

QnA on the tender/ToR:

1. **Partners and qualitative stream** – The TOR references WWF’s partners as co-contributors to the qualitative stream and jointly authored sections of the report. Could you please confirm who these partners are and whether consultants will have working access to them during the project?

WWF and the Norwegian Academy of International Law (NAIL) are the main partners working on the qualitative stream, supported by our direct consultations with relevant experts from academia and other organisations. Consultants will work directly with WWF and NAIL, while meetings with relevant experts may be convened by WWF as needs arise.

2. **Definition of ‘ambitious states’** – Which countries are envisaged as forming the ‘ambitious states’ pool for coalition modelling: the broader group of ~133 countries that have expressed support for binding measures, the HAC member countries specifically, or a different subset?

"Ambitious states" are defined as the group of 133 countries that have expressed support for all four elements WWF identified as must-haves for an effective treaty.

3. **Time horizon and base year** – We would propose using 2025 as the base year, with scenario projections extending to 2030 and 2035. Could you confirm whether this aligns with WWF’s expectations, or whether an alternative time horizon is intended?

The scenario projections extending to 5-10 years into the future after the treaty adoption aligns with WWF's expectations, however the starting time (for the treaty to come into effect) should be 2027, as a realistic timeline for treaty conclusion and entry into force.

4. **Existing data and prior work** – Are there existing datasets, analytical models, or prior research from WWF or its partners that the consultant is expected to build upon as part of this study?

No, other than the previous recommendations from WWF for the binding measures needed for an effective treaty (see more on our [Resources webpage](#)) and the qualitative analysis that WWF and NAIL will conduct.

5. **Sequencing of qualitative and quantitative streams** – Will WWF’s qualitative preliminary findings be available before consultants begin modelling, or are both streams expected to run in parallel from project start? This has implications for how the methodology is sequenced, and we would appreciate clarity on the

mechanism for resolving any inconsistencies between the two streams should assumptions diverge during project execution.

WWF and NAIL will have a short head start on the qualitative stream, a few weeks before the consultants start their work. The expectation is that we will have an alignment period in the first two weeks when the consultants commence the project. During this period preliminary findings from the qualitative stream will be discussed, adjusted as appropriate and necessary upon inputs from consultants, and used to inform the initial phase of the quantitative stream.

Afterwards, we will have frequent (weekly, or once every two weeks) check-ins to ensure inconsistencies are detected early and discussed, to find the best way to resolve the issues.

- 6. Intended audiences and stakeholders** – The TOR mentions presentations to WWF teams and relevant stakeholders. Could you indicate who the external stakeholders are likely to be and if the entire report / findings will be made publicly available?

Some key experts and negotiators from a selective group of countries are the intended audience for these presentations (for consultation purpose and ensuring major gaps or shortcomings in the research are adequately addressed before finalisation). The entire report and findings will be made public once finalised and approved by WWF's relevant teams.

- 7. Co-branding of outputs** – The tender notes the possibility of co-branding on outputs. Could you clarify the extent and form of co-branding envisaged (e.g. report covers, executive summaries, external communications), and whether this would apply to all deliverables or selected outputs only? Likewise, in the absence of a co-branding arrangement, would the quantitative insights and / or modelling outputs from consultant be cited / sourced appropriately.

Co-branding—upon discussion and agreement with the consultants—can be expected for the final report (and any complementary products such as executive summary, or a short summary version of the report). The co-branding usually comes in the form of logo placement on cover page (following WWF's branding guideline for publications published in joint partnership) and in the Acknowledgement page (1st page after cover) where authors and experts who contribute to the project are listed.

Otherwise, the quantitative insights and / or modelling outputs from consultant used in the report will be cited on the Acknowledgments page.

Some examples can be seen in the cover and acknowledgement page of these publications: [Impacts of plastic pollution on biodiversity](#) and [Regulating High-risk Plastic Products](#).

8. **Contracting entity** – Could you please confirm the likely contracting entity on the WWF side for this engagement? From ICIS’s side, we would be contracting under our UK entity, LNRS Data Services Ltd.

The contracting entity from WWF’s side would be the Norwegian branch of WWF, WWF Verdens naturfond (WWF-Norway).

9. **Research scope and methodology:** One approach we were envisioning would involve piloting a method for plastic packaging that could then be applied to additional types of high-risk plastic products in subsequent efforts. Would that type of approach be of interest to WWF?

If “in subsequent efforts” refers to future projects outside of this one, it would not meet our current research needs—we require a methodology that addresses the entry-into-force threshold for treaty effectiveness. However, if “subsequent efforts” means first testing the modelling with plastic packaging, then applying the validated methodology to other high-risk plastic products within this project, it could be acceptable. (In short, this current project should not be only the pilot method).