Terms of Reference:

Independent evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy

Terms of Reference: Independent evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy

Contents

1. Evaluation context

Influencing policy and policy processes for the conservation of biodiversity at all scales has been at the core of the work of IUCN (the International Union for Conservation of Nature) for decades given its vision of *A just world that values and conserves nature*, and its mission to *Influence, encourage and assist societies to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.*

As constituents of the world's largest and oldest Union for the conservation of nature, the Council, 1400+ Members, seven Commissions, 75 National and Regional Committees and the IUCN Secretariat, along with their Framework Partners and project donors, jointly work to influence policies at all levels around the world to achieve this mission and deliver the four-year IUCN Programme that is adopted by all Members. Policy influence is an integral part of IUCN's theory of change in which policy influence outcomes are based on knowledge and science informed by implementation of actions "on the ground" (and in the water).

The last time IUCN influence on policy was comprehensively reviewed was in 2005, when a descriptive study of IUCN's Secretariat and Commission work was undertaken (the report is available on IUCN's website). That study informed IUCN's definition of policy and established IUCN's conceptualisation of the policy cycle as a collection of steps organised in four different domains of action (agenda setting, policy formulation, policy implementation and policy review). However, for a variety of reasons the intended phase II that would have assessed effectiveness was postponed indefinitely.

Since then, various evaluations of IUCN projects have assessed specific policy influence outcomes and an independent review commissioned in 2021 by Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) assessed IUCN's development relevancy and made recommendations to further evaluate IUCN's capacity to "transform societies" through policy influence work in particular[1].

In February 2023 IUCN Secretariat leadership commissioned a learning-focused evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy at all scales: international, regional, national and sub-national. At the request of Secretariat leadership, this evaluation is financially supported by one of its framework partners, SDC.

2. IUCN policy influence context

Delivery mechanisms to influence policy

Within IUCN, policy influence is understood to encompass the participatory and collaborative processes through which IUCN contributes to shaping any aspect of a policy at any stage of the policy cycle. IUCN describes a four-stage cycle for the policies it seeks to influence: agenda setting, policy formulation, policy implementation, and policy review[2].

IUCN sets conservation priorities through a unique multi-stakeholder decision-making process resulting in policies and decisions that guide the development and promotion of recommendations to governments and global conservation standards and policies. These outcomes are IUCN's Resolutions and Recommendations. As IUCN's highest body, the Members Assembly defines the general and specific policies of IUCN.

As a Union, IUCN establishes its policy positions first and foremost based on the IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations[3]. In addition, the IUCN Council can provide additional guidance for IUCN's positions as appropriate. Other consultative processes to obtain input from Members to develop or refine policy positions may also be used in between sessions of the Members' Assembly.

All constituents of the Union contribute to advocating for and implementing the resulting policy positions through a variety of influence and advocacy approaches. Policy influence work is achieved under three broad delivery mechanisms, each with unique accountability requirements that have a bearing on the type of influencing strategies. However, it should be noted that many of the policy objectives IUCN pursues are achieved through coordination across all three of these mechanisms.

---

[1] External Review of IUCN's Development Relevancy and IUCN management response: external-review-of-iucns-development-relevancy-march-2020.pdf and external-review-of-iucns-development-relevancy-management-response-may-2020.pdf

[2] The policy cycle was described in the 2005 Review of IUCN's Influence on Policy and has been used since. This evaluation is expected to reconfirm or propose a new policy cycle relevant to planning IUCN policy work today.

[3] IUCN issued a publication in 2018 on "The Impact of IUCN Resolutions on International Conservation Efforts - an overview" 2018-011-En.pdf (iucn.org)

Three integrated delivery mechanisms for IUCN policy influence:

1. **Mobilising the Union**: Members, Commissions, Committees, and the Council, contribute independently and collectively to implement IUCN Resolutions and influence policy based on IUCN policy positions. Many IUCN Members also refer to the IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations to further guide and advance conservation actions and decision-making. Contributions to policy work are coordinated and disseminated across all IUCN components in a multi-directional influence and amplification process between the constituents of IUCN in which the network facilitates scaling effects.

    The work of IUCN Commissions and the general effects of mobilising the Union will be considered for this evaluation.

    IUCN Commissions are broad and active networks of scientists and other experts providing IUCN and its Members with sound knowledge, expertise, and policy advice to drive conservation and sustainable development. Over 15,000 scientists and experts from around the world and across a wide range of disciplines volunteer their expertise as members of an IUCN Commission. The IUCN Commissions play a special role in policy influence as the principal contributors and key stewards of several IUCN flagship knowledge products[4] that are formally recognised in global multilateral environmental agreements, and by governments and others at the national level.

    Support to mobilise and coordinate across the Union and for Commissions' contributions to policy comes from a variety of sources including cash and in-kind contributions.

2. **Programmatic Secretariat contributions to policy**, **i.e "non-portfolio":** Work led by global, regional or country Secretariat teams to influence policy at these respective scales.

    Guided by IUCN's general policy as stated in the Resolutions and Recommendations adopted by Members, the IUCN Secretariat prioritises international policy processes where the Union has a clear mandate either from its body of Resolutions, from the IUCN quadrennial programme adopted by the Members, from a recognised advisory role and track record[5], where it has a clear comparative advantage[6], or where there is a clear convergence with the implementation of the IUCN Programme[7] (through which new areas of work may also be identified[8]).

    For these international policy processes, the IUCN Secretariat engages with IUCN Members, Council members (including Commission Chairs), Parties to the Conventions and other policy stakeholders to exchange, align and influence positions and decisions. Among other engagement approaches, the Secretariat and Commissions provide technical and scientific inputs, targeted recommendations, and capacity building on both technical topics and advocacy strategies. This is achieved through a variety of products and services that include position papers[9], briefs (technical or policy), Statements by the Director General, Open letters (including to IUCN Members ahead of key events), interventions from the floor, articles and blogs, media briefs, webinars, side events and other dedicated capacity building and training activities.

    The Secretariat also participates in a number of regional and national policy processes. These include engagement with regional policy bodies (e.g. African Union, European Parliament and Commission) or processes (e.g. African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, the Regional

---

[4] Example flagship knowledge products: The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species™ and the Red List Index, IUCN Protected Area Categories, World Database on Protected Areas, IUCN Green List, among others.
[5] Examples of recognised advisory role or track record for: the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Global Biodiversity Framework, CITES and the World Heritage Convention.
[6] Examples of comparative advantage: the United Nations High-Level Political Forum, the United Nations General Assembly and other UN processes capitalising on the IUCN UN Observer Status and authoritative knowledge products.
[7] Example of alignment to Programme: engagement in the High Seas treaty negotiations
[8] Example of new area of work emerging from Programme implementations: negotiations of the new Plastic Pollution Treaty.
[9] Position papers are focused on the agenda of the respective prioritized meeting or process and provide concrete policy recommendations.

Forums on Sustainable Development). In many cases, policy influencing activities at the regional level have a direct correlation with the Secretariat's projects that include policy components.

Regional and national policy influence and engagement is supported by similar products, services and strategies as at the international level. In addition, the Secretariat uses a number of Union-wide communication channels[10] and hosts activities to socialize and amplify IUCN's policy positions and to create space for active engagement on policy.

Support for non-portfolio/programmatic work of the Secretariat is from unrestricted sources (framework income, membership dues, philanthropy income and others). More information on income sources can be found in the IUCN 2022 Annual Report.

3. **Portfolio contributions to policy**: projects that include policy objectives, led by the Secretariat and often co-implemented with Members and Commissions, that generally have regional, national and sub-national policy objectives, and that may have international policy objectives or links.

The project portfolio supports the implementation and delivery of the IUCN Programme on a global scale (currently delivering in 166 countries), with the goal of positive outcomes for people, land, water, oceans, and climate (the IUCN Programme).

Through its portfolio, the Secretariat, in collaboration with Members and Commissions, and the oversight of the Council:
- generates, compiles and/ or provides science and knowledge solutions based on locally-driven identification of conservation and development problems;
- disseminates this knowledge through engagement with policy stakeholders and policy makers to increase awareness, capacity, and will that lead to improved policy for biodiversity conservation and equitable sustainable natural resource management;
- supports governments and actors across other sectors to implement these policies by providing technical assistance, globally-recognized monitoring and reporting standards, capacity development, and direct financing; among others.

More information on the IUCN Secretariat portfolio can be found in the IUCN 2022 Annual Report section 5 Programme portfolio overview page 34.

Funding for the portfolio is restricted project income.

Type of activities under the three delivery mechanisms:

Common policy influencing activities and strategies under each of these mechanisms include:

- Generation, compilation, or facilitation of policy relevant research, science and knowledge, and provision of knowledge or science to policy-makers and implementers in government and economic sectors (including methods, metrics, data, and leadership roles in science-policy interfaces e.g. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, IPBES and others);
- Convening at multiple scales: national dialogue platforms, formal scientific panels, IUCN World Conservation Congress and Members' Assembly, other coalition-building work at regional and international levels;
- Advice and advocacy for priority setting and agenda setting: e.g. policy briefs, technical advice, including coordination of policy input from the Union to multilateral environmental agreements;
- Fulfilling formal mandates to deliver policy, e.g. provision of formally recognised indicators (e.g. Red List Index, among others)

---

[10] Written communications include: the IUCN Digest (newsletter) and dedicated webpages in the IUCN website, circulation of newsletters, factsheets and reports.

- Providing science and knowledge in formal processes to (e.g. IUCN submits Technical Analyses of the 'proposals to amend the appendices and add new species to the Convention' that then inform Party decisions.)
- Demonstrating or piloting approaches to implement policies 'on the ground';
- Capacity development for policy advocacy
- Technical assistance: in particular to policy-makers and implementers in governments;
- UN Observer Status.

3. Rationale and purpose

The primary purpose of the evaluation is to assess IUCN's effectiveness in contributing to policy at national, regional, and global levels. IUCN's leadership, and the Council in its leadership role, wishes to identify, communicate, and learn from successes and failures to establish principles and lessons for policy strategies and advocacy in the future.

The secondary purpose is to make recommendations to guide future policy influence strategies and activities by IUCN's Members, Commissions, Council, Secretariat and Committees. The evaluation will be used to:

i) update or clarify IUCN definitions of policy, policy influence and the policy cycle[11];
ii) improve guidelines and practices for identifying policy priorities and positions, and designing and implementing policy influence strategies at project, programme and institutional levels;
iii) feed into the IUCN Strategic Vision exercise currently being undertaken by IUCN's Council (see Annex 1: 2021 Congress Decision 147 WCC-2020-Dec-147-EN).

Thirdly, as this evaluation will clarify IUCN's policy influence pathways, it will also contribute to clarifying how these can be monitored and evaluated in future and thus inform institutional guidance for planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting for policy work for all of IUCN's constituents.

Finally, successful examples of policy impact will be turned into communication products that show funders and other IUCN stakeholders where IUCN has had significant impact on policy.

4. Audience and use

This evaluation is commissioned by the IUCN Executive Board, in coordination with the IUCN Council.

The key audiences for the evaluation are:

IUCN constituents:
- Commissions, in particular Chairs and Commission members participating in IUCN delegations to international multilateral environmental agreements
- Member organisations
- National, regional and interregional Committees
- Council

IUCN Secretariat:
- IUCN's Executive Board, made up of:
  - IUCN Director General
  - Deputy Director General for Regional and outposted Offices
  - Deputy Director General for Programme
  - Deputy Director General for Corporate Services
  - Chief Finance Officer
- Director of International Policy Centre
- Secretariat staff, in particular Directors of Regional Offices and Global Thematic Centres

---

[11] The evaluation should consider and review the definitions used in the 2005 review and the current definition proposed by the PPME Unit for internal policy monitoring.

IUCN partners and donors, in particular:
- Governments
- Intergovernmental organisations/agreements/treaties
- Framework partners
- Donors supporting IUCN policy influencing efforts

The independent evaluation report and the management response written by the Executive Board in consultation with all relevant evaluation stakeholders, particularly the Council, and will be published on the IUCN website.

5. Objectives and evaluation questions

The evaluation is expected to assess IUCN's influence on policy under each of the three delivery mechanisms mentioned above against the six evaluation criteria recognised by OECD DAC: **relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact** and **sustainability**. Indicative preliminary evaluation questions under each criterion are given in **Annex 1: Evaluation questions**. The evaluation team is invited to submit with the proposal a draft evaluation matrix. The team may suggest a prioritisation within the preliminary evaluation questions and is encouraged to add or modify questions. The final evaluation matrix will be approved by IUCN in the Inception Report.

In addition to the findings for each delivery mechanism, the evaluation should draw conclusions based on IUCN's ability to leverage greater policy influence through coordination across these mechanisms.

The evaluation should clarify the observed operational theories of change and how they connect in a Union-wide policy theory of change.

On the basis of the findings and conclusions the evaluation should make recommendations for future work.

Scope: The scope of influence on policy includes contributions any aspect of the policy cycle for public sector or private sector policies, laws or legal frameworks. The work of all IUCN constituents is in scope, and a sampling strategy aligned to the three main delivery mechanisms has been proposed. The proposed timeframe is from 2013 to 2023 (last ten years).

6. Methods and sources

Approach to the evaluation

To ensure ownership and usefulness of the evaluation, it will be undertaken in an independent manner, will be based on wide consultation of external and internal sources, and will solicit stakeholder input to validate the usefulness of the recommendations.

These terms of reference provide the minimum requirements for evaluation questions, methods and sources and the independent external evaluation team is expected to refine the methodology and sampling strategy, and to expand the stakeholder list to specify the external sources and informants (or categories of informants). These should be broadly outlined in the evaluation team's proposal and will be precisely specified in the inception report to be approved by IUCN.

Methods, sources, and analysis

This evaluation will take a mixed methods approach. Different methods or frameworks may be applied to different parts of the evaluation.

To the extent possible data triangulation will be achieved by analysing information from multiple sources. IUCN welcomes the use of relevant published or recognized analytical frameworks to guide the analysis of evidence.

Specific methods can include, among others:

- Document review (internal and external)
- Internal and external key informant interviews (KII)
- Stakeholder survey
- Focus groups
- Field or office visits (3 recommended)
- Qualitative data analysis tools such as NVivo or others
- Use of specific policy advocacy evaluation methods such as: episode studies, value for money studies, process tracing, etc[12]

List of stakeholders to be consulted

IUCN has provided the evaluation team with internal stakeholder categories and a preliminary list of key stakeholders to be consulted in the context of the evaluation (see ToR Annex 3). The evaluation team may propose changes or additions. Note that in addition to seeking the perspectives of the main audiences and users of the evaluation, non-IUCN stakeholders from among policy makers and policy-making bodies in the public and corporate sectors will be interviewed and/or surveyed.

The evaluation is expected to interview **approximately 60-78 internal and external key informants** across the three objectives. This must cover internal and external perspectives. Internal sources are considered to be: IUCN Secretariat staff, IUCN Commissions, IUCN Council, Members (including State Members), and National, regional and interregional Committees. External sources are: thematic experts, staff of partner organisations including policymakers, and staff of relevant conventions and agreements, and other policymaking bodies in both public and corporate sectors. Other sources may be proposed by the evaluation team.

IUCN is particularly interested in receiving an independent and external assessment of its effectiveness to influence policy, including external perceptions of its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact. It is therefore of utmost importance that a diversity of sources and perspectives are consulted, and that every effort is made to balance internal and external perspectives. This is essential to ensure the evaluation responds to questions about IUCN's influence on policy outcomes and decision-making.

Approach to sampling and sampling frame

The evaluation team is requested to anchor the sampling frame around the three delivery mechanisms outlined in Section 2 of this ToR to ensure coverage of all three, and to facilitate the alignment of findings and recommendations to the distinct internal planning and monitoring mechanisms.

The evaluation will evaluate a purposeful sample across each of the three policy influence delivery mechanisms. The inception phase of this evaluation should identify and include IUCN's most valuable policy influence achievements with input from key stakeholders.

The criteria for the purposeful sample of projects, programmes or initiatives reviewed needs to ensure coverage of a diversity of geographies, thematic topics, approaches, IUCN constituent involvement, and of geographic scales of influence (roughly 80% regional, national or sub-national and 20% international policy objectives).

The sampled interventions will not all be mutually exclusive because IUCN policy objectives frequently are achieved through a combination of work across the three delivery mechanisms. The evaluation is expected to make findings, conclusions and recommendations based on the integration of the Union's policy work across all elements assessed.

---

[12] Examples of the application of some of these methodologies are: Episode Study of project on forest policy in Guatemala (2017): knowfor-evaluation-case-study-2-guatemala.pdf (iucn.org); Episode study for forest landscape restoration project in Rwanda (2016): rep-2016-018.pdf (iucn.org); Value for Money study of forest landscape restoration in Guatemala (2018) Value for money | IUCN Library System.

The sampling requirements and suggested data sources for each delivery mechanism are outlined below and the evaluation team is invited to refine these during inception:

1. Mobilising the Union and Commissions' contribution to policy

Policy influence work, on any relevant scale, topic or sector, of two (2) Commissions, sampled from among three of the seven: Species Survival Commission (SSC) and/or World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) and/or World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL).

- Desk review and qualitative textual analysis of internal and external sources (internal: constituents' strategy documents, policy planning meeting minutes, etc), (external: position papers, inputs made to policy processes, draft and final policy texts and decisions, etc);
- App. 8-10 key informant interviews (internal and external) per commission;

2. Programmatic Secretariat policy work (non-portfolio)

Two (2) international policy processes or policy objectives led by the HQ based international policy unit[13] sample from among: CBD, UNFCCC, CITES and CMS. All would offer the opportunity to review IUCN's engagement over an extended time frame and held meetings in 2022 for which recent documentation is available.

- Desk review of internal and external sources (internal: delegation briefs and reports from policy events, etc), (external: position papers, inputs made to policy processes, draft and final policy texts and decisions, etc);
- App. 8-10 key informant interviews (internal and external) per process/objective;

Two (2) IUCN Regional Offices and their work on a selected national or regional policy objective.

- Desk review of internal and external sources (internal: delegation briefs and reports from policy events, etc), (external: position papers, inputs made to policy processes, draft and final policy texts and decisions, etc);
- App. 8-10 key informant interviews (internal and external) per process/objective;

3. Project portfolio

- 40 projects to be reviewed and assessed for their policy component or scope (desk review incl. project documents, monitoring data, donor reports, project evaluations, public documents, etc.).

For each of the two Regional offices considered for the regional policy objective/process:
- In-depth review of 2-3 projects per region (including at national level) among the 40 selected with 2-3 interviews per project.

---

[13] Named International Policy Centre as of 2022

Summary sampling framework and approximate number of key informant interviews:

Work sampled	Approximate KII per intervention	App. Total nb of KII
Union		
2 Commissions' policy objectives or processes targeted (any scale)	8-10	16-20
Programmatic / non portfolio		
2 international policy objectives or processes	8-10	16-20
2 regional or national policy objectives or processes	8-10	16-20
Portfolio		
40 projects for desk review	n/a, desk review	n/a
4-6 projects for in-depth review (within the 40)	Approx 3 interviews per project	12-18
	Total:	**60-78**

7. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation outputs expected include:

Inception Report

The evaluation team will submit an inception report for approval by IUCN that explains the detailed methodology, evaluation matrix and work to sample. This is expected to be informed by desk review and key informant interviews with a sub-set of the total key informants cited above to identify the final sample to be assessed under each delivery mechanism.

The inception report is expected to contain the following contents:

- Introduction
- Purpose and scope
- Working draft of an IUCN policy influence theory of change/impact pathway*
- Working draft definitions*
- Evaluation matrix*
- Evaluation methodology
- Evaluation work plan, management, and quality assurance process
- Sampling framework and proposed interventions to sample (with explanation of the alignment to the criteria and criteria for evaluability)
- Annexes: work plan, evaluation matrix, TORs, documents reviewed, draft data collection instruments including interview protocols, categories of stakeholders to interview with expected number of informants per category, expected table of contents of the final evaluation report, and any other as relevant.

*Theory of change: The evaluation should surface or re-create and validate a theory of change (or impact pathway) for each delivery mechanism, and one that demonstrates how these fit together in a cohesive Union-wide policy influence theory of change. IUCN currently does not have a shared policy-focused theory of change. It is expected that a working model will be proposed during the inception and refined throughout the evaluation. This should make clear how IUCN influences policies that guide the conservation of nature and the equitable and ecologically sustainable use of natural resources. It should describe the mechanisms and thematic aspects of IUCN's policy influence work in all three of the samples (programmatic, portfolio, and Union). If distinct approaches to policy influence emerge within these, these should be explained. The evaluation should explore whether a typology of policy influence strategies can be defined.

*Definitions: Describe or provide definitions relevant to IUCN for: policy, policy advice, policy advocacy, policy outcomes, policy implementation, policy review, systemic approach, societal transformation, sustainable development.

*Evaluation matrix: The evaluation matrix should detail the issues to be addressed by each evaluation criterion, key and/or sub-questions to be covered, performance indicators, sources of information, and information-gathering methods for each issue.

Preliminary findings

The evaluation team will verbally present its preliminary findings (online) to the Steering Committee at the conclusion of its data collection and analysis phase (i.e. by December 2023).

The structure of the evaluation report should be reconfirmed with the Steering Committee when preliminary findings are presented to ensure that the structure proposed in the inception report is still relevant.

In addition, the evaluation team is expected to propose appropriate means for inclusive and participatory validation of recommendations by key stakeholders (e.g. through workshops or other means).

Draft evaluation report

The draft report will be submitted in early Q1 2023 (see timetable below). The draft report will be presented and submitted to a stakeholders' review process by the Steering Committee before a final report is submitted. The review process of the draft report is meant to correct potential factual errors or pinpoint omissions, and the reviewers should not attempt to change or influence conclusions or recommendations directly. The process will be facilitated by the evaluation manager whose role is to ensure that the evaluation report adheres to the final ToR and matrix agreed in the inception report.

The final report should be structured to maximise readability and usefulness. The link between questions, data collection, analysis, findings/conclusions, and recommendations must be clearly made and set out in a transparent manner in the presentation of the review report. Recommendations are expected to be strategic and concise. Each recommendation should also clearly state the main audience(s) and delivery mechanism to which it applies. Recommendations may cut across delivery mechanisms.

All data collection tools, the terms of reference, and the list of stakeholders interviewed are to be included as an Annex to the final report.

Final evaluation report

The evaluation findings and recommendations will be presented in a final report, split into multiple volumes and annexes as appropriate, a concise executive summary, and a verbal presentation (online) supported by a PowerPoint slide deck by the evaluation team to the key stakeholders of the evaluation.

8. Travel Required

The evaluation is expected to visit a minimum of two (2) Regional offices and potentially Country Offices to assess both the non-portfolio work for national and regional policy influencing and the portfolio sample from the region. Office missions will also be used to meet with external evaluation informants and stakeholders. Where possible, other interviews will be conducted by phone or online as relevant.

The evaluation team's proposal and work are expected to make every effort possible to minimize travel and associated emissions. Travel must be well-thought through and optimised to limit CO_2 emissions. All travel will require prior approval of IUCN.

9. Expected deliverables and tentative timeframe

The review will take place between August 2023 and March 2024. Preliminary findings are expected by the end of 2023. A more detailed time schedule will be developed with the evaluation team, including an agreed timeframe for the following deliverables.

Milestone	Indicative completion date
Estimated closing of Request for Proposals	Day 0
Estimated contract award date	+ 3 weeks
Documentation review and preliminary analysis	+ 6 weeks
Inception report, including evaluation matrix	6-8 weeks after contract award date
IUCN approval of inception report	+ 3 weeks for Steering Committee to review and approve
Data collection and analysis phase	4-6 months
Preliminary findings presentation to Steering Committee and ExBo	December 2023
Stakeholder input/validation of recommendations	Targeting Q4 2023 and early Q1 2024
Draft report delivery to IUCN	Q1 2024
IUCN comments on draft report	+ 3 weeks for Steering Committee to review and approve
Final report, executive summary & verbal presentation to key review audiences	By end Q1 2024

10.   Roles and responsibilities

This evaluation will be undertaken by an independent evaluation team, selected through IUCN's procurement process.

Technical supervision and input will be provided by Evaluation Steering Committee[14] assembled for the duration of this review, composed of staff from IUCN, a representative of IUCN's Council, and a representative of the funding agency, SDC.

Day-to-day management and coordination will be by the Programme Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME Unit). The evaluation manager will assist the evaluation team to coordinate with the concurrent External Review of IUCN's Programme 2021-2024 and 20-Year Strategic Vision to seek synergies and avoid overlap of work sampled.

11.   Evaluation team experience and qualifications

The consultancy is open to evaluation teams in which all team members are independent of the design or implementation the work being evaluated.

Evaluation bids must declare:

1) If any team members were or are involved in the design or implementation of the work to be evaluated;

2) How the evaluation team proposes to avoid bias arising from a potential conflict of interest, either by excluding that team member from segments of the evaluation design, data collection or analysis;

3) Which aspects of IUCN policy work would need to be excluded from the sample to maintain independence and impartiality.

The following expertise is required for the evaluation team:

- A team leader with extensive (10-15 years) demonstrated experience in the evaluation, monitoring and strategic review of institutions, projects and programmes with a focus on policy influence or advocacy for nature conservation or development.

---

[14] The proposed composition of the Evaluation Steering Committee is: Head of PPME; 1 representative from SDC; 1 representative from the Programme and Policy Committee of Council (PPC) (excluding IUCN Commission Chairs on PPC), 1 from a Secretariat Global Thematic Centre, 1 from a Secretariat Region].

- Experience evaluating science or research-based policy advocacy or influence on all aspects of the policy cycle.
- Experience evaluating membership organisations or other similarly structured organisations or collective influence efforts.
- Experience with gender-sensitive evaluation, participatory evaluation or developmental evaluation desirable.
- A team that can bring together diversity of perspectives, particularly those of women, youth and indigenous peoples would be a strong asset.
- Familiarity or demonstrated understanding of the mandate, governance, programme and operations of IUCN, including the IUCN Members, Commissions and National and Regional Committees.
- Demonstrated knowledge or understanding of global, regional and national biodiversity conservation and natural resource management policies and their evolution over the last 50 years in the context of wider global human development challenges, multilateral approaches and agendas, across a range of geographical situations.
- Excellent analytical skills and proven record of undertaking evaluations of similar scope and focus, and delivering clear reports with relevant and attainable recommendations.
- Demonstrated experience of undertaking complex and large-scale evaluations in collaboration with a wide range of stakeholders.
- Excellent English language proficiency, with French and Spanish proficiency highly desirable (English, French and Spanish are IUCN's three official languages and the executive summary will be translated).

12. Cost

The available budget for this evaluation shall not exceed CHF 175 000, including all travel and accommodation expenses. All travel will require prior approval of IUCN.

Annexes

Annex 1: Evaluation questions

The questions below are preliminary and indicative. The evaluation team will propose the final key evaluation questions, sub-questions, indicators, and sources of information for each one in the evaluation matrix to be approved as part of the Inception Report.

In addition to the OECD DAC evaluation criteria listed below, the evaluation team should consider three of the IUCN-specific lines of inquiry from the IUCN Evaluation Policy (issued June 2023): One Programme Approach; Gender, indigenous peoples and youth; and Science/policy/action interface.). The evaluation team may propose to address these transversally across the standard criteria listed below or separately. Details of each of these IUCN lines of inquiry may be found in the IUCN Evaluation Policy (June 2023).

Relevance – The extent to which policy objectives and influence strategies responded to global, national and partner needs and responded to the needs and priorities of IUCN constituents and beneficiaries15, placing particular emphasis on needs, roles and perceptions of women and girls, youth, indigenous peoples, and the mechanisms to ensure continued relevance. i.e. Were the interventions doing the right things?

1. To what extent do policy objectives and influence strategies respond to global, national, partner and IUCN constituents and beneficiaries needs and priorities?
2. To what extent are processes to establish policy positions, prioritize policy objectives and design influence strategies responsive to context?
   a. To what extent have they been underpinned by analysis of potential for impact for biodiversity conservation and equitable and ecological natural resource management?
3. What is the quality of intervention designs? To what extent did they address relevant priorities and needs and contain clearly specified goals?
4. To what extent did designs adapt over time (to ensure continued relevance)?

Coherence –The compatibility of the policy influence objectives and strategies with other interventions in IUCN, the country, or the sector. i.e. How well does this intervention fit?

5. To what extent are the goals and influence strategies within policy thematic areas or within sectors harmonised (including duplication vs complementarity)? (internal coherence)
6. To what extent are policy objectives and influence strategies aligned with national, regional and global conservation and development objectives?
   a. To what extent were interventions coherent with interventions implemented by other actors? (external coherence)
7. How are IUCN influence strategies similar or different to those of other actors operating in the same policy contexts?

Efficiency –The extent to which the policy influence interventions delivered, or are likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way. i.e. How well are resources being used?

8. Do the resources used justify the results?
9. How have inputs been used to produce outputs? (consider economic efficiency and operational efficiency)
10. What outputs are used to achieve policy outcomes?
11. To what extent is the conversion of inputs to outputs to outcomes efficient? (consider implementation rates)

---

15 Beneficiaries are defined by OECD DAC as, "the individuals, groups, or organisations, whether targeted or not, that benefit directly or indirectly, from the development intervention." Other terms, such as rights holders or affected people, may also be used. IUCN encourages the use of the term rights-holder when appropriate.

12. What are the time frames associated with output delivery and outcome achievement in each stage of the policy cycle?
13. What are the drivers and inhibitors of engagement with policy work across the constituents of the Union?
14. What is the role of partnerships and alliances in the policy influence efforts? What is the role of the relationships across the Union in these efforts? Where and under what conditions is coordination or an increase of policy influence observed?
15. Are there are more efficient ways to influence policy?

For the effectiveness and impact criteria:

- Address the threshold between output, outcome and impact level change in policy influence work (contribution versus attribution) and the implications for planning, monitoring and evaluating policy influence work.
- Identify indicators for measuring the achievement of objectives and, if necessary, improve the clarity of the objectives and theory of change for the assessed interventions.

Effectiveness – The extent to which IUCN's policy influence efforts achieved, or are expected to achieve, their objectives. i.e. In what ways, and to what extent has IUCN's influencing work contributed to changes in every stage of the policy cycle?

16. To what extent were the intended outcomes achieved? (output and outcome level achievements)
17. How effective has IUCN been in setting and influencing the policy agenda?
18. How did perceptions of IUCN's role in the policy space change because of the project or policy influence work?
19. How effective has IUCN been in engaging with, building relationships with, and/or influencing key decision makers?
20. How effective has IUCN been in supporting policy implementation?
21. To what extent does the use of IUCN science and metrics to monitor policy commitments contribute to policy review and enhancements?
22. To what extent do the different constituents of IUCN, through their participation in the Union, and in particular the relationships and processes that define the Union, orient or increase the policy influence?
23. Were there unintended or unexpected policy outcomes or other consequences? What were the success factors and what were the impediments to success? What emerge as the necessary conditions for IUCN's policy influencing work to have the greatest effects?

Impact – The extent to which the interventions evaluated and the policy efforts of the Union as a whole, generated or are expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects. What difference has the policy change made, or can reasonably be expected to make, to the adoption at scale of new practices to benefit biodiversity conservation or equitable and sustainable natural resource management?

24. To what extent does the Union deliver a unique value proposition?
25. To what extent are policy outcomes influenced by IUCN advocacy and policy interventions?
26. To what extent do IUCN approaches to policy influence show evidence of scaling from small or limited effects to larger or more embedded effects?
27. To what extent has implementation of the targeted policies contributed to sustainable development? To equity and justice? To biodiversity conservation?
28. To what extent have the policies influenced by IUCN led to or can be expected to lead to societal transformation or systems change?

Sustainability –The extent to which the net benefits of the policy influence work continue, or are likely to continue. The extent to which the intervention strengthened enabling conditions, in particular partnerships, capacities or policies, that can be expected to contribute to lasting change. i.e. To what

extent did the evaluand strengthen enabling conditions, in particular partnerships, networks or capacities, that can be expected to contribute to sustained change?

29. How effective has IUCN been in building capacity for policy influence?
30. To what extent are the policies or legal frameworks likely to be implemented or enforced?
31. How likely is it that the results achieved will be sustained?
32. How likely is it that the outcomes achieved will lead to impact-level change to biodiversity targets, or human or societal well-being targets?

Annex 2: Preliminary document list

- [IUCN External Review 2015 (section on knowledge chains)](#)
- [IUCN Evaluation of IUCN's Influence on Policy: Phase 1 Describing the policy work of IUCN (2005](#))
- Value for Money evaluation of IUCN Forest Landscape Restoration work in Guatemala (2018) [Value for money | IUCN Library System](#)
- SDC review of development relevancy (2020) [external-review-of-iucns-development-relevancy-march-2020.pdf](#)
- Overview of IUCN's policy influence (2018) [The impact of IUCN resolutions on international conservation efforts : an overview | IUCN Library System](#)
- All IUCN evaluations are available at: [Evaluations Database | IUCN](#)
- All IUCN External Reviews (review of the IUCN Programme every four years) are available at: [External Reviews | IUCN](#)

Annex 3: Indicative list of categories of stakeholders to consult

Stakeholders and categories of stakeholders to interview or survey:

IUCN Internal stakeholder list (proposed by IUCN)

- IUCN Director General
- Deputy Director General for Regional and out posted Offices
- Deputy Director General for Programme
- Deputy Director General for Corporate Services
- Chief Finance Officer
- Director of International Policy Centre
- Director of Strategic Partnerships
- Head of Membership and Commission Support
- Head of Environmental Law Centre
- Secretariat staff, in particular
  - Regional Directors and/or Country Representatives
  - Knowledge product leads
  - Lead for CBD CoPs or other meetings in 2022
  - Lead for IUCN delegations to UNFCC CoPs or other meetings in 2022
  - Lead for work on high seas policy, TBD
  - Leads for portfolio projects, TBD
- Commission Chairs, based on the 2 Commissions sampled among:
  - Species Survival Commission (SSC)
  - World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)
  - World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL)
- Commission members participating as IUCN delegation members in policy fora
- National and Regional Committees Chairs
- Member organisations across different categories
- Council, in particular PPC

- o Council members in particular that have participated in various policy fora
- Framework partners

External stakeholders and/or key informants, list to be expanded by evaluation team:

- Major portfolio donors
- Policy makers in public sectors, at any jurisdictional or geographical scale
- Policy makers in corporate sectors
- Staff of policy-making or implementing bodies, including but not limited to multilateral environmental agreements Secretariat or current or future presidents of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) or the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
- Project stakeholders affected by policy work
- Indigenous Peoples' Organisations

Annex 4: 2021 Congress Resolution 147 (WCC-2020-Dec-147-EN)

Development of a new 20-year Strategic Vision, inclusive of a Financial Strategy, and Strategic Plan for the Union

The IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020, at its session in Marseille, France:

REQUESTS the IUCN Council, as a matter of priority, to establish an intersessional Council working group including IUCN Members to lead and work with the Director General:

a. to define a consultative process to undertake the following:

i. undertake a global situational analysis of IUCN that takes into account all points raised in the external review;

ii. develop options to address the points raised in the External Review of Aspects of IUCN's Governance, including strengthening Council's capacity to carry out its oversight and governance roles, and if needed, reviewing its membership models and any other needed organisational change;

iii. develop a long-term (20 years) integrated Strategic Vision that includes a Financial Strategy, and Strategic Plan and other implementation plans, as needed, that follow the four-year planning process of the Union; and

iv. establish a clear roadmap to ensure that the Union effectively and efficiently fulfils its mandated objectives, including by actively engaging its membership, while ensuring financial sustainability;

b. to consult with the IUCN membership during the process, including sharing the proposed process, the composition of the working group, and the situational analysis and the outcomes of that strategic planning process and options developed in a.ii; and

c. to submit the Strategic Vision, Financial Strategy and Strategic Plan and options developed in a.ii. to a vote by the Members before the end of the next World Conservation Congress.