

## **ATTACHMENT 1 – Terms of Reference**

### **Terms of reference for the independent Final Evaluation of Effective Capacity Building for the Global Plastics Treaty in Africa Project**

**July 2024**

#### **1. Evaluation context**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for an International Firm/Consultant, for the Final Evaluation of the project titled “**Effective Capacity Building for the Global Plastics Treaty in Africa Project (AFRIPAC)**” implemented by IUCN and GRID-Arendal.

Rapidly increasing levels of plastics pollution represent a serious global problem, negatively impacting the environmental, social, and economic dimensions of sustainable development of many nations. Under a business-as-usual scenario and in the absence of necessary interventions, the amount of plastic waste entering aquatic ecosystems could nearly triple from some 9–14 million tonnes per year in 2016 to a projected 23–37 million tons per year by 2040<sup>1</sup> with a particular impact on Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and/or Small Island Development States (SIDS). In order to address this plastic pollution issue, an historic resolution was adopted in February 2022, during the fifth session of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA-5.2). The resolution called for the development of an international legally binding instrument on plastic pollution, including in the marine environment by the end of 2024. To ensure that the future global plastics treaty delivers on its goals, an effective participation from all parties in the dialogues is needed as it is critical that every signatory ensure that the treaty obligations they will agree to can be implemented in their country. The complexity of the plastics life cycle however results in many countries requiring support to formulate the requisite tools from a legal, regulatory, and technical perspective.

To respond to the above challenges and needs and with the support of the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), IUCN and GRID-Arendal launched the “Effective Capacity Building for the Global Plastics Treaty in Africa” Project in November 2022. This project is a NOK 26.11 million, two-year initiative (ends in December 2024) which aims to empower five African countries (Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, and Sierra Leone) classified as belonging to LDCs and/or SIDS with knowledge and capacity to engage in the negotiations process for the Global Plastics Treaty. By strengthening the capacities of key stakeholders at different levels of governance and improving collaboration amongst key national ministries, the project will support their active engagement in the negotiation process and ensure their views are taken into account. More specifically, the Project aims at achieving the following outcomes through production and testing of guidelines and case studies through common ground dialogues, among other project activities:

- Outcome 1: Target States and Stakeholders, including women, play an active role in Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) negotiations processes for the Global Plastics Treaty;
- Outcome 2: Plastic pollution mitigation processes of Target States integrate Circular Economy (CE) principles in Waste Management (WM) practices.

#### **2. Rationale and Purpose for the Evaluation**

This Final Evaluation fulfils IUCN requirements 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 the

---

<sup>1</sup> [Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on Plastic Pollution | UNEP - UN Environment Programme](#)

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 evaluations should also help IUCN and GRID-Arendal identify key lessons learned that could be used for the development of future project proposals.

### 3. Audience, key stakeholders and use of the evaluation

The primary audiences for the final evaluation are:

- The AFRIPAC Project Coordinators and Managers in IUCN and GRID-Arendal for the purpose of informing decision-making and design of future projects;
- The IUCN Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning unit or the purpose of improving the monitoring and learning approach;
- NORAD and its evaluation department to provide information to the authorities and the general public.

The review will be made available to the public on IUCN's website.

### 4. Objectives and evaluation questions

This Final Evaluation will be carried out in conformity with IUCN Evaluation Policy (2023) and use the widely accepted OECD DAC Evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The Final Evaluation should explore the Project's work and the role played by IUCN and GRID-Arendal with the aim of assessing the results of the project intervention and its sustainability. Through the assessment of the performance and lessons learnt, the Final Evaluation will also contribute to both learning and accountability.

The specific objectives of the Final Evaluation are:

- To assess the **relevance** of the Project in terms of responding to the challenges it seeks to address and in terms of aligning with the objectives of the current IUCN's global plastic agenda; GRID-Arendal's flagship project on tackling plastic pollution; and NORAD's Marine Litter Agenda.
- To assess its **coherence** with the situational analysis and how well the Project fits in its context and its compatibility with other interventions led by IUCN and GRID-Arendal.
- To assess the **effectiveness** of the Project in achieving its objectives and provide clear insights about what has and has not worked. It will also analyse key underlying risks, assumptions and constraints which have affected intended result.
- To assess the **efficiency** in terms of use of resources and value for money through the delivery of the Project;
- To assess the **impacts** of the AFRIPAC project and provide clear indications about the positive and negative, intended and unintended changes that resulted from its interventions.
- To assess the **sustainability** of the project in terms of strengthening enabling conditions, in particular capacities, partnership and policy and likeliness to see these benefit continue in the longer term.
- To identify **lessons** and provide set of **short term** and **actionable recommendations** that can inform future decision-making on whether to improve, pursue, scale up or replicate similar projects elsewhere.
- Three additional lines of inquiry should also be addressed: contribution to the **IUCN One Programme Approach**, **Science/policy/action interface**, and **Gender Concerns**.

An initial set of questions that should guide the Final Evaluation in assessing the Project against each given criterion have been developed as follows:

## Relevance

- How relevant was the Project in terms of aligning and responding to the objectives of the current IUCN and GRID-Arendal Programmes and other needs and priorities in relation to reducing plastic pollution?
- Was the project Theory of Change (ToC) and logic for interventions realistic?
- To what extent was the project aligned to national strategies and priorities vis-a-vis their involvement in the Plastic treaty negotiation?
- Has there been any change (i.e change in the negotiation process) that affected the relevance of the Project since it has started?
- If so, how well did the project adapt to the changing environment and how well has the design adjusted to emerging circumstances?

## Coherence

- How well did the Project fit in its context? In particular:
  - To what extent were the capabilities of different partners and other counterparties carefully considered in the design of the Project?
  - To what extent was the Project aligned with previous IUCN and/or GRID-Arendal projects, knowledge products and stakeholder engagement process?
  - To what extent did the project harmonize its interventions with government priorities and other stakeholders?

## Effectiveness

- To what extent were the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate, and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced appropriately?
- To what extent has the Project delivered on its outputs and outcomes? In particular:
  - How effective has the project been in terms of helping target States and Stakeholders, including women, play an active role in Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) negotiations processes for the Global Plastics Treaty
  - How effective has the Project been in terms of helping Target States integrate Circular Economy (CE) principles in Waste Management (WM) practices?
- What constraints and limiting factors have been encountered by the project in meeting its objectives and delivering on its work plans? How did the project deal with constraints and risks in implementation?

## Efficiency

- To what extent is the Project governance system conducive to results achievement?
- Has the management approach promoted by the Project led to the most effective use of the resources, costs savings and to efficiencies of scale in the provision of coordination and technical support? More especially:
  - Are accounting and financial systems adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?
  - Have progress reports been produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements?
  - In terms of periodic update meetings, what worked and what didn't in ensuring effective communication and project alignment between IUCN and GRID-Arendal and their respective teams?
- To what extent has the Project been able to adapt to any changing conditions to improve the efficiency of project implementation?
- To what extent are the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) strategy and tools adequate and effective in view of:
  - Tracking progress against expected results
  - Enabling adaptation in the strategy according to current success and failures, changes of stakeholders' priorities or conditions on the context;

- Improving reporting, transparency and accountability to NORAD, and other key stakeholders.
- Providing lessons from activities and results that contribute to the enrichment and continuous improvement of the project;

### Sustainability

- Is there evidence of ‘country ownership’ of the project initiatives? What evidence exists that shows that the enabling conditions are in place to continue what was initiated by the project, particularly in terms of capacities, partnership and/or policy?
- To what extent have the mitigation measures identified to address the risks been implemented? Were these measures effective?

### Impact

- To what extent was the AFRIPAC project able to make a significant global contribution towards empowering government and their stakeholders in Africa to inform negotiations for the Global Plastics Treaty,
- Is there any evidence that shows that the AFRIPAC project had impacts beyond its direct zone of intervention?
- Were there any unintended consequences, both positive and negative resulting from the actions of the Project?

In addition to the above criteria and questions, the evaluator(s) will also ensure that the following topics are addressed in the evaluation:

- **IUCN one Programme Approach:** To what extent did the project engage all constituents of the Union in its design or implementation so far?
- **Science/policy/action interface:** To what extent is the knowledge or science produced or disseminated by the Project likely to influence policy or actions in the future?
- **Gender concerns:** To what extent have gender concerns been considered in the design and implementation so far?

## 5. Methods and source

This evaluation will be carried out in conformity with the IUCN Evaluation Policy (2023)<sup>1</sup>, 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.

### I. Scoping Phase - Framing the boundaries of the evaluations

The evaluator(s) will review key project documents and engage with IUCN and GRID-Arendal to finalise the evaluation objectives, questions, criteria and methodology. Against the above, the evaluator(s) will identify appropriate evidence that needs to be gathered and synthesized to fully inform the evaluation process – as well as sources of information including key individuals to be interviewed. The output of this phase will be an **inception report** which will include a **methodological note** and an **evaluation matrix** presenting how each evaluation question will be addressed, data sources and data collection methods that will be used to gather additional information needed and a set of criteria to rate the strength of the evidence collected. The evaluation matrix will be reviewed and should be approved by IUCN. Adequately addressing the key evaluation questions will be the basis for IUCN to sign off on the completeness of the inception report.

### II. Further data collection and analysis; development of draft evaluation report

In this phase, the evaluator(s) will work with IUCN, GRID-Arendal and other key stakeholders to gather and consolidate the necessary information to address the evaluation questions. The Evaluator(s) will present their preliminary findings during a short webinar in order to collect feedback from key target audience. The link between the evaluation questions, data collection, analysis, findings and conclusions must be clearly made and set out in a transparent manner during the presentation. Following the webinar, the evaluator(s) will submit a **draft evaluation report** for further review by the target audience.

### III. Finalising the evaluation reports and presenting findings to key stakeholders

Once the draft reports have been circulated, IUCN and GRID-Arendal will undertake a final review of the reports and provide their comments in written to the evaluator(s). The comments will be integrated by the evaluator(s) in the **final version of the report** and serve to finalise recommendations and to develop lessons learned. The evaluator(s) will submit a final evaluation report in word and PDF and will include a separate document highlighting where/how comments were incorporated. The final report should clearly and transparently demonstrate links between review questions, data collection, analysis, findings and conclusions. The conclusion and recommendations presented in the final report should be underpinned by a strong set of evidence and will be further explained during the final webinar.

Finally, evaluator(s) will produce a short but concise summaries that can be disseminated to the wider public for general information on the project's results and performance

#### A. *Methods, sources and analysis*

Different sources will be used to verify information, and evidence will be validated through triangulation. Information and insights will be derived mainly from three key sources:

- (1) Document review - including Project proposal, Project Implementation Reports, information and data collected through MEL system and other relevant knowledge products developed by the Project so far;
- (2) Key informant interviews – including interviews with executing partners and other relevant internal and external stakeholders across IUCN Headquarter and the Region
- (3) Optional online survey or other methods proposed by the evaluator(s)c.

#### B. *Stakeholders to be consulted*

The evaluation will adopt a consultative approach, seeking and sharing opinions with stakeholders at different stages throughout the evaluation process. Stakeholder categories include but are not limited to: IUCN and GRID-Arendal project staff, representatives from country government, and external stakeholders involved in or benefiting from the project.

The list of stakeholders to be consulted will presented and validated through the inception report. The total number of stakeholders to be consulted in the different region where the Project is implemented is however estimated to 25 people. A suggested list of stakeholders to be consulted in different categories will be provided during inception. The evaluation team may propose changes or additions.

#### C. *Sampling approach*

It is expected that the evaluator(s) will seek insights from representatives of all five countries. Therefore, no sampling will be necessary for this Final Evaluation.

## 6. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator(s) will be accountable for producing the following products for this Final Evaluation:

- ✓ **Draft inception report and Inception report** on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the report including a detailed evaluation matrix;
- ✓ **A Draft Preliminary Final Evaluation report and presentation**, to be presented at a debriefing meeting with IUCN and GRID-Arendal
- ✓ **Final Evaluation report**, including key findings, a set of limited and strategic recommendations (not to exceed 10 recommendations total), and response addressing issues raised during presentation of draft.
- ✓ A **Final presentation** targeted to evaluation key audiences in which the key finding and recommendations from the Final Evaluation will be presented.
- ✓ **A two-page executive summary** of key findings, lessons, recommendations and messages from the Final Evaluation report.

**The Inception Report** should be in English and include the following structure:

- A. Identification of the subject of the review, and relevant context
- B. Purpose and scope of the evaluation: why is the evaluation being conducted at this time, who needs the information and why? What aspects of the project will be covered, and not covered, by the evaluation
- C. Theory of change and results. A one-page diagram and explain it with a narrative, including a discussion of assumptions and drivers. This section should also confirm the formulation of planned results so that the evaluand can be assessed against its intended results
- D. An evaluation matrix presenting how each evaluation criteria and questions will be addressed, the indicators, the data sources and the data collection methods and tools that will be used to gather the information needed for the Mid Term Review and a set of criteria to rate the strength of the evidence collected.
- E. Methodology including approach for data collection and analysis, and stakeholder engagement, a rationale for selection of the methods, and selection of data sources (i.e. any sites to be visited, stakeholders to be interviewed)
- F. The evaluation workplan and schedule, as well as a description of roles and responsibilities for the management of the evaluation
- G. Potential limitations of the evaluation

The **final Evaluation report** should be in English and include the following structure:

- 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. Annexes

## 7. Travel requirements

Travel is not required for this Final Evaluation. All interviews are expected to be conducted remotely.

## 8. Schedule

It is expected that evaluator(s) will submit their deliverables according to the following schedule. The expected starting date for the Mid-Term Review is 2nd September 2024. Expected end date is 31st December 2024.

Outputs and deliverables	Proposed schedule and deadlines	Roles and responsibilities
Introductory call	Within 1 week of signing the service agreement	Evaluator(s), IUCN
Draft inception report submitted	Within 2 weeks of the introductory call	Evaluator(s)
Comments on inception report	Within 1 week after the submission of the inception report	IUCN and GRID-Arendal
Final inception report and approval	Within 1 week after the submission of comments	Evaluator(s) and IUCN

Data collection and analysis phase completed	Within 4 weeks after the approval of the inception report	Evaluator(s)
Preliminary findings presentation	Within 1 week after the completion of the data collection	Evaluator(s)
Draft report delivery	Within 2 weeks after the presentation of preliminary findings	Evaluator(s)
Comment on draft report	Within 1 week after the submission of the draft final report	IUCN and GRID-Arendal
Final report delivery and approval	Within 1 week after the submission of comments	Evaluator(s), IUCN
Final presentation	Within 1 week after the approval of the final report	Evaluator(s)
Two pagers summary document	Within 1 week after the approval of the final report	Evaluator(s)

## 9. Roles and responsibilities

This Final Evaluation is commissioned by IUCN and Day-to-day management and coordination will be done by its Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Unit. This evaluation will be undertaken by an independent evaluation team, selected through IUCN's procurement process.

## 10. Qualifications of the Evaluator(s)

IUCN requires a person or a team of evaluators with experience in assessing change in complex systems and with extensive expertise and knowledge in at least one of the following fields: Policy instrument and process, multilateral environmental negotiation process, plastic waste pollution, capacity building and governance.

In addition, the Lead team member will meet the following technical requirements:

- Advanced university degree in one of the thematic field mentioned above
- At least 10 years of relevant experience in supporting, designing, planning and/or conducting development evaluations; 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; Prior experience in conducting evaluation in countries where the Project is implemented would be an asset;
- English language fluency in both speaking and writing; Advance knowledge of Portuguese and French is also required.

Women are strongly encouraged to apply. The successful candidate will be selected based on merit. The review team members should be completely independent from any organisation that have been involved in designing, implementing, executing or advising any aspect of AFRIPAC project.

## 11. Cost

The maximum available budget for this review, including travel, is NOK 350,000 (~EUR 30,000). The evaluator(s) shall be paid 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 report

## 12. Appendices

- Evaluation Matrix

## Annex A. Evaluation matrix

<b>1. Relevance:</b>				
<i>Key evaluation questions</i>	<i>Sub-questions</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Data Collection Tools</i>
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				
<b>2. Coherence –</b>				
<i>Key evaluation questions</i>	<i>Sub-questions</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Data Collection Tools</i>
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				
<b>3. Effectiveness:</b>				
<i>Key evaluation questions</i>	<i>Sub-questions</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Data Collection Tools</i>
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				
<b>4. Efficiency:</b>				
<i>Key evaluation questions</i>	<i>Sub-questions</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Data Collection Tools</i>
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				
<b>5. Sustainability:</b>				
<i>Key evaluation questions</i>	<i>Sub-questions</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source of Information</i>	<i>Data Collection Tools</i>
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				

<b>6. Impact</b>				
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				
<b>One Programme Approach:</b>				
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				
<b>Relevance and efficiency of the evaluand with respect to gender</b>				
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				
<b>Science/policy/action interface:</b>				
<i>[Add rows as required]</i>				