



African Activists for Climate Justice

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END-TERM EVALUATION (ETE) OF THE AACJ PROGRAM



Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the
Netherlands



Oxfam



NATURAL
JUSTICE



The African Women's
Development and
Communication Network



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the AACJ Program

The African Activists for Climate Justice (AACJ) a five-year Program (2021- 2025) that aims to unify and amplify the voices in Africa; demanding that the most vulnerable groups – women, youth, local and indigenous communities – in the target countries and beyond have the capacity to defend and realize their human rights and live a decent and dignified life in a healthy and sustainable environment, within the context of the climate emergency.

The Program is funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) within the Power of Voices Program and is implemented in eight African countries: Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Mozambique, Senegal, Somalia and South Africa, as well as an African regional and global perspective in addition to a Netherlands component. The AACJ consortium is led by the Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA). PACJA is a coalition of over 1000 civil society organizations spread across 48 countries in the African continent working in the climate justice space. PACJA has been at the forefront of advancing climate justice in Africa for over 10 years, using evidence-based advocacy to shape and improve policies and laws on natural resource management, and supporting local communities to develop climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies. The other consortium members include:

- ◆ **Natural Justice (NJ)**, a team of pioneering lawyers and legal experts working with 24 partners in 10 countries in Africa. NJ uses legal empowerment, research, litigation and advocacy to stand with indigenous and local communities as they defend themselves and their ecosystems against environmental impacts caused by climate change and harmful extractive and infrastructure developments.
- ◆ **FEMNET**, a pan-African feminist network that brings together members in 43 countries in Africa. It is strategically positioned as a convener and dialogue facilitator, enabling women and girls to claim, affirm and use their collective power to end all forms of exclusion, oppression, exploitation and injustices against them. FEMNET pushes for the implementation of commitments made by African governments to advance gender equality and realization of women and girls rights.
- ◆ **Oxfam Novib**, a world-wide development organization that has over 65 years of advocacy and campaign experience. Working in alliance with local allies and people's movements, it has advocated, and supported numerous actions and initiatives for climate accountability, funding for systemic climate solutions and support for communities least able to adapt. Oxfam Novib is part of the Oxfam Confederation which works in 35 countries on the African continent.
- ◆ **The African Youth Commission (AYC)**, an implementing partner playing a key role in bringing more young people on board to raise awareness on climate change and influence national governments to implement climate-related programs in a transparent manner that benefits young people. The network also sees a vital role for youth in Africa

to contribute to the development of practical solutions and efforts to enhance the livelihoods of vulnerable communities. The AYC has 228 members in 46 countries on the African continent.

The AACJ Consortium believes that building strong and inclusive movements for climate justice in Africa – starting with the target countries – Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa will be an engine for a powerful pan-African movement for climate justice. These programs are supported by interventions aimed at influencing policies in the Netherlands and at the level of multinational institutions. 9 Program Advisory Committees (PAC) are responsible for the implementation of these 10 Program components (8 Country, 1 Regional & Global and the Netherlands). The 5-year Program started being implemented on 1st May 2021 and is planned to complete by 31st December 2025.

1.2 Program Goal and Objectives of the AACJ Program

The AACJ Program goal is to amplify and unite the voices in Africa demanding that women, youth, local and indigenous communities in the program countries can defend and realize their human rights and live a decent and dignified life in a healthy and sustainable environment, within the context of the climate emergency.

The strategic objective of the AACJ Program is a strong and inclusive African movement that has mobilized citizens, companies, and governments to advance climate justice, specifically contributing to:

1. Amplified voices of people who are disproportionately affected by the changing climate, and that offer solutions for a more sustainable future, such as women, youth, and local and indigenous communities.
2. African narratives that highlight lived experiences of women, youth and local and indigenous communities impacted by climate change, and which can help change the terms of debate on climate change.
3. Empowered citizens/ communities that claim and defend their social and environmental rights.
4. Scoping and scaling of community- based best practice on adaptive capacities of climate frontline communities and.
5. Policy and practice change that prevent adverse impacts of climate change, support communities that are already affected and enable the transition to more sustainable, and low carbon economies, while leaving no one behind.

The AACJ Program has two medium-term impact goals that will contribute to the overall objective:

1. Strong, inclusive, and effective movement promoting climate justice, while keeping governments and companies accountable.
2. Policies, practices, and frameworks that advance climate justice are adopted, funded, and implemented.

1.3 Description of Context and Problem Analysis

The African Activists for Climate Justice (AACJ) project operates within a complex context of national, sectoral, and political challenges that shape climate resilience in Africa. In the eight African countries (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Mozambique, Senegal, Somalia, and South Africa), the project addresses the disproportionate impact of climate change on marginalized groups such as women, youth, and indigenous communities, who often face compounded vulnerabilities due to social and economic inequities. Despite contributing the least to global greenhouse gas emissions, African countries bear some of the most severe consequences, including extreme weather, land degradation, and food insecurity. The AACJ consortium, led by PACJA, FEMNET, Oxfam, Natural Justice, and the African Youth Commission, seeks to counter this “climate injustice” by mobilizing communities and amplifying voices at the frontlines of the climate crisis. The rationale behind AACJ lies in the urgent need to bridge gaps in government responsiveness and foster climate policies that recognize and involve those most affected. A key challenge is overcoming political barriers, such as limited civic space and underrepresentation of these groups in policy development and climate action frameworks. The AACJ’s problem analysis highlights the need for inclusive, rights-based approaches to climate change, enabling traditionally excluded communities to actively participate in decision-making processes and build sustainable, climate-resilient futures.

1.4 Description of Intervention Logic and Theory of Change

The African Activists for Climate Justice (AACJ) project’s Theory of Change (ToC) envisions a long-term impact of achieving climate justice by mobilizing marginalized African communities—including women, youth, and indigenous groups—to advocate for equitable climate policies. The intervention logic follows a structured pathway from inputs and activities, such as capacity-building, narrative development, and advocacy, to outputs that strengthen movements, raise awareness, and foster community resilience as detailed in the AACJ Project Theory of Change in Annex 4. These outputs are designed to lead to outcomes of strengthened human rights frameworks, enhanced community adaptive capacities, and increased political will for climate-just policies.

The ToC acknowledges external factors, such as political instability and limited civic space, which could impact outcomes. For instance, the success of policy advocacy is dependent on governmental responsiveness and openness to civil society input. Assumptions underlying the intervention include the belief that empowered communities will effectively mobilize, that inclusive narratives will resonate across society, and that advocacy will shift policy agendas toward justice. The AACJ approach leverages learning and adaptation to continuously refine strategies, ensuring alignment between community needs and climate action goals. The ToC diagram can be accessed in Annex 4 - AACJ Theory of Change (ToC).

1.5 Background of the AACJ Mid Term Review Evaluation

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) evaluation of the AACJ project, conducted in 2023, provided an in-depth evaluation of the project's progress, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability up to its midpoint. The review emphasized the program's success in amplifying African voices, particularly those of women, youth, and local communities, to advance climate justice. It highlighted the development of strong climate justice narratives, increased capacities of civil society organizations, and enhanced political will for policy advocacy. However, the MTR also identified critical areas for improvement, including the need for a robust sustainability strategy, stronger partnerships, and better integration of cross-cutting issues such as gender, safeguarding, and locally led action. This End-Term Evaluation will build on the findings and recommendations of the MTR to assess the project's final outcomes and provide actionable insights for future programming. The MTR report will be provided to the consultant as listed project documents in Annex 4 of the Annexes section.

2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

2.1 Introduction

The AACJ project conducted a Mid-Term Review (MTR) in 2023 to assess progress and improve program effectiveness. The MTR provided critical insights into the program's implementation, identifying key achievements and challenges, and offered actionable recommendations to guide the remaining project period. The AACJ project is looking to engage a consultant to conduct an End Term Evaluation (ETE) for the AACJ Program. The ETE will build on the MTR findings and assess the overall progress, lessons learned and the sustainability of the AACJ program. This section outlines the key objectives of conducting the ETE for the AACJ Project in terms of the overall objective, specific objectives and intended use of the evaluation.

2.2 Overall Objective

The overall objective of the End-Term Evaluation (ETE) is to assess the overall performance of the AACJ project, balancing both accountability and learning. This will include assessing **effectiveness, sustainability, coherence,** and **AACJ's cross-cutting priorities** while also drawing lessons to inform future programming and advocacy strategies for the AACJ Consortium Partners. The evaluation will also critically assess the partnership dynamics, particularly the effectiveness of the southern-led consortium model. It will explore how this approach has influenced collaboration, decision-making, and the overall impact of the project.

2.3 Specific Objectives

1. **Effectiveness** – To measure the extent to which the project has achieved expected and unexpected outcomes, including changes in climate justice policy, community resilience, and the capacity of civil society organizations to advocate for climate justice.
2. **Sustainability** – To assess the likelihood that the activities and results of the project across the 5 pathways will be sustained beyond the project's lifecycle, particularly with

regard to local ownership, institutional capacity, and financial sustainability.

3. **Coherence** – To evaluate the alignment and coordination of the AACJ project’s coherence with other climate justice initiatives, policies, programs at national, regional, and global levels and coherence between the strategic partnership and MoFA (and the Dutch Embassies)?
4. **AACJ Cross-Cutting Factors** – To assess how effectively the AACJ project integrated and addressed cross-cutting priorities such as gender transformation, climate, safeguarding, locally-led action, learning agenda reflection and evaluation processes.
5. **Theory of Change (ToC) Validity and Adaptation** – To learn from program implementation about the validity and adaptation of the AACJ’s ToC.

2.4 Intended Use of the Evaluation

The results of the ETE will serve multiple purposes:

- ◆ **For AACJ Consortium Partners:** To refine future climate justice strategies for learning and to improve the design and implementation of similar projects in the future.
- ◆ **For the donor:** To provide accountability regarding the use of funds and the achievement of project goals, and to inform future investment in climate justice initiatives.
- ◆ **For the project participants:** To provide feedback and learning on how well the project met their needs and how they can be further engaged in climate justice efforts.
- ◆ **For policymakers:** To understand the project’s contributions to national and international climate frameworks and policies.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This section describes geographical focus, the evaluation period, specific thematic domain and expenditure that will be a part of the evaluation. However, the expenditure of the evaluation is further detailed in section 10 on the budget for the evaluation as well as project documents as listed in Annex 4.

3.1 Geographical Scope

The evaluation will cover all the countries where the AACJ program has been implemented: Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Somalia, Kenya, Senegal, South Africa, and Mozambique, as well as additional focus areas of the AACJ program, including the Netherlands, regional, and global levels. The evaluation will consider both urban and rural contexts, with a particular emphasis on regions most affected by climate change, such as drought-prone areas, coastal zones, and regions with significant indigenous populations. To ensure depth and representativeness, the evaluation will include all countries in the desk review, while a carefully selected sample of countries will be

included in the evaluators' primary data collection. The sampling approach will be designed to capture a diverse range of experiences, contexts, and lessons learned, ensuring that findings are both comprehensive and actionable.

3.2 Time Scope

The evaluation will cover the full project cycle from **1st May 2021 to 31st December 2025**, with particular attention to the changes and adaptations made during the COVID-19 pandemic. The time scope includes: review of project planning and inception phases (2020–2021), assessment of mid-term results (2022–2023), and final assessment of outcomes in 2024–2025. The assessment at the outcome level must adhere to assessment grid criterion 10a and 10b of the IOB Evaluation Criteria 2024. The consultant will need to be aware of this time scope and propose ways in which results data achieved during the second half of 2025, while the evaluation is taking place, will be incorporated into the final evaluation report.

3.3 Thematic Scope

The thematic areas to be evaluated include the 5 pathways of the AACJ project results:

- ◆ **Strengthening Movements on Climate Justice:** Evaluate the program's effectiveness in building, strengthening and empowering grassroots movements, networks, and coalitions that advocate for climate justice, particularly among marginalized communities.
- ◆ **Developing and Sharing Narratives on Climate Justice:** Assess the program's success in creating and disseminating powerful, inclusive narratives that raise awareness about climate justice issues and highlight the perspectives and voices of those most affected by climate change.
- ◆ **Human Rights Frameworks Strengthening:** Examine the extent to which the program has supported the integration of human rights into climate justice efforts, reinforcing legal and social protections for vulnerable populations impacted by climate-related challenges.
- ◆ **Communities' Adaptive Capacities:** Evaluate the program's role in enhancing communities' ability to adapt to the adverse effects of climate change, focusing on building resilience, promoting sustainable practices, and supporting livelihoods threatened by climate impacts.
- ◆ **Climate Just Policies:** Review the program's contributions to influencing and shaping national, regional and global climate policies, ensuring they are equitable, just, and responsive to the needs of affected communities. Assess the impact of the AACJ's advocacy initiatives in driving policy changes at local, national, and international levels, with an emphasis on aligning policies with climate justice principles.

4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

4.1 Evaluation Criteria (OECD/DAC) and Cross-Cutting Issues

The evaluation objectives and evaluation questions are guided by the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. The evaluation questions have incorporated other relevant cross-cutting issues (e.g. gender, youth engagement, climate, safeguarding and locally-led action), accompanied by cross-cutting questions. The evaluation questions will ideally incorporate requirements/perspectives from the Reference Group, consortium partners as well as from the MoFA to which mutual agreement will be reached on how the evaluation is carried out (methodologically). The evaluation will include 'efficiency' criterion on results efficiency (timely delivery of results) and operational efficiency (organizational efficiency). The selection of the OECD/DAC criteria and cross-cutting issues is based on criterion 7 of MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria.

4.2 Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will focus on the following main questions. The questions are aligned with the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and the AACJ cross cutting factors as outlined in the below table and will have to be answered and assessed through data collection methodologies and analysis which are aligned with IOB evaluation criteria:

Evaluation Criteria	Main Question	Sub-Questions
1. Effectiveness	1. Has the AACJ Project achieved its expected and unexpected outcomes (in reference to the project's result framework for baseline data and targets in Annex 4), including changes in climate justice policy, community resilience, and the capacity of civil society organizations to advocate for climate justice?	1.1 What progress has been made toward achieving the expected and unexpected outcomes across the 5 pathways? 1.2 Were the project's advocacy, capacity-strengthening, and community engagement strategies effective in driving change in the AACJ project? 1.3 Were the project's advocacy strategies effective in influencing climate justice policies at the local, national, and international levels? How effective? 1.4 Did the capacity-strengthening initiatives improve the ability of CSOs to advocate for climate justice? 1.5 How effective were the project's community engagement activities in fostering grassroots participation and mobilizing local action for climate justice? 1.6 Was the project effective in achieving project objectives in regions affected by conflict or instability?

		<p>1.7 How did the project address the unique challenges posed by conflict or instability to ensure the effective delivery of the intended outcomes in these areas?</p> <p>1.8 How did the partnerships with external stakeholders (particularly with the Netherlands Embassy) and the coordination mechanisms within the AACJ consortium take shape? To what extent were these partnerships and coordination mechanisms effective in supporting project implementation? Which delays occurred and why/how did they take shape? Why were these partnerships and coordination mechanisms effective (or not)?</p> <p>1.9 Did these partnerships and coordination mechanisms enhance project results?</p>
2. Sustainability	<p>2. Is there a likelihood that the activities and results of the project will be sustained beyond the project's lifecycle, particularly with regard to local ownership, institutional capacity, and financial sustainability?</p>	<p>2.1 Are the activities and results of the project likely to be sustained beyond the project's end?</p> <p>2.2 Has the project built local ownership and institutional capacity for climate justice advocacy?</p> <p>2.3 What are the key conditions necessary for the sustainability of the project results, and to what extent have these conditions been achieved?</p> <p>2.4 Are there additional actions that the project should take to further boost the sustainability of its results. What specific strategies or interventions would enhance this likelihood?</p> <p>2.5 Are there externalities of the project likely to advance or hinder sustainability?</p>
3. Coherence	<p>3. Has there been alignment and coordination of the AACJ project's coherence with other climate justice initiatives, policies, and programs at national, regional, and global levels and between the strategic partnership and MoFA (and the Dutch Embassies)?</p>	<p>3.1 Has the project been coherent with other climate justice initiatives, policies, and programs at the national, regional, and global levels?</p> <p>3.2 Has the project been coherent with these initiatives and actors to enhance synergies, avoid duplication, and contribute to broader climate justice goals?</p> <p>3.3 Has the project been coherent with the policies and priorities of MoFA?</p> <p>3.4 Were the project's strategies coherent with emerging trends and priorities in climate justice?</p> <p>3.5 Were the project's interventions coherent between regional and global levels?</p>

<p>AACJ Cross-Cutting Factors</p>	<p>4. How effectively did the AACJ project integrate and address cross-cutting priorities such as gender transformation, climate, safeguarding, locally-led action, learning agenda reflection and evaluation processes?</p>	<p>4.1 Has the project addressed gender disparities in climate justice? If so, how and was this effective? If not, why not?</p> <p>4.2 Has the project engaged and empowered youth in climate justice initiatives?</p> <p>4.3 Did the project contribute to climate change adaptation and mitigation and what are the results in this regard?</p> <p>4.4 Did the project contribute to climate change adaptation and what are the results in this regard?</p> <p>4.5 Were the safeguarding principles incorporated throughout the project? To what extent were they incorporated? Were there any challenges experienced?</p> <p>4.6 Did the project take adequate measures to protect vulnerable populations and protection on SEAH in community engagement and project activities?</p> <p>4.7 Did the project foster locally-led action? To what extent? Were there any challenges experienced?</p> <p>4.8 How effectively were local communities, CSOs, and local leaders empowered to take ownership of climate justice actions?</p> <p>4.9 Are these locally-led action initiatives likely to last beyond the project's lifecycle?</p> <p>4.10 What lessons and best practices can be drawn from the project's learning agenda?</p> <p>4.11 How can these lessons and best practices and on the implementation to inform future climate justice programming?</p> <p>4.12 Were the Mid-Term Review (MTR) recommendations implemented, and what impact did this have on the project's outcomes?</p> <p>4.13 To what extent was the Project Management Unit (PMU) involved in the evaluation process, and how did this influence the outcomes of the evaluation?</p> <p>4.14. How well were all AACJ stakeholders (consortium members, implementing partners, and target communities) involved in the evaluation process, and how did this influence the outcomes of the evaluation?</p>
--	--	---

		4.15 What evaluation can be made of the overall monitoring approach? How effective was the collection of monitoring data, and what can be said of the use of the SCS indicators as part of the evaluation of this program?
Theory of Change (ToC) Validity and Adaptation	5. What can be learnt from program implementation about the validity and adaptation of the AACJ's ToC?	<p>5.1 Is the Theory of Change (ToC) and its underlying risks and assumptions relevant to the AACJ strategies and results?</p> <p>5.2 What adaptations and interlinkages to the ToC are necessary to enhance its alignment with the AACJ project's evolving priorities and the post-project sustainability strategy?</p> <p>5.3 Are all learning agenda questions related to the ToC answered successfully and how were they answered?</p>

5. METHODOLOGY

5.1 Introduction

The methodology for this evaluation will have to integrate approaches and methods aligned with MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria and MoFA ETE guidelines, ensuring a thorough and ethical evaluation process. The Consultant needs to be aware that evaluation will be approved based on the MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria. This section will therefore provide guidelines on what type of methods are expected, set criteria for methodology and sampling. The proposed methodology will be elaborated in the inception report by the consultant, detailing how the proposed methodology meets the requirements of this ToR and standards of MoFA's 2024 IOB Quality Evaluation Criteria.

5.2 Evaluation Research Design

The proposed evaluation's research design by the consultant will structure the overall approach and methods of the evaluation. The proposed approach and methods must achieve the evaluation objectives in a valid and reliable manner and be appropriate to answer the evaluation questions. The 'technical proposal' and 'inception report' should elaborate on the research design, the combination of methods selected and how these methods are expected to validly and reliably contribute to answering the evaluation questions. The description of research design by the consultant will be approved based on criterion 9 of MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria.

5.3 Data Triangulation

The evaluation robustness will be increased by use of mixed methods or data sources approach also known as 'triangulation'. The consultant is required to propose a comprehensive methodology that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative approaches, as well as triangulation of data, to

address the evaluation questions and to fulfill the evaluation's objectives. To ensure the reliability and validity of findings, the evaluation will employ triangulation by using multiple data sources and methods to cross-check results. This will help to mitigate biases and ensure that findings are well-substantiated. Triangulation will be applied across methods by combining qualitative and quantitative data, data sources by collecting information from multiple stakeholder groups and data types by incorporating both primary and secondary data. The consultant must present the proposed information sources, indicators, result areas and selected research methods per evaluation question in an evaluation matrix.

5.4 Sampling and Case Selection

Given the wide geographical scope of the AACJ project, a representative sampling strategy will be required to ensure that findings are generalizable across the project's target countries¹. The consultant will need to propose a sample and sampling framework that ensures inclusivity across geographic regions with representation from urban, rural, and remote areas affected by climate change in the project countries, key and diverse stakeholders with representation from partners, government officials, local CSOs, community members, youth and women's organizations and target groups with representation from vulnerable groups such as women, youth, indigenous peoples and marginalized communities. Sampling method will include probability sampling (for quantitative methods) and purposive sampling (for qualitative methods). The proposed sample size and sampling framework should be justified based on representativeness and a clear rationale provided for the selection of case studies. The sample size should be based on a power calculation. The sampling and case selection will further be discussed and agreed upon during the inception phase of the evaluation. The description of sampling and case selection by the consultant will be approved based on criterion 12 of MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria.

5.5 Sufficient and Independent Information Sources

There needs to be sufficient and independent information Sources for the evaluation based on criterion 13 of MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria. The consultant shall collect information from the AACJ program non-direct stakeholders that were not directly involved with the project to provide important information about the external factors, assumptions or what would have happened in the absence of the AACJ program intervention. Information on external factors and assumptions can be referenced from the AACJ Project Theory of Change in Annex 4 of the Annexes section. In addition to information sources obtained from direct stakeholders, the consultant has to consider to include other information sources such as the non-targeted population, informed but not directly engaged stakeholders (staff from other donors, CSOs, NGOs, national or sub-national government officials; researchers, academics etc.) the evaluator's own direct observations and validated independent secondary data sources as per criterion 13 of MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria. The 'technical proposal' and 'inception report' should present which information

¹ Full coverage of all countries of implementation is not necessarily a requirement, if the evaluation is based on robust and well evidenced findings, and as long as sampling framework ensures sufficient and convincing representativity across regions. Options, like a detailed evaluation of all program pathways in a sample of countries, and a selected evaluation of some program pathways in the remaining countries will be considered, if the evaluation commissioners judge that the proposition ensures a sufficient geographical representativity.

sources will be included in a way that minimizes source bias, by using sufficient and independent information sources.

5.6 Description of Limitations and Bias

The consultant's Technical Proposal and Inception Report should clearly describe the potential limitations and bias (and any other forms of limitations and bias) that might arise in the reliability and validity (both internal and external) of the proposed methodology sampling strategy, case selection and available information sources. The description of limitations and bias will be approved based on criterion 14 of MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria.

5.7 Description of Result Areas and Indicators

The 'technical proposal' and 'inception report' should present the valid quantitative and qualitative indicators that describe the result areas as concretely as possible to assess the intended results and should adhere to the SMART criteria. The description of results areas and the indicators for the AACJ program is presented in Annex 4 of the Annexes section. The description of result areas and indicators will be based on criterion 11 of MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria.

5.8 Plausibility of Causal Claims

The proposed evaluation methods should be appropriate to assess the contribution or attribution of the interventions to the observed results at the outcome or impact levels. The consultant will propose evaluation method(s) to evaluate the degree to which causal claims of the AACJ program interventions about the results, effects, and outcomes are plausible. The consultant can consider to use qualitative evaluation methods that are suitable for substantiating claims about effectiveness such as: realistic evaluation, contribution analysis, process tracing and general elimination methodology. The consultant can consider to use quantitative evaluation methods to robustly substantiate causal claims about effects of AACJ program interventions making use of Maryland scientific methods scale that delineates 5 progressing levels of rigor: single observation moment, after a project: a comparison with and without the project (level 1), two observation moments, comparisons before and after the project, without a control group (level 2), two observation moments: comparing before and after, and with and without the project (double difference) (level 3), two observation moments: comparing before and after, and with and without the project (double difference, semi-experimental design), while accounting for other external influences (level 4) and two observation moments: comparing before and after, and with and without the project (double difference); participants are randomly assigned to a project (randomized control group, experimental design) (level 5). ETes commissioned by the MoFA with quantitative evaluations should have a minimum of Level 4 rigor which is generally accepted as robust to support substantial causal claims. The plausibility of causal claims will be approved based on criterion 10a and 10b of MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria.

5.9 Substantiation of Findings

The consultant will be responsible for ensuring that all conclusions are based on sufficient evidence. Findings should not rely on anecdotal examples or isolated cases, but rather be grounded in systematically collected and analyzed data. Where findings are drawn from qualitative sources (e.g., interviews), they should be supported by multiple examples and triangulated with other data.

5.10 Suggested Evaluation Methods

The evaluation will prioritize on utilizing existing project methods and existing project data. The consultant will propose their methodology, which will be further be discussed with the project team during the inception phase of the evaluation. The following are the suggested evaluation methods:

- ◆ **Participatory Evaluation Methods:** Methods such as outcome mapping or outcome harvesting (OH) can be used to capture the perspectives of local communities and their contributions to climate justice advocacy. The outcome substantiation of the OH database from routine reporting would be desirable.
- ◆ **Feministic approach to MEL:** The consultant should pay special attention to the principles of a Feminist Approach to MEL in the ETE. MoFA acknowledges the importance of an inclusive approach to MEL for the AACJ program such as the Feminist Approach to MEL. The technical proposal for the consultant will outline how a feminist approach will be used during data collection, analysis and sense making of the evaluation report data. This is to be reflected in the observations, findings, recommendations and conclusions.
- ◆ **Document Review:** A review of all relevant project documents, including the original project proposal, mid-term review reports, annual reports, policy briefs, and any other relevant AACJ program publications.
- ◆ **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs):** In-depth interviews with stakeholders, including AACJ program governance structures, donor representatives, consortium partners, country-level downstream partners, government officials, and project participants' representatives.
- ◆ **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs):** Group discussions with AACJ program partners, project participants and community members to assess the perceived impact of the project on their livelihoods and resilience.
- ◆ **Surveys and Questionnaires:** Quantitative surveys with AACJ program partners, project participants and stakeholders to assess specific outcomes related to capacity-building, advocacy, and community resilience.
- ◆ **Case Studies and Most Significant Stories (MCSs):** Case studies and MCSs focusing on specific countries or regions where the project had notable successes or faced significant challenges. The case studies and MCSs should provide insights into the factors that influenced project performance and outcomes.

- ◆ **Capacity Assessment:** The consultant should use a robust methodology is required to assess the capacity of civil society organizations involved in the project. One possible framework to use is the Five Core Capabilities (5CC) model.

5.11 Answers to Evaluation Questions

The consultant's draft and final report should provide an answer to all evaluation questions. If the consultant faced unforeseen limitations during the evaluation process that prevents answering all evaluation questions, the reports must highlight which evaluation questions were not answered and give reasons for this. The answers to the evaluation questions will be approved based on criterion 16 of MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria.

5.12 Logic of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations in the ETE Report

The consultant should have a clear and rational connection in the ETE report from findings to conclusions, and from the conclusions to the recommendations. Each conclusion should be supported by specific findings. It is important that the final report takes possible limitations and bias sufficiently into account. Recommendations, in turn, must logically follow from the conclusions presented in the ETE report. It is expected from the consultant that the draft and final report(s) not only mention what limitations and possible biases are but also clearly and fully reflects on what this means for the conducted evaluation, the presented results and findings and the formulated conclusions and recommendations. The logic of findings, conclusions and recommendations will be approved based on criterion 17 of MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria.

5.13 Inception, Draft and Final Report

The consultant will produce 3 reports in 3 stages: inception report, draft report and final report. The reports should present all research methods, data collection methods, data sources and data analysis techniques in a systematic, complete and transparent manner. The draft and final reports (or annexes) should discuss and compare findings from all different research methods, data collection methods and data sources as per Annex 3 of the Annexes section. The draft and final reports should transparently describe how it weighed the evidence, how it addressed the discrepancies between findings and how it combined findings from different sources and methods to come to an overall judgement and conclusion. The transparency of the draft and final reports will be approved based on criterion 15 of MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria.

6. RESEARCH ETHICS

The AACJ project focuses on vulnerable populations, making it critical that the evaluation adheres to the highest possible research ethics. The following research ethics must be integrated into the evaluation process:

1. **Confidentiality, Anonymity and Data Protection:** Given the potentially sensitive nature of the information gathered—particularly related to advocacy activities and the experiences of marginalized groups—it is essential that all data be handled with confidentiality,

securely stored and in compliance with data protection laws and AACJ project policies. Personal identifiers should not be disclosed in any reports unless explicit consent is given by participants.

- 2. Informed Consent:** All participants in the evaluation must provide informed consent before any data collection begins. This requires that participants are fully informed about the purpose of the evaluation, the use of the data, and their right to withdraw from the evaluation at any time without penalty.
- 3. Safeguarding:** All research activities must prioritize safeguarding principles to ensure the safety, dignity, and rights of all participants, particularly vulnerable groups such as women, youth, and marginalized communities. The consultant must adhere to the AACJ safeguarding policy and ensure that no participant experiences harm, discrimination, or exploitation as a result of their participation in the research.
- 4. Protection from SEAH:** Strict measures must be taken to prevent and address any risks of sexual exploitation, abuse, or harassment during data collection, stakeholder engagements, or community interactions. The consultant is required to establish and follow clear reporting and response mechanisms for any SEAH-related concerns or incidents that may arise during the consultancy.
- 5. Cultural Sensitivity and Respect:** The consultant must approach all interactions with cultural sensitivity and respect, ensuring that the data collection methods are appropriate for the context and do not perpetuate harmful stereotypes or biases.

The consultant should propose other ethical risks and strategies for mitigating these potential ethical risks.

7. DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE

7.1 Deliverables:

The assessment of the deliverables will be based on the ToR and MoFA's 2024 IOB evaluation quality criteria. However, the consultant will be expected to deliver the following deliverables:

- 1. Inception Report:** The consultant to provide an inception report outlining the detailed evaluation methodology, work plan, and timeline. It will also include an initial desk review of project documents, identification of key informants, and a sampling strategy. The report should not exceed 20 pages (excluding annexes).
- 2. Data Collection Tools:** The consultant will provide data collection tools, including interview guides, survey instruments, and focus group discussion templates. These tools will be reviewed and approved by the Reference Group prior to data collection.
- 3. Preliminary Findings Report:** The preliminary findings report will summarize key insights from the fieldwork and provide an initial analysis of the data collected. This report will be used to engage stakeholders in a validation process to ensure that the findings accurately

reflect the situation on the ground.

- 4. Draft Report:** The draft report will present a full analysis of the evaluation findings, addressing each of the evaluation questions and providing conclusion and recommendations. The report will include: executive summary, description of the methodology used, analysis of the project's findings, challenges, and lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations as per Annex 3 of the Annexes section.
- 5. Final Evaluation Report:** The final report will be produced by incorporating all feedback from the Reference Group, Donor and the AACJ Consortium Partners. It will be submitted in **English** and, in other languages (French and Portuguese). The report should not exceed **60 pages**, excluding annexes as per Annex 3 of the Annexes section.
- 6. Presentation of Findings:** The consultant will present the findings to the AACJ program governance structures and also to key AACJ program stakeholders during a validation workshop. This workshop will provide an opportunity for stakeholders to discuss the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

7.2 Timeline

The evaluation timeline is categorized into 3 phases as guided by MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria: **Phase 1: Formation of The Reference Group**, **Phase 2: Elaborated Methodology** and **Phase 3: Draft and Final Report**. The entire ETE timeline is expected to be **6 months** from the date of contract signing. The ETE assignment is expected to be completed after the inception meeting. The detailed timeline is as follows:

No.	Task	Duration	Timeline (by when)	Responsible
Phase 1: Terms of Reference				
1.	Nomination of the Reference Group	2 Weeks	13 th December, 2024	PMU
2.	Drafting of the Draft Terms of Reference	3 Weeks	20 th December, 2024	PMU/ Reference Group
3.	Review and Approval of the Terms of Reference	4 Weeks	14 st February, 2025	Reference Group/ MoFA Focal Point
4.	Advertisement of the Terms of Reference	6 Weeks	28 th March, 2025	PMU
5	Receipt and Filing of the Technical & Financial Proposals for Shortlisting.	2 Weeks	11 th April, 2025	PMU

No.	Task	Duration	Timeline (by when)	Responsible
6	Review and Shortlisting of the Technical & Financial Proposals.	3 Weeks	2 nd May, 2025	Reference Group
6.	Interviews and Selection of the Consultant	2 Weeks	16 th May, 2025	Reference Group
7.	Contract Signing and Kick-off Meeting with the Consultant	1 Week	30 th May, 2025	PMU
8.	Document Review of the AACJ Program Documents by the Consultant	2 Weeks	13 th June, 2025	Consultant
Phase 2: Elaborated Methodology				
9.	Submission and Approval of an Inception Report by the Consultant	2 Weeks	27 th June, 2025	Consultant/ Reference Group
10.	Development, Approval and Piloting of the Data Collection Tools	3 Weeks	18 th July, 2025	Consultant/ Reference Group
11.	Field Data Collection	8 Weeks	12 th September, 2025	Consultant/ PMU
12.	Data Analysis	4 Weeks	10 th October, 2025	Consultant
Phase 3: Draft and Final Report				
13.	Development, Submission and Approval of the Draft Report	4 Weeks	7 th November, 2025	Consultant/ Reference Group
15.	Development, Submission and Approval of the Final Report	4 Weeks	5 th December, 2025	Consultant/ Reference Group
16.	Validation Workshop by the PGG Unit	0.5 Week	10 th December, 2025	Consultant/ Reference Group/ PGG Unit
17.	Sharing the Results to AACJ Consortium Partners, Stakeholders and Communities	2 Weeks	24 th December, 2025	Consultant/ AACJ Key Project Stakeholders
Total Duration		55 Weeks (About 13 Months)		

8. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

8.1 The Consultant or the Evaluator

The consultant will be responsible for:

1. Developing and implementing the evaluation methodology.
2. Conducting fieldwork and data collection.
3. Producing all ToR deliverables in line with the agreed timeline.
4. Ensuring compliance with research ethics throughout the evaluation.
5. Ensuring compliance with the ToR, MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria and Feminist Evaluation Approach.

8.2 AACJ Program PMU Team

The AACJ Program PMU team will provide:

1. Access to all project documentation.
2. Coordination with the donor, consortium partners, country downstream partners and local partners to facilitate fieldwork.
3. Facilitate the selection of key informants and stakeholders by the consultant for key informant interviews.

8.3 Reference Group

The Reference Group plays a crucial role in guaranteeing the quality and independence of the evaluation process. It serves as an advisory body to the PMU. The reference group comprises the PMU representative (MEAL Coordinator), MEAL workstream representative from each of the five consortium partner organizations, and two external experts with experience in evaluation methodologies, relevant themes and geographical target countries. There is also participation of the Donor focal point from the Dutch Ministry of Netherlands (MoFA) in the reference group for joint responsibility to make the ETE a success. The Reference Group will be responsible for:

1. To review and approve the ToR.
2. Selection of consultant to be contracted as the evaluator.
3. To review and approve the inception report submitted by the evaluator.
4. To review and approve the draft and final ETE report by the evaluator.

8.4 Reporting and Communication

The consultant will report directly to the AACJ Program Management Unit (PMU) and the AACJ MEAL Coordinator. The consultant will also work closely with the Reference Group to review and approve the consultant's deliverables. Regular communication and updates will be achieved through weekly meetings and monthly meetings up to the final approval of final report.

9. REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CONSULTANT AND THE CONSULTANT'S TEAM

9.1 Independence of the Consultant and Consultant's Team

The evaluators and their affiliated organizations should not have been involved in the design or implementation of the project under evaluation – either with the organization responsible for implementation or at the MFA. Additionally, they must maintain complete impartiality with no vested interest in the ultimate outcome of the evaluation.

9.2 Consultant and Consultant's Team, Qualifications and Skills

The Consultant and Consultant's Team must be composed as follows:

- ◆ Be a firm and/or a team of Evaluation Specialists based in AACJ implementation countries.
- ◆ A team of consultants, comprising a minimum of 6 members, with diverse and complementary expertise relevant to End of Term Evaluation (ETE) for the AACJ project.
- ◆ A team that includes, at a minimum, the following roles:
 - ▶ Lead Consultant/ Evaluator/ Team Leader: An expert in evaluation methodologies, with extensive experience in managing and delivering complex evaluations, particularly for multi-country, multi-stakeholder development projects.
 - ▶ Data Analyst: A specialist proficient in both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis techniques, with experience using statistical and qualitative analysis tools.
 - ▶ Reporting Specialist: A specialist with expertise in synthesizing evaluation findings into clear, actionable, and donor-compliant reports, ensuring alignment with evaluation frameworks and stakeholder expectations.
 - ▶ Climate Justice Specialist: A specialist with deep knowledge on climate justice issues, including policy advocacy, grassroots engagement, and capacity building.
 - ▶ Gender and Inclusion Specialist: A specialist with expertise in integrating gender equity, youth engagement, and inclusion frameworks into evaluation processes and analysis.
 - ▶ Safeguarding Specialist: A specialist with proven experience in safeguarding and the Prevention of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, and Harassment (PSEAH), ensuring ethical standards are upheld throughout the evaluation process.

The Consultant must mandatorily possess the following qualifications and skills:

- ◆ Hold a Masters' Degree from a recognized university in a relevant field such as Environmental or Climate Studies, Sustainable Development, Development Studies, Gender and Development, Social Sciences, Monitoring and Evaluation or equivalent.
- ◆ At least 10 years of professional experience in Climate Justice-related Project Evaluations, or related fields and evidence of previous consultancy assignments in the same area,

particularly for large-scale donor-funded programs.

- ◆ Has a strong background in MEAL for large, multi-year and multi-country development programs in conducting end term evaluations for development programs.
- ◆ Has expertise in both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies, including participatory methods such as Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions, and desk research.
- ◆ Proven experience with qualitative and quantitative data analysis
- ◆ Has deep understanding of the climate justice movement in Africa, including the political, social, and economic dynamics that influence the program's target countries (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa).
- ◆ Has commitment to upholding the highest ethical standards in engagement with stakeholders, ensuring confidentiality, transparency, impartiality throughout the assignment, manage conflicts of interest and maintain the independence throughout the assignment.
- ◆ Has familiarity with safeguarding principles, ensuring that no harm is caused to vulnerable populations during the review and data collection processes.
- ◆ Demonstrate familiarity with the AACJ program ToC and objectives.
- ◆ Experience in evaluating programs (above euro 10 million) in multi-country settings and with a diversity of stakeholders.
- ◆ Experience in facilitating online, offline, hybrid validation workshops.
- ◆ Previous experience - at least two assignments - comparable in content, time, scope and money.
- ◆ Has team members and/or network of experts/ specialists/ consultants based in the AACJ countries and with consultancy experience in Dutch MoFA funded programs.
- ◆ Expertise in Human rights approaches, Gender and Feminist Evaluations, and a clear understanding of matters climate justice.
- ◆ Ability to communicate in English is mandatory. However, communicating in additional languages such as French and Portuguese languages will be necessary in some project evaluation countries.
- ◆ Excellent conceptual and analytical skills.
- ◆ Strong writing, analytical and facilitation skills.
- ◆ Proven abilities in working across geographies, languages, contexts and cultures.
- ◆ Ability to organize and deliver evaluation deliverables on time against a tight deadline.

10. BUDGET FOR THE EVALUATION

10.1 Budget

The total budget for the evaluation will be in line with the AACJ program budget provision. The budget reserved for the evaluation is set at maximum **100,000 EUR** inclusive of applicable taxes. The proposed budget should cover all costs related to: consultant fees, fieldwork expenses, including travel and accommodation, data collection, translation and transcription services (if required) and report production and dissemination. Therefore, the consultant will be required to submit a detailed budget proposal including a breakdown of the number of days per lead consultant, number of days per consultant's team members, and costs per activity to ensure transparency and accountability. The final budget for this assignment will be determined based on the scope of work, methodology, and deliverables as outlined in this ToR.

10.2 Payment

The consultant will be paid 30% upon acceptance of the inception report, 40% upon submission and acceptance of draft report, and the remaining 30% upon submission and acceptance of the final report.

11. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR THE PROPOSALS AND HOW TO APPLY

This consultancy is initiated by the Lead Party of the Consortium (PACJA) and its procurement rules apply to awarding this assignment. A procedure requesting for competitive quotations is to be implemented. Applicants interested in undertaking the consultancy, are asked to express their interest by applying with the Technical Proposals and Financial Proposals. The Technical Proposals and Financial Proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Technical Proposal (carries 80%)

- ◆ A technical proposal (maximum 20 pages excluding annexes) outlining how you plan to undertake the consultancy:
 - ▶ Understanding and interpretation of the Terms of Reference;
 - ▶ Description of the intended approach, methodology, tools, analysis and reporting in the consultancy assignment;
 - ▶ Overview of the perceived risks and mitigation strategies.
- ◆ A summary of the team composition and expertise including an annex of the CVs of the consultants who will carry out the work, outlining how they meet the expected criteria, including relevant experiences and their roles and person-day inputs on this evaluation.
- ◆ A detailed work plan including start and completion dates and the time periods required for each phase of the consultancy with the associated phase deliverables.
- ◆ Attach at least 2 samples of previous/similar assignments undertaken.

Financial Proposal (Carries 20%)

- ◆ The consultant shall propose a detailed and itemized financial proposal including the professional fees, logistics, and, tax obligations, administrative costs as well as field mobilization (including travel and accommodation (Full budget proposition for undertaking the assignment)
- ◆ The final budget indication will be determined by the Consortium's Project Management Unit (PMU) Team based on available funds.

The prospective consultant/s is expected to submit **detailed** technical and financial **(itemized)** proposals to; recruitment@pacja.org with a copy to info@pacja.org by **close of business 11th April, 2025**.

12. ANNEXES

The following annexes will be helpful to the interested bidders in preparation of their technical and financial proposals and they are accessible via the following links:

[Annex 1 – MoFA's 2024 IOB Evaluation Quality Criteria](#)

[Annex 2 – Extra information on SCS End Term Evaluation \(ETE\)](#)

[Annex 3 – Suggested Draft and Final Evaluation Report Format](#)

Annex 4 – List of Relevant Project Documents/ References for Review (to be provided to the interested bidders):

1. AACJ Project Proposal and AACJ Theory of Change (ToC)
2. AACJ Global Results Framework (with baseline data for project result indicators)
3. AACJ Baseline Evaluation Report
4. AACJ Project Budget
5. Annual Progress Reports (Year 2021 – 2023)
6. Annual Plan Narrative Reports (Year 2021 – 2023)
7. Mid-Term Review Report



African Activists for Climate Justice



Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the
Netherlands



Oxfam



The African Women's
Development and
Communication Network



CONTACT US

PANAFRICAN CLIMATE JUSTICE ALLIANCE (PACJA)



Continental Secretariat
Kabarnet Road, Off Ngong Road, J13
P. O. Box 51005 00200 Nairobi
Kenya



+254 20 8075808



info@pacja.org