

**Development of Recommendations for Consolidation  
of the  
Consortium for the Conservation of Coastal and Marine  
Ecosystems in the Western Indian Ocean**

**A Discussion Document**

Draft for La Réunion Meeting

**Report to WIO-C**

**Draft 1.0 – August 2009**

**Sarah Humphrey**

**Contents**

Contents ..... i

List of Appendices ..... ii

List of Acronyms ..... iii

Executive Summary ..... iv

1.0. Introduction ..... 1

2.0. Operationalisation of WIO-C ..... 2

    2.1. Issues ..... 2

    2.2. Survey on Shaping the Future of WIO-C ..... 3

    2.3. Lessons from PRCM ..... 4

3.0. Towards a Joint Work Programme for WIO-C..... 5

    3.1. WIO-C Contributions to WIO-LaB ..... 5

    3.2. Joint Work Programme..... 6

4.0. Moving Forward ..... 7

    4.1. Membership and Accountability ..... 7

    4.2. Structure and Governance of WIO-C ..... 8

    4.3. Secretariat ..... 8

    4.4. Fundraising, Programme and Added Value of WIO-C..... 9

    4.5. Summary of Recommendations ..... 10

Further Reading and Acknowledgments ..... 11

Appendix 1. Outline /Contents for Operational Guidelines..... 12

Draft for La Réunion Meeting

## List of Annexes

- Annex 1: *Shaping the Future of WIO-C Results of a Survey to WIO-C members and other conservation NGOs active in the WIO-C Region Summary of Responses*, 30 April 2009
- Annex 2: *PRCM Lessons for WIO-C: A Discussion Document*, Draft 1, 31 July 2009
- Annex 3: *Minutes of the WIO-LaB Partners Meeting and WIO-C meeting*, Cape Town, South Africa. 19 November 2008.
- Annex 4: *Report of the WIO-C Meeting of 10 June 2009*, Mombasa, Kenya.
- Annex 5: *Statement to the UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB Regional Stakeholder Workshop on the Development of a Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the Protection of the Western Indian Ocean Coastal and Marine Environment from Land-based Sources and Activities*, Cape Town – 21 November 2008.
- Annex 6: *Statement to the Regional Stakeholders Workshop on the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) focused on Land-based Sources and Activities in the Western Indian Ocean Region, on the Contribution of NGOs in the implementation of the WIO-LaB SAP*, Mombasa – 12 June 2009.
- Annex 7: *Summary of WIO-C contributions to WIO-LaB*, Draft 1, 16 July 2009, Excel/PDF, 4pp

## List of Acronyms

ASCLMEs	Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems
CORDIO	Coastal Oceans Research and Development in the Indian Ocean
EAWLS	East Africa Wildlife Society
FAP	<i>Fonds d'Appui au PRCM</i> (PRCM Support Fund)
IGO	Intergovernmental organization
IOC (COI)	Indian Ocean Commission ( <i>Commission de l'Océan Indien</i> )
IOC/UNESCO	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
LBSA	Land-based Sources and Activities of marine and coastal degradation
MASMA	Marine Science for Management (Grant scheme)
NEPAD/ COSMAR	The New Partnership for Africa's Development Coastal and Marine sub – programme
NGO	Non governmental organization
PRCM	<i>Programme régional de Conservation de la zone Côtière et Marine en Afrique de l'Ouest</i> (West African Regional Programme for Marine and Coastal Conservation)
ReCoMaP	Regional Programme for the Sustainable Management of the Coastal Zones of the Countries of the Indian Ocean
SAP	Strategic Action Programme
SWIOFP	South Western Indian Ocean Fisheries Project
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WIO-C	Consortium for the Conservation of Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in the Western Indian Ocean
WIO-LaB	Addressing land-based Activities in the Western Indian Ocean
WIOMSA	Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

**Executive Summary**

(For final draft)

Draft for La Réunion Meeting

## 1.0. Introduction

The Consortium for the Conservation of Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in the Western Indian Ocean (WIO-C) was established in 2006 as a collaborative initiative to raise the profile of the ten members in the region, to facilitate their fundraising, and to improve their overall effectiveness in marine and coastal conservation through sharing of lessons and a streamlined work programme.

The constitutive meeting brought together six international and regional non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and four intergovernmental organisations and programmes (Box 1) involved in marine and coastal conservation in the ten signatory countries to the Nairobi Convention<sup>1</sup>. The WIO-C members agreed to collaborate “to support synergy and strengthen coordination in the implementation of activities and programmes related to marine and coastal ecosystem management, research and development” (UNEP, 2006). WIO-C was formally launched at the fifth Conference of the Parties of the Nairobi Convention in November 2007, reinforcing its mandate and anchoring in the context of the Nairobi Convention. Wetlands International and Birdlife International – were invited to join WIO-C as full members during WIO-C’s June 2009 meeting.

### Box 1: Regional organisations participating in the Nairobi Meeting / WIO-C Founder Members

#### Non-Governmental Organisations

- Coastal Oceans Research and Development in the Indian Ocean (CORDIO)
- East Africa Wildlife Society (EAWLS)
- World Conservation Union (IUCN)
- Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)
- Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA)
- World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)

#### Intergovernmental Organisations and Programmes

- Indian Ocean Commission (IOC)
- United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)
- The New Partnership for Africa’s Development Coastal and Marine sub - programme (NEPAD/ COSMAR)
- Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (IOC/UNESCO)

The WIO-C comprises organisations whose interests and values largely converge, but who sometimes compete at national, regional or international level for funding and other resources. At a practical level Consortium offers the potential to reduce duplication and overlap amongst the activities of its member organisations, to reduce competition for resources, to enable information sharing and learning between organisation and projects, and to increase the overall reach of conservation work in the region by better exploiting complementarities in its members regional infrastructure, policy access and fundraising capacities. The link to the Nairobi Convention creates an opportunity for endorsement of the WIO-C members’ programmes.

The creation of the Consortium was inspired by the perceived success of PRCM<sup>2</sup>, a regional marine and coastal conservation programme established in West Africa and which involves some of the same organisations. PRCM has proved an effective platform for communicating and fundraising on issues related to marine conservation both within and beyond the region.

<sup>1</sup> *Convention for the Protection Management and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern Africa Region*. The Contracting Parties are Comoros, France (La Réunion), Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, Somalia, Tanzania and the Republic of South Africa

<sup>2</sup> *Programme Régional de conservation de la zone côtière et marine en Afrique de l’Ouest* or West African Regional Programme for Marine and Coastal Conservation

Despite its high profile launch in November 2007, less than two years after its formation the WIO-C had reached a state of collaborative inertia. In view of these concerns and on the initiative of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the WIO-C partners agreed to employ a consultant to assist in the next stage of consolidation of the partnership. The consultancy had two tasks: first, to develop a set of proposals and recommendations relating to the institutionalisation or operationalisation of WIO-C; and second, to facilitate definition of a joint programme of work for WIO-C, and specifically to facilitate a process to develop and implement a joint work programme in support of the WIO-LaB initiative.

This report is based on general discussions, interviews and correspondence with WIO-C members; a survey of WIO-C members conducted in early 2009 and on two WIO-C members meetings organised in November 2008 and June 2009 as well as on specific discussions surrounding input to the WIO-LaB project. It also takes account of complementary exchanges around development of a Charter for WIO-C led by Amber Luong and David Obura at CORDIO. Information on PRCM was drawn from the PRCM website, internal and external assessments, discussion with PRCM members and questionnaires sent to the PRCM members and secretariat.

Sections 2 and 3 present basic findings relating to the two tasks while Section 4 provides a synthesis of the issues facing WIO-C and recommendations for elaboration of operational guidelines (replacing the current operational principles). Outline operational guidance are presented in Appendix 1.

## **2.0. Operationalisation of WIO-C**

### **2.1. Issues**

Preliminary discussions during and around the November 2008 WIO-C meeting identified five interrelated internal concerns contributing to the prevailing state of inertia:

1. The need to clarify the membership, structure and governance of WIO-C, with background documentation open to different interpretations;
2. Acknowledged failure on the part of the secretariat to meet the expectations of the partners, exacerbated by lack of feedback from WIO-C members;
3. Concerns around the whether the benefits to an individual organisation of being an active member of the consortium would outweigh the costs, including transaction costs (such as staff time and meeting attendance costs) and potentially secretariat costs;
4. Concerns around roles of and responsibilities within the Consortium and, related to this, about differences in size, culture and accountability of different organisations;
5. The need to build confidence given the co-existence of co-operative and competitive relationships amongst the members.

Overall, WIO-C members made it clear they share a strong desire for a stronger platform for marine and coastal conservation and appreciate the need to pull together to avoid fragmentation and duplication of effort. Members highlighted ambiguities around the original membership of WIO-C as well the nature or expected level of collaboration.

Members generally welcomed WWF's having taken on the role as secretariat on an un-remunerated basis and while they expressed disappointment in the limited follow up they also accepted responsibility for failing to respond to initiatives from the secretariat. Some members mentioned the perceived political nature of WWF's role and suggested that this may have exacerbated a lack of collaboration.

Some of these issues have been aired and partially if not fully resolved during discussions in the November and June WIO-C meetings and during the subsequent development of the WIO-C Charter. This will be reflected in the wrap up section of this report.

## 2.2. Survey on Shaping the Future of WIO-C

The survey on *Shaping the Future of WIO-C* was designed to provide a rapid overview of the breadth and balance of opinion concerning the future activities and operations of WIO-C. The survey consisted of 18 multiple choice questions covering the perceived benefits of WIO-C, activities, membership, secretariat, governance, and promotion. The survey was established online through *Survey Monkey* and was open for four weeks from 26 March to 22 April and in total nine responses were received from eight organisations or programmes active in marine and coastal conservation in the WIO-Region. However, of these three respondents were unable to answer any of the questions due to poor internet connections and time constraints.

In view of the low number of responses the survey results cannot be seen as representing the majority view of WIO-C members, but does serve as a basis for further discussion on the development of operational guidelines for WIO-C. The following paragraphs highlight the options identified by the greatest number of respondents in key areas. ('All' indicates that all respondents to a given question selected this option). The full survey report is available as Annex 1.

There was a strong consensus on the **value of WIO-C** both to marine and coastal conservation in the region and to WIO-C member and partner organisations. The greatest number of respondents identified (all) *increased policy influence in favour of marine and coastal conservation* as a benefit to regional conservation, rapidly followed by *improved dialogue, sharing of information, sharing of lessons and reduced duplication of efforts between conservation actors*. The *opportunity to pool expertise and skills* was most frequently identified (all) as of benefit to individual organisations.

In terms of **outputs or functions**, the most frequently identified were *to provide a flexible platform for dialogue on marine and coastal conservation issues in the WIO-C region; organise meetings and events bringing together conservation actors from the WIO-C region; develop common policy positions amongst conservation actors in the WIO-C region; and, undertake joint fundraising for marine and coastal conservation activities in the WIO-C region*.

All respondents suggested international and regional NGOs should be **members** of WIO-C and most also identified intergovernmental organisations. While the categories of 'member' and 'partner' were not always used exclusively, a majority suggested other groups of actors – notably community based organisations (all) – should be **partners** and all respondents were open to partnerships inclusive of a wide range of organisations.

Principal **responsibilities of members** were identified (all) as *to report annually to the principle coordination body of WIO-C on activities related to WIO's overall purpose and/or programme; to nominate an individual to serve as the principal point of contact for WIO-C activities; to attend WIO-C meetings regularly; and, to contribute to development and review of WIO-C communication materials*. All respondents suggested WIO-C members should **formalise membership** through a letter of intent subscribing to the purpose and operational guidelines of WIO-C. All respondents suggested **meetings** be organised alongside other suitable regional events while respondents were divided as to whether meetings should be annual or bi-annual.

The **responsibilities of the secretariat** were identified (all) as *to serve as an information clearing house on WIO-C member activities; to serve as a spokesperson for the WIO-C; to undertake promotions and marketing of WIO-C through relevant media channels; and, catalyse development of joint projects (matchmaking role)*. Most respondents (80%) also identified, *to organise WIO-C meetings, to represent the WIO-C in meetings and conferences; and, to identify fundraising opportunities for WIO-C members*.

All respondents identified the need for **dedicated staff** with 60% suggesting *one or more dedicated staff persons* would be realistic and 40% suggesting a *part-time staff person with time allocated to WIO-C in his/her workplan and terms of reference*.

A majority of respondents (80%) suggested WIO-C be at least partly **funded** through funds raised expressly from the third party to support collaboration efforts, while 60% of respondents supported funding by its host organisation in the short term only and funding through overheads on joint projects and programmes.

Views regarding how WIO-C should be established in a **legal and administrative** sense were very mixed, though a majority (80%) of respondents suggested it should function independently (as opposed to being established as an integral programme of its host).

Views were also quite divided regarding the **governance bodies** that should be established for WIO-C. Forty percent of respondents selected the options of a *steering committee with subset of members represented* and a *members' forum or assembly*. The remaining respondents selected a *steering committee with all members represented*, together with various other options. One respondent noted that WIO-C should try to avoid having too much bureaucracy and that if there are lots of members a members assembly may not be possible early on due to costs.

Members supported a wide range of **promotion or outreach activities** for WIO-C, particularly favouring (all) *presentations to meetings and conferences* and use of member organisations' newsletters. Fewer supported *development of a WIO-C logo* while only a minority favoured *creation of a WIO-C blog*.

### 2.3. Lessons from PRCM

PRCM – the *Programme Régional de conservation de la zone côtière et marine en Afrique de l'Ouest* – is a regional coastal and marine conservation spanning seven countries of West Africa. Building on several years of cooperation and following a three year establishment period, PRCM was launched in 2004 by five founding partners: four international NGOs and one intergovernmental organisation. Its specific aim is: *"The biological and cultural diversity and the integrity of West African marine and coastal ecosystems are better preserved and managed through concerted initiatives put forward by a broad regional partnership.*

PRCM was identified prior to the 2006 formative meeting of WIO-C as a replicable example of a partnership approach to conservation of coastal and marine resources at a regional scale. It has superficial similarities to WIO-C including in its mission and in overlap of its core membership but also substantial differences in its origins and in the level of collaboration anticipated by the core members (called 'programme partners' in PRCM).

The PRCM experience has been well documented, though parts of its records are available only in French (e.g. website, meeting reports and evaluation). In view of this, a discussion document was prepared to provide a rapid overview of various aspects of the nature and operations of PRCM of relevance to WIO-C, to explore similarities and differences with WIO-C, and to highlight some potential lessons for WIO-C based on the above issues (Annex 2).

The discussion document reflects a number of issues of relevance to WIO-C and provides insight into some of the issues WIO-C is struggling with – notably the scope of its membership, the services and added value it offers to wider stakeholders (including potential donors), governance structures and accountability, administration, secretariat role and staffing, and funding for transaction costs.

Key lessons based on the PRCM experiences are summarised in are taken up in the conclusions.

### 3.0. Towards a Joint Work Programme for WIO-C

The second task for this consultancy was to facilitate definition of a joint programme of work for WIO-C, and specifically to facilitate a process to develop and implement a joint work programme in support of the WIO-LaB initiative.

#### 3.1. WIO-C Contributions to WIO-LaB

The WIO-LaB process provided an opportunity to identify existing and potential WIO-C contributions to WIO-LaB and the LBSA SAP through two WIO-C meetings organized in advance of WIO-LaB regional stakeholders meetings (See Annexes 3 & 4). Discussions during these meetings:

- Acknowledged the strategic role of NGOs contributions in providing momentum towards adoption of the Strategic Action Plan (SAP);
- Identified key areas of interest and areas for potential improvement of the SAP, notably in the approach to critical habitats;
- Confirmed the WIO-C partners interest and commitment to working individually and as a consortium with the WIO-LaB process and in contributing to the implementation of the SAP;
- Identified expectations and potential benefits for the consortium members including recognition or their ongoing contributions to WIO-Lab and more broadly to the Nairobi Convention Process; endorsement of and a clear mandate for development of NGO projects and programmes; and seed funding for project development and/or support to transaction costs of the consortium;
- Identified a number of areas where the WIO-C partners could add value to the WIO-C process (Box 3), that were highlighted in the WIO-C 'Statements of Intent' to the multi-stakeholder meetings (Annexes 5 & 6).
- Generated working lists of WIO-C projects and project concepts that could contribute to the WIO-Lab process.
- Generated a set of criteria for priority WIO-C projects within the WIO-LaB process:
  - Existing competence and interest of the members,
  - Scope for regional action,
  - Comparative advantage offered by working together as a consortium, and,
  - Low likelihood of countries taking the initiative in these areas.

### **Box 3. Value Added to the WIO-LaB Process by the WIO-C Partners**

The conclusion of our meeting is that we are committed individually and as a consortium to work with the Nairobi Convention Secretariat and with the governments of the region in refining and implementing the SAP.

As partners we will bring to this process:

- Our experience in professional implementation of projects and programmes from local to regional level, and our proven ability to engage a wide range of stakeholders from community to international level;
- Our technical expertise and our reach to networks of scientists and practitioners within and beyond the region;
- Our commitment to building capacity at all levels in the region;
- Our fundraising and communications abilities; and last but not least,
- A substantial and broad-based body of ongoing work in support of three of the four objectives of the SAP.

Source: WIO-C 2008, *Statement of Intent to WIO-Lab Multi-stakeholder Meeting*

WIO-C's NGO members completed and agreed to share summaries of their contributions to the WIO-LaB based on a template developed by the project secretariat. The compiled results (Annex 7) identify over 85 projects that are contributing to the WIO-LaB initiative, together representing an annual budget of some 11 million US dollars. In terms of number of projects, NGO's are contributing most significantly to targets related to 'habitats' and 'governance and awareness'. In budget terms there are also significant contributions to river flows targets through several major river basin programmes.

While intended to facilitate 'matchmaking' of partners and gap analysis in the context of the WIO-LaB SAP, these results may also be used to identify areas of for potential collaboration towards WIO-C's wider mission. At present the bulk of projects are being implemented individually by the NGOs, though several members have benefited from grants through the WIOMSA MASMA Programme or ReCoMaP Programme and are contributing to those programmes wider objectives. Members' individual portfolios also reflect their own organisational objectives and accountability to their governance bodies.

### 3.2. Joint Work Programme

The wider question of development of a WIO-C programme of actions should be discussed in a follow up email discussion that sought to identify collective ambitions for such a programme. A continuum of options was discussed ranging from basic collaboration on information sharing to a fully developed portfolio or programme of actions that could be jointly promoted (Box 4).

#### Box 4: Continuum of Programme Cooperation in and beyond the WIO-LaB Context

**Step/Option 1.** To compile existing contributions (funded projects and initiatives, whether ongoing or planned) to the SAP. This will generate momentum for adoption and implementation of the SAP and recognition; and depending on their timing may be useful to help lever future funding in a future GEF proposal and other WIO-LaB and WIO-C proposals.

**Step/Option 2.** To compile potential WIO-C contributions based on interest and competence, alignment to individual organizational priorities, to serve as a place marker for WIO-LaB partnership development and future proposal development around specific themes/area.

**Step/Option 3.** To develop one or more project concepts as a basis for fundraising for identified catalytic actions in support of WIO-LaB, each involving two or more WIO-C partners.

**Step/Option 4.** To outline a larger package of catalytic actions in support of WIO-LaB for joint programme-based fundraising. This may include cross-cutting-process goals (capacity, civil society engagement etc) but would not necessarily have a coherent set of goals and objectives as it forms a subset of the larger WIO-LaB SAP.

**Step/Option 5.** To develop a joint WIO-C programme that includes but goes beyond strategic contributions to the WIO-LaB SAP (longer term?)

The following comments and recommendations from WIO-C members emerged in the discussion:

- There are opportunities to work with ASLME, SWIOFP (and potentially World Bank national and regional initiatives);
- The ASLMEs projects database, maintained by Lucy Scott, already brings together relevant information, though it doesn't provide specific detail on the match to – for example – the WIO-LaB project targets;
- The combined mandates of the WIO-C go beyond the WIO-LaB, ASLME and SWIOFP SAPs. The WIO-C should also define actionable areas that may not be covered by the three projects or their expected SAPs. For example, COI as a partner and supporter of WIO-C presents opportunities beyond the SAPs;
- Steps 1,2, 3 would be the easiest to work on in the near future but if one or more of these fundraising concepts were to include support for the WIO-C, then 4 and/or 5 would become more feasible with the support of a secretariat or perhaps some other means of donating staff time to the partnership;
- The larger packages (Step 4 and/or 5), or concepts requiring partnership may require support from the WIO-LaB project or, after the adoption of the SAP, from the Convention Secretariat.

In summary, WIO-C members felt that the development of a more comprehensive programme of actions would depend on active facilitation by a WIO-C secretariat, or possibly on individual members being able to dedicate time and resources to developing and fundraising for projects on behalf of the wider consortium.

Significantly, several of the WIO-C partners are currently going through institutional and/or programmatic changes leading to difficulties in defining their contributions to or detailed vision for a comprehensive joint programme.

In practice, the level of WIO-C programme cooperation is likely to emerge over time based on practical experience of working together under the WIO-C umbrella. The experience with WIO-LaB lays the groundwork for future collaboration in this area.

## 4.0. Moving Ahead

A number of the issues raised at the beginning of this report have been tackled directly or indirectly through the dialogue and information exchange in and around the November and June WIO-C meetings.

The decision taken at the June WIO-C meeting to develop a Charter for WIO-C represents a significant landmark in terms of clarifying the nature of WIO-C, addressing its vision, context, principles, membership, key outputs and commitment<sup>3</sup>. The Charter has the potential to serve as a foundation for WIO-C while allowing operational guidance to evolve as the members gain practical experience in using and establishing how best to use the WIO-C umbrella.

The following paragraphs take up some of the outstanding issues with specific recommendations for elaboration of operational guidelines (replacing the current 'operational principles'). The outline operational guidance presented in Appendix 1 is intended as an outline for further discussion prior to being developed into a fuller narrative. It is anticipated that the guidelines would be reviewed and revised on a needs basis by the secretariat under the overall guidance of a steering committee.

### 4.1. Membership and Accountability

The main outstanding issue in the Charter is that of membership, which, based on WIO-C's June meeting, has been defined as '*a group of international and regional NGOs in partnership with intergovernmental organizations that have presence and are active in regional marine and coastal ecosystem management in the Western Indian Ocean*'.

This wording reflected the need to balance the different accountabilities of NGOs and IGOs with their desire to have strong working relationship, and was intended to address practical issues of collaboration in policy advocacy. While many members argued that WIO-C needs to be able to make statements on behalf of the group, IGOs noted that it may be difficult for them to take on policy issues in view of their accountability to their member states.

It is recommended that the partnership concept be retained in the operational guidelines since one of the agreed functions of WIO-C is *to present a united voice on issues and policies*. However the PRCM experience, as well as that of influential groups such as the Global Oceans Forum, highlight the advantages of employing a flexible approach to policy advocacy and can offer specific examples as to how to speak on behalf of its different partners. Where possible it is recommended that WIO-C retain such a flexible approach, for example, speaking on behalf of its (core) members or the 'assembly' as appropriate.

The charter currently reads, '*Membership is open to organizations that subscribe to the objectives of the Consortium and meet its requirements*'. Proposed criteria for membership are that the organization is active in one or more countries of the region and is involved in the implementation of activities relevant to WIO-C's Mission. Safeguards to protect the WIO-C 'brand' can be provided by administrative criteria including that the organisation has a registered address or other legal presence in one or more countries of the region, that it has been operating for a specified minimum period (e.g. 3 years), and through the need for steering committee approval.

In general members support the idea that WIO-C membership will eventually include national NGOs and organizations, possibly as a new category of membership. However it is recommended that a phased approach to membership is taken with any further formal or new types of membership put on hold until WIO-C has gained more experience working as a consortium and the role and interest of such membership can be clarified.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Charter was developed by Amber Luong and David Obura at CORDIO and a pre-final draft is incorporates review comments.

## 4.2. Structure and Governance of WIO-C

The Consortium needs to establish an effective, responsive and flexible governance structure providing for coordination and decision making, and that accommodates the different accountability and constituencies of its members and partners.

Based on the experience of PRCM and other similar programmes, it is recommended that WIO-C formalise the establishment of a secretariat or coordination unit that should report to a Steering Committee (SC) comprising the some or all of the NGO members, and possibly a representative of WIO-C's IGO partners. NGOs need to ensure their membership is endorsed by their own internal governance structures and put in place any internal consultative mechanisms needed to facilitate efficient decision making process at the steering committee level. IGOs would form a separate and probably informal partners group that, at this stage, would participate fully in SC meetings.

There should be further provision for a multi-tiered membership structure allowing international NGOs and other member organisations to participate within their limits. A semi-formal approach to broadening participation similar to PRCM's broad but flexible forum may prove more appropriate than a membership arrangement. The WIO-C forum or 'Assembly' should have a recognised role in setting strategic direction of the consortium.

This suggestion reflects both that several WIO-C members already have their own membership structures and that small organisations may struggle to meet the transaction costs associated with full membership especially since, unlike PRCM, WIO-C is not currently in a position to cover such costs from a central budget. If and when 'Assembly' membership is expanded, WIO-C should also pay specific attention to the issue PRCM has faced of having 'outer circle' members feel they are being less well served than the 'inner circle'. If WIO-C expands its membership to national and local organisations it should develop clear mechanisms to anticipate and meet their expectations including, potentially, for direct funding.

## 4.3. Secretariat

The WIO-C secretariat function should be strengthened and clearly defined so that expectations of the function are clear to all parties. It is recommended that as a minimum a clear mandate, terms of reference and general workplan should be developed and the coordinator should report to the steering committee.

In the short term it looks unlikely that there will be a core budget to support secretariat costs. Instead the secretariat will continue to be provided by one of the members on a voluntary basis. Nevertheless, it is recommended that criteria for hosting the secretariat are agreed and a basic hosting arrangement is formalised permitting to ensure management support for this independent role. Support tasks as well as specific activities should be delegated amongst the membership during as long as there is no dedicated WIO-C coordinator or officer.

WIO-C members have expressed a preference that funds for the coordination function be raised externally; this is taken up in 'added value' below. Two further options are to charge a token membership fee as an expression of commitment – though this may be problematic for some members and is unlikely to make a substantial contribution – and that a direct or indirect levy be charged on any projects operating in the name of the consortium. It is recommended that specific procedures be developed in this respect, including relating to the issue of management fees/overhead due to the host organisation. The PRCM model could be adopted or rates could be determined as and when external funding is received.

If the Secretariat is to manage funds on behalf of the WIO-C it will need to formalise a long term hosting arrangement with a suitable member in order to provide the necessary accounting guarantees, and this is likely to preclude the earlier idea of a rotating secretariat. Like PRCM, WIO-C should develop an annual budget and a detailed manual of procedures if and when there are prospects of substantial core funding.

#### 4.4. Fundraising, Programme and Added Value of WIO-C

The potential added value of WIO-C to its members and partners as well as to more effective conservation has been highlighted in the Charter (*'The opportunity'*). However the extent to which these outcomes will be achieved depends on the nature and level of collaboration amongst the WIO-C partners, which is likely to be settled in the longer term only through practical experience investing time in and working together under the WIO-C umbrella. The following comments and suggestions are intended for discussion only.

In order to raise external funding to cover transaction and potentially programme costs WIO-C will need to better define the value it adds for third parties, particularly donors. WIO-C needs to be clear whether it presents its ambitions as a joint programme, a process for better engaging civil society in policy processes, or a 'club' where members have agreed to coordinate their efforts as and when this adds value. This has implications for the way in which WIO-C sets out to attract funding for the secretariat. The WIO-C Charter already provides a general proposition for approaching donors and a useful next step may be to establish a dialogue with donors to establish their interest in, expectations and desires of the Consortium.

##### *Facilitating information gathering and liaison*

The WIO-LaB consultation process illustrated the demand for a streamlined process for liaison with the growing number of international NGO actors in the WIO-C region. It has also demonstrated the importance of NGOs contributions in terms of the attributes<sup>4</sup> it brings to the WIO-LaB and wider Nairobi Convention processes (Box 3 above), the sheer scale of activity and the potential for leveraging co-finance.

##### *Creating dialogue and synergy*

WIO-C can foster synergy amongst its members and partners and has the potential to streamline and reduce overlap in activities even at a basic level of collaboration based on information sharing and dialogue. This kind of collaboration is increasingly sought and even expected amongst donors interested in funding programme level activities, however, and is unlikely to generate external donor support in itself. While the benefits to members and partners are clear, WIO-C may need to take care to avoid being perceived as a BINGO 'club' generating preferential access to policy processes and funding.

Additional benefits at this level of collaboration include cross-organisational learning leading to synthesis and dissemination of lessons learned and coherent messaging in education and awareness work, communications and advocacy.

##### *Engaging Civil Society*

WIO-C could engage a wider set of actors involved in coastal and marine conservation through broadening its membership, through other consultative processes, or, as its individual members do already, through specific programme activities. The Consortium adds value in its region-wide reach as well as in the attributes mentioned in the above sections.

Joint activities at this level are likely to be an attractive proposition for donors, and will demonstrate WIO-C's commitment to wider participation as well as provide an avenue for exploring whether wider membership is appropriate. It is suggested that collaborative work be developed in this area, perhaps building on the environmental education work supported through WIO-LaB.

##### *Other Programme Activities*

Although at this stage it seems premature for WIO-C to be considering a comprehensive joint programme, the WIO-C partners have an immediate opportunity to follow up on project ideas developed at the June 09 meeting and during the WIO-LaB partners meeting, notably under the habitats theme. The forthcoming meeting provides an opportunity to refine the current ideas and select one or more concepts for further development and fundraising through the WIO-LaB Process. One or more WIO-C partners could like to take a lead in developing each proposal, perhaps through formation of a short term working group.

---

<sup>4</sup> Arguably the attributes highlighted in the partnership statement could equally apply to individual organisations, though each excels in different areas

## 4.5. Summary of Recommendations

### Membership and Accountability

#### Short term

- The membership description of '*a group of international and regional NGOs in partnership with intergovernmental organizations*' should be maintained in order to accommodate NGO collaboration in policy advocacy.
- A phased approach to expanding membership should be taken with any further formal or new types of membership put on hold until WIO-C has gained more experience working as a consortium and the role and interest of such membership can be clarified

### Structure and Governance

#### Short term

- WIO-C formalise the establishment of a secretariat or coordination unit that should report to a Steering Committee (SC) comprising the some or all of the NGO members, and possibly a representative of WIO-C's IGO partners
- NGOs need to ensure their membership is endorsed by their own internal governance structures and put in place any internal consultative mechanisms needed to facilitate efficient decision making process at the steering committee level

#### Medium term

- There should be further provision for a multi-tiered membership structure allowing international NGOs and other member organisations to participate within their limits
- If WIO-C expands its membership to national and local organisations it should develop clear mechanisms to anticipate and meet their expectations including, potentially, for direct funding

### Secretariat

#### Short term

- A clear mandate, terms of reference and general workplan should be developed and the coordinator should report to the steering committee.

#### Medium term

- Specific procedures for levying of direct and indirect overheads on WIO-C project should be developed, including relating to the issue of management fees/overhead due to the host organisation
- In order to facilitate grant / project based fundraising, WIO-C should to formalise a long term hosting arrangement with a suitable member in order to provide the necessary accounting guarantees

## Further Reading

Humphrey 2009. *PRCM Lessons for WIO-C: A Discussion Document, Draft 1*, 31 July 2009.

Humphrey 2009. *Shaping the Future of WIO-C Results of a Survey to WIO-C members and other conservation NGOs active in the WIO-C Region Summary of Responses*, 30 April 2009.

WIO-C (UNEP), 2006. *Report of the Meeting of the Partners' Consultative Forum for the Conservation of Marine Ecosystems in Western Indian Ocean, hosted by UNEP from 31 August to 1 September 2006*. UNEP, Nairobi.

WIO-C (IUCN), 2007. *Draft Guiding Principles for the Consortium for Conservation of Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in the Western Indian Ocean*.

WIO-C. 2008. *Minutes of the WIO-LaB Partners Meeting and WIO-C meeting*, Cape Town, South Africa. 19 November 2008.

WIO-C, 2008. *Statement to the UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB Regional Stakeholder Workshop on the Development of a Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the Protection of the Western Indian Ocean Coastal and Marine Environment from Land-based Sources and Activities*, Cape Town – 21 November 2008.

WIO-C (CORDIO), 2009. *Charter*, Draft 2, 30 July 2009

WIO-C. 2009. *Report of the WIO-C Meeting of 10 June 2009*, Mombasa, Kenya.

WIO-C, 2009. *Statement to the Regional Stakeholders Workshop on the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) focused on Land-based Sources and Activities in the Western Indian Ocean Region, on the Contribution of NGOs in the implementation of the WIO-LaB SAP*, Mombasa – 12 June 2009.

WIO-C, 2009. *Summary of WIO-C contributions to WIO-LaB*, Draft 1, 16 July 2009, Excel/PDF, 4pp.

Younge, A. 2006. *Towards an Integrated Programme for Marine Conservation in the Western Indian Ocean: Priorities for Collaborative Action and Co-Ordination Mechanisms. Report on Survey of Stakeholders' Views. (July 2006). Report to UNEP & WWF*.

WWF, 2007. *Conservation of Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in Western Indian Ocean Streamlined through a New Consortium Launched Today in Johannesburg*. WWF Press release, Johannesburg, 6 November 2007.

## Acknowledgments

This report is based on the contributions and support of the following:

Representatives of WIO-C members and partners - Hadley Becha (EAWLS), Gina Bonne (IOC), Julius Francis (WIOMSA), Jane Gaithuma (Birdlife international), Emma Greatrix (Wetlands International), Ali Kaka (EAWLS/IUCN), Nyawira Muthiga (WCS), Oliver Naswira (Wetlands International), Amani Ngusaru (WWF), David Obura (CORDIO), Ross Wanluss (Birdlife International), Dixon Waruinge (Nairobi Convention) and the late Abdulrahman Issa (IUCN).

WIO-LaB programme - Peter Scheren (UNEP WIO-LaB) and Johnson Kitheka (WIO-LaB)

WIO-C Meeting observers - Anjan Datta (UNEP GPA), Margareth Kyewalyanga (IMS), James Stapley (ASCLMEs), Amanda Younge Hayes (SAP Facilitator)

Amber Luong, WIO-C intern at CORDIO who developed the text of the WIO-C Charter

PRCM correspondents - Ahmed Senhoury, Mama Dagou Diop, Emma Greatrix, Paul Siegel, Mathieu Ducrocq

## Appendix 1. Outline /Contents for Operational Guidelines

NOTE: This expanded outline is based on the original IUCN draft (draft 1), the survey results and above discussion. It is proposed that individual elements are agreed before this is prepared in a more narrative form.

### MEMBERSHIP

#### Members

##### a. Who

Membership

- International and regional NGOs

Other criteria – (geographic, thematic, administrative)

- Active in one or more countries of the region
- Activities relevant to WIO-C Mission
- Registered address or other legal presence in one or more countries of the region
- *Operating for at least X years?*

##### b. Responsibilities

- To nominate an individual to serve as the principal point of contact for WIO-C activities
- To report annually to the principle coordination body of WIO-C on activities related to WIO's overall purpose and/or programme;
- To attend WIO-C meetings regularly
- To participate actively in the work of the consortium including in development and implementation of joint initiatives
- To contribute to development and review of WIO-C communication materials.
- Provide information updates
- Anything else? E.g. contribute to agreed elements of biannual or annual work programme?

##### c. Joining arrangements

- Approval by *Steering Committee?*
- Letter of adhesion with reference to Charter
- *Should it acknowledge and accept responsibilities as per current operational guidance?*
- Membership may be withdrawn by a registered letter to the secretariat
- *Provision to ask members to withdraw? (e.g. if blocking progress through inactivity or repeated dissent from majority positions?)*

#### Partners

##### a. Who

- IGOs /Programmes of IGOs

*Other provisions as above- perhaps reduced responsibilities?*

#### Other

- Include provision for further members – national NGOs, CBOs?
- Include provision for distinction of core and wider membership (cf. PRCM 'programme partners' and 'members'?)

- Include provision for other types of collaboration – supporters?

## **SECRETARIAT**

### **a. Staffing**

- Need for a dedicated role on at least a part time basis (Indicative minimum commitment – 10%)
- If this is done on a voluntary basis, need for letter of authorisation of line manager (linked to hosting arrangement?)

### **b. Reporting /Accountability to Steering Group**

(See responsibilities for practical detail)

### **c. Responsibilities/ mandate of the Secretariat**

The secretariat is responsible for supporting the core functions of the Consortium. Specifically, the roles and responsibilities of the secretariat include:

- Managing all documentation and records relating to the Consortium and act as a repository;
- Facilitating and keeping track of member recruitment to the Consortium;
- Convening meetings: Coordinating virtual discussions, meetings of the steering committee and other meetings, acting as secretary for all steering committee meetings, developing agendas, preparing and distributing minutes and other documents and handling necessary logistics;
- Acting as a communication centre and a conduit for information flow;
- Acting as the official *spokesperson* of the steering committee and the Consortium;
- Facilitating the development of an [annual][biennial] work programme for the Consortium for approval by the SC;
- Keeping track or and reporting on progress against the annual workplan, including compiling contributions of members;
- *Where appropriate*, developing and managing budgets, keeping accounts and producing financial reports for the Consortium core functions;
- *Where appropriate*, leading fundraising efforts in close consultation with the Steering Committee.

### **d. Secretariat Funding**

- In the short term the secretariat host will cover staff and basic infrastructure (communications) costs;
- The Consortium shall seek to secure donor funding specifically for secretariat costs;
- [Include provision for nominal membership contribution]
- Include provisions for sharing of an overhead/management fee (with host organisation for projects and enabling activities implemented by the secretariat; with implementing organisation for all other projects initiated under the WIO- umbrella)
- General guidance: Where possible an element of direct costs should be factored into project budgets

*Provision for a detailed manual of procedures, to be developed in the event that funding from one or more external donors is channelled through the secretariat*

### **e. Hosting arrangements**

- A basic hosting agreement should be formalised on a renewable one year basis, with provision to extend this basis should this be a requirement for longer term WIO-C funding.

Criteria: The host

- Should be a founder member of the consortium
- Should accept the independent nature of the secretariat and its accountability to the steering committee

- Should have the necessary administrative infrastructure to provide financial management and reporting on behalf of the Consortium
- Should be in a position to provide basic infrastructure (suitable office space, communication infrastructure) for at least one secretariat staff member, whether part or full time

*Direct costs of hosting the secretariat will be factored into the consortium budget as and when this becomes feasible, possibly on a stepped basis. Indirect costs will be based on a management fee on funds managed on behalf of WIO-C. (See reference to manual of procedures above).*

## **GOVERNANCE**

### **a. Steering Committee**

- A Steering Committee will be established as the main decision making body of the consortium
- Membership of the Steering Committee will comprise all full members of the Consortium
- The Steering Committee will
  - Set strategic direction for the consortium, including on the advice of the partners group and assembly
  - Take overall responsibility for the day-to-day guidance of the Consortium and Secretariat activities, including through approval of an [annual][ biannual] work programme and of new initiatives
  - Etc?

### **b. Decisions**

- Majority decision making regarding operational issues (Could expand e.g.. all present at a meeting may suffice if at least 2/3 present)
- Need for consensus on any joint policy positions and communications
- Members commit to put in place a mechanism for streamlined decision making should decisions need to be referred to their headquarters or other body.
- *Define roles (as secretariat above)?*

### **b. Future development of governance structures**

- *Include provision for a two tiered structure (e.g. SC and forum or assembly) if membership expands;*
- *The assembly should set strategic direction and approve any work programme (cf. PRCM)*
- *Include provision for representation of the 'partners group'*
- *Include provision to review SC membership as new members join (Number of SC members should not exceed 8?, Plus aim for representation).*
- *Include provision to nominate a WIO-C chairperson? (is this needed, or per meeting?)*

### **c. Meetings**

- Scheduled SC meetings at least annually, but twice annually if possible, where possible linked to appropriate events
- SC agenda to be developed in advance through secretariat (or as delegated), both members and partners may propose agenda items
- Secretariat responsible for (delegation of) SC minutes, to be circulated within four weeks
- Partners participate equally in discussions
- Observers may be invited to part or all of SC meetings (e.g. donors, programme collaborators, potential members), observers may be invited to contribute speak by the chair but priority is given to members and partners
- The SC reserves the right to hold a closed meeting

- Opportunistic meetings of working groups may be organised and should be announced in advance where feasible. They should be open to all members and a brief written report should be circulated within two weeks of the meeting
- Include provision for assembly meetings

## **WORK PROGRAMME**

### **a. General**

- Current text: The Consortium shall seek to set a programme of work that builds on and reinforces those of member organizations without duplicating these. [The initial focus of the Consortium is on information exchange, which should serve as a framework for improving coordination between organisations as well as non-governmental and governmental processes].
- An [annual][biennial] work programme will be developed by the Secretariat in consultation with members for approval by SC (include provision for assembly approval?)
- The Programme will be
- The work programme may include strategic initiatives such as advocacy/policy influence, communications, reporting, or input to regional events as well as projects.
- Expand on level of definition – overall direction, thematic priorities, and short term ‘pushes’

### **b. Criteria for new initiatives**

- Fit to mission and work programme of WIO-C
- Existing competence and interest of the members
- Scope for regional action
- Comparative advantage offered by working together as a consortium, and,
- Low likelihood of countries taking the initiative in these areas.

### **c. Process to develop and implement initiatives**

- The SC may delegate leadership in project development, fundraising and implementation to any member or partner based on their specific experience and competences; this would usually be the partner who identifies and initiates the activity.
- Any member may instigate discussion and cooperation around a new initiative, ideally this should be shared by email at the soonest opportunity. If needed the SC will meet virtually (phone or other means) to determine whether a new initiatives should be part of the work programme (ref general criteria, fit to current workplan, timeliness, implications for effort and fundraising *vis à vis* planned activities etc)
- Not all initiatives of individual or groups of partners will necessarily be adopted as part of the consortium programme: in this case they should not be represented as such
- The secretariat will keep track of funding approaches and in the event of conflict (multiple requests to a single donor) will liaise with the SC to develop a combined approach
- Temporary task groups may be established (e.g proposal development)

## **REVISION OF OPERATIONAL GUIDANCE**

- Provision for changing of arrangements based on propositions from the steering committee or secretariat on behalf of members (.ie. based on a consultative process)