

Annex 1

Report of the Chair of the Management Working Group

The Secretary General welcomed participants and drew their attention to Document SC54-3 Rev.2 *Adoption of the provisional working programme*. Following revision by the previous day's meeting of the Executive Team, the agenda now covered:

- CEPA Implementation Working Group
- Language Strategy (Doc. SC54-13 Rev.1)
- Review of current and proposed cooperative agreements (Doc. SC54-16 Rev.1)

CEPA Implementation Working Group:

The Chair of the Working Group on CEPA Implementation (South Africa) reported that the Group's role is to support the Secretariat's implementation of the CEPA Action Plan.

The Secretary General confirmed that, following SC53, the Secretariat had integrated the CEPA Action Plan into its triennial work plan. It would report further on this to the Standing Committee under agenda item 12 *Work plan of the Secretariat for 2018 and proposed format for 2019-2021*.

Language Strategy:

The Secretariat referred the meeting to document Doc. SC54-13 Rev.1 and outlined the process until now, respecting the decisions of SC52 and SC53, leading to a draft resolution for the Standing Committee to consider at agenda item 13.

Review of current and proposed cooperative agreements:

The Secretariat referred to document Doc. SC54-16 Rev.1 on Secretariat actions in response to Decision SC53-03, which includes a decision tree and criteria for establishing a formal cooperative agreement. The Secretariat looks to the Standing Committee for guidance on the appropriateness and utility of the decision tree.

Contracting Parties welcomed the decision-making tool and raised several issues:

- Inclusion in the decision tree of a test of whether a formal agreement is necessary for effective partnership (United States of America)
- Creation of a more transparent form indicating outcomes for each criterion (Senegal)
- The source of the mandate to apply the criteria (Canada) and whether a final decision is made by COP or Standing Committee (South Africa) or the Management Working Group in line with Decision SC52-11 (Senegal)
- Use of a template to reduce workload and ensure standards, with Parties having an opportunity to review the draft template (United States of America, Senegal)
- The process for terminating agreements that do not meet the criteria (Canada, Senegal, Switzerland)
- Agreements with IOPs and their standardization (Canada)
- Exceptional agreements, which do not meet the criteria but may support Convention implementation (e.g. United States of America, Colombia [on behalf of regional Chair Argentina] re. Inter-American Convention for the Protection of Sea Turtles, Finland re. Society for Ecological Restoration)

- Inclusion of a risk management test in the decision tree, particularly addressing reputational risk to the Convention in partnering with private companies (Australia)
- The need to keep the process light and agile.

The Secretariat reported that the concerns would be incorporated into the proposed process, and confirmed that a single Memorandum of Cooperation for all IOPs was now in place. For current agreements that do not meet the criteria, as suggested by Parties, the Secretariat would contact the partners concerned to find the best approach, whether to renegotiate the agreement with value added, or let it end without renewal.

The Secretary General noted that agreements with donors fell outside of this process. She invited a decision instructing the Secretariat to apply the criteria, taking account of the comments of Australia, Canada and United States of America, and then report the results.

The Management working Group recommends that the Standing Committee take the following decisions:

- The Standing Committee decides to use the decision tree, as amended, found in Annex 2 to SC54-16 as a tool for the Secretariat and the Management Working Group to evaluate whether it is appropriate to consider entering into a cooperative agreement with an interested entity.
- The Standing Committee decided to request the Secretariat to reach out to the six organizations listed within Annex 1 of SC54-16 that have current agreements but which have been found not to meet the criteria for MOUs that Parties have agreed to use in order to explore whether there is interest by the organization in question in amending or concluding the agreement.
- The Standing Committee decided to accept the evaluation of current and expired agreements found in Annex 1 of SC54-16 and, based on views expressed by the Management Working Group, requested the Secretariat to engage representatives from the Inter-American Convention for the Protection of Sea Turtles and the Society for Ecological Restoration to explore the possibilities of re-engaging in collaboration, and in so doing to determine whether a formal cooperative agreement would be necessary, and to report the outcomes of its efforts to the Management Working Group at a future meeting.

Other business: 360-degree evaluation of the Secretary General

Austria proposed that the Standing Committee should decide to implement a 360-degree evaluation of the Secretary General's performance before the COP, following past practice.

The Chair confirmed that the Executive Team had addressed the matter and taken decisions in accordance with IUCN rules.

The Secretary General reported that her annual evaluation for 2017 had been carried out according to IUCN policy. Regarding an internal 360-degree evaluation, she was consulting with IUCN Human Resources on how to apply it. Further questions should be directed to them.

Parties proposed an external performance evaluation before COP13 (Switzerland, South Africa).

The United States of America noted doubts as to the value of the tool for evaluation, and supported the use of IUCN rules and processes.

Australia recalled the support of the Facilitation Working Group and SC53 in decision SC53-23 for the work of the Secretary General, and suggested further evaluation after COP13.

Japan proposed that IUCN staffing rules be posted on the website for full transparency.

Finland requested that the mandate, tasks and responsibilities of the Executive Team be shared.

The Chair proposed to continue the discussion in the Standing Committee with IUCN Human Resources present at a later session.