Terms of reference for the mid-term review of IUCN’s project: Rio Doce Panel

November 2019

Introduction and Evaluation Background

The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), founded in 1948, is the world’s oldest and largest environmental organisation. Conserving biodiversity is central to the mission of IUCN. The goal of the organisation is to demonstrate how biodiversity is fundamental to addressing some of the world’s greatest challenges such as climate change, sustainable development and food security. IUCN works toward its mission by developing hundreds of conservation projects all over the world from the local level to those involving several countries, all aimed at the sustainable management of biodiversity and natural resources. Since the early 2000s, IUCN has established and managed a variety of Independent Scientific and Technical Advisory Panels (ISTAPs) to deliver credible and robust advice to third parties in a manner that is transparent, accountable and scientifically rigorous. Through this mechanism, IUCN helps third parties addressing complex and often contentious issues concerning natural resource use through bringing together internationally recognised experts that provide unbiased scientific advice to reduce a project’s impacts on nature and identify new solutions that can contribute to conservation, while meeting economic and development goals.

In 2015, the collapse of the Fundão tailings dam, part of the Samarco iron ore mine in the Brazilian State of Minas Gerais resulted in 19 deaths, and severely impacted the local communities and environment in the Rio Doce watershed. The spill ran approximately 670 river kilometres, from the Samarco mine through the Rio Doce basin to eventually reach the Atlantic Ocean, affecting towns, villages, farms and fisheries along the way.

Following the accident, the Renova Foundation was created by Samarco's shareholders, the global mining companies BHP and Vale, to oversee the implementation of the remediation and compensation programme agreed by the government, companies and communities. The Renova Foundation then asked IUCN to establish an ISTAP to provide them with expert advice on the environmental and socio-economic restoration efforts in the area.

Through a 5 year contract with the Renova Foundation, the Rio Doce Panel (RDP)¹ was established in mid 2017 and has since operated through monthly virtual meetings and bi-annual face-to-face meetings and field visits. The RDP consults stakeholders and technical references, defines priority themes to work on and produces thematic reports and issues papers with objective recommendations to the Renova Foundation and interested parts for the recovery of the Rio Doce Basin. All of the work is done with the support and under the coordination of IUCN.

Rationale for the mid-term review

This midterm review fulfills the IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Policy to conduct an independent midterm review (MTR) for the purpose of learning and reflection on project management and early results.

Objectives of the mid-term review

The mid-term review should explore RDP’s work and achievements and IUCN support with the aim of providing guidance on how to maximize the potential for achieving the intended results and improve learning in its remaining timeframe (2022). Through the assessment of the progress, performance, achievements and lessons learnt to date, the review will contribute to both learning and accountability.

¹ See Annex 1 for panel member composition
The specific objectives of the mid-term review are:

- To assess the **relevance** of the RDP to its stakeholders and to the priority issues for biodiversity conservation in the Rio Doce basin.
- To assess the **effectiveness** of the RDP at achieving its objectives and provide clear insights about what has and hasn’t worked so far and why.
- To assess the **sustainability** and **potential impact** of the RDP process and provide some indication about how the project is progressing towards delivering on its Theory of Change.
- To assess the **adherence** of the RDP to the ISTAP core principles and support to it from IUCN.
- To assess the **efficiency** in terms of value for money of the delivery of the RDP outputs.
- To **identify lessons** and provide set of **actionable recommendations** on how the project and the project coordination/management could be adjusted for further improvement and to strengthen delivery on the ToC.

The key evaluation questions for the mid-term review are:

**Relevance:**
1. To what extent does the work of the RDP address the priority issues?
   1.1. To what extent is the panel composition fit-for purpose?
   1.2. How relevant is the RDP, and in particular its recommendations, advice and other outputs:
       a. To the conservation goal of restoring the Rio Doce basin?
       b. To the Renova Foundation?
       c. To regulators and policy makers?
       d. To do-ers and influencers?

**Effectiveness:**
2. What can we learn from the way the RDP is operating and supported by IUCN?
   2.1. How effective is the RDP’s modus operandi? Is the panel provided with the adequate resources and support from IUCN to deliver on its outputs? What has and what hasn’t worked well so far? How have the problems encountered been resolved?
   2.2. How effective are the strategies in place in reaching out and influencing the RDP targeted audiences? What factors have contributed to accelerate or hinder the uptake of the RDP recommendations by its targeted audience(s)?
   2.3. To what extent is the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) strategy and tools set up helping to (a) answer key guiding questions, (b) detect any needed programme implementation adjustments for better progress towards results, and (c) collect the right kind of data in view of conducting an impact evaluation by the end of the project? What adjustments to the MEL system are recommended to help understand impact of the RDP?

**Sustainability and impact:**
3. To what extent is the project set up to deliver on its Theory of Change (ToC)?
   3.1. To what extent does the RDP meet Renova’s expectation in terms of providing timely and actionable recommendations? To what extent does Renova meet the RDP’s expectation in terms of providing timely and constructive feedback on their recommendations?
   3.2. What are the early markers that demonstrate that the RDP’s recommendations are adopted by the Renova foundation? Is there any evidence of these recommendations being presently implemented on the ground? What are the major barriers that prevent the RDP’s recommendations from being adopted or implemented?
   3.3. What are the early markers of the RDP’s influence on regulators and policy makers? On the do-ers and on the influencers?
3.4. To what extent have external factors influenced the work of the RDP? Are there any positive or negative unintended results caused by the work of the panel that can be demonstrated? To what extent may these unintended results affect the future work of the RDP?

Adherence to ISTAP criteria:

4. To what extent is the RDP adhering to the ISTAP core principles²?

4.1. To what extent is the RDP maintaining Independence? Transparency? Accountability? Engagement?
4.2. What are the factors that contribute to or diminish Independence? Transparency? Accountability? Engagement?
4.3. What measures (policies, procedures, etc) would be appropriate to ensure adherence of the RDP to the ISTAP principles?

Efficiency

5. To what extent are the RDP outputs in balance with the level of effort, time and resources spent?

5.1. Have spending and project delivery progressed according to the planned schedule?
5.2. Are there less costly ways of achieving the same outputs?

Audience for the review

The primary audiences for the review are Renova Foundation, Rio Doce Panel, IUCN’s Global Business and Biodiversity Programme and the staff from the IUCN Brazilian Programme offices involved in the project. Other audience could include Samarco’s shareholders and the global mining companies BHP and Vale. The review will be made available to the public on IUCN’s website.

More specifically, the intended users and uses of the review are:

- The RDP Project Coordinators and Managers in IUCN’s global and regional programmes and in Renova Foundation, for the purpose of managing the project, and in particular, for making adjustments to improve delivery of outcomes;
- The members of the Panel, for the purpose of improving the effectiveness and efficiency of their work
- The IUCN Monitoring and Learning team, for the purpose of improving the RDP monitoring and learning approach;
- The Global Directors and Director General at IUCN, for the purpose of gathering lessons to inform future project design and implementation of other ISTAP projects

Methodology

This evaluation will be carried out in conformity with the IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (2015)³, which sets out IUCN’s institutional commitment to evaluation, and the criteria and standards for the evaluation and evaluation of its projects, programmes and organizational units. IUCN’s evaluation standards and criteria are based on the widely accepted OECD DAC Evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The evaluator(s) is expected to develop an evaluation framework based on the suggested key evaluation questions above but may suggest additional questions or modifications. The inception report will be prepared as the first deliverable of the evaluation and will include an evaluation matrix⁴ presenting how the key issues will be addressed, the data sources and the data collection methods that will be used for the evaluation and a set of criteria to rate the strength of the evidence collected.

---

² See Annex document submitted in annex 4 for more information on the four core principle
³https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/content/documents/the_iucn_monitoring_and_evaluation_policy_2015.pdf
⁴ See annex 2 for draft evaluation matrix
Adequately addressing the key evaluation questions will be the basis for IUCN to sign off on the completeness of the evaluation report.

All data collection tools are to be included as annexes to the final evaluation report. The link between evaluation questions, data collection, analysis, findings and conclusions must be clearly made and set out in a transparent manner in the presentation of the evaluation findings. Conclusion and recommendations should be underpinned by a strong set of evidences.

The evaluation will seek the views of the range of stakeholders who have been engaged in the process to date\(^5\) to conclude whether the project is on track and expected to realise its set objectives.

The evaluator(s) is expected to use mixed methods, including:
- Review of relevant documentation from the project\(^6\);
- At least 10 interviews of key stakeholders (list to be provided at inception);
- Field visits to the Rio Doce basin (location to be visited and list of people to be meet to be provided at inception);
- Other methods may be proposed as needed and as project resources allow, e.g. surveys or focus group.

**Schedule and deliverables**

The evaluation will run from January to end of May 2020. The expected outputs are:
- An inception report including refined key evaluation questions, revised evaluation matrix; approach to sampling stakeholders and field activities, work plan and schedule.
- A draft 20 page evaluation report.
- A final 20 page evaluation report.
- A webinar on key findings, including 15 slides summary presentation of key findings

The 20 page evaluation report is expected to follow the format below:

A. Title page including project identification details
B. Executive Summary (including at a minimum the methodology, findings and recommendations)
C. Table of Contents
D. List of Abbreviations and Acronyms
E. A short introduction to project/programme – context and description
F. Purpose of the Evaluation
G. Evaluation Issues and Questions
H. Methodology (including approach to data analysis)
I. Findings - organized according to the key evaluation questions
J. Conclusions and lessons learned
K. Recommendations – actionable recommendations clearly linked to findings and lessons
L. Appendices

Appendices must include: Evaluation terms of reference; Data collection instruments; Evaluation schedule/timetable (including field visits); List of people met/interviewed; Documents consulted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone / deliverable</th>
<th>Indicative completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of Evaluation consultant</td>
<td>05 January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date and evaluator appointed</td>
<td>20 January 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) See indicative list in annex 3
\(^6\) See list in annex 4
Qualifications of the Evaluator(s)

IUCN requires an evaluator or a team of evaluators with experience in assessing change in complex systems and with extensive expertise and knowledge in the field of governance, water and ecosystem management, landscape approach, or social science, or a combination thereof, applied to policy instruments and practice.

In addition, the consultant or lead consultant shall have:

- At least 10 years’ experience as an evaluator with demonstrated quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis skills, with proven record of conducting formative, process and impact evaluation;
- Proven experience in evaluating similar projects;
- Complete independence from IUCN, the Renova Foundation and the Panel members;
- English and Portuguese language fluency.
- Women are strongly encouraged to apply. IUCN is an equal opportunity employer and the successful candidate will be selected based on merit.

Budget

The available budget for this review is USD25’000, exclusive of travel and accommodation expenses. All travel will require prior approval of IUCN. Proof of travel in the form of economy class tickets with the most direct routes and other necessary receipts will be required for reimbursements.

The evaluator(s) shall be paid by IUCN upon completion of the following milestones:

- 30% upon signing of the contract
- 30% after presentation of the draft report
- 40% after the approval of the final reports

Submission

We welcome applications from Organisations and/or individual Consultants.

a) Personal CV of the Evaluator that will prepare and lead the activities, indicating all relevant past experiences and main competencies; CVs of any other person to be involved in the evaluation should also be submitted

b) A brief description (max 2 pages) of why the Evaluator or the Evaluator’s team is the most suitable for the assignment, including a short description of the plan and methods envisaged to meet the mid-term review objectives.

c) A short budget description that demonstrates that the assignment will be done within the budget envelope

d) The Evaluator or the Evaluator’s team will need to confirm that they are not subject to any executive control from IUCN, Renova and the Panel member’s and that they don’t have any personal relationship with anyone working in one of these institutions. Applicant who will not confirm their independence will be disqualified.
How to apply?
The interested candidates, who meet the above mentioned criteria, may send their application to: BBPPanel@iucn.org with the Subject “RDP Mid Term Evaluation” no later than 05th January 2020.
Annex 1: Members of the Rio Doce Panel

- **Yolanda Kakabadse**, Chair of the Rio Doce Panel. Former President of IUCN, former Ecuadorian Minister of Environment; lives in Quito, Ecuador. **GOVERNANCE**

- **Francisco Barbosa**, PhD, Deputy Chair of the Panel, Professor of Freshwater Ecology and Limnology in the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), lives in Belo Horizonte, Brazil. **FRESHWATER BIOLOGY**

- **Christianne Maroun**, DSc, Professor of Environmental Engineering at PUC-Rio and Environmental Management and Sustainability at FGV, lives in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. **WATER MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTRY**

- **Luis E. Sánchez**, PhD, Professor of Mining Engineering at Escola Politécnica, University of São Paulo; lives in São Paulo, Brazil. **ENGINEERING AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

- **Luiza Alonso**, EdD, former Professor of Sociology, at Brasilia Catholic University; member of FUNDHAM (Fundação Museu do Homem Americano); lives in Brasilia. **HEALTH, ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIAL JUSTICE**

- **Maria Cecilia Wey de Brito**, MSC, Member of EKOS Brasil Institute; Former Secretary of Biodiversity and Forests of the Ministry of the Environment of Brazil, lives in São Paulo, Brazil. **LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT AND BIODIVERSITY**

- **Peter H. May**, PhD, Professor at the Department of Development, Agriculture and Society of the Federal Rural University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRRJ), lives in New York, USA. **NATURAL RESOURCES AND ECOLOGICAL ECONOMY**
Annex 2: Draft evaluation matrix, to be completed at inception by the evaluator:

Completing and finalizing the evaluation matrix, particularly the sub-questions, should draw on the learning questions identified in the MEL strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>Subquestions</th>
<th>Data sources/ data collection methods</th>
<th>Results Summary</th>
<th>Rubrik for Evidence rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Indicative list and contact of stakeholders who have been engaged in the process to date

To be shared once the evaluator has been selected
Annex 4: Indicative list of key project documents

- Contract between Renova and IUCN
- TTAC and TTAC2
- Panel TORs
- MEL Strategy and other MEL material (spreadsheet, tools, etc)
- Panel recruitment material
- All Panel publications
- RPD Project Board meeting minutes
- All Panel meeting minutes
- Work plans
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Points available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Quality of the Expression of Interest</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the assignment</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach and capacity to address each of the five key questions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods proposed</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Qualifications of the evaluator(s)</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the evaluator(s)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E expertise</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language skills</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Budget</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>