TERMS OF REFERENCE

END OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

SHARED RESOURCES,
JOINT SOLUTIONS
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Glossary

CBO Community-based Organisation
CSO Civil Society Organisation
DGIS Directorate-general for International Cooperation
EIA Environmental Impact Assessments
ERG External Reference Group
IUCN NL International Union for the Conservation of Nature Committee of the Netherlands
IPG International Public Goods
PMEL Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MoFA NL Ministry of Foreign Affairs Netherlands
MTR Mid-term Review
NCEA Netherlands Commission on Environmental Assessment
NGO Non-governmental Organisation
SEA Strategic Environmental Assessments
SRJS Shared Resources, Joint Solutions
ToC Theory of Change
ToR Terms of Reference
VBDO Dutch Association of Investors for Sustainable Development
WWF NL World Wildlife Fund for Nature Netherlands
1. Introduction

The Shared Resources Joint Solutions (SRJS) Alliance is a strategic partnership between the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) - NL and World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) - NL, implemented between 2016 and 2020 and financed by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Alliance focuses on safeguarding ecosystems and the services, International Public Goods (IPGs) those ecosystems provide in the form of water provisioning, food security, and climate resilience. The program works towards sustainably managed landscapes that provide the most essential ecosystem services on which local communities and broader economic development depend, and works to optimize ecological, social and economic values. To find a balance in interests of different stakeholders, the program aims to strengthen the lobby and advocacy skills of civil society to function as a countervailing power to governments and businesses. At the same time, the program aims to promote an enabling environment, gender responsiveness and inclusiveness of marginalized groups. Although strategic choices vary in the landscapes SRJS operates, all ToCs evolve around the general ToC related to capacity development, partnership building and changes in policies and practices of people within communities, businesses and government. For a detailed Theory of Change (ToC), see Annex 1.

Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) cannot secure ecosystem services on their own. It is therefore central to our approach to develop flexible and dynamic partnerships between CSOs, businesses and different levels of government. We envision that it is through tri-partite dialogue and collaboration that society will be able to overcome the challenges to food, water and climate security. It is anticipated that these multi-stakeholder governance systems create joint and innovative solutions to secure ecosystem services and the IPGs they provision.

The program is carried out with partner CSOs in 8 ecoregions in 16 countries: Zambezi (Zambia, Mozambique), Albertine Rift (Uganda, Tanzania), West Africa (Burkina Faso, Benin, Ghana), Madagascar, South Asian islands (Philippines, Indonesia) Mekong (Myanmar, Cambodia), Pantanal-Chaco (Bolivia, Paraguay) and Guiana Shield (Suriname, Guyana). The interventions in the targeted areas in the countries are scaled up through lobby and advocacy, so that solutions at local level will affect the larger landscape and even at the global level. Through exchanges, learning and lobby towards international fora and organizations, the international program, in which - among others - IUCN-NL, WWF-NL, Dutch Association of Investors for Sustainable Development (VBDO), and the National Commission on Environmental Assessments (NCEA) are collaborating, is closely integrated with the country programs.

As the program is coming to an end, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs requires an independent external final evaluation. These Terms of Reference (ToR) lays out the concept of the final evaluation and specifies the evaluation questions, the proposed methods, the responsibilities and tasks of the evaluation team and the time frame.

2. Scope and objectives of the evaluation

The SRJS alliance is a large program (total program budget of 12 million euros per year, for 5 years), relating to a wide variety of themes in a variety of landscapes in 16 countries in three continents (including a supporting global program) and therefore involving a large variety of partners and actors. The scope of the end term evaluation will include:

- Assessing the results towards the general ToC objectives related to capacity development, partnership & network building and lobby & advocacy to achieve changes in policies and practices.
- Assessing the validity of the assumptions underlying these envisioned components of the program ToC.

- Assessing the adaptive management based on pathways of changes in behaviours/attitudes and/or regulations/laws at community, businesses and policy level of social actors influenced by the program.

- The assessments will be done in a conveniently selected sample of countries.

The 2016 inception reports provide baseline information on context and stakeholders, the Capacity Assessment Tool provides capacity development baselines for (most) CSOs in the countries.

The November 2018 report of the Mid Term Review provides data collected during the mid-term review and should be used to avoid duplication. The MTR was learning focused but also undertaken against the three key areas of enquiry: Capacity development, partnerships & networks and Lobby & Advocacy.

The IUCN/WWF database was filled over time with monitoring data gathered during bi-annual outcome harvesting workshops.

The main aim of the end evaluation is accountability towards the donor (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and the CSO partners (see Annex 3) and their constituencies in the Strategic Partnership. Therefore, the objectives are to:

a) determine the extent to which the SRJS partnership has made progress (outcomes/ potential impact) compared to the original objectives and Theory of Change (capacity strengthening, partnerships, enabling environment, gender and inclusiveness, changes in policies and practices leading to securing ecosystem-based IPGs water, food and climate). Substantiation/validation of a selection of already harvested outcomes in the program, as well as identifying other, including unintended outcomes, will therefore be a key focus;

b) determine the effectiveness of strategic choices and adaptive management made throughout the program at different levels.

3. Main evaluation questions

The main evaluation questions all revolve around measuring the OECD/ DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, efficiency) and cooperation/ coordination, related to results achieved (outcomes/ potential impact) compared to generic, original ToC:

1. Relevance questions:
   a. Did the program contribute to changed policies and practices of stakeholders to respond to the challenges occurring in the landscape? If so, how and why was this contribution important/relevant? Look at different levels – from local to global.
   b. What evidences demonstrate the program’s contribution to addressing gender and social inclusion concerns and challenges (women, men, youth, elderly, indigenous/minorities, people with disabilities, other marginalized groups)?
2. Effectiveness questions:
   a. To what extent has capacity development of the program at grassroot level been effective or not effective, and why? To what extent has the program strengthened CSOs capacities (individual, organizational or system-wide) to represent the interest of local communities/constituencies? Which approaches were most successful?
   b. What evidence can be found in the program for (in)effectiveness of multi-stakeholder partnerships and networks in achieving program objectives?
   c. To what extent and why, have the advocacy initiatives of CSOs in the program contributed to (expected and unexpected) changes in policies and practices? To what extent has (systematic) adaptive management contributed to timely adaptations in the approaches employed?
   d. To what extent have innovative approaches effectively been implemented in the program?
   e. What can be concluded based on a) to c) about the underlying ToC assumptions regarding the relationships between the 3 components of the ToC?

3. Impact question:
   a. In what way have specific steps (capacity building, partnerships, gender, inclusiveness, change policies and/or practices) in the SRJS ToC actually or potentially contributed to securing ecosystems-based IPGs?

4. Sustainability questions:
   a. What indications are observable in the program that might lead to intended/unintended effects after the duration of the program as intended at the inception of the program (i.e. continuation of multi-stakeholder partnerships after completion of the program; ability of CSOs to continue to make a high value contribution to the partnerships and maintain their monitoring capacity and communication skills; and sustained improved enabling environment)?
   b. What evidence is there for decreased, maintained or increased operational space for CSOs? To what extent have partners in the program taken different measures to protect/promote civic space?

5. Efficiency\(^1\) question:
   a. What deliberate decisions (strategy, programme, and management adjustments) have been made in line with the program’s principles\(^2\) on the most responsible (and

---

\(^1\) We refer to the definition of efficiency offered by the Ministry of Finance of the Netherlands: “Efficiency is the extent to which optimal effects are achieved at the lowest possible cost without undesirable side effects.” It is important to point out that according to this definition, efficiency is about the relationship between costs and effects of an intervention, project, program or policy, and NOT about the relationship between costs and activities or outputs (Publication: “The Efficiency Lab –A guide to analyzing the efficiency of development interventions”).

\(^2\) Mentioned for example in contracts, due diligence policies, financial audits regulations, program document and institutional policies.
6. Collaboration question:
   a. To what extent have the partnerships principles of D&D framework (shared goals, mutual trust, autonomy, equality) been applied in the program?

4. Methodology
The evaluation team, consisting of a lead evaluator and 3-4 regional evaluators, will be responsible for answering the evaluation questions. Because outcome harvesting (OH) is used as the main monitoring methodology, most data will be qualitative. However, quantitative analysis of trends over time will be gathered, where possible. It is important that the evaluation team takes into account, whenever possible, the perspectives of local CSOs and their constituency in their assessment. Although the evaluation considers all the countries/landscapes, detailed fieldwork can take place in a selection of a sample of countries/landscapes. The choice of these landscapes will be based on the following criteria: interesting for MoFA; interesting for potential follow-up program; where collaboration between IUCN NL and WWF NL exists; considerable monetary recipient.

Prior to the execution of the final evaluation, a few studies and analyses will be supervised by the PMEL team, that will shed light on key elements of SRJS and that can serve as input for the evaluation. These studies will be performed by a combination of SRJS field staff, IUCN/WWF office staff and external consultant(s) and are expected to be completed before the analysis stage of the evaluation. It is crucial that the findings are being used as major input into the final evaluation. The studies foreseen are:

1) Analysis of harvested outcomes (quantitative/qualitative) between 2016-2019;
2) Landscape study;
3) Impact on ecosystems study.

Further details will have to be developed, but the main issues in the studies are mentioned in the yellow boxes below.

1. Analysis of outcome harvest
Outcome harvesting has been used as monitoring tool during the program in all 16 countries. Out of the total set of harvested outcomes of SRJS, maximally 10 max outcomes per landscape will be selected for substantiation and validated, during the first quarter of 2020. SRJS field staff will be responsible to consult sufficient external sources to verify the outcomes.

To complement these substantiations, an analysis and visualization of all harvested outcomes during the program phase (2016-2019) is envisaged at the end of the first quarter of 2020. An externally facilitated analysis will be done, looking at partnerships and capacity strengthening trends and most significant changes in the landscapes. The lead evaluator will select a few stories of outcome pathways that will be elaborated on during the evaluation. It would be recommendable to keep an eye on negative side-effects of positive outcomes. Additionally, the harvested outcomes will have to be linked to the outcomes harvested during the 2018 MTR and to (the potential) impacts on IPGs in the impact study (as described below).
2. Landscape approach study

The landscape approach study, to be performed by an external consultant, should show what significant changes have occurred in the landscapes and what (and how) ecological, economic, political and social approaches have acted or interacted to obtain these changes. The study will be done for a sample of 4 landscapes: West-Africa (Ghana), Zambezi, Philippines and Chaco-Pantanal. Possible questions to be answered in the landscape approach study, that should be completed before April 2020, include:

- a. What ecological, economic or social approaches (or a combination of these) (e.g. financial activist approach, campaigning, legal action, changing national legislation to make multi-stakeholder dialogue mandatory etc.) have been effectively used in the program?
- b. What evidence can be found in the program that endorses the landscape approach, as more effective as unit of intervention than ecosystems or species? To what extent have conflicting interests been addressed by the approach?
- c. To what extent did the international programs contribute to the landscape results? What evidence can be found in the program that results from the landscapes led to results in the international arena?

3. Impact on ecosystems study

The impact study will consist of a second measurement of the baseline work started within SRJS at the Annual Report 2018. This study will be looking for evidence of observable effects of the program, that contribute to securing those ecosystem-based IPGs the program focusses on – climate, water, food and biodiversity. The study will be performed by IUCN/WWF office staff.

Suggested methodologies for the evaluation:

The methodologies proposed below and in the evaluation matrix are proposals, and can be adjusted, depending on the ideas of the lead consultant and the rest of the evaluation team, in consultation with the PMEL team, during the inception phase of the evaluation.

Desk research

During the desk research, the consultant looks at different documents produced before and during the implementation of SRJS, e.g. the (qualitative) baselines provided in the inception report, qualitative data from the MTR review etc., to answer (parts of) the evaluation questions (for a full overview see the evaluation matrix below).

Outcome harvest substantiation

A selection of the total set of - during the monitoring process - harvested outcomes of SRJS will be substantiated (meaning verified by external sources) in the program during the first quarter of 2020. The selection of the outcomes to be harvested during the evaluation, will be made together with the evaluation team, in order to come to a representative set of substantiated outcomes. More information about the process can be found in annex 2. The substantiation process should build on the exercise undertaken during the mid-term review.
Interviews

For answering several evaluation questions, interviews can be done with key informants from Alliance partners and independently involved people. Where possible, local CSOs and their constituencies should be involved. The evaluators should avoid “selection bias” and take into account that having difficulties in reaching people doesn’t mean they don’t need to be heard.

For many questions a selection of CSO partners and WWF NL and IUCN NL staff should be interviewed to illustrate examples related to evaluation criteria.

Evaluation matrix

In matrix form, the different evaluation questions can be answered through the following evaluation research methods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Specifics</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Methods/tools</th>
<th>Key informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>1a. Program contribution</td>
<td>The link between international program and local efforts should be scrutinized <em>(can only be done after effectiveness and coordination questions have been investigated)</em></td>
<td>Program reports, IUCN/WWF Outcome Harvesting (OH) database (substantiation and analysis) MTR report</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>PMEL group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1a. Why was contribution relevant ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b. Evidence of contribution re. gender/social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>2a. Evidence of capacity development results</td>
<td>Results in strengthened CSO capacities</td>
<td>Baseline scores compared with end scores of Capacity Analysis Tool</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>Local informants around specific outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2b. Effectiveness of (multi) stakeholder partnerships</td>
<td>Results at outcome level (accountability ceiling)</td>
<td>Inception report (context, stakeholder baselines), Program reports, Annual reports, IUCN/WWF database. Landscape study MTR report</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>Local informants around specific outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2c. Effectiveness in changing policies &amp; practices</td>
<td>Approaches that led/failed to expected &amp; unexpected changes</td>
<td>Inception report (context, stakeholder baselines), Program reports, Annual reports, IUCN/WWF database, MTR report</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>Local informants around specific outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2d. Effectiveness of prioritized MTR themes</td>
<td>Outcomes of last phase priorities</td>
<td>MTR report, IUCN/WWF database</td>
<td>Desk review and interviews</td>
<td>Selected key informants (from local to global)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2e. Assumed linkages between 3 ToC components</td>
<td>Only after Q’s 2a-c have been investigated</td>
<td>Program reports, IUCN/WWF database (OH analysis)</td>
<td>Desk review and interviews</td>
<td>Selected key informants (from local to global)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Proposed research method</td>
<td>Evaluation question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Steps in the ToC contributed to securing ecosystem based IPGs</td>
<td>Desk Research</td>
<td>1.a 1.b 2.a 2.b 2.c 2.d 3.a 4.a 4.b 5.a 6.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential long term effects on IPGs</td>
<td>Outcome harvest substantiation (see annex 2)</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN/WWF database (OH analysis) Impact study</td>
<td>Outcome harvest analysis</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review and interviews</td>
<td>Landscape study</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected key informants (from local to global)</td>
<td>Impact on ecosystems study</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interviews</td>
<td>Selected informants (from local to global)</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Timeframe

The actual evaluation process is planned between February and October 2020. Before the selection of a (team of) consultant(s) the period July -October will be reserved for the ToR writing and acceptance process. The former by the External Reference Group and the latter by IOB/ MoFA.

Planning of the main activities (and deliverables) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deadline/timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft ToR from External Reference Group (ERG)</td>
<td>15 July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share draft ToR and collect input and agreement of IUCN NL, WWF NL and CSO partners</td>
<td>19 July – 1 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalisation of ToR by PME-team</td>
<td>1-5 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement of IUCN NL and WWF NL Steering Group</td>
<td>12 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a long list ready of potential consultants involved in the evaluation (ask partners, contacts, ERG) and send out pre-announcement through networks</td>
<td>15 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare draft budget, elaborate separate ToR for side-studies and find synergies with other initiatives within SRJS (e.g.. landscape study, impact on ecosystems study, partnerships study)</td>
<td>15 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation of ToR by MoFa/ IOB For information to ERG, IGG and DSO</td>
<td>15-7 October 2019; 21 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendering of ToR</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead consultant or company contracted</td>
<td>30 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others contracted (as much as possible by lead consultant)</td>
<td>15 January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Harvesting substantiation</td>
<td>15 January-31 March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception phase: fine tune of methodologies proposed</td>
<td>1 December 2019 – 31 January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape and impact studies finalized</td>
<td>Before April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work (4 regional outcome harvesters)</td>
<td>1 March – 30 June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>15 July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review by ERG, IUCN NL, WWF NL, IOB and the field</td>
<td>31 August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final version of evaluation report</td>
<td>25 September 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final evaluation report to MoFA</td>
<td>Before 30 November 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Qualifications and experience required
The alliance is looking for a consultancy firm that hires all required evaluators (lead consultant and regional consultants) and takes responsibility for the overall evaluation process. The partnership seeks one lead consultant and four regional consultants to conduct the end of program evaluation. The role of the regional consultant is to amplify the voice of the CSOs and their constituencies.

1. Lead consultant
   a. Technical expertise in at least two of the areas of L&A, capacity strengthening, operational space, gender, CSOs, multi-stakeholder (or three-partite) partnerships, policy development, ecosystems;
   b. Evaluation expertise, ideally with complex program evaluations with multiple partners and in multiple countries; and with outcome harvesting;
   c. Methodological expertise: facilitation skills, presentation skills, evaluation methodology development, ability to deal with different expectations and reconcile diverse interests;
   d. Regional experience with one or multiple regions/ countries where the partnership is active;
   e. Very good organizational, collaboration and communication skills;
   f. Excellent writing skills and experience with bringing together different reporting formats;
   g. Fluent in English. Knowledge of Dutch is an asset.

2. Regional consultants
The Alliance seeks 4 regional consultants (a) one for Latin-Amercia, b) one for Francophone Africa, c) one for Anglophone Africa and Mozambique; and d) one for Asia).
   a. Together, the consultants should cover all the technical expertise requirements, i.e. L&A, capacity strengthening, operational space, gender, CSOs, partnerships, policy development, ecosystems;
   b. Evaluation expertise, ideally with complex program evaluations with multiple partners and in multiple countries, and knowledge and use of outcome mapping or harvesting.
   c. Regional experience with multiple countries in the region for which they will be responsible;
   d. Very good organizational, collaboration and communication skills. Ability to deal with different expectations and reconcile diverse interests;
   e. Excellent writing skills and experience with bringing together different reporting formats and data sources;
   f. Fluent in English and in the main language(s) in their region.
7. Responsibilities & Deliverables
The lead consultant will be responsible 1) for the finalization of the methodology, 2) for the final report of the evaluation, 3) for the fulfilment of the ToR of the evaluation, 4) coordinate the rest of the evaluation team and their inputs, 5) organize a kick-off workshop (for WWF NL and IUCN NL staff in the Netherlands and webinars for partners) and a diffusion meeting on key findings at the end of program evaluation. The independent External Reference Group has given advise on the draft Terms of Reference and will give feedback on the draft evaluation report. The draft ToR will be reviewed by IOB to guarantee compliance with IOB standards and adapted accordingly.

The lead consultant, in close collaboration with the Program Monitoring Evaluation and Learning (PME&L) team of the Alliance, will propose the different responsibilities and deliverables of the evaluation team. This will depend on the methodologies chosen and the set-up of the evaluation.

The final report should clearly define findings, general conclusions and recommendations for the alliance partners.

8. Location of assignment
The regional consultants will gather data regionally in countries and landscapes. The lead consultant will be responsible for overall coherence and synergy and international data gathering. (S)he will collaborate intensively with the PME&L team of IUCN NL and WWF NL in Amsterdam and Zeist. The lead consultant will need to convene with the rest of the team to ensure coherence and coordination of research. It is possible that this will be outside of the Netherlands.

The rest of the evaluation team will work in the SRJS regions, countries and landscapes. They will have to travel in the region and possibly at least one time to Europe.

9. Evaluation management
The commissioner of the final evaluation is the SRJS Steering Group. The lead consultant or consultancy firm coordinates and liaises with the PME&L team and reports to the Steering Group. All official written work related to the engagement and agreed deliverables are to be sent in soft copy (digital).

Contact details of the PME&L team are:

Name: Gunilla Kuperus
E-mail address: gkuperus@wwf.nl
Telephone number: +31 6 13787032

Name: Marielouise Slettenhaar-Ket
E-mail address: Marielouise.slettenhaar-ket@iucn.nl
Telephone number: +31 6 27561411

10. Selection of applicants
This ToR will be shared with short-listed consultants and consultancy firms found in the networks of IUCN NL and WWF NL. Interested applicants or firms can apply for the position till 30th November 2019 by sending their CV, application letter (detailing their availability and suitability for the assignment and a brief approach note of maximum 5 pages) and financial proposal to Gunilla Kuperus and Marielouise Slettenhaar-Ket.
Annex 1. Theory of Change of SRJS

Figure 1 shows the Theory of Change of the SRJS program. Figure 2 highlights the outcomes envisaged by the program, i.e. for which the program will be accountable.

Figure 1 - SRJS Theory of Change
Figure 2 - SRJS Theory of Change – highlighting the accountability ceiling

1. Outcomes on CSO capacity
   CSOs have strengthened capacities for lobby & advocacy

2. Outcomes on improved enabling environment, gender responsiveness and inclusiveness
   CSOs able to maintain or increase operational space

3. Outcomes on partnerships established for lobby & advocacy
   Multi Stakeholder Partnerships established and functioning

4. Outcomes on lobby and advocacy for changed policies & practices
   Governments change policies and practices that ensure sustainable and inclusive IPGs
   Businesses change policies, practices and investments to safeguard IPGs in compliance with legal and sustainability standards
   Civil society actors e.g. local communities and/or other institutions change their practices
Annex 2. Substantiation of outcomes

Towards the end of the SRJS program we would like to have the most important outcomes substantiated, i.e. validated by external sources.

A short reminder from the Outcome Harvesting training:

WHY?

- Substantiation focuses on answering two key questions, one on agreement with the outcome (description) and one on agreement with the contribution of SRJS and relevance/significance for the main objective
- The objective of substantiation is not only to confirm outcomes, but also to add another level of credibility, truth and accuracy of the reported changes. Substantiation is not about gathering additional opinions about how or why a change did or did not happen. It focuses on:
  - Degree of correctness of description (erroneous/correct)
  - Degree of completeness (incomplete/complete)
  - Level of evidence provided
  - Degree of plausibility of change

WHICH OUTCOMES?

The following types of reported outcomes may need substantiation:

- **Greater claims made in the descriptions**: If your sets of outcomes harvested include a lot of ‘big’ and ‘bold’ changes, you might want to substantiate (some of) these. Substantiation may help you to refute possible critique that your outcomes are ‘too good to be true’.
- **Great claims but weak evidence**: Especially great claims (so big changes) that sound great, but for which your evidence base is weak, need substantiation by knowledgeable outsiders.

WHICH PERSONS?

- A validator is someone that knows about the change, significance and contribution but is independent from your organization; (s)he did not have a role in implementing parts of the SRJS.
- Ideally you would want to have two to three validators per outcome description that will be substantiated. Ideally, at least one of the validators is a beneficiary of the outcome (i.e. local CSOs or communities). The right validator:
  - needs to know about the outcome you selected to substantiate.
  - can provide complementary perspectives and/or evidence
should not depend on your program (e.g. receive funds or be benefited in other ways). A direct beneficiary who received support from your organization is less suitable because of the risk of subconscious bias.

should not have any conflicts of interest or possible political interests/issues that may bias their objectivity.

HOW?

- Substantiation can be done making use of different means/methods.
  - By email/Skype: Especially when you select ‘high-level’ validators such as thematic experts, policy makers, etc., you will approach them through email. They may either not have time to meet you, or they are based at distance from where you are.
  - Through individual meetings: Where possible, you can set up a meeting/interview with a validator to individually talk through one or more outcome descriptions. It can be done face-to-face or through Skype/telephone.
  - In a joint gathering/workshop: You can also organize substantiation in a joint setting, whereby you invite several validators who can complement ideas and detail. This can take the shape of a panel review.
  - Please be aware of confidentiality: In some cases you have to be careful and protect your ‘sources’

- The outcome should dispose of (observable) evidence.

Substantiation of outcomes – your selection

➢ Select your most important outcomes that you may want to substantiate (=externally validate)
  - Importance may be judged based on the relevance of the outcome for your objective
  - Importance may be judged based on your contribution to its achievement
  - Importance may be judged based on a remarkable sequence of outcomes

➢ Identify potential validators for each outcome description. A validator may be relevant for one or more outcome descriptions.

➢ Propose the means/methods you would like to use. A single method may concern one or more outcomes and on or more validators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max. 5 important outcomes selected for MTR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. 5 new important outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3. Fragment of evaluation requirements from MoFA

Artikel 11 Evaluatie

11.1 De evaluatie van het partnerschap bestaat uit de volgende onderdelen:

- een onafhankelijke, externe eindevaluatie uit te voeren in 2020 van de effecten van het programma van IUCN - NL in het kader van het Strategisch Partnerschap Plieten en Beïnvloeden 2016-2020, passend bij het deel van het bijbehorende beleidskader, d.w.z. capaciteitsontwikkeling van zuidelijke maatschappelijke organisaties voor plieten en beïnvloeden.

- een tussentijdse review (2018) en een eind review (2020) door de Inspectie Ontwikkelingscoöperatie en Beleidsbeoordeling (IOR) van de strategische partnerschappen als mechanisme voor het beoordelen van de gestelde doelen van het beleidskader, waarin ook de rol van het Ministerie zal worden meegenomen.

11.2 De onafhankelijke externe eindevaluatie van de effecten van het programma van IUCN - NL is voor de verantwoordelijkheid en het budget van IUCN - NL. Hiervoor geldt dat:

A) IUCN - NL in overleg met de Minister de Terms of Reference en te volgen methodologie oostelt waarbij de hoofdvraag refereert aan de doelstelling van het beleidskader, d.w.z. capaciteitsontwikkeling van zuidelijke maatschappelijke organisaties voor plieten en beïnvloeden.

B) IUCN - NL in overleg met de Minister, een onafhankelijke, externe referentiegroep insluit, die advies geeft over de Terms of Reference en de te volgen methodologie. De Terms of Reference en de te volgen methodologie worden, mede op basis van het advies van de referentiegroep, gezamenlijk vastgesteld door IUCN - NL en de Minister.

C) Zowel Terms of Reference, methodologie als het rapport van de externe eindevaluatie dienen te voldoen aan de kwaliteitsniveaus voor externe evaluaties zoals beschreven in de IOR richtlijnen die gevoegd worden bij de subsidiebeschikking.

D) IUCN - NL verantwoordelijk is voor de baselines die nodig zijn voor de eindevaluatie van het programma en er voor zorg draagt dat deze zijn uitgevoerd in 2016. De baselines bestaan uit een uitgevoerde context analyse per land met daarin in ieder geval gegevens over de capaciteit van de zuidelijke partners in 2016 en de stand van zaken t.a.v. de thematische doelen op plieten en beïnvloeden.

---

2 elke strategische partner stelt een eigen referentiegroep samen

---

E) Het rapport van de externe eindevaluatie dienst uiterlijk 30 juni 2020 beschikbaar te zijn.

F) De kosten van de uit te voeren baselines en de externe eindevaluatie worden gedragen door IUCN - NL uit middelen van het Strategische Partnerschap.
Annex 4. List of CSO partners

To be included in a later stage.