

Evaluation Management Response Template

Management Response – Rio Dolce Panel Final Evaluation – January 2023

JANUARY 2023

Objective of the evaluation

This final evaluation fulfils the IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Policy to conduct an independent final evaluation for the purpose of assessing the results of the intervention. It is expected that the findings and recommendations of this final evaluation will help to inform future decisions such as whether to pursue additional interventions, to scale up existing interventions, or to replicate this project elsewhere. The external evaluation should also help IUCN identify key lessons learned that could be used for the development of future project proposals and improve the implementation of future interventions.

The Process

- Preparation of the final evaluation started in late 2021 and an RfP was issued on 24 January 2022. The RfP was issued as an open procedure, in accordance with the IUCN's Policy on Procurement of Goods and Services . Deadline for Submission was 21 February 2022.
- M. Meijer won the contract over two other competitors. Contract was signed by both parties on 04 April 2022. A junior consultant, Ms Gerzeli Pitre was later contracted in August 2023 to support M. Meijer in conducting this evaluation. A professional copy editor was finally contracted in December 2022 to proofread and edit the final report.
- The inception meeting took place in April 2023. The first draft report was received in August 2023 and revised several times until it was finally accepted by IUCN in December 2022.

Strength of the report

- The report confirmed the high level of relevance of the RDP in the context of the Rio Doce basin reparatory process. The report notably highlighted the consensus among key stakeholders that the Panel was able to play a role that no other actor involved in reparatory process was able to mainly because of its independent status and its focus on providing landscape-scale perspective and innovative long term solutions.
- The report highlighted the fruitful collaboration of the Panel and the Renova Foundation established and maintained throughout the 5 years of the project implementation despite the evolving political context and staff turnover among the organisations. It also highlighted IUCN's convening power and the role it played in fostering dialogues, knowledge sharing, brainstorming, problem-solving and new knowledge creation.
- The report captured the use of the RDP's recommendations by the Renova Foundation and other actors (only partially), which confirms some of the output to outcome causal pathways identified during the development of the project Theory of Change.

Challenge posed by the report and areas of disagreement

The report had a number of challenges, which have limited its utility.

- In general, the report failed to fully appreciate the role of the Panel and the particular arrangements that shaped its *modus operandi*. The independent status of the RDP and the fact that it worked toward developing and bringing an integrated and long-term vision for the restoration of the basin clearly separate its work from the work a normal consultant would do. In this sense, the mandate of the Panel was not to address concrete demands of very practical nature but to challenge the Renova Foundation to develop and implement an integrated outcomes-based strategy.
- The report did not fully appreciate how the situation changed over time with the involvement of the public prosecutors, judicialization of the context and Covid. A better integration of these changes in the analysis of the findings and the development of the recommendation would have benefited the report and the crafting of recommendations that would have certainly helped IUCN with the establishment and management of future ISTAP.
- IUCN is open to critics and willing to build on it to improve its work as long as they are perceive as constructive and supported by adequate evidence. Unfortunately, several findings of the report lacked sufficient qualification or evidence to be considered as meaningful and therefore limited their interest and future use.
- On several aspects, the report failed to bring additional value to some of the findings already elaborated during the Mid-term review. IUCN see this a lost opportunity in terms of crystallising some of the challenges faced by the RDP into clear and well-articulated learning statements.
- The report failed to consider some instances of influence that the Panel has had on different audiences which limited its capacity to fully measure and appreciate the impact of the Panel on other actors than the Renova Foundation.

IUCN use of the report and its recommendation

IUCN's welcome the eight (8) recommendations put forward by the evaluators as the basis for the establishment and management of future ISTAP.

The Enterprise and Investment Team will lead the implementation and tracking of the actions to implement the recommendations below and will count on the support of several other units named here with shared responsibility for the actions and intended results. Every individual/unit requested to act (listed below) has been consulted and commented on this response and agreed on the planned actions. The final evaluation is available here to review.

Project identification data			
Project title:	Rio Doce Panel		
Date started:	September 2017	Registration n°:	P02516
Date closed:	- April 30, 2023		
Project manager:	Programme/office:		
Stephen Edwards	Enterprise and Investment Team	Centre for Economy and Finance, Gland	

Management Response Summary Data	
Name of evaluation or midterm review: Rio Doce Panel Project Final Evaluation	Unit/person responsible for managing/tracking follow-up: Joao Leal – RDP MEL officer; Steve Edwards – RDP project manager
Date received: 13 December 2022	
Date Management Response approved: Last updated:	Units/individuals requested to take action: Enterprise and Investment Team (IUCN) The Rio Doce Panel (RDP) The Renova Foundation (RF)

Recommendation	Management response	Intended Result	Actions planned (including timeframe)	Completed Actions (progress update)
<i>List each recommendation from the report, one per row.</i>	<i>e.g. Agree, partially agree or disagree (explain as needed)</i>	<i>What is the intended result of the action you plan to take?</i>	<i>Actions should be SMART</i>	
<p>Sustainability of Rio Doce Panel's results</p> <p>1. IUCN to adopt strategies and platforms in order to guarantee continued access and use of the documents, knowledge and recommendations generated by RDP, as well as continued promotion of the work in a proactive manner:</p> <p>(i) Organising workshops and events by IUCN, with the objective of disseminating the main recommendations made by the Panel over the years. The workshops could be presented by the RDP members. Municipalities of the Rio Doce Basin, mining companies, governmental spaces should be targeted;</p> <p>ii) establish partnerships with different institutions, such as universities, public services and researchers, so that the material produced will remain easily available, and can be used for activities in the Rio Doce Basin, areas with similar problems and for policy making.</p>	<p>Partially Agree. IUCN will continue to display and provide access to the Panel documents and will also encourage Renova to do so. However, the closure of the Panel hampers the creation of new partnerships with other stakeholders.</p>	<p>IUCN Secretariat is making efforts to continue publicizing the Rio Doce Panel's work by itself and in partnership with Renova Foundation.</p>	<p>Until the end of the Panel lifespan, IUCN Secretariat is still producing web stories about the Panel's work in specific topics – as part of the planned activities).</p>	<p>Renova and IUCN Secretariat organized a series of events discussing TR02, TR03, and TR04 called <i>Conhecimento em Pauta</i>, which helped to disseminate the Panel's work and upload them into Renova's platform. For the launch of TR05, IUCN held a webinar to present TR05, also publicly available through Youtube. The Renova's responses to the recommendations is also publicly available in the projects page, on IUCN website.</p>
<p>Sustainability of Rio Doce Panel's results</p> <p>2. IUCN should consider strengthening its team in Brazil and maintain part of its national staff dedicated to the mission of making the work done by the RDP over the years visible. As a consequence, over the coming months, IUCN could create more spaces of interaction to promote synergies and influence with key stakeholders other than Renova, such as mining companies and state and federal governments (Ministry of the Environment).</p>	<p>Agree. Throughout the last years of the Panel, IUCN is taking active measures to strengthen Brazil's office and is prospecting new projects in collaboration with IUCN Sur.</p>	<p>To continue IUCN's team in Brazil it is necessary to prospect new partners, maintain a good relationship with the national membership, and create regional and global support for a robust institutional presence.</p>	<p>In terms of institutional support, there are planned trips from IUCN's Director General and Regional leadership in early 2023 that will help strengthen Brazil's office. Furthermore, there will be a closing meeting with Renova Foundation to discuss joint future plans.</p>	<p>IUCN has been prospecting new partnerships and projects in Brazil, all currently under negotiation.</p>
<p>For future ISTAPs</p> <p>3. IUCN should consider the possibility of including a professional on future ISTAP projects to take care only of the liaison between the ISTAP and all the key stakeholders. This will allow the Panel to understand the needs of the institutions and adapt its approach, as well as gaining influence</p>	<p>Agree. In face of the complexity of stakeholders in the Rio Doce reparation process a more active institutional reach out was necessary. This absence would have been mitigated with a National Coordinator, but IUCN Brazil lacked this role.</p>	<p>IUCN needs to internalize the need to promote better institutional relations, especially in complex scenarios in future ISTAPs. This is critical to promote ISTAP independence and should be independent of the engagement with Donor organizations.</p>	<p>This recommendation (and others) will be included in the IUCN Procedures for the establishment of an ISTAP and will be reinforced internally in the creation process of future ISTAPs.</p>	<p>-</p>

<p>For future ISTAPs</p> <p>4. While independence is a key characteristic of ISTAPs, as soon as this leads to the loss of relevance due to changing circumstances, it should not be absolute, and a certain degree of flexibility will help to remain relevant.</p>	<p>Partially Agree. The balance between independence and relevance with the donor must be assessed under each ISTAP.</p>	<p>To assess the trade-off between independence and relevance in future panels, ISTAPs have to rely on adaptative management procedures such as MEL frameworks, mid-term reviews and frequent meetings and discussions.</p>	<p>Two MEL reports are currently being produced to understand the Panel's work throughout its lifespan and to assess the MEL framework throughout these years. These reports will consider this recommendation.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>For future ISTAPs</p> <p>5. IUCN to consider the possibility of contracting some Panel members to work full time or to contract specific personnel according to specific needs. Agreements with universities could also improve flexibility and productivity.</p>	<p>Partially Agree. Depending on resources, time availability and productivity goals, IUCN should consider different ways to establish ISTAP membership.</p>	<p>To increase the productivity, quality, and areas of expertise of Panel members, IUCN should consider future ISTAPs and some possible scenarios in which a more flexible working structure would be a better option. That means the possibility of including temporary experts to address specific issues, or making partnerships with other research institutions.</p>	<p>This recommendation will be included in the ongoing discussions about the new ISTAP Procedures Guidelines, and taken into consideration for future ISTAPs.</p>	
<p>For future ISTAPs</p> <p>6. Ensure all key stakeholders are included at design stage and define how the ISTAP work can be optimised for its use by each institution.</p>	<p>Partially Agree. While key stakeholders' engagement is relevant and will be undertaken, consulting with all stakeholders at the design stage might be counterproductive and should be conducted in an <i>ad hoc</i> manner, with a few stakeholders.</p>	<p>Future ISTAPs should include a step to work on a stakeholder mapping and the development of a theory of change early-on, and use adaptive management tools to improve it along its lifespan.</p>	<p>This recommendation will be included in the ongoing discussions about the new ISTAP Procedures Guidelines, and taken into consideration for future ISTAPs.</p>	
<p>For Renova Foundation</p> <p>7. Renova to identify and establish approaches and partnerships that will enhance long-term holistic measures</p>	<p>Agree. Renova Foundation partners with several universities and the civic society in activities for the Rio Doce reparation.</p>	<p>Albeit Renova's partnerships with other institutions has a perennial nature to engage in well-defined scopes within the TTAC, Renova tries to establish long-term ties with other institutions to improve long-term results. Possible examples of these partnerships are Renova's relations with the Rio Doce Watershed Committee, Instituto Terra, agroecological cooperatives linked to MST, among others.</p>	<p>Renova wishes to strengthen long-term strategical partnerships for reparation efforts. One example is the partnership with UNESCO establish a participative monitoring water with citizen's engagements.</p>	
<p>For Renova Foundation</p> <p>8. Renova to use their central position in the reparatory process to include the Panel in the governance sphere, promoting better liaison between the IUCN/Panel and other institutions. Even with the imminent end of the Panel, Renova could act in consonance with IUCN (see recommendations above) to promote the dissemination of the Panel's work.</p>	<p>Partially Agree. Renova has reinforced multiple times the importance of RDP members and IUCN to establish a more active role in the reparation process. Renova does not have a management authority to ask for RDP's inclusion in governance sphere, and, with the end of the RDP, this part of the recommendation can not be implemented.</p>	<p>Renova maintains all RDP's documents in its institutional site and all of Renova's collaborators make reference when executing their actions (e.g.: when applying the impact assessment on coastal and marine biodiversity).</p>	<p>Renova will maintain the webinars and the "Conhecimento em Pauta" e-books in its Technical Information Center. Renova also keeps an open door to collaborate with IUCN's in any events and technical discussions.</p>	