



Perception is the only reality

Report of a Quick Scan among major CEC External
Stakeholders

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004 - 2010

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

Colophon

IUCN - The World Conservation Union was founded in 1948 and brings together 75 states, 108 government agencies, 760 NGOs, 35 affiliates, and some 10,000 scientists and experts in Commissions in all giving reach into 181 countries in a unique worldwide partnership.

The IUCN mission is to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.

IUCN has approximately 1000 staff, most of whom are located in its 42 regional and country offices while 100 work at its Headquarters in Gland, Switzerland.

IUCN Commission on Education and Communication - CEC is one of six Commissions, contributing communication and education expertise to support IUCN's mission.

CEC is a global network of voluntary, active and professional experts in environmental communication and education, who work in NGO, mass media, government, international organizations, academic institutions and the private sector. They have a special interest in applying their knowledge and skills for biodiversity and sustainable development issues.

Commission on Education and Communication
Rue Mauverney 28
CH- 1196 Gland
Switzerland

Tel. + 41 22 999 0282
Fax + 41 22 999 0025
wendy.goldstein@iucn.org
www.iucn.org/cec/

This report was prepared by HECT Consultancy for IUCN Commission on Education and Communication, Utrecht, March 2003

HECT Consultancy is specialized in communication strategies, stakeholder management, interventions for effective interaction, training and knowledge management.

Gerard Doustraat 8
3583 SE Utrecht, Netherlands
Tel. + 31 30 210 9823
Fax + 31 30 210 9839
hesselink@hect.nl
www.hect.nl

CONTENT

Executive summary	4
1. Introduction	8
2. CEC: knowledge and opinions	10
3. Suggestions for improvement	16
4. Core competences	20
5. What should CEC be concerned with in the first place?	23
6. Priorities for a work program	26
7. Issues for a new mandate	30
8. Risks	31
Annex 1. List of people interviewed	35
Annex 2. Checklist for interview issues	36
Annex 3. Products and activities named by respondents clustered into groups	37
Annex 4. Recommendations for the CEC planning process	38
Annex 5. Questions for CEC members on the CEC Strategic Plan 2004 – 2010	39
Annex 6. Acronyms	41

Photo on the front cover: CEC high level working lunch on a Work Program for Article 13 CBD, during COP6 CBD, The Hague 2002, CEC image bank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background on Quick Scan

To prepare for the strategic planning of the CEC program, to be integrated in the overall IUCN Program 2004 – 2008, the CEC Chair has asked HECT Consultancy to conduct - through face to face and telephonic interviews - a quick scan exploring how its main external stakeholders, e.g. the IUCN Secretariat and Council perceive the current and potential added value of CEC. This report analyses the various views and illustrates them with quotes from the interviews, all of which are in colour. The method of a quick scan provides for qualitative indications on a variety of issues, it does not provide 'hard' evidence based on quantitative data. It is also important to underline that the group of respondents has been too small and that interview method used leaves too much room for interpretation of responses. Nevertheless, this quick scan tries to present these perceptions as a mirror for CEC and a framework for the discussion on its Strategic Plan and work program. For all major findings the report contains recommendations to be taken into consideration.

Knowledge about CEC and its core business

The quick scan brought to light the existence of a number of misunderstandings among respondents about what CEC is about, what communication, education, participation and awareness (CEPA) can do to help achieve IUCN's mission in general and the IUCN program in particular. CEC should realize that it is operating in a 'hard' science – environment, where there is very little understanding and appreciation for 'soft' concepts and methods such as 'adult learning', customer satisfaction, the importance of tacit knowledge, the psychology of the non-expert, the process of learning and the management of change. Many respondents from the Secretariat are of the opinion that *they do the conservation science and that when the 'cutting edge' scientific facts are established, CEC should through its volunteer network, change the thinking and practices of politicians and other stakeholders in biodiversity and ecosystem management.* CEC has here an internal mission.

Opinions about CEC

A second finding relates to the CEC image. All respondents have some basic knowledge about CEC and its products. The CEC image emerging from the interviews has some positive elements, e.g. being strategic, realizing change, making impact, participatory etc. Negative elements are e.g. not informing us, CEPA is too abstract, not linking with program, no strategy, struggling for attention. CEC has to work on its image and move it from diffuse and mixed feelings towards clarity and appreciation of its added value.

Isolation

Although much has improved during the last years, CEC is perceived as a Commission which does not or does not enough connect to the IUCN program and works too much in isolation from mainstream IUCN. In this respect a few respondents even implicitly question the relevance of CEC for IUCN. The strategic plan should address explicitly how much of the CEC program should be connected to the overall IUCN Program.

What else to improve?

A number of respondents also commented on the CEC 'tone of voice' towards the Secretariat which was perceived by some as defensive and based on unmet expectations. Some respondents commented on the CEC website: an area where CEC should lead in IUCN, but does not. A number of respondents stressed the importance for CEC to recognize that its expertise and membership are different from that of other commissions and that CEC should use this difference to position itself better.

Added value to IUCN

Although respondents do not always have a clear understanding of CEPA, all respondents underline that the CEC expertise in principle is important for IUCN. A few see the niche for CEC to help IUCN with its corporate communication. Most respondents see the added value of CEPA in support for the global and regional programs: strategic communication advice in the planning stage, access to the CEPA knowledge and capacity building by CEC in the execution stage. A few added explicitly that CEC should be placed under the Director Program and not under the Head of the Communication Unit, who reports to the Director Corporate Strategy. Some respondents see the added value of CEC in helping IUCN to be more effective and having more impact in international events, e.g. GBF, WCC, WPC. Some respondents think CEC should be the guardian in IUCN program and policy, of the element in the IUCN mission that pertains to changing practices and behaviour.

Market for CEC products

The majority of respondents see a far larger market for future CEC program spearheads inside the various components of the IUCN program, than as a separate program e.g. in the way the CEC CEPA advocacy program towards the Conventions so far has been positioned. They came up with a great number of suggestions for products. These products are close to what CEC already has developed in the last period. The strategic plan should make a portfolio analysis of the current products and analyse where they can be best marketed as building bricks for CEPA support to individual programs. An investment is needed to establish relationships with programs in which they 'learn by doing' the added value of CEPA as expertise and CEC as a Commission.

CEC mandate, membership and regions

Some respondents see no need for change in the existing CEC mandate others provide suggestions for reformulation. The membership of CEC is still perceived as basically focused on (formal) education and some respondents stressed the importance of connecting more with those areas of expertise really needed in the CEC program spearheads. Finally respondents from the region felt that CEC should invest much more in regional programs and less in the global program. They felt that the regional programs provide much more opportunities for the CEC expertise as they are more practical and on the ground activities.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1. Internal profiling CEC and its areas of expertise

The Strategic plan should contain a clear paragraph positioning CEC within IUCN and making explicit in which way CEC expertise is an underpinning element for realize the IUCN mission; the plan should also contain a strategy to convey these messages to Council, Secretariat and IUCN members; the CEC work program should contain an element for internal learning: a non-jargon position paper on education and communication, clarifying the concepts and positioning CEPA as a tool for the IUCN mission in general and the IUCN program and projects in particular.

Recommendation 2. CEC desired image

The Strategic Plan should contain a formulation of the way CEC would like to be perceived. It should also contain strategic interventions to bridge the gap from the current image to the desired image. The same way the strategic plan should look at its current perceived flagship products and its desired flagship products. The work program should detail the realization of these flagship products.

Recommendation 3. Strategic principle: ‘join them’

The strategic plan should make a decision on the strategic principle to deal with the perception of major external stakeholders that CEC is working in isolation, e.g. opting for the principle “join them”; the work program should reflect this principle by concentrating at least 80% of the CEC activities on the IUCN program and on partnerships with IUCN regional offices, programs or commissions. It should reduce the number of activities, which it undertakes on its own to contribute to the IUCN mission to less than 20%.

Recommendation 4. CEC website: a model for IUCN

The strategic plan should contain provisions not only to improve the CEC website, but to make it a model of knowledge management for all IUCN components.

Recommendation 5. Tone of voice: ‘dancing with the client’

The strategic plan should contain a framework for external communication in which CEC should change its tone of voice from ‘aggressive’ (“*based upon unmet expectations*”) to understanding and ‘moving with the client’ (customer orientation: ‘not blaming the patient for being sick’).

Recommendation 6. Position CEC and its expertise as ‘different’

The strategic plan should position CEC among the other IUCN Commissions and the CEC area of expertise among the other IUCN areas of expertise. CEC should capitalize on being different, especially when it is perceived as such. .

Recommendation 7. Formulate core competences

The strategic plan should formulate the CEC core competences and make choices for the short term on which competences to concentrate in membership policy and priorities for the work program.

Recommendation 8: Choice for internal markets

The CEC strategic plan should analyse its old internal and external markets make a choices for concentrating on strategic market opportunities. The strategic plan should make a portfolio analysis of CEC products and see how they could fit in to the various market options. Guiding principles for these choices are do not develop new products for new markets; develop new products for old markets, sell old products to old markets or sell old products to new markets.

Recommendation 9. Program planning

The strategic plan should identify priorities and procedures to connect with program and commissions to connect CEC expertise and activities to strategic program elements and commission activities; it should also identify criteria for success and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation.

Recommendation 10. CEC Mandate

If CEC should make a shift towards the internal market, a new Mandate is necessary. The mandate should reflect the CEC strategy. The mandate should further capture in key words the CEC knowledge area and its relevance for the IUCN mission.

Recommendation 11. CEC Membership

The strategic plan should identify criteria for membership according to the core competences and key areas of CEC activities.

Recommendation 12. Regional activities

The strategic plan should identify mechanisms how regional networks could connect with the IUCN regional program and how this could be supported from the centre.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

The IUCN Commission on Education and Communication CEC is in the process of formulating a new Strategic Plan and Work Program for the Commission for the next inter session period between the World Conservation Congress in November 2004 in Bangkok and the next World Conservation Congress in 2008. The CEC Steering Committee will discuss the high lights of a new CEC strategic plan, the main elements of a new work program and the formulation of a new Mandate during its meeting in Gland 26 – 30 May 2003. This meeting is well timed as all components of IUCN are planning this year their contributions to next inter-session IUCN program. A CEC work program should be an integrated element of the wider IUCN program. As the CEC chair intends to formulate a demand oriented program, she identified the need to explore the perceptions, views, needs and demands of the major external CEC stakeholders and customers, not represented in the Steering Committee: IUCN top management and presidency, heads of IUCN programs, regional offices, regional Councillors, donors and CEC partners and clients.

Terms of Reference

The Chair asked in December 2002 HECT Consultancy to carry out a quick scan among 30 key opinion leaders among external stakeholders identified by the Chair. The results of the quick scan should be made available to the Steering Committee in a report by the end of March 2003. The report also should contain a list of questions for CEC members to explore their opinions about the main strategic choices for the Commission for the next period. The aim of this report is to generate building bricks for a discussion in the CEC Steering Committee and the wider CEC membership on a work program for CEC for the period 2004 - 2010. The year 2010 is chosen to challenge the imagination beyond the period between two Congresses.

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004 – 2010

A strategic plan should make explicit the vision of CEC, the business it is in, its core competences and identity, its strong and weak points, the opportunities and threats, the most important goals, priority areas of work, priority issues to address and ways to monitor and evaluate progress. This is an exercise that will be done in dialogue between the CEC steering Committee and membership. The process of building the Strategic Plan is in Annex 4. This report provides for this dialogue a framework in the sense that it reflects how the most important external stakeholders view these questions.

Perception is the only reality

A commission, like any other organization, operates in an environment. Its stakeholders and customers take notice of the activities and products and form opinions about their added value, based on their own perceptions and those of their peers. Sometimes only based on what their peers say and sometimes even in spite of facts to the contrary. The success of a Commission is therefore not only dependent of what it thinks is the right thing to do, but also of what is perceived as right, timely and useful by its external stakeholders and customers. This quick scan tries to present these perceptions as a mirror for CEC and a framework for the discussion on strategy and work program. The title of the report seems appropriate for CEC as

it refers to one of the principles of the communication discipline: "*Perception is the only reality*".

The interviews

The recommendations of this report are based on interviews with IUCN top management and Presidency, heads of program, regional offices, regional Councillors, donors and CEC partners. Over thirty people were interviewed. A list of the names and functions of the people interviewed can be found in Annex 1. Two third of the interviews were conducted face to face. The other interviews were done by telephone. The limitations of a quick scan are both in time and in method. The results provide only qualitative indications of perceived current performance, desired directions, focus and priorities. The method used cannot provide reliable quantitative data. Nevertheless, the quick scan provides a basis for further discussion, on which a strategy and a more detailed work program can be formulated.

Quick scan

The interviews tried to scan perceptions of respondents and explore deeper insights, motives and opinions behind the answers. The main topics the interviews touched upon are listed in Annex 2. Especially in the one-hour face-to-face interviews answers were further explored and deepened. Afterwards all answers were analysed per topic and per person, as most questions explored another aspect of added value. The analysis was carried out by the interviewer and an independent consultant, who had no prior knowledge of CEC or the people interviewed. The outcome of the analysis was checked through feedback on the draft report by some of the respondents. The results of the quick scan are described in this report.

Structure of this report

In this report the thoughts and ideas offered by participants are used to provide some first guidance on major elements of a work program: relevance of the issue, wider aims, desired results, major target groups, priority interventions, and success and failure factors. The report follows partly the line of questioning in the interviews and illustrates trends in the answers with quotes. All sections of the report end with one or more recommendations for the discussions to develop the strategic plan. In Annex 3 products and activities are listed. In Annex 4 specific recommendations are listed for the CEC process to formulate the Strategic Plan. In Annex 6 questions are listed which can be used to get a first input from CEC members in the planning process.

Acknowledgements

HECT Consultancy, greatly appreciated the ready willingness of a range of respondents to make time available for the interviews and to provide valuable advice and feedback. The comments on the draft report by Denise Hamú, Huguette Labelle, Miguel Pellerano were very helpful. Some very good beginnings of a strategy and work program for CEC were provided, as well as many useful comments and suggestions.

Frits Hesselink
Utrecht, March 2003

2. CEC: KNOWLEDGE AND OPINIONS

IUCN mission

All face to face interviews with IUCN staff started with a general ice breaking question about what motivated them to work for IUCN and what made them enthusiastic about this organization. A wide variety of answers came showing a high degree of commitment. It also revealed a wide variety of interpretations of the IUCN mission and the impact of IUCN in the conservation community and the world at large. It was outside the scope to investigate this issue more deeply. One has to conclude though, that where CEC wants to contribute to the IUCN mission, it has to accept as a 'fact of life' that although IUCN has formulated a vision and mission, in practice there are many different interpretations of what IUCN is about.

IUCN Commissions

Most interviews brought to light that although Commissions are a part of IUCN, not all staffs in the IUCN Secretariat know how in general Commissions operate, what the motives are to join a volunteer knowledge network, or what one realistically can expect from voluntary network. Some staffs spontaneously confirmed this:

IUCN staff does not know much about Commissions, let alone that they know the CEC capacities and possibilities

Again the scope of the quick scan did not allow to pursue this line of question. But the signal is clear. And again it seems to be a fact of life that CEC has to operate in an environment where there is not always enough understanding about how knowledge networks function.

Formal knowledge of CEC

Of the more than thirty respondents only one person stated that he actually had insufficient knowledge about CEC and that his opinions were merely based on information from others. Most respondents had a fairly accurate knowledge about the core business of the Commission. Asked what their first association was when they heard the word CEC most of them were more or less close to or reproduced elements of what CEC considers to be its mandate: a network of experts in education and communication, that contributes to the IUCN mission through advocacy to integrate education and communication into conservation policies and practices and through building capacity in education and communication.

No knowledge of Education and Communication disciplines leads to unrealistic expectations

Although respondents know in what business CEC is, throughout the interviews it was apparent that a significant number of respondents do not possess much knowledge about the disciplines of communication and education. Some have obvious misconceptions about what education and communication can do and cannot do. This lack of knowledge leads in many cases to unrealistic expectations. One such expectation is that once CEC has made tools and guidelines how to communicate more effectively, the IUCN program staffs and IUCN members will be able to do so: *"you make the training materials and manual, and we do the training, because we are the experts"*. There seems to be little understanding that CEC

knowledge is personalized and that communication skills can be developed, but not or not only through reading guidelines or manuals. Another unrealistic expectation relates to the effect and impact an education and communication knowledge network in itself can have on changes in behaviour and practices

“we (the topic programs) provide the content, and then CEC through its network of volunteers should change the opinions of the world’s policy makers and the general public”.

Education means schools

For some respondents education equals schools. Some think that CEC should not get involved in education. A very small minority of respondents see formal education as an important field of work for CEC. That education is a much wider concept than formal education – including formal, non formal, informal and development education - is apparently not known to a number of respondents.

CEC should not concentrate on education, which is too far from the IUCN core business.

In Europe there are so many countries, languages and cultures; schools in Central & Eastern Europe need new environmental education curricula; CEC should help with materials like the book of Ana Kalinowska; Europe has 1/3 of the total of IUCN members, our communication capacity is limited: our office needs advice and tools from CEC.

CEC should concentrate on helping our governments in Africa with formulating strategic programs for environmental education: CEC should work in partnerships with Ministries of Education.

CEC has an internal mission

These misconceptions were consistent during the interviews of a number of respondents. Asked what CEC should concentrate on in the next period the following answers illustrate the misconceptions identified before. For CEC this means that it has to recognize that it still has an important internal mission to explain what communication and education can do and cannot do and what CEC as a network can do and cannot do.

CEC should support the paradigm shift of IUCN towards changes in behaviour and practices of corporate sector

CEC should in the next period realize a change in perceptions of a number of decision makers that conservation is not a luxury, something for your spare time, but a fundamental part of our survival; this change should be measured in changes in policies and budgets

CEC should make sure that IUCN stories are ten times more present in major media

CEC should realize in the next period a raised appreciation amongst the worlds 20.000 most influential politicians what IUCN stands for and has to offer.

CEC should focus on the UN observer status in the UN and help educate the UN system about IUCN.

CEC should educate decision makers about the importance of IUCN's vision.

CEC should make a substantial percentage of decision makers embrace sustainable development as a framework for decisions.

CEC should raise awareness about the importance of biodiversity among the public worldwide.

Faces of CEC

Almost a third of the respondents answered that they associated the commission first with its leadership or representation in the secretariat and after that with elements of its field of expertise. Especially among respondents from IUCN Headquarters, CEC was mostly associated with Wendy Goldstein, Head of the Education Program in the IUCN Secretariat. A few respondents, basically from IUCN top management and Council, associated CEC in the first place with Denise Hamu, the CEC Chair.

Knowledge of CEC products

There was only one respondent who could not think of a product of CEC; the others had no problem in naming two products immediately. In itself this is an indication that the immediate environment is well aware of CEC, its products and activities. The combined answers of respondents resulted in a long list of products. Often they indicated that for them these products came first to mind, because they were either involved in it or they had used it. The products which were mentioned most, are:

- the GBF and COP6 CBD interventions (12)
- the three CEC videos in Amman (11)
- the ESD workshop in Johannesburg (4)
- the strategic communication advice for WSSD (3)
- the BEPA activities (3)

Perceived flagship products

Three of these products were also mentioned when people were asked about their first associations with CEC. One could argue that activities such as the CBD COP6 and Amman interventions have positively influenced the CEC image. At the same time they might too unilaterally colour the CEC image, or in other words are these really the CEC flagship products?

In Annex 5 the products and activities, named by respondents, are clustered according to the CEC product groups. First of all it seems, that all product groups are represented. This clustering is a bit artificial as some activities and products originate from the period before the existence of product groups. No questions were asked about use and perceived quality. Some respondents did comment themselves in some cases. Explicit appreciation was noted for the Amman videos, the BEPA, WSSD and CBD COP6 interventions, in terms of 'innovative' or 'very effective method'.

Feelings and opinions

Giving politically correct answers is one thing, to identify deeper opinions and perceptions are quite another thing. Respondents were invited to go into more detail about what their thoughts or feelings were about CEC. Most respondents came up with positive feelings, sometimes accompanied with a form of 'caveat':

The CEC image is improving, CEC is narrowing its focus; since Perth CEC came a hell of a long way, but it still has to realize its full potential.

Positive feelings: training in Central Europe, Support to Red List training, advice and support for IUCN exposure during CBD and WSSD; high tech communication approaches of BEPA.

Exciting: CEC workshops networking CEPA professionals, its CBD campaign.

Positive feelings: people making impact; CEC not yet fully grown into Union, among commissions CEC ranks on a shared third place with CEL after SSC and WCPA; CEC helps IUCN change towards an orientation to realize changes and not only to deliver tools for change.

Positive feelings: based on personal interest in education and communication; they are good colleagues; easy to collaborate; CEC deserves a higher priority; CEC has an image of being considered to be in addition to the program; there is a need to mainstream CEC with the IUCN program.

Very positive: CEC is about change; it is the only commission in which I attended a steering committee, I saw people at work: diverse, active, participatory.

High-quality publications.

Not to be compared with the previous committee; energetic, involved in those things which matter (WSSD, IUCN website); timely; constructive; committed; helpful, creative, hardworking, people you want to get involved with.

Critical or negative feelings and opinions

When pursued a bit further most respondents also came up with some first reservations and negative feelings. The negative feelings have to do with lack of information, lack of added value to the regions, the abstract level of 'CEPA', 'aggressive' behaviour of CEC protagonists:

Except for Vietnam and Pakistan, I haven't heard or seen anything from CEC in this region since the 1999 CEC Conference in Bangkok, that is a pity, because it used to do good things here and I was kept informed

Invisible for our program, we know the Steering Committee members, but not more; the CEC expert network is not used; the CEC has an image of working on CBD on an abstract level; the needs are on regional level and in technical CEPA support for concrete aspects of Biodiversity.

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

CEC fights for communication priorities instead of negotiating.

Expert network that does not know how to link to the program; un-clarity whether CEC belongs to CSG or Program; a stable but not exciting commission.

CEC has a weak image in HQ, much stronger in the regions, where IUCN operates at a more practical level.

CEC has an image of being a very loose network here in the region without much cohesiveness.

CEC doesn't influence IUCN as much as it does the outside world.

CEC is irrelevant in my region, globally CEC is struggling for attention within IUCN.

CEC has no clear and coherent strategy, it is a 'hidden' commission.

Image: first conclusions

Respondents have mixed feelings about CEC. Some are positive, most are positive but critical, some have some negative connotations. On the basis of this qualitative method one can distil the following positive and negative elements of the CEC image:¹

Positive elements	Negative elements
Strategic	Not informing us, not communicating
Realizing change	Working on a too abstract level: CEPA
People you want to get involved with	Not knowing how to link to programs
Making impact where it matters	Overall quality of network is questioned
Helping to change IUCN to be more effective	Unknown and irrelevant in my region
Diverse, creative, active and participatory	No clear and coherent strategy
Timely, constructive, committed in actions	Huge potential, but still looking for a niche
Multicultural	Struggling for attention, too frustrated
High quality products	Too much identification with too less people
Partners	External CEC influence greater than internal

No profile

Respondents see it as a risk factor if CEC does not raise its profile within IUCN. For some respondents this has to do with the difference in the key features between CEC and the other "mainstream" structures of IUCN. For others it has to do with IUCN as organization and the myriad of activities and priorities IUCN itself is engaged in. Some respondents point at the IUCN Secretariat itself as very slow in integrating modern communication and knowledge management and not easily recognizing good advice in these areas.

In IUCN there is too much information congestion within IUCN and CEC is not heard in all the noise.

¹ A quick scan provides only indications, for more precise information, additional image research is necessary

Profile the leading edge of communication techniques, this is the more necessary because of the 'slowness' in the IUCN Secretariat on all issues that are not conservation science

CEC should raise its political profile in IUCN and the profile of the social instruments for nature conservation; CEC should challenge Council and WCC with papers and motions or resolutions (supported by a long list of important sponsors) that force Council and Congress to formulate an explicit statement on the need of the social instruments to realise IUCN's mission.

Make explicit how you serve other commissions and programs.

Recommendation 1. Internal profiling of CEC and its areas of expertise

The Strategic plan should contain a clear paragraph positioning CEC within IUCN and making explicit in which way CEC expertise is an underpinning element to realize the IUCN mission; the plan should also contain a strategy to convey these messages to Council, Secretariat and IUCN members; the CEC work program should contain an element for internal learning: a non-jargon position paper on education and communication, clarifying the concepts and positioning CEPA as a tool for the IUCN mission in general and the IUCN program and projects in particular.

Recommendation 2. CEC desired image

The Strategic Plan should contain a formulation of the way CEC would like to be perceived. It should also contain strategic interventions to bridge the gap from the current image to the desired image. The same way the strategic plan should look at its current perceived flagship products and its desired flagship products. The work program should detail the realization of these flagship products.

3. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Specific issues where CEC should improve

Some elements in the behaviour and practices of CEC are disturbing in the eyes of respondents and may form the basis for some of the CEC negative image features. When asked what they do not like, the great majority had no difficulty in immediately finding some answers. Only a few did not have an answer to the question (“*can you name two things which you do not like about CEC, which CEC should improve or which CEC should avoid?*”). In itself this can be seen as an indication that in the eyes of a majority of respondents there is ample room for improvement.

The relationship between CEC and the secretariat is unclear and seems different from that of other commissions; CEC has not been successful in helping IUCN establish an effective communication program.

Lack of influence in HQ: lack of links with programs and commissions, lack of cooperation.

Lack of integration with programs; it does not use studies on key communication issues and does not make the connection with what IUCN does and the use of its activities.

Lack of communication with Secretariat; excessive emphasis on self improvement of CEC (e.g. house style, absence of focus on global impact, absence of vision).

Selling CEPA too aggressive; there is no clarity what CEC is and what it can add to the communication of IUCN program people, who are in the business of communication every day.

There is a direct link between CEC and CSG; CEC is now two levels down in hierarchy compared to other Commission focal points; CEC does not acknowledge its different nature, it tries to compete too much with other commissions (CEC is a network of communication and education professionals, not of conservation scientists); CEC representatives are too defensive or aggressive to effectively change the paradigm.

CEC's website doesn't work as clearing house, there is not enough Spanish language material, information is not easy to find.

Issues most frequently mentioned are:

- CEC works as a separate organization, in isolation from mainstream IUCN
- There is a lack of communication with other programs, commissions, regional offices
- There is also a lack of help and support to other programs, especially with regard to providing tools to communicate difficult concepts

Further were mentioned issues such as:

- too much focus on Head Quarters and too little on the needs in the regions
- too abstract focus on CBD convention and not on practical tools
- too aggressively selling CEPA

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

- the lack of a clear program and strategy, that clarify the added value of CEC
- the CEC website: not a clearing house, not regularly updated, not user-friendly
- defensive and aggressive attitudes

Perception of working in isolation

The perception of CEC working in isolation and the lack of communication and cooperation are to be taken serious, as they are coming back also in a positive way in the perceived added value of CEC. Another interesting feature of this perception is that about 50% of the products named by respondents are the product of cooperation either with regional offices, other programs or commissions. This could be an indication that in the eyes of a majority of respondents there should not be any activities of CEC which are undertaken by CEC itself and not as a joint production with another IUCN component. Some respondents say so explicitly. Concentrating on the internal market would also solve part of the CEC fund raising problems. It definitely would improve the appreciation of the CEC activities within 'mainstream IUCN', and the only reality of CEC is the perception of its major customers!

A Commission 'Sui Generis'?

Many respondents stress that they perceive CEC as a Commission very different, if not totally different from other Commissions and the CEC knowledge area as very different from the other knowledge areas in IUCN. The same is true for their perception of CEC members compared to members of other Commissions. The following quotes illustrate this:

CEC has a different mandate than other commissions; their mandate is anchored in solid conservation outputs, the CEC mandate is service oriented.

CEC knowledge cannot be captured in IUCN secretariat or programs; other Commissions provide ecological knowledge, CEC provides societal knowledge and approaches (participation); and it provides knowledge and approaches to change personal and organizational behaviour.

CEC is about personalized knowledge, a network of people that do innovations in communication connected to IUCN, an organization that is not sophisticated at all in communication.

CEC should not try so hard to be a Commission like the other IUCN Commissions.

CEC is not 'topic' based but 'tool' based: we are about the 'what', CEC is about the 'how'.

CEC represents a fundamental aspect of nature conservation, it is an essential function but it is not seen as academic or scientific, so it has always problems within IUCN.

The profile CEC members is not equal to the level of SSC scientists and PA managers: CEC members are CEPA practitioners and 'soft' academics.

As this issue came back during many of the interviews it is important to look deeper into it. Especially as many respondents stated that they felt that CEC should recognize this difference

and take it into account for their positioning. Based on the perceptions of a large number of respondents one could construct the following differences between the key features of CEC and those of the other Commissions..

CEC KEY FEATURES	KEY FEATURES OF OTHER COMMISSIONS
People centred	Nature centred
Methodologies to influence	Content of biodiversity conservation
Servicing conservation output	Formulating conservation output
Realizing change	Formulating tools for change in nature
Perceptions and motives	Scientific facts and principles
Change in behaviour & practices	Change in ecosystems, species,
The world outside IUCN	The world inside IUCN
Awareness, participation	Rules, regulations, financial mechanisms
Adult learning, coaching, networking	Top down information, instruction, training
Personalized Knowledge	Codified Knowledge
Practitioners, civil servants, academic experts	Scientific experts, conservation managers

Fundamental support to IUCN mission

Many respondents stated that IUCN would be much more effective if it applied the CEC approaches in its external communication and if its program contained a strategic communication element developed (and in some cases implemented) by CEC. To underpin this most respondents see it as vital that IUCN reaches out to the non conservation community, if it wants to remain a relevant player. Some respondents state that the words *'influence, encourage and assist societies'* from the IUCN mission statement imply the importance of the CEC area of expertise. Some respondents point to global trends such as the accountability for results, the information society, public participation and new modes of global governance, which make the CEC expertise more relevant than ever.

Consequences of being a 'Commission Sui Generis'

For some respondents the different character of CEC also implies that IUCN may not need a Commission for this area of expertise, but a small group of advisors, as was earlier advised in the report of David Munroe and Gabor Bruszt, evaluating the IUCN Commissions in 1995. For other respondents the different character of CEC could imply that this commission – in the case that IUCN would opt for a governance system with a smaller Council - would not necessarily be represented on Council as CEC does not touch on the IUCN core fields of expertise: species, ecosystems and protected areas. Some respondents argued that whatever its different character, CEC should stay a Commission like other Commissions, because as this network structure offers benefits to members, who otherwise would not contribute their time and expertise on a voluntary basis. One respondent argued that as CEC expertise is becoming more and more important for IUCN in the information and knowledge society, CEC should be represented on a smaller Council at the cost of other Commissions that represent the traditional IUCN knowledge areas, as these areas are basically already covered by regional councillors.

Recommendation 3. ‘join them’

The strategic plan should make a decision on the strategic principle to deal with the perception of major external stakeholders that CEC is working in isolation, e.g. opting for the principle “join them”; the work program should reflect this principle by concentrating at least 80% of the CEC activities on the IUCN program and on partnerships with IUCN regional offices, programs or commissions. It should reduce the number of activities which it undertakes on its own to contribute to the IUCN mission to less than 20%.

Recommendation 4. CEC website: a model for IUCN

The strategic plan should contain provisions not only to improve the CEC website, but to make it a model of knowledge management for all IUCN components.

Recommendation 5. Tone of voice: ‘dancing with the client’

The strategic plan should contain a framework for external communication in which CEC should change its tone of voice from ‘aggressive’ to understanding and ‘moving with the client’ (customer orientation: ‘not blaming the patient to be sick’).

Recommendation 6. Position CEC and its expertise as ‘different’

The strategic plan should position CEC among the other IUCN Commissions and the CEC area of expertise among the other IUCN areas of expertise. CEC should capitalize on being different, especially when it is perceived as such. .

4. CORE COMPETENCES

Added value

When asked what ideally should be the added value of CEC to IUCN, respondents had not much difficulty in immediately coming up with an answer. This can be seen as an indication that 'deep down' there is no doubt that the IUCN community is aware of the added value of a body of education and communication expertise for IUCN, or at least of the potential added value. No one made explicit or implicit remarks to the contrary. Some respondents noted that CEC was the only global network of experts in environmental education and communication. Others noted that IUCN lacks communication expertise at all levels and needs to draw on CEC.

CEC promotes change, and programs do not think far beyond their own reach about change; they do not know about the audience and how to change them: evaluation points at that.

CEC can access to cutting edge thinking on communication to improve effectiveness of IUCN's work by improving messages and means; access to networks, experts, materials, knowledge; component for program implementation.

Advice in project formulation; capacity building CEPA in regions; campaigns; access to CEPA networks.

Capacity building of secretariat & members in communication through actual training, coaching, manuals, guidelines, coursework.

The importance for IUCN of having a global multicultural group of different commentators which could help us effectively tailor our messages and issues to target groups: e.g. the logo of Montreal (which had negative cultural implications for our African colleagues) should have been tested through the CEC network.

SSC science products would have more effect if CEC techniques and strategies would be applied; e.g. when a Red List comes out, CEC should have masterminded a sophisticated strategy linked with the Secretariats activities to make an impact in the regions, using regional offices and councillors and making a big splash in local and regional media and reaching the key audiences.

A body that groups networks of professionals interested in making people conscious about conservation and operates on the level of beliefs, values, motives for behaviour change (CEC should not concentrate on education: that derails this focus.)

Mainstreaming communication in the IUCN institution and programs; question mark is how far CEC should be involved in corporate communication.

CEC can provide support to other commissions and programs to make known what they do, e.g. strategic planning and realization of publications, videos, workshops, and other products and messages; CEC does so in some regions but not in HQ; CEC also

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

*has the internal communication knowledge and skills to help integrate the Global Program in the Union; IUCN needs to build its capacity in communication
Access to network of people with cutting edge knowledge on the power of creating awareness, packages messages and influencing the Union to integrate CEPA in its operations; motor for thinking beyond scientific information as the only means to influence knowledge, attitudes and practices.*

IUCN used to be focused on bio-physical information, assuming that knowledge about species and ecosystems would move decision makers; It did not. Then IUCN focused also on socio-political aspects of conservation, assuming that this combined information would move them; now IUCN has to realize that it should use the expertise of CEC to communicate and reach the audiences in an effective way, both in the form of advice as in the form of actual delivering the messages.

Without people knowing about biodiversity and sustainable development, the IUCN work is not relevant; CEC should help with an education and communication strategy for the IUCN program components to help key audiences internalise the IUCN messages (not just PR).

IUCN should be the main advisor to CBD; CEC should be the main forum for education and communication of the Convention: the CBD Secretariat cannot handle the work program for article 13.

Ensure that IUCN has a communications strategy and that it is regularly updated; Be the conscience of IUCN in education and communication: help and support programs that in planning their products right from the start they think about education and communication; Bring good professional experience to support IUCN in education and communication.

Perceived areas of added value

The quotes above are just half of the many suggestions where CEC could add value to IUCN. When analysing all the answers the conclusion is that CEC added value is seen in various areas. The areas which were mentioned most are:

- Advice and support to project and program planning and implementation (14)
- Providing access for IUCN projects & programs to knowledge networks on CEPA (6)
- Capacity building in communication in programs and regions (6)
- Advice on communicating and marketing IUCN as an organization (6)
- Being the IUCN conscience on all aspects of education and communication (3)
- Strategic communication advice on IUCN's interventions in UN system and WCC (3)

One could argue that these areas of added value, provide a basis for perceived potential core competences.

Perceived potentialcore competences

Analysing the various statements by respondents about added value, one could say that external stakeholders perceive the following potential core competences for CEC.

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

Perceived core competences

Provider	of CEPA Knowledge	Conservation community
Coach	in Capacity building CEPA	Program, regions
Strategist	in Planning of CEPA interventions	Program, regions
Advisor	in Corporate communication	CSG
Guardian	of Changing practices & behaviour	IUCN Mission
Guide	in Strategic communication & learning	International events

Recommendation 7. Core competences

The strategic plan should formulate the CEC core competences and make choices for the short term on which competences to concentrate in membership policy and priorities for the work program.

5. WHAT SHOULD CEC BE CONCERNED WITH IN THE FIRST PLACE?

Strategic principle: *join them!*

Focus is a key to success for CEC. That is the main message from many respondents. If respondents were in charge, CEC would also concentrate on working for and with the IUCN program and commissions. Given the difficulties CEC has been facing historically, it would make sense not to try to develop separate activities: they do not make CEC popular in IUCN; they are difficult to fund and they lead to question marks in the Secretariat about the relevance of CEC for the organization. If you cannot beat them, join them, would be a sound strategic principle for CEC, as was mentioned in chapter 3. Once CEC and its area of expertise is well accepted by mainstream IUCN, CEC could think of widening the scope of its activities.

Internal Market options for input and roles of CEC, as perceived by respondents

Analysing the responses in the quick scan, one can distil the following internal markets.

Market	CEC role, product, service, activity
IUCN Programs, Projects, Commissions e.g. SSC: invasive species; WCPA: interpretation, education, public support, stakeholder management; CEM: Water; Wetlands; Forests programs)	Provider of knowledge on communication, education, awareness, public participation and knowledge management (access to networks and CEC website/clearinghouse)
<i>Regional support through young professionals: DGIS, SIDA</i>	Capacity building to improve communication knowledge and skills of program staffs and members
<i>N.B. Need for CEC to invest in exploration of global and regional opportunities in planning stage (everyone agrees with this role)</i>	Strategic planning of communication interventions in project planning and implementation
CSG <i>N.B. not everyone agrees with this role</i>	Advice in marketing and corporate communication strategies and interventions
WCC, Council, CSG, Commissions <i>N.B. some expectations are not realistic</i>	Challenging IUCN not to overlook education and communication aspects: keeping IUCN exciting, relevant, customer and result oriented and making a real impact in the external world
Global Policy, CSG, Commissions <i>N.B. not everyone agrees with this role</i>	Guidance and support for IUCN in effective interaction, learning and impact in international forums and events

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

External Market options for input and roles CEC, as perceived by respondents

Some respondents identify external markets for CEC and in some case also indicate donors.

CBD Secretariat & Parties	Leadership and implementation CBD Work program art.13
WSSD & Kiev follow-up, Parties	Development and capacity building for conservation in ESD

Criteria for market choice

The commercial marketing discipline offers the following options. Experience learns that new products for new markets are extremely risky.

Old product for New market	New Product New market
Old product for Old market	New product Old market

Product market combinations

Some respondents had suggestions for priority product market combinations:

CEC should have a supply of building bricks for participation aspects of the various components of the IUCN program (e.g. training course and network PEBLDS).

The tools, training, coaching, experiences and network from CEC Capacity building in CEPA for conservation managers in Central Europe, are indeed an ‘old’ CEC product, which can be ‘sold’ to the various components of the IUCN internal market. The same applies to the COP6 CBD interventions, which can be sold to other IUCN programs for their COP interventions. In the same way the Galapagos training was sold to Asia and can be sold to other regional biodiversity programs, where there is a demand. A portfolio analysis is necessary to make this list complete.

Comparing market perceptions of respondents with current activities

The work for other conventions (e.g. Ramsar, Climate Change) was not mentioned explicitly by any of the respondent, although the Ramsar respondent was very happy with the CEC input and network. A few respondents discourage the work for other conventions explicitly:

“working for other conventions is not our core business; you are then spreading too thin, trying to do everything”.

Most work of the current CEC products groups is somehow covered by the respondents, except maybe for the advocacy and media product groups.

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

Advocacy

The current advocacy role for CEPA in conventions is not mentioned by respondents. In some cases, 'too aggressive selling of CEPA' was discouraged by respondents. A few respondents had question marks whether advocacy activities towards conventions were a task for a Commission. They were of the opinion that in those cases CEC should put it on the agenda of IUCN and the advocacy should be done by the organization with the support of CEC.

Media

The current media product group was also not mentioned explicitly by respondents, although implicitly there is a market for these activities seen the high appreciation of the Amman and CBD videos and the demand for CEC input in IUCN interventions during TEXT MISSING

Recommendation 8: Choice for internal markets

The CEC strategic plan should analyse its old internal and external markets make a choices for concentrating on strategic market opportunities. The strategic plan should make a portfolio analysis of CEC products and see how they could fit in to the various market options. Guiding principles for these choices are do not develop new products for new markets; develop new products for old markets, sell old products to old markets or sell old products to new markets.

6. PRIORITIES FOR A CEC WORK PROGRAM

Perceived Potential Programmatic Spearheads for CEC

Asked what for a work program the two major spearheads of activities should be the respondents were quite consistent with earlier answers.

Strategic and practical communication support to influence behaviour of policymakers and managers in IUCN water, fisheries, forests, wetlands, PA programs (borrow credibility in joint projects); Challenge Commissions and Programs on how to be influential.

Demonstrate the link between conservation science and the daily life, so that people can understand and connect.

Provide communication support to help IUCN program make better and more standardized policy procedures, help our programs to market their products and improve their image; build capacity in the Union to underpin this mainstreaming effort to reach other audiences than the conservation community.

Focus on participation systems, build capacity in multi-stakeholder decision making processes, strategic approaches to initiate societal processes; focus on knowledge management (traditional knowledge, tacit and personalized knowledge; continue to focus on innovative communication (video as workshop report etc.); be issue and less organization driven (break through the themes-regions approach).

Focus on KRA framework and change needed in target groups; work with Red List, BD program, PA program, especially in the regions, NB SSC has no regional structure, CEC with its well developed structure could fill this gap to a certain extent.

CEC has a supply of building bricks for participation aspects of the various components of the IUCN program (e.g. training course and network PEBLDS); CEC has small but very active core groups which actively explore where the program needs participation expertise, e.g. a group for invasive species (SSC), a group for WCPA etc.

CEC role in delivering the program by providing a strategic view at key result areas from the communication perspective at the initial planning phase of the program (e.g. how to put invasive species on the agenda of governments and how to get key audiences appreciate the issue); CEC should provide its expertise to other Commissions, e.g. start a series of communication guidelines like WCPA.

What CEC should not do anymore

Priority setting is also stop certain activities or avoid doing certain things. Respondents gave the following answers:

Don't join weak commissions and programs (e.g. Climate change, CBD); do not work for CSG.

Do not widen the gap with others because of CEPA jargon, be practical instead of abstract.

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

Do not engage in formal education, do not work with schools, youth and children.

Do not implement your own programs, always work with others.

Do not engage in media and corporate communication.

Don't do too many things. Don't expand too easily do not spread too thinly and work for every convention or whoever ask CEC input.

Do not try to service IUCN members.

Do not do the marketing of IUCN (job for secretariat).

Do not do something as commission externally separate from programs or other commissions: always keep your supporting role for the IUCN 'content' commissions and programs.

Do's and don'ts

One could summarize the suggestions for priorities in a CEC work program, as follows:

DO'S	DON'TS
Strategic support to IUCN programs, projects	Spread too thin, link with weak elements
Capacity building CEPA	Use CEPA jargon or sell aggressively
Corporate Management Group support	Link with Corporate Management Group
CBD CEPA work program support	Work in isolation from IUCN program
Strategic communication COPs CBD & WCC	Micro manage the secretariat
Develop conservation element in ESD	Work for schools, youth, children

Illustration of potential perceived spearheads with concrete products, as suggested by respondents

Respondents were asked to name the two most relevant products CEC should deliver in focussing on the core markets indicated by respondents. For some respondents this proved to be a very difficult question and they came up with very abstract answers, some respondents formulated the products in terms of criteria for success (what would make them satisfied with a new CEC focus), see below. About half of the respondents had very concrete suggestions for products of CEC, they are listed below grouped along the earlier key areas of work for CEC, identified by respondents (see chapter 4 and 5).

Providing communication and education knowledge

- Website with publications and other sites showing good examples of education and communication (cases of problems solved on the ground, e.g. in protected areas, proving added value of communication and showing how one can copy the approach)
- CEPA publications & training materials

Strategic planning of communications in program and projects

- Guidelines to show projects how to plan communication in a strategic way, right from the start
- Ongoing support to program managers to use studies to become change oriented, e.g. more thinking about the demand side, about a distribution strategy etc.

Capacity building of program staff and members

- Models to show projects how to translate scientific conclusions into visuals and three paragraphs for policy makers
- Facts sheets for policymakers on conservation issues
- Training materials to help build capacity in internal and external audiences on the of topics of IUCN programs
- Series of practical guidance for policymakers & managers on how to integrate CEPA into thematic areas (e.g. how to deal with CEPA in Wetlands)
- Assistance in the policy-practice loop: repackage policy messages on sustainable livelihoods for IUCN members, so that practical first steps can be taken in forestry of Protected Areas

Communication and marketing advice to CSG

- Integrated communication strategy for IUCN
- Regular updating of IUCN communication strategy
- Better image IUCN through improved presentations

Guardian of Education and Communication for IUCN's mission

- Carry out yearly WORLD Survey on perceptions of conservation

Guidance to let IUCN make more impact at international forums

- Strategic communication advice and support on thematic recommendations in GBF
- Guidelines for influencing policymaking on education and communication
- Strategic seminars
- Support for WPC Durban and WCC Bangkok

Article 13 CBD work program

- Work program elements: capacity building program and clearinghouse

Follow up on WSSD & ESD

- Conservation in ESD: mix of tools from publications to internet debates with scientist and educators
- Scan the program and IUCN Commission work for information on issues which are going to make a difference and make them accessible for educators in schools and the general public
- Environmental citizenship project

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

- Partnerships with Ministries of Education in Africa and Asia to develop teaching material and teacher training

Criteria for success for CEC activities

Some respondents formulated their ideal products of CEC in terms of criteria for success. The identified the following criteria:

- CEC has a larger budget, the right strategic partners, works with secretariat and program
- Quantified evidence of change in the knowledge, attitudes and practices of IUCN project people in relation to communication; clear roles and responsibilities between CSG, various IUCN communication officers and CEC
- Every program takes CEC seriously, asks CEC advice, works closely with WG and CEC members clear sense that CEC input is recognizable in quality products of other commissions
- It is natural to have CEC involved in planning the IUCN program and ask for their expertise and building bricks for participation in implementing the program
- Awareness in Secretariat and Council that education and communication is an important issue for IUCN
- CEC has internal demand for its input
- Education and Communication was present throughout the whole program not only as end of pipe tool, but as integral part
- Capacity of IUCN technical program managers in communication is improved
- Tangible influence on CBD process: government of Japan puts money into CEPA
- After ten years we have not a usual WPC but a World Participation Congress
- Demonstrate in next WCC tools for Governments on CEPA that prove the synergy of communication triggering interaction
- Scientist pretend to know what communication is, but CEC succeeds in raising awareness on communication as discipline: strategic advice, video, merchandising, marketing, learning networks

Procedures to identify product market combinations

Participants also offered suggestions how to identify the best product market combinations for CEC and connect with global and regional programs and commissions:

have short information meetings in HQ and the regions with programs to explain CEC and explore joint projects.

make sure you have connecting points in the different programs and commission, may a CEC Steering Committee member should sit ex officio on one of the other Commissions.

Use internationally funded volunteers UNV, SIDA, SNV, DGIS; have 5 local volunteers in the regions make them link up with members, and fundraise € 100.000 for activities.

CEC should have volunteers in the regional offices to support the network and activities and help IUCN to become more outward looking; DGIS, DSI (070 - 3486539), supports this; one needs an organization that supervises the volunteers and a quota of five; one regional office could apply in the name of more offices.

Recommendation 9. Program planning

The strategic plan should identify priorities and procedures to connect with program and commissions to connect CEC expertise and activities to strategic program elements and commission activities; it should also identify criteria for success and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation.

7. ISSUES FOR A NEW MANDATE

Commission Mandate

When asked what would be the two most important issues for a CEC mandate, a number of respondents have difficulty in finding a clear answer. Some clearly are not familiar with the concept *Commission Mandate*. Others find it difficult to only name two things or to be concrete and not philosophical. The word education is rarely mentioned.

Key elements

Issues mentioned most for a new mandate for CEC are:

- influencing IUCN to integrate CEPA in program and projects (10)
- capacity building in CEPA (8)
- focus on tools for change behaviour and practices (5)
- focus on knowledge on participation, knowledge management, behaviour change (5)

Some respondents are of the opinion that the current mandate is fine and no change is needed, e.g.: "*The CEC mandate is broad enough*".

Recommendation 10. Mandate

If CEC should make a shift towards the internal market, a new Mandate is necessary. The mandate should reflect the CEC strategy. The mandate should further capture in key words the CEC knowledge area and its relevance for the IUCN mission.

8. RISKS

General risks:

Respondents were asked what they saw as the major risks CEC would be running in the coming period. A few alluded to the governance debate in Council and the repeated discussion about the relevance of commissions. Other came up with quite general formulations of risk, which would apply for any commission.

A major risk is premature death if the conclusions of the governance task force go in the wrong direction and WCC adopts them.

Financial risks; technical risks (no new ideas, no added value, not enough services in methods, training, strategic communication advice); political risks (too many turf battles, concentrating too much on institutional issues; personality problems).

A lot of added value comes from the selection of the right priorities, tools and approaches.

Specific risks

From the various other answers more specific risk for CEC can be distilled. The most important risks for CEC – as perceived by respondents – are :

- Fragmentation of activities (8)
- Membership (7)
- Inward focus (6)
- No profile (4)
- No added value to regions (3)

Fragmentation of activities

Spreading its activities too thin is mentioned a number of times as a risk factor. It is of importance as it also came up in other questions. It is an indication that fragmentation might be the case at the moment in the perception of respondents.

Being too dispersed, that you do not make a difference anymore: define priorities and areas of content and major target groups.

In trying to be successful, CEC is doing too much and spreading itself too thin, it loses its profile.

Membership

A number of respondents made remarks about membership as risk factor such as:

- too many ‘paper’ members
- numbers do not count
- no added value or benefits to commission members which makes them back out
- wrong expertise
- lack of time to do voluntary work in regions
- not enough face to face communication between commission members
- no critical mass of active members

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

- in our region they only work on a consultancy base for our program

Other remarks were about motivation and quality:

Motivation of membership is important, a Commission should invest in it.

CEC members should be leaders in their own right; they should have stature otherwise they will not change IUCN.

The trend is that knowledge and communication become more important, CEC's role for IUCN becomes more important, but a commission is as good as its members, steering committee and Chair are: the Chair and steering committee are very engaged, active and professional; the regional chair here does nothing, in HQ you need a good presence, that champions CEC and establishes good working relations with other programs, that seems to be lacking.

Explore which members are interested in CEC priorities and explore their own priorities; Invest in participation projects.

Although one can argue that some of these comments will be true for any Commission, the fact that many respondents brought these issues up is in itself an indication that in the eyes of a number of respondents CEC should have a critical look at its membership. In its new program it should try to address the following aspects of membership:

- Age, gender and regional balance
- Right profile in relation to the main program elements (knowledge areas)
- Motivation for active involvement
- Quality control and monitoring
- Authority and seniority
- Voluntary contributions versus contributions on consultancy basis

Inward focus

Respondents see as an important risk factor an 'inward focus' of CEC. This is the more to be taken serious as this same issue came also up in other questions. It is an indication that many respondents perceive CEC in this way of 'being apart', 'having its own program and agenda apart from IUCN':

Inward looking activities without any impact beyond the CEC network ("preaching to the converted"), not being relevant to IUCN and external audiences.

Being perceived as being separate, apart and marginalized: CEC is minority and need alliances.

Added value to Regions

Especially respondents from the regions point out as a risk factor that the CEC program focuses too much on the global level. In some regions CEC is well integrated in the regional program, but could be more effective if more attention and priorities would be given from the global CEC program to support these regional activities.

Recommendation 11. Membership

The strategic plan should identify criteria for membership according to the core competences and key areas of CEC activities.

Recommendation 12. Regional activities

The strategic plan should identify mechanisms how regional networks could connect with the IUCN regional program and how this could be supported from the centre.

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

ANNEXES

Annex 1. List of people interviewed

Face to face interviews

Achim Steiner, Director General IUCN, Gland

Bill Jackson, Director Global Program IUCN, Gland

Miguel de Araujo, Director IUCN Corporate Strategies, Gland

Veronique Lavorel, IUCN Chief Financial Officer, Gland

Juanita Castano, Special Advisor to the IUCN Director General, Gland

Susan Mainka, Head IUCN Global Species Program, Gland

Nancy McPherson, Head IUCN Global Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, Gland

Corli Pretorius, Acting Head IUCN Communications Unit; Assistant to the DG, Gland

Martha Rojas, Head of IUCN Global Policy, Gland

David Sheppard, Head IUCN Global Protected Area Program, Gland

Jean Thie, Head IUCN Information Management Unit, Gland

Elroy Bos, Communication Advisor IUCN Wetlands and Water Resources Program, Gland

Joachim Gratzfeld, IUCN WESCANA Program Officer, Gland

Francis Parakatil, IUCN Acting Regional Director for WESCANA, Gland

Nguyen Minh Thong, IUCN Country Representative, Hanoi

Hans Friedrich, Asian Regional Program Director, Asian regional office, Bangkok

Zakir Hussain, Director Membership Program, Asian regional office, Bangkok

Peter Bos, Representative of Dutch Donor, The Hague

Sandra Hails, Advisor on CEPA, Ramsar Secretariat, Gland

Telephonic interviews

Yolanda Kakabadse, President IUCN, Ecuador

Dan Martin, Vice-President IUCN, USA

Alistair Gammel, Regional Councillor for Europe, U.K.

Wren Green, IUCN Regional Councillor for Oceania, New Zealand

Huguette Labelle, IUCN Regional Councillor for North America, Canada

Hastings Chikoko, Information and Marketing Officer IUCN ROSA, Zimbabwe

Enrique Lahmann, Regional Director IUCN ORMA, Costa Rica

Tamas Marghescu, Regional Director of IUCN OfE, Belgium

Miguel Pellerano, Regional Director IUCN SUR, Ecuador

David Brackett, Chair SSC, Canada

Ton van der Zon, Representative of Dutch donor, The Hague

Annex 2. Checklist for interview issues

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

1. First association with CEC; image CEC
2. Two products/successes CEC
3. Two things respondent does not like of CEC
4. What ideally should be the added value CEC to IUCN
5. Two major issues a CEC program should focus on
6. Two things CEC should NOT do anymore
7. Two main products CEC should deliver in the next 4 years
8. Two major issues for a new CEC mandate
9. Two major risks CEC is running in the next 4 years
10. Last good advice and other suggestions

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

Annex 3. Products and activities named by respondents, clustered into groups

CEC PR

CEC mouse pad

Logo CEC

Electronic newsletter Former Chair

Report Hungary Meeting CEC Matra Project in Central Europe

CEC Videos

Amman videos report Chair, Workshop Knowledge Management, Closing Session

CEC video for the meeting of the Ministers of Environment of the Americas (Canada)

Video CEC member on ESD for Brazilian preparation for WSSD

CEPA Advocacy

Brochure 'Communication as an instrument for environmental policy'

GBF and COP6 interventions (workshop, video, brochure, lunch, lobby)

BEPA website, expert meeting and networking technology

Workshops Quito to influence governments to plan strategically environmental education

Principles of Environmental Education in Environmental Management Acts (Africa)

CEPA Capacity Building

Bangkok Conference on Strategic Planning of Education and Communication

Bangkok Training workshop for National Biodiversity Coordinators

Galapagos workshop how to develop a NBSAP in dialogue with relevant stakeholders

Matra project "Effective communication for conservation managers" in Central Europe

Environmental Citizenship Project for Latin America

Comunicacion efectiva para involucrar Actores claves en las Estrategias de Biodiversidad

Diversidad Biologica y Participacion Publica

Evaluating Environmental Education

Guidelines on integrating environmental issues into school curricula for Southern Africa

North African Bio Diversity Education tools

Cooperation with other Commissions

SSC Red List training package

WCPA Cooperation in Europe on visitor centres

Preparation of a CEC initiative for Durban through the Buenos Aires meeting

Corporate Communication Advice

Strategic advice to position IUCN during WSSD

ESD

ESD workshop in Johannesburg

ESDebate

Knowledge Management

Ideas behind improvement IUCN website

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

Annex 4. Recommendations for the CEC planning process

Draft Time Table

April 3 – April 14

Send Report and questionnaire to Steering Committee members, ask for feedback and let steering committee members fill in questionnaire (and do suggestions for improvement questionnaire)

April 14 – 17 April

Improve questionnaire

April 17 – April 28

Send questionnaire to CEC members

April 28 – May 14

Summarize conclusions of input CEC members and send to Steering Committee Members

May 26 – May 30

Discuss Report and results questionnaire during steering committee Strategic Planning meeting

Decide on strategy and priorities

Decide on further procedure and editing committee

June 1 – June 30

Write draft strategy and program on the basis directions Steering Committee and negotiations with IUCN thematic programs and external opportunities

July 1 – July 15

Comments by Steering Committee members

July 16 – July 30

Send draft to CEC members and ask for comments and text suggestions

August 1 – August 31

Collecting and analysing feedback from CEC members

September

CEC bureau decides during WPC in Durban on main editing issues final version

October – November

Last editing and negotiations with other programs

December 1 onwards

Chair CEC guides process of integration CEC strategic plan into IUCN program

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

Annex 5. Questions for CEC members on CEC Strategic Plan 2004 – 2010

Finish the following sentences	
My name and email address are	
My motivation to be a CEC member is	
I expect from CEC	
The ultimate goal or vision of CEC is to	
CEC wants to achieve that	
CEC wants to change	

CEC wants to be perceived as an organization that is (cross three items of your choice, or formulate your own):

Provider	Knowledge CEPA for the conservation community	
Coach	Capacity building in CEPA for the IUCN Program and regions	
Strategist	Planning of CEPA interventions for the IUCN Program and regions	
Advisor	Corporate communication of the IUCN CSG	
Guardian	Changing practices & behaviour in implementing the IUCN Mission	
Guide	Communication & learning support for IUCN in international events	
....		
....		

The most important goals for CEC are (cross three items of your choice, or formulate your own):

Assess communication gaps in IUCN programs, projects	
Identify priorities for CEPA interventions	
Recommend actions for CEPA interventions in IUCN programs, project	
Develop and promote policies and guidelines for CEPA	
Enhance efforts of individuals working in CEPA	
Promote the importance of CEPA in the conservation community	
Develop and improve the IUCN corporate communication	
Build capacity in CEPA among IUCN staff and members	
.....	
.....	

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders

CEC should be most concerned with (cross three answers of your choice, or formulate your own):

IUCN program and projects	
IUCN corporate communication	
Work program for article 13 CBD	
CEPA activities in other Conventions	
Follow up on WSSD and provide leadership to the development of ESD	
Follow up on WSSD and develop conservation as underpinning element of ESD	
IUCN knowledge management	
Communication support IUCN events GBF, WCC; interventions in UN system	
.....	
.....	

CEC should concentrate on the following areas of expertise (cross three answers of your choice, or formulate your own):

Formal education	
Education research	
Informal, non formal, development education	
Strategic communication planning	
ESD	
CEPA for Biodiversity	
Knowledge management	
Corporate communication	
.....	
.....	

CEC should concentrate on the following clients (cross three items, or formulate your own):

IUCN program, projects, commissions	
CSG	
CBD Secretariat	
Secretariats of other Conventions	
IUCN state members	
IUCN NGO members	
CEC members	
Global Education Community	
.....	
.....	

Other comments and suggestions for the CEC Strategic Plan 2004 – 2010:

Annex 6. ACRONYMS

WCC	World Conservation Congress
GBF	Global Biodiversity Forum
COP	Convention of the Parties
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
BEPA	Biodiversity Education and Public Awareness
ESD	Education for Sustainable Development

Perception is the only reality

Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, report of a quick scan among major CEC external stakeholders