set up special vehicles for briefing parties on key issues. The Union did more than act as “nature’s ambassador”, as it ensured Members could speak for themselves.
NGO stakeholders in Russia, Europe and Central Asia helped shape forest law.

The Central African Forest Commission expanded to include civil society representatives.

In IUCN-convened national roundtables, grassroots organizations from Mexico, Guatemala and El Salvador advanced their role in water resource management.

The Union’s “Strengthening Voices for Better Choices” in the Democratic Republic of Congo established three innovative multi-stakeholder structures to link local, provincial and national action on forest governance. It created 27 “committees for dialogue and vigilance” to represent local customary chiefs, women, pygmies, priests, teachers and clan representatives.

To accelerate progress, IUCN multiplied capacity building and technical assistance to:

- the Central African Republic’s forestry code;
- protected area legislation for the governments of Guinea Bissau and Gabon;
- West African officials and NGOs to negotiate better trade agreements; and
- the sustainable development of Mediterranean aquaculture.

**KRA 4.4 Improved relevance and effectiveness of international environmental arrangements**

Environmental management really means managing people. It works best through cooperative, flexible and voluntary participation by all stakeholders. The trick is to strike a balance between efficiency and participation, inclusion and exclusion. IUCN united governments, NGOs, universities, civil society and the private sector to form new collaborative partnerships. It then equipped partners with tools to implement, monitor and evaluate treaty obligations on their own.

Some breakthroughs highlight the “I” in IUCN, as international policy work came to fruition.

- All too often, countries sign onto agreements they are unable to implement. IUCN changed that, through workshops helping Europe and Latin America translate the words of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) into action at the national level, especially in protected areas. The Union’s coordination and synergies helped deliver the 2010 biodiversity target.
- Working with officials at the Ministerial level, the Union pioneered a new collaborative way of doing business in Russia to curb illegal logging and improve forest governance, transferred this progress to West and Central Africa, and has incorporated it into the programme as a whole.
- Rather than continue the conventional and isolated ‘fortress conservation’ approach, IUCN ensured that national leaders in Europe embraced the concept of integrated ecological networks to improve the extent, coherence and connectivity of protected areas.
- The Union’s Environmental Law Commission (ELC) improved the workings of international tools ranging from the CBD to the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea to the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. Only IUCN could fill this unique niche, fusing science, pragmatism and law.
Through similar processes of structured collaboration, IUCN improved policy work on protected areas, climate adaptation, biodiversity targets, wetlands, drylands and river basin management – while ensuring each effort helped reduce poverty. We analysed complex legal issues ranging from genetic marine resources to the biodiversity dimensions of the environmental impact assessment process. The Union’s advice helped:

- Bangladesh adapt to climate change;
- Vietnam draft a biodiversity law;
- Sri Lanka develop and launch a national sustainable strategy; and
- Nigeria ratify a trans-boundary united water charter linking six states of the Komadugu-Yobe River.

IUCN promoted successful management tools and practices in order to translate conceptual principles into tangible results. These included:

- “Ecological networks” to improve the extent, coherence and connectivity of protected areas throughout Europe. Examples ranged from the Sava River in Southeastern Europe to protected area systems in Russia, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan.
- “Important plant areas” (IPAs), from the Gornje Podunavlje in Southeastern Europe to a list of IPAs in Russia’s Altay-Sayan.
- “Intercontinental biosphere reserves” established between Andalusia (Spain) and Morocco and approved by UNESCO in October 2006.

IUCN built partnerships within three Commission Specialist Groups to improve the coverage and effectiveness of the global system of marine protected areas. It set up a scientific alliance with Canada, Germany, Mexico, UNESCO and universities to advance biogeographic classification. A classic IUCN tripartite relationship – governments, NGOs and businesses – helped Russia improve forest governance and galvanized ten riparian countries under the Nile Basin Discourse.

From Paris and Montenegro to Porquerolles and Fiji, IUCN dialogue platforms and fora stirred cutting-edge debate on the dual challenge of poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation. More than abstract talk shops, however, the platforms brought results.

- By convening 450 people from 60 governments and representatives from 12 European Overseas regions, IUCN earned recognition by, and action from, the EU Council.
- Likewise, IUCN’s 1st Conference of the Mediterranean Marine Protected Areas Network engaged 110 marine conservation experts from governments, NGOs, intergovernmental and international organizations, to improve the levels of protection and conservation.
- IUCN’s new Oceania office hosted a regional meeting that promoted regional application of international arrangements on invasive species.

Commitments made under the Aarhus Convention were integrated into the TEMATEA framework to facilitate its implementation in Central and Southeastern Europe and the CIS countries. New guidance and resolutions on river basin management, climate change adaptation, and wetlands and poverty reduction were further elaborated under the Ramsar Convention, using IUCN’s Water and Nature Initiative and regional water project experience.

KRA 4.5 Non-environmental international arrangements promote biodiversity conservation as a key element of successful sustainable development

IUCN expanded the portfolio of biodiversity-related multilateral instruments to include trade agreements and development cooperation. But without communication or interaction between the trade and environment communities in multilateral negotiations, the results were incoherent. In debates on access and benefit sharing or the interface with intellectual property rights billions of people had no stake in trade or development outcomes. For the sake of nature, IUCN set out to correct that imbalance.
The Union worked closely with the European Union to incorporate biodiversity aspects as a core component in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, trade and development policies. Policy change emerged through negotiation of agreements between the EU and timber exporting countries like Ghana on curbing the export of illegal timber.

IUCN provided dialogue platforms and fora to promote conservation issues in the framework of international trade regulations and market access agreements. Our ‘best conservation practices’ informed the U.S.–Chile Free Trade Agreement (FTA), and our ‘invasive species issues’ influenced the implementation of the Central America–Dominican Republic FTA. Beyond trade, IUCN helped develop an Andean Biodiversity Institute and hosted the European Green Belt secretariat.

Union partnerships and co-management models added the trans-boundary lower Senegal River delta to UNESCO’s World Network of Biosphere Reserves. We connected Burkina Faso and Ghana in management of shared ecosystems. IUCN also wrought cooperative agreements with the Federation of European Aquaculture Producers.

Cooperation agreements were further concluded between IUCN and the Federation of European Aquaculture Producers, the University of Valencia, Europarc-España, the Fundación González Bernáldez, the University of Almeria, and the University of Malaga’s International Association for the Exchange of Students for Technical Experience.

KRA 4.6 Multi-national businesses support biodiversity conservation

Some claim corporations and conservation are mutually incompatible. IUCN disputes that. The Union believes that while challenges are real, a more accountable private sector could contribute to sustainable development if the private sector was engaged through effective incentives, dialogue and collaboration. IUCN continuously raised the ‘good practices’ standards for the private sector, then helped business partners clear the highest bar, whether in trade or corporate social and environmental responsibility. Today, business is acknowledged as a vital stakeholder when it comes to solving the world’s biodiversity crisis. IUCN is proud to have encouraged the private sector to embed biodiversity into its policies and develop good practices.

Our Business and Biodiversity partnerships engage the multi-national private sector to achieve conservation goals and ensure equitable access to resources. These include:

- a three-year agreement with the Holcim Group to develop robust conservation standards which bring sector-wide improvements in Sri Lanka, Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Panama; and
- recommendations to Sakhalin Energy on how the oil and gas company could minimize risks to, and mitigate impacts on, critically endangered gray whales and their habitat. A five-year agreement raises biodiversity performance standards through the energy sector.

IUCN’s analyses, conservation tools and raised awareness helped:

- ACCOR Hotels use more sustainably biological resources in daily operations and purchasing policies;
- banks integrate biodiversity conservation into their lending and investment decisions as a way to reduce their exposure to risk;
• the International Finance Corporation develop a tool that helps companies in emerging markets grasp and improve their relationship to biodiversity in ways that improve business performance;
• the World Business Council for Sustainable Development mobilize business and markets to conserve nature;
• the World Economic Forum’s Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Report develop biodiversity indicators; and
• the Ceylon Chamber of Commerce establish a landmark coral reef awareness centre.

IUCN Fostered Dialogue with the mining, energy, tourism and development industries, and led:

• the International Council on Mining and Metals through the publication of Good Practice Guidance for Mining and Biodiversity;
• the International Risk Governance Council’s work on governing risks and opportunities of biofuels;
• global tourism stream workshops at the International Tropical Marine Ecosystem Symposium; and
• a series of one-hour television debates by diverse opinion shapers to discuss solid waste and air quality; fisheries management and terrestrial biodiversity; climate change; the role of ecosystems in disaster mitigation.

**Key Result Area 5: Ecosystems and Sustainable Livelihoods**

**KRA 5.1 Improved understanding of how social, economic and environmental objectives can be reconciled in the management and restoration of ecosystems**

First, IUCN integrated biodiversity conservation, community livelihoods, and poverty eradication in One Programme. It then began to translate this knowledge into policies and practices that placed human needs at the centre of natural resource management, a restorative strategy known as the Ecosystem Approach. Based on 50 comprehensive analyses showing how to enhance the ecosystem to meet current and future needs, IUCN developed a wide array of policy, management and capacity building tools and methods linking conservation efforts with the capacity to address human security and livelihood issues together.

Thirty-four IUCN publications focused on five major themes: (1) protected areas; (2) ecosystems and security; (3) invasive alien species; (4) agro-ecology; and (5) pro-poor conservation. These ranged from environmental flows assessments in Tanzania’s Pangani River to food security in China, Cameroon, Ecuador and Costa Rica.

IUCN policy papers enhanced the principles, policies, practices and benefits of good governance in natural resource management, including:

• the link between human rights and the environment;
• the legal and institutional framework underpinning payment for ecosystem services; and
• climate change impacts and adaptations on vulnerable indigenous people.

Crucial reference materials such as online databases, factsheets, brochures and species distribution maps guided the Union’s work in protected areas and World Heritage sites.

IUCN helped establish the parameters and guidelines for protected area conservation through:
- connectivity corridors in the Himalayas and the Andes;
- legislation and its implications for management in Saudi Arabia and Jordan;
- water communication strategies in Western Asia and North Africa; and
- natural resource damage assessment and emergency action plan for the oil spill in post-conflict Lebanon and in post-tsunami Sri Lanka.

**KRA 5.2 Tools and methods for integrated management and restoration of ecosystems**

IUCN advanced tools and methods to conserve nature while securing human benefits. It ensured people could use and apply their ecosystem knowledge through collaborative decisions. The applied research and analysis helped address the challenges of managing ecosystems. The Union defined integrated restoration in topics that ranged from commercial aquaculture and community-based forest strategies to rapid flows assessment in Vietnam and dams in Nepal.

IUCN systematically collected information on the global use and trade of species, then brought its *databases and scientific networks* to analyse proposals for species to be listed on CITES. It also enhanced the capacity of managers and decision makers through the Protected Areas Learning Network, garnering 450,000 hits per month.

The Union’s significant *policy* interventions: halted destructive high seas bottom fishing; controlled reckless development on Libya’s pristine rich cultural, coastal and archaeological heritage; stopped the Buk-Bjela hydropower plant from eroding the Durmitor World Heritage Site in southern Europe; and ensured fish farm projects carry out environmental impact studies.

IUCN empowered stakeholders with the *management and legal tools* to develop and implement strategies that protect biological diversity and enhance human society.

- In the Andes, we co-developed an Integrated Water Resources Management strategy based on codified hydro-graphic units, then trained local officials how to implement it.
- In Vietnam, we enhanced governance, encouraged private sector to invest locally, and ensured the rights of ethnic groups to plan, manage and commercialize forest resources.
- In Asia, we translated toolkits into Chinese, Lao, Thai, Vietnamese, Sinhala, Khmer and Burmese, empowering stakeholders to collaborate on co-managing stressed river basins.

IUCN *monitoring methods* improved poverty-focused conservation. Equipped with IUCN legal support, partners could measure social impacts of protected areas, implement payment for watershed services, and analyse which villagers depend most on wetlands and empower them to conserve them.

**KRA 5.3 Stakeholders make informed choices and negotiate outcomes that balance biodiversity conservation and human development needs**

For IUCN, *knowledge leads to empowerment as it builds capacity and instills a sense of responsibility and motivation; this sense of ‘ownership’ enables people and institutions to plan, manage, conserve and use natural resources in a sustainable and equitable manner*. But it required a considerable effort and substantial resources to empower stakeholders to the point where outcomes deliver ecosystem services. The process required democratization of decision making and community involvement in resource management.
Effective capacity building provides the right advice at the right time to the right stakeholders at the right level. IUCN’s effort trained and tutored:

- district level committees trained in wetland conservation and beach management along Lake Victoria in Uganda;
- Fiji’s conservationists in legal mechanisms for the establishment and management of terrestrial protected areas;
- staff in ninety-six projects in Mesoamerica on how to enhance the voice of civil society advocates in environmental policy; and
- conservationists on how to build consensus on priorities for the future of biodiversity in Africa, leading to the Dar es Salaam Vision Statement.

**Awareness raising** initiatives:

- showed 200 government and NGO representatives in Botswana, Kenya and Niger how to evaluate the hidden wealth of dryland ecosystem services;
- educated U.S. Congressmen about the benefits of accession to the Law of the Sea Convention;
- used documentaries and photo exhibits to teach Arabic partners how to build sustainable cities, restore desiccated rivers, and manage water management; and
- provided the textbook to Central American universities on environmental law.

IUCN convened **platforms for dialogue** between civil society and governments to develop unified approaches, partnerships and fora for collective action on conservation. The Union’s neutrality and credibility helped diverse constituencies address contentious governance issues related to water management, forest conservation and protected areas. Triumphs included:

- Locking in collaborative management of Sri Lanka’s Knuckles Protection Area;
- Forging an amalgamated stakeholder structure of forest conservation in Nepal;
- Establishing a multi-stakeholder framework for poverty reduction in the Congo basin;
- Empowering a multi-sector agenda building process in the tropical forests of Acre State;
- Galvanizing experts, economists, sociologists, local groups and conservationists to improve the viability of Egypt’s first Marine Protected Area on the Mediterranean coast; and
- Advancing the U.S. World Heritage Programme through stakeholder consultation on the revision of the indicative list.

By demonstrating the real gains from greater **community involvement**, IUCN turned marginalized antagonists into responsible resource custodians.

- In Bangladesh wetlands, IUCN helped poor communities develop resilient *Bairas*, or floating vegetable gardens, which the government proclaimed a food security model.
- In Thailand, the Union supported Thai baan, a village-led approach to water management. Initiated to rebuild local expertise and articulate nature’s value to authorities, the project ended up sparking a viral conservation movement with the will, conviction, knowledge and authority to establish fish conservation zones.
- In Nepal, a landscape plan for village tourism was set in motion in Domukha in 2006. Over 2,000 hectares of mangrove areas were planted by communities in the Pushkin and Jiwani coastal areas of Balochistan, Pakistan, in 2008.

IUCN’s decentralization process helped marginalized groups gain **access to decision making** in:

- Bangladesh, where cooperative management and controlled exploitation of the Tanguar Haor wetlands ecosystem give the poor the right to fish and benefit from a mechanism providing them with 40 percent of the share of fish sales; and
- Burkina Faso, where the Arly National Park communities now take part in management of animals in Village and Inter-Village Committees.
IUCN forged durable models of co-management in sectors and regional partnerships, which in:

- Mesoamerica established Alianzas, or local trans-boundary commissions that shared environmental governance in three frontier areas;
- Bangladesh’s Chittagong Hill tracts rehabilitated 10 hectares of degraded forests through an environmentally-sound shifting cultivation model;
- Lao PDR’s Hin Nam No National Park developed a co-management model; and
- Burundi advanced an ecosystem management plan for the Rusizi River Valley.

**KRA 5.4 National and sub-national policies, laws and institutional arrangements better integrate human well-being with biodiversity conservation**

Democratic governance requires both: 1) robust and interactive institutions and 2) a transparent architecture of accountable and enforceable rules. IUCN helped build and strengthen the first by integrating government, civil society, the private sector and indigenous communities in mass collaboration. Concurrently, IUCN helped establish government policy frameworks within which those collaborators could act on the basis of clear rights and responsibilities.

By identifying market access challenges faced by poor, rural communities, IUCN helped bring policy change solutions to natural resource management in:

- Amazonia, where legislative changes on the licensing, enforcement and certification of forest timber helped slow the ravages of illegal logging;
- Mauritania, where new laws and management plans institutionalized monitoring of coastal fisheries; and
- Mali, which issued an IUCN-recommended decree banning the digging of artificial streams in the Inner Niger Delta.

IUCN management practices modified behaviour in issues as divergent as deep water fishing operations, restoration of degraded ecosystems, and urban parks in African slums. Most change involved incentives, removal of barriers and by-laws which, for example provoked:

- Vietnam to include non-timber forest products in its policies and accounting;
- Tanzania to empower villages with responsibility to manage national resources;
- Guatemala to set and enforce rules on private sector environmental impacts;
- Guinea Bissau to develop a protected areas strategic plan; and
- Egypt to create a demonstration project for democratic irrigation in the Nile Valley.

From its inception IUCN has strived to establish and support trans-boundary representative governance bodies and management fora, whether they oversee:

- the Gourma Sahel ecosystem between Burkina Faso and Mali;
- national wetland working groups in Angola and Lesotho;
- national protected area committees in Fiji; or
- multi-stakeholder forest governance in Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Sri Lanka, Liberia, Tanzania and Brazil.
As part of institutional capacity building, the Union:

- trained 240 wetland managers in southern Africa;
- mentored protected area managers in Yemen, Oman and Saudi Arabia; and
- gathered politicians in the Netherlands to incorporate natural resource governance into human security.

**KRA 5.5 Governance structures take into account the rights, responsibilities and interests of stakeholders and allow for their equitable participation in decision making regarding biodiversity conservation and human development**

Global conservation efforts succeed only through effective national governance. Within effective nations, local communities take care of nature when people have clearly defined resource ownership rights and can defend access to those resources. At all these levels, IUCN sought to bring mutual reinforcement. Local efforts focused on equitable decision making and distribution of benefits within communities. Policy efforts supported institutional mechanisms and discussion fora. Regional institutional arrangements varied – from voluntary codes of conduct for private businesses to professional procedures and partnerships among sectors – but they all mobilized diverse constituencies to realize common goals.

IUCN worked toward policy change in issues as diverse as how UNEP could incorporate gender considerations or how China’s state authority could incorporate forest landscape restoration. The Union also improved management practices for natural resource governance by broadening participation and empowering disadvantaged actors in:

- the Middle East, promoting local governance through a traditional community-based ‘hima’ approach to ensure protection and conservation of protected areas;
- the Arabian Gulf, harmonizing oil and gas development with marine biodiversity offsets; and
- West Africa, developing a trans-boundary participatory management plan for small pelagic fisheries.

IUCN’s conservation governance bodies collaborate in fora across boundaries in:

- Mesoamerica, among 200 organizations in the co-management of three shared ecosystems;
- West Africa, involving trans-boundary management of marine and coastal biodiversity in Mauritania, Senegal, Cape Verde, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Gambia and Sierra Leone;
- Senegal, through a national Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) monitoring body;
- The Democratic Republic of Congo involving 15 dialogue committees, including women and indigenous people; and
- Jordan's Environment Ministry, for project management in ecosystem restoration.

The Union’s events and conferences brought a confluence of fresh perspectives. In Morocco we convened jurists, scientists and international organizations to collaborate on the Mediterranean’s high sea regime. In Papua New Guinea we convened Pacific Island residents to grasp community conservation and the law. And in Lisbon we convened Europeans on private sector governance frameworks for biodiversity conservation.
7. ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

The 20th Century saw the muscular expansion of environmentalism. But for all its influence that movement failed to resolve basic questions: How do we grow sustainably? How do we simultaneously protect biodiversity, commit to justice and equity, and promote a low-carbon economy? As IUCN resets the terms of engagement between humanity and the biosphere, we must change the culture, rules framework and incentive structure that guide our relationship.

That means reorganizing the Union itself. The decision to do so has not been taken lightly. We do not embrace change management for the sake of change alone. The Union is responding deliberately to the direct demands of its Members and partners as specified in formal surveys, reviews, working groups, planning and vision exercises. Indeed, before it could reorganize how its complex mechanism should change, the Union first had to decide where it wanted to go, by when and how:

- On the longer term, IUCN's vision and strategy for the 21st Century can be found in The Future of Sustainability and its subsequent Transition to Sustainability studies. These are both conceptual and solutions-oriented, undertaken with the world’s top thinkers and institutions, to provide the basis on which to plan as we look toward the end of the century.
- The Union’s medium-term plan, 2020 Vision, integrates current managerial and structural processes to ensure strategic and efficient delivery of the IUCN Programme.
- Shaping a Sustainable Future helps us plan, implement, monitor, and evaluate our conservation work 2009–2012. This result-based, demand-driven plan of action addresses global issues, incorporates national priorities, and brings structure to detailed work plans.
- Yearly plans are presented to the IUCN Council, which approves budgets and work plans which shape the coming year, including resources required to deliver the Programme and meet strategic objectives and targets.

With these instruments to allow us to plan from the long- to the short-term, we then looked at strategic intervention points, all a part of the organizational change process.

Continue Decentralization

Members want to retain IUCN’s proven strengths – stakeholder interaction, innovative entrepreneurship, global influence and collaborative partnerships – then augment these through creative incentives, stable financial flows, and delivery of more coherent and consistent results.

Other improvements require an overhaul. The Union’s global structure will shift authority and responsibility away from the centre. It will outpost and outsource thematic programmes, integrate national efforts into the global programme, and set priorities from the bottom up.

Starting in 2007, this process improved the Union’s ability to: reach new partners; earn higher returns from limited investment resources; add value and support for Members; enhance the role of Commissions; respond quickly and effectively to emerging challenges; ensure accountability of managers responsible for decisions and results; and connect conservation to the roots of security and poverty concerns.
Unleash the Global Network

IUCN’s former conventional hierarchical and matrix management models faced challenges including bottlenecks, information overload and frustration. Instead, day-to-day work was accomplished through formal and casual connections. To enhance those networks, IUCN will:

• develop more informed, integrated and collaborative governance arrangements;
• ensure access to the latest and most credible science-based conservation developments;
• break down cultural barriers between Members, Commissions and Secretariat so each explicitly and mutually adds value to the others; and
• harness information technologies and management systems to communicate more effectively with staff, Members, constituents and the larger world.

Increase the Secretariat’s Effectiveness

Any organization the size and complexity of IUCN requires a core team of dedicated people working solely in the interests of the Union. In the coming years, IUCN will enable the Secretariat to meet the expectations of its Members, Commissions, donors and partners to increase relevance in a rapidly changing world. The Union will strengthen the Secretariat’s presence in various parts of the world to ensure connectivity with problems on the ground, and ensure staff has the appropriate technical, collaborative and multi-cultural talents to serve IUCN’s Mission.

Secure and Diversify Funding

Thanks to long-term framework agreements with bilateral donors and a private foundation, IUCN has recorded a steady increase in both core income and expenditure. But IUCN’s funding structure has constrained choices about spending priorities and limited IUCN’s ability to unlock its potential. To become a vigorous membership and partner organization with a worldwide public reputation for its promotion of science-based best practice in sustainability, IUCN will:

• strengthen its fundraising ability to procure the additional resources it needs;
• shift fundraising from local field projects toward policy and programme development, networking and Member support;
• build up a sufficient reserve to provide security against risks; and
• be able to undertake innovative activities in new frontier areas.

IUCN’s hallmarks – democratic and participatory processes, staff professionalism and volunteer networks – will continue to remain at the heart of its networking role. But decentralization will devolve Secretariat authority, transform information technology and management systems, diversify funding sources, and restore influence to involved Members through a transparent, responsive and integrated approach. This ‘One Programme’ strategy will position IUCN as a global player in the field of conservation and sustainable development.
Every External Review tries to look at IUCN as a whole. The External Review completed in 2008 examined IUCN through the lens of membership engagement and specific aspects of the IUCN Programme, including the poverty-conservation work and the policy-practice loop. Many of the issues raised by the diagnosis are not new to IUCN and characterized as preventing IUCN from realizing its full potential.

The main challenges facing IUCN include:

- making the governance structure work so that the parts of the Union – Commissions, Members and Secretariat – are able to be more than the sum of the parts;
- ensuring that the highly decentralized and distributed Secretariat is supported by very strong systems in order to enable strong collaboration, communication and accountability;
- diversifying the funding base away from a project-oriented model heavily dependent on Official Development Assistance to a more flexible model capable of delivering IUCN’s value proposition; and
- enhancing the tools at IUCN’s disposal, particularly in the areas of knowledge management and networking, to allow IUCN to remain competitive and a leading voice for nature and the sustainable use of natural resources.

The Review called upon the Director General to sustain a process of leadership and change management in order to address these challenges and recommended the following priority actions:

- consolidate the priorities emerging from recent reviews and strategies into a single change management process supported by adequate resources and a business plan;
- ensure that a new membership policy and strategy is aligned with IUCN’s organizational evolution in the IUCN Strategy 2009–2020;
- use the IUCN Strategy and the change management process to engage existing and potential donors at a high level in order to ensure long-term agreements for support and an immediate investment to strengthen IUCN’s organizational systems in the short-term; and
- use a formal and well-implemented change management process to demonstrate to Members, Commissions and donors IUCN’s commitment to change.

In addition to priority actions, the Review made a dozen additional recommendations supported by numerous suggestions on how best to implement the recommendations. Implementation of the Programme was a strong area of focus, and the Review put forward a number of recommendations aimed at enhancing IUCN’s ability for strategic influencing, from different funding models to enhanced design techniques and better systems for capturing results and managing information.
9. **Congress and the New Programme**

In October 2008 the largest environmental meeting in IUCN’s history gathered in Barcelona. The 8,000-strong World Conservation Congress met, debated and decided where, who, how and why decision makers must protect the planet’s natural wealth, immediately.

That’s a tall order, which the IUCN Programme was designed to meet. The 2009–2012 Programme was developed through the most extensive consultation process ever. It integrated thoughtful input from IUCN Members, Commissions, donors and partners. It was anchored by our Mission Statement. It also took on the resolutions and recommendations approved at Congress, recent lessons learned about sustainability, and emerging issues and trends.

Climate change had dominated reports and presentations, with impacts driving every issue from threatened species and forest management, to infectious diseases and indigenous rights. The IUCN Red List showed that we are facing an extinction crisis, but that well-funded and planned measures can bring recovery – as it has for 40 species of mammals.

In response to ever-growing threats to environmental health and the lack of progress towards sustainability, the Programme strengthens the Union’s heartland work on conserving biodiversity. But it approaches conservation as a strategic basis that helps address underlying threats such as climate change, energy, poverty and security, and economy and markets. These strategic policy interventions are identified in four thematic programme areas:

1. **Changing the climate forecast**: Integrating biodiversity considerations and opportunities into climate change policy and practice
2. **Naturally energising the future**: Implementing ecologically sustainable, equitable and efficient energy systems
3. **Managing ecosystems for human well-being**: Improving livelihoods, reducing poverty and vulnerability, and enhancing environmental and human security through sustainable ecosystem management
4. **Greening the world economy**: Integrating ecosystem conservation values in economic policy, finance and markets

In the midst of a global economic meltdown, IUCN leveraged new financial resources, matched by new initiative and new technology applications to expand knowledge, empower billions, and improve governance from mountain glacier to ocean floor. While many parts of the recession-weary world grow understandably suspicious of business ventures, IUCN was able to leverage market forces everywhere, from local watersheds to multi-national corporations.

Our Union came away from Barcelona with a stronger definition of its roles, responsibilities and expectations. To be sure, conditions are constantly changing. Conservation actions need to be monitored and adjusted in an ongoing process of “adaptive management”. But when informed through the energized network, the results lead to more effective and responsive action, continuing to deliver results in the global sustainability cause, improving the habitat of all life – human, plant and animal – in the forests, wetlands, drylands and seascapes of the world.
Programme Planning

Like a living constitution, the IUCN Programme is less a finished product than an ongoing process. That deliberative process is tempered by and adapted to the needs of 1,100 Members as they arise. As ‘nature’s ambassador’ the Union constantly responds to shifting currents in the sustainable development agenda. No change occurs overnight. No agenda is set in stone.

Yet every parliament operates under a framework, a working document that comes from fixing words on paper. Consider the 2009–2012 Programme as a photograph of IUCN’s priorities taken at the moment of the latest World Conservation Congress. And just as a snapshot is framed, focused, timed and exposed the Programme is shaped by four equally influential forces.

Each World Conservation Congress passes more than one hundred Member Resolutions, which either reinforce the existing Programme document or signal new priority areas. The Union’s democratic legitimacy rests on its ability to implement and monitor these resolutions.

Global and component Situation Analyses diagnose the dimensions of human and ecosystem well-being, and directly inform the prescription in the programme plans.

Every four years the External Reviews, like a comprehensive ‘institutional x-ray,’ reveal the Union’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and help redesign the Programme.

Unforeseen events like the Asian tsunami lead directly to the transformation of essential Project Portfolio components in the adaptive Programme, such as the “Mangroves for the Future” Initiative.

Once IUCN prepares the diagnosis, as described above, it is able to develop the Global Programme framework. The Union consults with Members and partners through regional conservation fora or email and phone conversations. Then IUCN component programme plans are developed, covering the Regions, Global Thematic Programmes and Commissions, responding to each of the five programmatic areas and ten global results. Ultimately the Programme is considered at the World Conservation Congress by the IUCN Members, who reject or approve or influence it with a series of Resolutions.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The global programme monitoring plan is a highly aggregated synthesis of the component programme monitoring plans. This allows IUCN to simultaneously see the detail of programme implementation as well as roll up the results to see institution-wide programme delivery.
So the programme framework exists at two levels and two stages. The planning process began with the development of the global framework, which yielded five programme areas and ten global results. Component programmes – covering the regional offices, thematic programmes, Commissions and cross-cutting issues such as social policy, gender and economics – are then programmed against that framework. This approach benefits from top-down and bottom-up vision.

The global monitoring framework and the component programme monitoring plans were also developed simultaneously. Four out of five component programme results seek to influence policy change, so the synthesized policy indicators are designed to reflect the extent to which the target policy has included biodiversity considerations and how many policies were successfully influenced. The remaining 20 percent of the component programme results can be measured through traditional indices: livelihoods, poverty alleviation, equity of access and participation rates. The programme monitoring team will then synthesize the data it receives to show the extent of IUCN’s success. Measuring influence is largely a qualitative exercise, but the analysis does reveal quantitative patterns.

This is essentially a ‘learning-by-doing’ adaptive management effort. The process of developing component programme monitoring plans became a capacity building exercise for IUCN staff. Thus the quality of the results and the indicators proposed are currently the responsibility of the component programmes. At IUCN, these plans are referred to regularly and component programmes are encouraged to update them as implementation progresses.
Over four years the Union experienced moderate financial growth. On average our annual income grew 7.8 percent from 2005–2008, reaching CHF 133 million.

IUCN’s budget has two sources of funds. One third is core income, and includes membership dues, income earned from sales and fees, and voluntary contributions provided by donors and income from Framework Partners. Two thirds is restricted income, including pre-defined projects and programmes.

Four new Framework Agreements – with France, Spain and Italy and the MAVA Foundation – brought to ten the total number of Framework Partners. Framework Agreements have been and continue to be instrumental in strengthening IUCN’s Programme and allow the Union to focus on its real value as a network and to apply its value proposition effectively. They enable decentralization, innovation and catalyse the work of IUCN’s scientific, technical and policy networks as well as foster the development of new programme areas.

In line with Council’s recommendation, and Secretariat strategy, donor diversification has improved with support from governments, bilateral development agencies, multilateral and intergovernmental institutions, international conventions and non-governmental organizations, foundations and corporations.

Official Development Assistance (ODA) continues to represent a major source of support for the Union’s work, but IUCN will need to expand and diversify its funding further, leading to an increase in the share of core funding over the next four years. The global economic downturn coincided with the end of the 2005–2008 Programme. The resulting uncertainty put in doubt future levels of ODA funding as well as corporate philanthropy to support IUCN’s 2009–2012 Programme.

IUCN has thus launched an initiative to generate revenue from private high net worth individuals. This type of fundraising, while well-established in the global non-profit sector, is new to IUCN. Considering this, in addition to the current economic climate, IUCN will proceed with this initiative in stages, setting more modest initial financial targets in order to build the infrastructure for success towards a significant medium-term target.

Aside from revenue diversification to compensate for projected decreases in ODA funding, individual philanthropy has benefits that address other funding challenges. Most of IUCN’s current revenue is project restricted. This means that IUCN has limited funds for core costs and has very little ability to adapt quickly to changing programmatic needs or external conditions. Given the nature of individual philanthropy, it tends to provide much more opportunity to secure this much-needed core, unrestricted revenue.
### Distribution of project funds from IUCN partners

(in thousands of Swiss francs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>9,762</td>
<td>10,155</td>
<td>10,326</td>
<td>11,070</td>
<td>41,313</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4,974</td>
<td>5,032</td>
<td>5,229</td>
<td>4,969</td>
<td>20,204</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4,267</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>4,374</td>
<td>4,263</td>
<td>17,192</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4,193</td>
<td>4,173</td>
<td>4,377</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>17,040</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3,637</td>
<td>3,763</td>
<td>3,696</td>
<td>3,798</td>
<td>14,894</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other donors</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>11,070</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>3,069</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>11,580</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Governmental Orgs</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>3,804</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>3,632</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Governments</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAVA Foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Foundations</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilaterals</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35,100</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>38,900</td>
<td>41,292</td>
<td>152,792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>185</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilaterals</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
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<td>Total</td>
<td>35,100</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>38,900</td>
<td>41,292</td>
<td>152,792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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### Contributions by donor category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>61,936</td>
<td>75,475</td>
<td>84,181</td>
<td>87,537</td>
<td>309,129</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilaterals</td>
<td>17,669</td>
<td>12,709</td>
<td>9,513</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>46,206</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>9,762</td>
<td>10,155</td>
<td>10,326</td>
<td>11,070</td>
<td>41,313</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Governmental Organizations</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>3,618</td>
<td>5,095</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>17,555</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4,887</td>
<td>4,555</td>
<td>4,856</td>
<td>9,707</td>
<td>23,805</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>4,035</td>
<td>7,129</td>
<td>9,238</td>
<td>22,792</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>4,254</td>
<td>11,382</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101,471</td>
<td>112,379</td>
<td>125,189</td>
<td>133,143</td>
<td>472,182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>65,794</td>
<td>71,191</td>
<td>71,941</td>
<td>74,472</td>
<td>283,399</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Thematic Programmes</td>
<td>18,015</td>
<td>17,928</td>
<td>24,821</td>
<td>23,558</td>
<td>84,322</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>6,843</td>
<td>7,381</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>9,069</td>
<td>30,719</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Constituency and Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>5,044</td>
<td>5,422</td>
<td>4,859</td>
<td>8,267</td>
<td>23,592</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress 2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,012</td>
<td>10,012</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissions’ Operating Fund</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>5,440</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director General’s Office</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>6,057</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Fund</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>-153</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98,987</td>
<td>105,228</td>
<td>111,996</td>
<td>129,473</td>
<td>445,684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. CONCLUSION: “THE CHALLENGES OF SOFT POWER AND ITS POSSIBILITIES”

By Ashok Khosla, IUCN President

Our social systems have begun to show signs of gradual recovery from recent tremendous economic shocks. Our natural systems, having had a million times longer to evolve, are likely to prove even more resilient. The question is whether the biosphere can remain hospitable to humankind in the face of the huge, compound stresses we increasingly subject it to.

What is the cumulative impact of our spewing out vast quantities of greenhouse gases, flooding chemicals and genetic modifications into our watersheds, carelessly extracting resources from Mother Earth, destroying pristine and productive habitats, introducing alien invasive species, and committing wanton violence against nature?

We have begun to find out. We are reaching a point beyond which the biosphere starts to collapse, taking humankind with it. To respond to this ultimate, imposing and multi-faceted threat to the very survival of life on our planet, IUCN brings a profoundly important vision, together with the relevant set of robust, cutting-edge tools, deployed by capable, dedicated and trained practitioners.

Our vision of a sustainable world is fair and just, because it respects nature and because it provides everyone with an adequate, decent and fulfilling life. Our tools range from pure science, field research and analytical methods, to communication and effective policy advocacy. These have been carefully tested, verified and ground-truthed through our worldwide network of action-research projects, many of them in the remotest corners of the globe. IUCN’s enormous scientific database – a veritable treasure trove of information on biodiversity – works in a unique position to design strategies that empower people and their governments to live harmoniously with nature.

Our reserve of ten thousand volunteer experts and our army of a thousand member organizations provide an invisible but highly dynamic “human shield” against further destruction of our precious life-giving environment. IUCN’s networks of grassroots organizations and government agencies, scientists and corporations, civil society and indigenous peoples are the front-line forces that will catalyse and, hopefully, reverse the disequilibrium between people and the planet.

Fortunately, our most useful knowledge about nature is contagious; it spreads throughout the world like a benign virus, transforming people and institutions. It can reach even the marginalized people who live in fragile ecosystems and have the primary responsibility of maintaining them. Our work is to influence rather than govern; IUCN exerts its authority more through its soft power than the hard power that governments and corporations can use and this is what gives it its real power. The Union stakes its reputation on the fragile yet timeless notion that inclusive, just, equitable and sustainable governance of nature is, as Aldo Leopold wrote, “an evolutionary possibility and an ecological necessity.”
IUCN’s networked approach integrates and synergizes the soft power strengths of Commissions, Members, partners and the Secretariat. These networks are built on the foundations of IUCN’s Global Thematic Programmes and supported by them. For example, the Water and Nature Initiative, Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy have already been tested as a successful means of engaging broad constituencies in taking ownership and caring for the resources of nature they depend on.

The business as usual approach is no longer adequate and trying to change it by fine-tuning or quick fixes exclude the very people most exposed to risk. As the world continues, in the words of one of IUCN’s founders, Sir Julian Huxley, to be “ecologically out of joint” and resource scarcities cripple many nations into grabbing onto unsound environmental practices, our soft power orientation is daily put to the test. Our unique global network links businesses and governments, rich and poor, science and civil society, indigenous people and UN officials. It shows both what is evolutionarily possible and what is ecologically necessary, and fuses principles with pragmatism to fulfil the vision of ‘a just world that values and conserves nature’.
OUR DONORS AND PARTNERS

The implementation of the 2005–2008 Programme described in this report was made possible through the support, trust and confidence of a growing number of partners: governments, development cooperation agencies, multilateral and intergovernmental institutions, international conventions and non-governmental organizations, foundations and corporations.

Framework Partners

- Canadian International Development Agency
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark
- Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs, Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development, France
- Ministry for Ecology, Energy and Sustainable Planning and Development, France
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate General for Development Cooperation, Italy
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate-General for International Cooperation, The Netherlands
- Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
- The Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation
- MAVA Foundation

Programme and Project funding (above Swiss francs 250,000 per annum)

- Governments
  - Australian Agency for International Development
  - Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs, Austria
  - Centre National de Gestion des Réserves de Faune, Gouvernement de la République du Bénin
  - International Development Research Centre, Canada
  - Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland
  - The French Development Agency
  - Regional Council of Ile-de-France
  - Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany
  - Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Germany
  - German Technical Cooperation
  - Forestry Commission of Ghana
  - Irish Aid
  - Ministry for Environment, Territory and Sea, Direction for Nature Protection, Italy
  - Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, The Netherlands
  - Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Government of the Republic of South Africa
  - Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning, Provincial Government of the Western Cape, South Africa
Ministry of Environment and Rural and Marine Affairs, Spain
Barcelona Provincial Council, Spain
Department of the Environment and Housing, Government of Catalonia, Spain
Regional Ministry for Environment, Government of Andalucia, Spain
City Council of Barcelona, Spain
Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs
Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, United Kingdom
Department for International Development, United Kingdom
Department of State, United States of America
United States Agency for International Development

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
The World Bank Group

Foundations
The Howard G. Buffett Foundation
The J.M. Kaplan Fund
Fondación Gonzalo Rio Arronte I.A.P. Mexico
Ford Foundation
The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
Total Foundation
W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Non-Governmental Organizations
Conservation International
Fondation Internationale du Banc d’Arguin
IUCN National Committee of The Netherlands
Wetlands International
World Wide Fund For Nature

Private Sector
Holcim
Oracle
Shell International
Sakhalin Energy Investment Company Ltd

Results of the IUCN Programme 2005–2008