



IUCN



Shell
Solutions
International



Shell
Solutions
BV

Evaluation of the IUCN– Shellcollabo 2014–2017

partnership,

SD. Turner

9 October 2017.

Preface

This is the report of an evaluation of the collaborative partnership between Shell Global Solutions International and IUCN, 2014 – 2017, commissioned by the Director General of IUCN and the Vice President, Environment, of Shell.

I wish to thank IUCN and Shell for this interesting assignment and especially to thank all those informants who generously took the time to provide information and opinions about the progress of the partnership. I hope that the report will prove useful in enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the partnership and helping the partners to achieve their joint objectives.

Stephen Turner

Manchester

9 October, 2017.

Contents

Preface

i

6.4	Governance and management	26
6.5	Communication	26
6.6	Summary partnership assessment	27
6.7	Summary of recommendations	30
Annex 1. Terms of reference		33
Annex 2. Review matrix		38
Annex 3. Persons interviewed		41
References		42

Tables

Table 1.	Summary partnership assessment	28
Table 2.	Summary of recommendations	30

communications about it. The external communications of the partnership are governed by a mix of conservatism and economy. It is difficult to know how effective these rather limited external communications are, as monitoring of website hits, for example, is incomplete. The WGWA and its story of Flex the whale was the most prominent communication success in the review period. Overall, it must be concluded that the contribution of public communication to the effectiveness of the partnership has been limited.

The governance of the partnership has been broadly satisfactory. Links with the IUCN Council's Private Sector Task Force will need to be revived when that body is reconvened.

Overall, management and coordination arrangements over the review period have facilitated efficient administration and implementation of the IUCN–Shell partnership. The experience and attitudes of the individuals involved have been more significant in this than the formal systems and procedures in use.

During the latter part of the review period, IUCN personnel were much absorbed in the (still ongoing) process of reforming the IUCN Programme. In planning the structure and contents of the next phase of the partnership, IUCN and Shell should seek to optimise the accountability, communication, management and reporting benefits that IUCN's changes should offer – in particular, exploring ways to build concepts that

One of the lessons from the technical collaborations of the review period was that IUCN's regional and country level resources– including their local networks and cultural insights– were not always optimally exploited. The partners should now explore the possibility of bringing one or more IUCN Regional or Country Offices into support for one or more of Shell's ten country specific energy transition planning processes.

IUCN and Shell should consider broader possibilities during the next phase for 'bringing new players to the table':

- x continued efforts to engage new (probably large scale)

The report concludes with application of a subjective summary partnership assessment tool that was also used in the 2010 evaluation of the partnership. This qualitative assessment confirms that the partnership has made substantial progress since 2010. Much remains to be done, and new challenges have become clearer during the review period. But IUCN and Shell stand on firm foundations as they consider a further phase of collaboration.

By way of summary, the table below provides a consolidated list of the recommendations made by this review, with explanatory comments where appropriate.

Report section	No.	Recommendation	Comment
6.2		The character, strategies and funding of the partnership	
	1	For both focused projects and conceptual or strategic work:	
		x formulate the work and its objectives	

Report section	No.	Recommendation	Comment
			for that consumption.
	10	Without necessarily waiting for a new Shell project through which to pilot it, the partners should keep NPI in the 'project funnel' and explore other ways of elaborating and applying the concept.	
	11	Re-examine the assumption that significant innovations like NPI	

Report section	No.	Recommendation	Comment
		management of the 'project funnel', ensuring it is always clear which ideas are where in it, and why.	
	19	Develop a simple system for documenting each item in and beyond the 'project funnel', from preliminary concepts to practical projects.	This should summarise the nature of the idea or activity, and periodically record significant activities and results.
6.5	Communication		
	20	Commit to a higher and more active communication profile in the next phase of the partnership.	This will, inevitably, mean increased resources.
	21	Renew the joint communication plan for 2018 and work systematically to implement and report on it.	
	22	For each partnership activity, the relevant technical and communication staff should produce periodic one page summaries for public communication.	This should help address the obvious fact that effective communications require useable material to communicate – and provide the necessary linkage between communications and learning.
	23	IUCN and Shell should reappraise their policies on communication and debate around partnership activities, and consider the limited use of social media as an additional communication medium in the next phase.	Action in this regard should of course take into account the partners' reasons for caution in this area.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Shell Global Solutions International BV (referred to hereafter as ‘Shell’) and IUCN (the International Union for Conservation of Nature) agreed the latest phase of their long running collaboration on 18 December 2013, to be effective from January 2014 to December 2017. This followed an earlier agreement signed in 2007, and a history of collaboration dating back to 1999, when Shell brought a number of NGOs together to discuss potential joint approaches to biodiversity conservation (Quaile et al., 2012:3). The report just cited summarised the work done through the partnership over the originally planned five years from 2007¹, as well as activities over the earlier period from 1999. In 2010, a mid term review of the agreement was undertaken (Turner, 2010).

As the current phase of the agreement nears its end, IUCN and Shell have agreed in principle to launch a further phase from January 2018. This evaluation is intended to support the planning of activities in the new phase, based on lessons learned since 2014.

1.2 Objectives and scope of the partnership

A concept note annexed to the 2013 partnership agreement stated that

In 2012, IUCN developed a new business engagement framework. The framework is based on lessons learned from the 2007–2013 partnership.

steering committee meetings) that the partners hold. The most comprehensive summary of activities was that presented to the July 2017 collaboration meeting (IUCN & Shell, 2017). It included the following.

- x Two major IUCN Independent Scientific and Technical Advisory Panels (ISTAPs; see IUCN, 2014). The Western Grey Whale Advisory Panel (WGWAP; see Martin Mehers, 2016) advises the Sakhalin Energy Investment Company (in which Shell has a minority holding). It was established in 2006. The Niger Delta Panel (NDP) worked with the Shell Petroleum Development Company (SPDC) in Nigeria from 2012 to 2017 (NDP 2013);
- x Joint efforts to develop broad concepts and strategies include exploration of nature based solutions (NBS), which have emerged as a key initiative for both organisations. IUCN defines them as “actions to protect, sustainably manage and restore natural or modified ecosystems, which address societal challenges (e.g. climate change, food and water security or natural disasters) effectively and adaptively, while simultaneously providing human well being and biodiversity benefits (Cohen & Shacham et al. (eds.), 2016: xii). Shell focuses on them as a means of capturing and storing CO₂ emissions through natural carbon sinks, such as forests and peatlands. IUCN and Shell have also worked on the concept of net positive impact (NPI), notably through an NPI Alliance with Rio Tinto, the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and The Nature Conservancy (TNC). This grouping disbanded in 2015 (section 3.2.2 below). The two organisations also collaborated on the concept of natural capital, piloting a Natural Capital Protocol in the Philippines in 2016. At a workshop in 2016, Shell and IUCN explored the concept of transformational change in biodiversity management, and whether the two organisations’ concepts and approaches in this area could contribute to each other (IUCN 2017a). This was a constructive discussion but it has not yet led to specific joint actions – discussions continue on how best to apply a potentially valuable concept (section 5.2).
- x On a smaller scale, there were joint efforts to develop or amend technical approaches in ~~apply~~ ~~continue~~ joint areas. There ~~is~~ ~~more~~

Evaluation of the IUCN-Shell

2 Relevance

2.1 Introduction

The key question posed about relevance by the TOR and the evaluation Matrix (Annexes 1 and 2) is “to assess the relevance and appropriateness of the scope and ambition of the IUCN”

Shell partnership performs – and it can make an important contribution – it can only be one factor among the many that influence the attitudes and performance of multinational extractive industries. While IUCN's intentions in engaging with the sector are endorsed, there is realism about the extent to which IUCN can 'transform' the sector's practice.

3 Effectiveness

3.1 Introduction

According to the TOR (Annex 1), a key question is “to assess the effectiveness of the partnership in achieving its intended results and explore the current factors that support and hinder the fulfilment of the Collaborative Partnership Agreement”. The following sections of this chapter address the main topics that the TOR set out under this key question, with section 3.2 addressing both “delivery against intended results” and “delivery of conservation results”. The sub-questions on effectiveness shown in the evaluation matrix (Annex 2) are reproduced in the box.

3.2 Delivery of intended results

The delivery of results is assessed in terms of the three ‘value drivers’ identified for the partnership. Complete empirical assessment of delivery against intended results is not possible because not all the joint activities were planned or reported against specific performance indicators.

3.2.1 Bringing science to bear

Strong results were achieved in terms of ‘bringing science to bear’ through the work of the two ISTAPs active during the review period. The NDP’s main report included a series of recommendations on the internal environmental management procedures of the Shell Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria (SPDC) on oil spill response procedures; on bio-remediation and rehabilitation procedures; and on social environmental strategy (IUCN Niger Delta Panel, 2013). These were elaborated in a series of technical annexes, in further publications on the management and adaptive monitoring of mangrove habitats, and in a recent scientific paper on land farming methods for the bio-remediation of Niger Delta soils affected by oil spills (Brown et al., 2017). Overall, it is too soon to assess how effectively the NDP’s work has achieved practical conservation results. But science was certainly ‘brought to bear’. The WGWA has a longer history in this regard, continued constructively during most of the review period after some difficulties leading up to the 2014 evaluation (Turner, 2014). Although Shell is a minority shareholder in the Sakhalin Energy Investment Company (SEIC), which is the WGWA’s principal point of technical contact, some key environmental personnel at SEIC are Shell staff. During the period covered by this review, the WGWA has reportedly become more agile in its operations: better able to hold meetings and give advice at short notice. The recent publication on its work was one of the highlights of the IUCN–Shell partnership’s public relations (Martin Mehers, 2016), with some of the Panel’s important contributions on seismic and noise issues summarised in Nowacek & Southall, 2016.

In this partnership, ‘bringing science to bear’ is the easy part of the task. Linking this to tangible results depends heavily on personal skills in the inevitable mediation between sponsors, producers and consumers of the science. Local operating companies such as SEIC and SPDC have to be willing and interested. This interest has to be facilitated and cultivated by diplomatic individuals who develop the required credibility with those companies’ technical staff and with ISTAPs. (IUCN–Shell Partnership Evaluation Report, 2017, p. 8)

of IUCN science has now been replaced by a local ‘pull’ from the operating company: a substantial achievement.

The partnership faces a more complex challenge in ‘bringing science to bear’ on the broader conceptual issues that it has been approaching, such as NBS and NPI. These are less amenable to the focused scientific inputs that ISTAP has tended to provide, and in which IUCN itself has mostly specialised. ‘Bringing science to bear’ at this conceptual scale is not a short term task. With

adoption and implementation of the NPI concept; policy work to institutionalise NPI as the benchmark for environmental performance by these industries; building broader awareness and understanding of NPI; and operationalising NPI in business practices (IUCN 2015a). Although substantial work was done to elaborate the NPI concept and the ways in which it might be applied, the NPI Alliance did not achieve these ambitious goals. Alliance participants, and others, recognised that NPI was an appropriate objective, but it was most feasibly tackled in new projects – of which there were fewer during the review period, for global economic reasons – and it proved hard to establish an unambiguous business case for it, despite its environmental merits (and a working paper on the business case: IUCN 2015b). There were also criticisms in some private sector quarters that IUCN was adopting too prescriptive an attitude, and that industry is unlikely to welcome what appears to be instructions from NGOs. An internal review of the NPI Alliance found that

The “why” was clear, but there were basic challenges in what the Alliance was trying to do. The theory of change and the long term goal were not clear. The NPI Alliance tried different tools, e.g. papers, databases, advocacy, projects on the ground. The group was not always completely aligned on what the products were.

It was also more difficult to share learning than expected. For example, the aim was to bring together lots of practical experience through the database but in reality, there were fewer experiences than expected. And even with those cases that were identified, these were challenged in how to talk about applying NPI in a consistent manner, how to document it and present it in a useful way.

The business case and conservation case papers are unique and still relevant outputs. However, they took a long time to deliver, including comment processes to make sure that they were scientifically credible. It could be said that “perfection became the enemy of the good”.

IUCN 2015a:3.

Echoing other instances in which IUCN’s private sector partners have wished for a more level playing field after adopting significant environmental measures (such as the WGWAP) Rio Tinto began to feel exposed in its NPI commitment. Shell, with its lack of new projects in which to pilot NPI, could not engage beyond the conceptual level. Ultimately, the partners decided not to continue with the Alliance, despite their belief in NPI as an appropriate and potentially viable concept. At the end of the review period, Shell continued to endorse the NPI concept, with the intention of applying it when a new project emerges for development; and there is potential for further IPIECA discussions of NPI to draw on the experience that Shell and IUCN have had in this area.

The December 2016 workshop on transformational change included country mapping work in which biodiversity conservation issues and opportunities were identified: not all of them directly linked to Shell operations. This created new potential for IUCN and Shell to reach out to other operators and encourage them to join them, formally or informally, in conservation efforts. But the opportunity created by the workshop has not yet been exploited. The partners continue to discuss the concept, which is potentially central to their commitment and strategy for change in the extractive industries. But by the time of this review, further steps to crystallise thinking had not yet occurred. With the limited time and resources available (in this case, IUCN is seen as responsible for the next move), delays in such conceptual development work are not unusual.

Through its ISTAPs (notably in Nigeria and Russia) the partnership has also had an influence on regulators, who have been engaged by these panels and responded, sometimes constructively, to their concerns. The Majnoon training programme also involves these officials and has been well received by them so far. Another indirect way in which the Shell/IUCN partnership has ‘brought other players to the table’ is the new Rio Doce Panel, established by IUCN in consultation with BHP, which owns 50% of the Samar mine in Brazil. Failure of a tailings dam at the mine in 2015 killed 19 people and caused extensive environmental damage (IUCN 2017b). High level contacts between Shell and BHP helped to assure the latter that an IUCN

ISTAR was a constructive way to address the Rio Doce issues. A chair has been selected for the new panel, and selection of members is currently under way. This ISTAR will report to a foundation set up by BHP and the other owners of Samarco to tackle the results of the dam collapse.

3.2.3 Bringing biodiversity to the attention of Shell's leadership

It is difficult to prove the extent to which Shell and IUCN have achieved this third 'value driver'. But informants are confident that almost two decades of collaboration between the organisations have indeed helped to bring biodiversity to the attention of Shell's leadership. This is the third of three modes of interaction between IUCN and Shell. The first is focused technical collaboration on specific projects – operational or conceptual. The second is informal technical consultation – the 'sounding board' function that was mentioned above – in which environmental and other managers in Shell may explore ideas and issues with their counterparts in IUCN, and IUCN can similarly seek inputs from Shell, through phone calls and meetings. Consultation like this may lead to ideas entering the 'project funnel' that the partners have developed for moulding and filtering them that may, in some cases, become funded joint activities. The third mode of interaction is at leadership level, where occasional calls or face-to-face meetings between senior executives may give direction to the partnership, address urgent issues, or determine how particular concepts or themes should be developed together. The Oil and Gas Climate Initiative of the ten major oil and gas producers is another forum for interaction at this level (OGCI 2017).

This third mode of interaction is irregular but significant. Both sides could probably make more of it, although it would be unrealistic to think of scheduling regular calls or meetings. But it is one of the two ways in which the partnership has helped to bring biodiversity to the attention of Shell's leadership. The other, of course, is through the company's internal management and reporting structures.

There is no doubt that Shell's leadership is well aware of the biodiversity issues with which the IUCN partnership is concerned. But these are only part of a broader set of concerns that will shape the whole future of the company: climate change, biodiversity, and the social licence to operate.

It is significant, in this regard, that the current phase of the partnership should have been presented in 2013 as aiming at a stronger focus. The agreement says that “future collaborations between Shell and IUCN need to be purposeful and targeted” (IUCN & Shell, 2013: 15), and internal communications (probably responding to Council concerns) referred to a revised relationship that would focus on specific issues where IUCN could make a practical difference. Four years later, IUCN and Shell informants confirm the importance of practical, targeted, operational activities, but also endorse the broader modes of interaction outlined above. A strict emphasis on focus, they have concluded, is too limiting. It would fail to deliver the full, sometimes intangible value that this now trusting relationship can offer.

Experience during the review period indicates that, for IUCN, effectiveness should be driven by a tension between modesty and ambition. On the one hand, as argued above, IUCN should not expect to transform Shell. On the other, work over the last 0.98aTj /TT3 1 to

Evaluation of the IUCN-Shell

for a price – to measure the frequency with which different communication channels and products are accessed – from website hits to viewings of a documentary, references to a publication or awareness of an advertisement, for example. Secondly, focused surveys or evaluations can research the extent to which policy and practice have changed in the desired directions, and how much stakeholders attribute any such shift to the communications in question.

Overall, it must be concluded that the contribution of public communication to the effectiveness of the partnership has been limited. This is partly because for the reasons outlined above, those communications have been limited.

efficiency of Shell's engagement in this partnership. There is regular working contact between IUCN and Shell staff at this level. Their formal monthly meetings do not happen quite monthly, but communication between the two teams is efficient.

The concept of secondments between the partner organisations did not progress during the review period. Opinions at management level were not uniformly positive in Shell or in IUCN. At one point when there did seem to be an opportunity to fund a secondment in the environmental economics field in 2016, there were problems in finalising the TOR and position description, and in identifying a suitable candidate, within the available window; and the opportunity passed. Earlier IUCN secondments to Shell either did not return to IUCN afterwards, or did so only briefly – diminishing the value of the exercise.

Limited resources both stimulate and impede efficiency in this relationship. The lack of staff time across the IUCN Secretariat is one reason, but only one reason, why the organisations sometimes seem slow to Shell. Some activities, including work on biofuels, NPI and Majnoon capacity development, have developed more slowly than expected, and sometimes inconclusively. Other reasons for IUCN's slow performance include the complex constitution of the organisation, meaning that multiple constituencies and offices often have to be consulted and committed; and its organisational personality – a mix of NGO, science and governments, with a dash of business stirred in. That makes achieving administrative efficiency a challenge. Conversely, for both Shell and IUCN, the limited funding available for their work together does help to focus minds, and has some effect in encouraging both sides to stay on their toes and do the best they can with what they have.

In this connection, it can be asked whether either or both sides can identify alternative, potentially smarter funding strategies for what they want to do together. This is certainly a matter for more thought – although IUCN is constantly exploring such possibilities, and reported at the July 2017 partnership meeting about its hopes for work under the Green Climate Fund. Joint development of the NBS concept should also lead to new funding opportunities, although IUCN will be wary of any implication that NBS is reduced to a commercial carbon trading mechanism. and sometimes inco

periods, characterise their use of the ‘project funnel’. In other circumstances this informality could signal inefficiency – a casual, uncertain approach to deciding what to do together. In this partnership, periodic discussions of the contents of the ‘project funnel’ remain focused and thoughtful, although there are remarks from time to time about needing to maintain the necessary

useful library of documentation across the activities. But the most structured summary, most comprehensively assembled for the July 2017 meeting, is the set of 'pre read' notes assembled ahead of each partnership meeting. Not surprisingly, therefore, several informants pointed to monitoring, reporting and learning as inefficient aspects of the partnership.

It should be possible, without undue effort, to develop a simple system for documenting each item in the 'project funnel', from preliminary concepts to practical projects. A one paragraph summary could be followed by periodic notes about what was discussed, decided or done, at which dates, with what results. Ultimately, each document could be filed according to its progress through or beyond the 'funnel', with, if relevant, a concluding note on whether the concept or activity is complete, rejected, to be returned to later, or merged into other ongoing work.

This would offer a more structured mechanism for learning from partnership experience than is currently available, as well as strengthening accountability, facilitating reporting and contributing to monitoring and evaluation. But the organic approach to management is a strength of the partnership.

4.6 Value for money

Although they are very different organisations, Shell and IUCN are both committed to achieving value for money (VFM). The TOR's evaluation question on this point (shown in the matrix at Annex 2) asks to what extent the partnership is perceived by Shell and by IUCN as delivering VFM. That is easy to answer. Both parties recognise that the partnership is operated with very modest funding but has achieved, and continues to achieve, important results. Subjectively, this evaluation can affirm that view.

Objective measurement of VFM is much more challenging. In theory it would be feasible to measure the money being spent on each concept or activity. Recording expenditures on tangible costs like travel, meetings and consultancy fees would be straightforward. With considerable effort and discipline, all personnel could record hours spent working on each of the identified activities – which, in the case of the more preliminary or conceptual work, would be hours spent thinking, talking and possibly writing. Total costs could then be calculated, perhaps through templates linked to the monitoring and reporting format suggested in section 4.4 above. Measurement of benefits would be much more difficult, and would require impressive feats of (environmental) economics, for example in assigning values to enhanced ecosystem functions, calculating savings to Shell and/or to the societies with which it works, and potentially linking to carbon values. Probably contentious decisions would have to be taken about the weighting of commercial, social and environmental benefits.

The result, in theory, would be (potentially regular) data on the VFM of the IUCN–Shell partnership, in aggregate and for each component area of work. In practice, this does not seem worth the effort, if it can be done at all. At management level, the private sector is arguably better aware than the public sector (in which IUCN can be classed, with its predominantly public funding) that some decision making is necessarily subjective – and that the value added by some expenditures cannot be accurately calculated. Expert judgement, based on experience rather than quantitative evidence, has a legitimate place. That expert judgement by the management of IUCN and Shell will continue to determine whether the partnership constitutes VFM.

Evaluation of the IUCN-Shell collaborative

5.3 IUCN

For IUCN, the success of the WGWAP and NDPI STAP (despite many trials and tribulations) has had valuable and apparently sustainable results, proving that it is possible for the Union to work with extractive industries to enhance their performance in addressing specific

section 3.2.2, other players have watched, listened and learned while not quite taking a seat at the table. Shell's role in IPIECA and consequently IUCN's indirect influence there, are particularly valuable in this regard. Again indirectly, IUCN's work with Shell has probably been influential in its gradually closer links with Total.

The question is what to do next, or differently, in order to reach the rest of the oil and gas sector more effectively. One argument presented to this review is that, in current price conditions, the time is not right for any attempt to promote major innovation, and that a continuing incremental approach is probably appropriate. More broadly, informants point out that some of the gravest environmental challenges coming from the sector come from small players, not the big ones like Shell with which IUCN mainly deals. The question is how IUCN can engage with those more local operators. The answer, if there is one, is likely to link to the arguments presented above about using IUCN's country level resources more actively in the next phase of the Shell partnership (section 3.3). A further challenge, on which IUCN can already learn something from the Shell partnership, concerns joint ventures: it is obviously more complex to persuade all partners in a JV to adopt improved environmental practices.

6 Lessons and recommendations

6.1 Introduction

This final chapter responds to the last section of the evaluation matrix (Annex 2), combining the presentation of lessons learned during the review period with recommendations for Shell and IUCN to consider as they prepare their next phase of collaboration. Within the presentation of lessons, recommendations are shown in bold and embedded in the narrative. They are then presented in a summary list in Table 2 on page 30.

6.2 The character, strategy and funding of the partnership

Eighteen years after formal engagements between IUCN and Shell began, the partnership is now characterised by professional and organisational trust. The partners have learned that they can interact and contribute to each other's objectives through various modalities at several levels, spanning technical interactions on focused projects, and conceptual and strategic discussions at higher or top management levels. The highest priority for the next phase of the partnership must be to maintain this trust and the multiple ways in which it is expressed.

At the same time, there is consensus that 'business as usual' would not be the best way to frame the next phase of collaboration. This should not become a comfortable relationship. It can become stronger through disagreements as well as converging views. The thinking has often developed most productively when the discussions were difficult.

The partners have already learned that such a relationship cannot progress on the basis of prescription by environmentalists to the private sector. Instead, they base their collaboration on joint identification of issues that can usefully be explored – again, recognising their differences but seeking points of convergence. A related lesson for IUCN is that it should not expect to transform Shell through this partnership. It can help Shell to achieve real conservation results through meaningful enhancements of its environmental practice. But this partnership is only one element in the complex array of factors that govern how Shell develops and how it affects ecosystems and biodiversity.

There was a sense among some informants that IUCN was more reactive than proactive during the review period, creating elements through to frame

conceptual discussions are valuable, but the focused projects are more visible inside and outside the two organisations.

However, the trust now established between these partners reinforces the argument that the qualitative, subjective aspects of their collaboration and decision making are legitimate and can be productive. Detailed efforts to measure the value for money of each activity would not be rewarding. But these qualitative dimensions do help to confirm that the Shell–IUCN partnership is more than the sum of its parts.

The partners should therefore be proactive about stimulating top level interactions between Shell and IUCN management. At that level, such meetings or conversations are hard to plan or predict, but they should not be left entirely to chance at occasions like Davos where the relevant individuals are likely to coincide.

Based on the lessons of the last four years, a number of opportunities arise for IUCN in structuring its contributions to the next phase of the partnership.

- x IUCN should strive to engage its Regional and Country Offices more in the design and implementation of partnership activities.

Important lessons were learned during the review period about the concept of NPI and its application. As argued above, apparently negative lessons can have positive directions, and although there were challenges around taking the NPI Alliance forward and building a business case that businesses found persuasive, the partners confirm that the concept remains on the table. Without necessarily waiting for a new Shell project through which to pilot it,

and IUCN should renew their joint communications plan for 2018 and work systematically to implement and report on it.

Experience during the review period has helped to identify two areas in which communications merge into other areas of the partnership effort. The first is monitoring and reporting of activities. Building on the more systematic but still simple monitoring and tracking processes recommended above for each partnership activity, the relevant technical and communications staff should produce periodic one page summaries for public communication. This should help address the obvious fact that effective communications require useable material to communicate – and provide the necessary linkage between communications and learning.

The second area concerns the interface between communications and debate. The partners' website communications do not allow for reader commentary – which would be a foundation for public debate. As pointed out in section 3.5, doing this would cost money because of the need for moderating user posts. Nor do the partners currently use social media much for communicating their work together. Doing so would automatically open up public debate on whatever is posted. Taking into account the partners' reasons for caution in this area, it is recommended that IUCN and Shell reappraise their policies on communication and debate around partnership activities, and consider the limited use of social media as an additional communications medium in the next phase.

6.6 Summary partnership assessment

The 2010 review of the IUCN–Shell partnership suggested that a summary partnership assessment tool might usefully be applied. It said

Various methods have been developed for the structured assessment of partnerships. Review of the literature did not identify one that could appropriately serve as the central instrument for this review. However, a partnership assessment tool developed for the United Kingdom government does offer a useful way of summarising the status of the IUCN–Shell partnership (Hardy et al., 2003). It was designed for use, much like the survey questionnaires used for this study, as a series of statements that participants would score on the basis of agreement or disagreement. These statements are grouped under six 'partnership principles'. Rather than offering a score on an agreement/disagreement scale, Table 1 below shows each of the normative statements presented by the UK government tool, and offers a summary statement about the IUCN–Shell partnership. Not all the statements are directly applicable to this partnership, of course, as they were developed for partnerships involving public sector agencies. As a possible stimulus to critical reading of the table, the reviewer's summary judgment is shown in colour in the right hand column.

Turner, 2010:29.

For the purposes of comparison, a second, equally subjective attempt has been made to use the same assessment tool. Table 1 below shows the results from this 2017 assessment with those from the 2010 exercise also shown for comparison. Comments refer to the 2017 assessment. The darker green represents a stronger positive assessment than the mildly positive assessment of the lighter green. Orange suggests that the criterion in question is not fully met. The lighter green indicates that the criterion has not been met.

Table 1. Use of this tool

Table 1. Summary partnership assessment

Principle 1: recognise and accept the need for partnership		2017	2010
There have been substantial past achievements within the partnership.	Yes– although some of these have been conceptual rather than leading to direct conservation results.		
The factors associated with successful working are known and understood.	Yes– although these factors are not always successfully combined in actual joint activities.		
The principal barriers to successful partnership working are known and understood.	Yes– although they are not always fully overcome.		
The extent to which partners engage in partnership working voluntarily or under pressure/mandate is recognised and understood.	Both partners recognise that joint activities are voluntary but that, having committed to a form		

The partnership has succeeded in having the right people in the right place at the right time to promote partnership working.

True. Key staff on both sides drove the partnership well during the review period.



6.7 Summary of recommendations

By way of summary, Table 2 below lists the recommendations made in sections 6.2–6.5 above. The recommendations are amplified, where appropriate, with comments in the right hand column.

Table 2. Summary of recommendations

Report section	No.	Recommendation	Comment
6.2	The character, strategies and funding of the partnership		
	1	For both focused projects and conceptual or strategic work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> x formulate the work and its objectives clearly; x set objectives modestly; x keep activities simple; x specify performance indicators. 	
	2	Intensify efforts to identify and launch new projects.	Broad conceptual discussions are valuable, but the focused projects are more visible inside and outside the two organisations.
	3	Be proactive about stimulating top level interactions between Shell and IUCN management.	At that level, such meetings or conversations are hard to plan or predict, but they should not be left entirely to chance at occasions like Davos where the relevant individuals are likely to coincide.
	4	IUCN should strive to engage its Regional and Country Offices more in the design and implementation of partnership activities.	
	5	IUCN should seek to engage its Global Programmes Commission and State Members more fully in the design and implementation of partnership activities.	
	6	IUCN should align the next phase of the Shell partnership closely with its restructured Programme.	
	7	IUCN and Shell should seek and explore additional funding for partnership activities, or for work derived from the partnership.	This could be built on IUCN access to global opportunities like the Green Climate Fund, and/or to other funding streams within Shell, linked to specific business opportunities or projects.
6.3			

Report section	No.	Recommendation	Comment
		should keep NPI in the 'project funnel' and explore other ways of elaborating and applying the concept.	
	11	Re-examine the assumption that significant innovations like NPI can only be attempted when Shell launches a new project. Consider whether some enhanced concepts and practices can be applied to existing operations too.	
	12	Explore the possibility of bringing one or more IUCN Regional Country Offices into support for one or more of Shell's ten country specific energy transition planning processes.	
	13	<p>With regard to 'bringing new players to the table':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> x continue efforts to bring new (probably large scale) players to the table; x reach out to other players with the offer of joint informal discussions on concepts, scenarios and strategy; x pilot efforts at country level, possibly involving IUCN country offices, and building on existing IUCN Shell experience to engage smaller scale operators; x try to engage the entire oil and gas sector in a country. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x for example through links with IPIECA- links with that body should be maintained and strengthened as well as specific contacts with individual cov3t individual

Report section	No.	Recommendation	Comment
	19	Develop a simple system for documenting each item in and beyond the 'project funnel', from preliminary concepts to practical projects.	This should summarise the nature of the idea or activity, and periodically record significant activities and results.
6.5	Communication		
	20	Commit to a higher and more active communication profile in the next phase of the partnership.	This will, inevitably, mean increased resources.
	21	Renew R e n e w	

Annex 1. Terms

The partners have begun to design a new agreement to commence in 2018 and will use this evaluation to inform the new agreement. What is learned from this evaluation will also be of interest more broadly for IUCN's strategy for engaging with the private sector, particularly the energy sector.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are outlined in the evaluation matrix at the end of this document.

1. To assess the relevance and appropriateness of the scope and ambition of the IUCN-Shell Partnership Agreement.
2. To assess the effectiveness of the partnership in achieving its intended results and explore the current factors that support and hinder the fulfilment of the Collaborative Partnership Agreement. Main topics should be:
 - x Delivery against intended results
 - x Delivery of conservation results
 - x Effectiveness of partnership
 - x Effectiveness of stakeholder engagement and role of SE in delivering results and conservation results
 - x Effectiveness of communications
3. To assess factors contributing to the efficiency and effectiveness of the partnership including leadership, management, governance and communication.
4. To assess the sustainability of results and potential impact of these on conservation and climate change.
5. To make recommendations based on these findings and lessons learned to a) contribute to IUCN's strategy for engaging the energy sector, and b) to inform the design of the planned subsequent phase of the IUCN-Shell partnership starting in 2018.

Scope of the review

The scope of the Review includes the strategic dimension of the Shell and partnership Shell the p¹ E
TT3 1 Tf 1.3552 0 TD 0 Tc <0003>Ton phase of the partnership (ES) and (ES) Sustainability 100360

Evaluation of

The evaluation is expected to use mixed methods, including:

- x Review of relevant documentation from the past four years (including but not limited to the recent evaluations of the WGWA and other initiatives between IUCN and Shell);
- x Interviews of key stakeholders from Shell (including but not limited to Executive Directors, Vice Presidents, Environmentally Sensitive Areas Team), IUCN (including but not limited to the Secretariat, Council, Commission and Members), and any other relevant stakeholder groups.
- x Other methods, as deemed necessary by the evaluator, such as a survey.

The Shell–IUCN Steering Committee will convene a meeting after the review to discuss the results and next steps.

Deliverables

The following deliverables are expected of the review team:

1. An inception report that includes: Final methodology, including proposed approach to the evaluation, refined Evaluation Matrix, proposed methods, indicators, list of stakeholders to be consulted, set of data collection tools, and outline of final report.
2. Draft report.
3. Final report with annexes with all data collection tools.

The Review findings and recommendations will be presented, by the evaluator, to a joint meeting of the Steering Committee and the Relationship Team.

The IUCN relationship manager will present and discuss the results of the evaluation with other stakeholders following acceptance of the final report by IUCN.

The IUCN relationship manager will develop a Management Response and Action Plan, seeking M a n

Performance areas	Key questions	Subquestions	Indicators	Sources of data
Sustainability and potential for impact	To assess the sustainability of results and potential impact of these on conservation and climate change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › What lessons have been learned about the sustainability of the relationship? x What factors are likely to influence the sustainability of the relationship? x What mechanisms are in place for monitoring and evaluation to learning and adaptation? x What incentives are internal and external to the relationship? x To what extent is the partnership considered transparent and accountable by IUCN Members, other stakeholders and other key stakeholders? x To what extent is the partnership perceived by Shell and by IUCN as delivering value for money? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › monitoring and reporting › 5. Score on partnership assessment tool 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › What examples of changes to Shell's policy, process or decisions have been observed that can be linked to the relationship? x What examples of changes to IUCN's policy (including IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations), processes or decisions have been observed that can be linked to the relationship? x Have any of these changes also been observed 		

Evaluation of the IUCN- Shell collaborative partnership, 2014-2017

Performance areas	Key questions	Subquestions	Indicators	Sources of data
		the partners' broader constituencies?		

Annex 3. Persons interviewed

D. Aiama	Community Manager, IUCN Green List, Global Protected Areas Programme
I. Andersen	Director General, IUCN
A. Andrade	Chair, IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management
R. Asante Owusu	IUCNBBP
M. Bateson	Global Practice Leader, Energy, Environment and Climate Change, Rio Tinto
G. Bos	Director, IUCNBBP
K. Bye Bruun	SE Special Projects Manager, SPDC
S. Edwards	Relationship Manager, IUCNBBP
H. El Shaer	Regional Programme Coordinator a.i., IUCN ROWA
A. Grigg	Head, Business and Biodiversity Programme, UNEP/WCMC
J. Hughes	Member, IUCN Council
L.A. Hurt	Communications and Knowledge Manager, IUCNBBP
S. Kapila	Vice President, Government Relations, Shell
C.G. Lundin	Head, Global Marine Programme, IUCN
E. McKenzie	Majnoon Environmental Lead, SIPD
S. Maginnis	Global Director, IUCN NBS Group
N. Olsen	Head, IUCN Economic and Finance Unit
D. Quaile	Former Relationship Manager, Shell
P. Rosabal	Deputy Director, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme
G. Roseboom	Relationship Manager, Shell
R. Thomas	Vice President for Environment, Shell
J. Touron	Environmental Adviser, Projects and Technology– Safety

K.

References

Martin Mehers,
2016

Martin Mehers, G., 2016. Western Grey Whale Advisory Panel: stories of influence. Gland: IUCN, WWF and IFAW.

NDP, 2013

IUCN Niger Delta Panel, 2013. Sustainable remediation and rehabilitation of biodiversity and habitats of a 956