



WWF TANZANIA

Endline Evaluation of the DARWIN - Mara Wetland Conservation (MWC) in Tanzania

June, 2022 to March 31st , 2025

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

Project/Programme Name(s)	UKAID/DARWIN – Mara Wetland Conservation (MWC) Programme – A community led fishery Management at Mara wetlands, in Tanzania Project.
Project/Programme Location(s)	Mara Wetland Conservation (MWC) Programme is in the north-west of Tanzania covering five districts; of Musoma, Serengeti, Rorya, Butiama and Tarime districts.
Project/Programme Number(s)	Reference TZ208900/TAN0029
Names of Project/Programme Executants (WWF Office, name of project/programme manager)	Kanuni Kanuni – Project Executant PEng. Christian Joseph [Chonya] – Freshwater Thematic Lead
Project/Programme Duration (from start year)	June 2022, To March 31, 2025
Period to Be Evaluated	June 1 st , 2022, To March 15 th 2025
Potential Sites to Visit	Musoma, Serengeti, Rorya, Butiama and Tarime districts.
Project/Programme Budget Sources and Amounts (for period to be evaluated)	DARWIN, AND WWF UK GBP 517,304
Names of Implementing Partners (if relevant)	WWF UK WWF Tanzania IHE Delft - Institute for Water Education Tanzania Fishery Research Institute (TAFIRI) Victoria Farming and Fishing Organization (VIFAFIO)

PROJECT/PROGRAMME OVERVIEW

The Mara Wetland Conservation – a community led fishery management of Mara Wetlands in Tanzania Project, funded by WWF UK/Darwin Initiative under award number 403405. The project is a two-year and ten-month initiative aimed at promoting the restoration of habitats, ecosystems, and biodiversity in the Mara Wetlands while improving the livelihoods of surrounding communities. The project spans 27 villages across five districts—Butiama, Tarime, Rorya, Musoma, and Serengeti — covering the 387 km² Mara Wetlands, one of the largest intact papyrus swamps in Sub-Saharan Africa. The Mara wetlands, located at the confluence of the Mara River and Lake Victoria, are critical for global biodiversity and provide essential ecosystem services, including fisheries that underpin food security and livelihoods for approximately 110,000 residents.

The Community Led Fishery Management Project addresses pressing challenges such as overfishing, illegal fishing practices, and data gaps in fish diversity and habitat use. It leverages an integrated approach to assess fisheries, design co-management plans, promote



sustainable fishing, and create alternative income streams, particularly for women. Furthermore, it aims to enhance the capacity of local and national stakeholders to sustain conservation outcomes and scale the impacts beyond the project timeline. WWF UK leads overall management, while WWF Tanzania implement the project in partnership with IHE-Delft, TAFIRI, VIFAFIO, and. Regional Secretariate (RS) – fishery department, LVBWB and Local Government Authorities with grant agreements and joint governance mechanisms for effective delivery, sustainability and scaling up.

Theory of Change

The project's theory of change is rooted in the Mara Wetlands Integrated Management Plan (IWMP), which highlights the need for informed management based on biophysical and socio-economic data to achieve resilient freshwater biodiversity and livelihoods. The foundational step involves conducting a fisheries situation assessment to close knowledge gaps and establish a baseline for long-term adaptive management. By fostering community ownership and benefits from ecosystem management, the project encourages pro-environmental behaviours and collective action.

Through the development of fisheries co-management plans (Output 1), immediate implementation of sustainable measures (Output 2), and the creation of new income opportunities, particularly for women (Output 3), the project aims to achieve short-term biodiversity and livelihood benefits. To ensure sustainability, Output 4 focuses on institutionalizing financing strategies, integrating project learnings into local development plans, and influencing national policies. This multi-layered approach is designed to reduce overfishing, protect threatened species, and enhance livelihoods, laying a foundation for the replication of successful strategies across the Mara Wetlands and beyond.

In the short term, the project will establish baseline fisheries data, protect critical habitats, and build the capacity of 1,250 community members to co-manage fisheries. In the long term, it envisions increased government capacity, strengthened leadership in biodiversity management, improved resilience of fishery-related livelihoods, and greater funding for wetland conservation, ultimately contributing to Tanzania's fulfilment of inland fishery and wetland-related international commitments.

Geographical and Contextual Aspects

The Mara Wetlands, spanning 387 km², represent one of the most extensive and ecologically significant papyrus swamps in sub-Saharan Africa. Located at the point where the Mara River flows into Lake Victoria, these wetlands are vital for global biodiversity, supporting a range of aquatic and terrestrial species, including some endangered and critically endangered native fish species such as *Oreochromis esculentus* and *O. variabilis*. The wetlands are also a critical ecological buffer, filtering pollutants from upstream and regulating water flow into Lake Victoria, thereby playing a significant role in regional water and food security.

The wetlands directly sustain the livelihoods of approximately 110,000 people residing in 27 surrounding villages across five districts: Butiama, Tarime, Rorya, Musoma, and Serengeti.

These communities are heavily dependent on the wetlands for fisheries, which are a primary source of nutrition and income. However, unsustainable practices such as overfishing and the use of illegal small-mesh nets have led to declining fish stocks and biodiversity. This situation is exacerbated by inadequate fisheries management, habitat degradation, and gaps in data required to inform conservation efforts.

The 2018 Mara Wetlands Integrated Management Plan underscores the urgency of



addressing these threats through informed and participatory conservation strategies. Despite these challenges, recent initiatives, including a community-led River Health Assessment for the Mara River and empowerment projects for women in natural resource management, demonstrate the potential for impactful, community-driven solutions. The Mara Wetlands Conservation Project builds on these successes to strengthen fisheries management, enhance community livelihoods, and foster biodiversity conservation, creating a sustainable framework for wetland preservation and livelihood resilience.

Major Stakeholders and Their Roles

Stakeholder	Roles	Interests/Concerns
IHE-Delft	Providing technical expertise on fisheries biodiversity and habitat monitoring.	Building local capacity (TAFIRI) for fisheries monitoring and sustainable wetland management.
TAFIRI (Tanzania Fisheries Research Institute)	Conducting fisheries assessments, biodiversity monitoring, and guiding co-management plans.	Advancing research and management capabilities to conserve fisheries and biodiversity.
VIFAFIO	Supporting local fishery management, capacity-building, and community engagement.	Empowering local fishers for sustainable practices and improving livelihoods.
LVBWB (Lake Victoria Basin Water Board)	Ensuring alignment with water resource management policies and wetland conservation regulations.	Promoting sustainable water and wetland resource use, management and policy enforcement.
Mara Regional Administrative Secretary	oversees the Regional Administration & Local Government, giving more power to the people to effectively participate in the planning and implementation of development programmes within their area.	Promoting implementation, engagement, and liaison across the Local Government Authorities (LGAs).
Local Government Authorities (LGAs)	Supporting project activities, enforcing bylaws, and mobilizing communities.	Balancing conservation needs with community development goals.
Beach Management Units (BMUs) and Community fishery Management Unit (CMU)	Implementing co-management plans and protecting fish breeding grounds.	Sustainable fisheries management and increased community ownership of conservation activities.
Local Communities	Participating in fisheries co-management, adopting sustainable practices, and utilizing post-harvest technologies.	Improved livelihoods, better fish stocks, and enhanced income through sustainable fishing and value chain activities.
Women's Groups	Exploring new income streams, engaging in governance, and enhancing market strategies.	Increased financial stability, and better access to microfinance.



International Conservation Organizations	Providing technical support, visibility, and funding for scaling-up conservation efforts.	Demonstrating replicable and impactful conservation solutions globally.
Water User Associations (WUAs)	Facilitating sustainable water resource use, engaging in community education, and supporting conservation efforts.	Ensuring equitable water access, improving livelihoods through sustainable practices, and fostering community participation.

EVALUATION PURPOSE, USE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE

Evaluation Purpose and Use

The endline evaluation aims to assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, impact, and sustainability of the WWF UK/Darwin-funded community led fishery management project against the design. The evaluation will cover all the project's interventions to restore habitats, protect biodiversity, promote sustainable fisheries, and improve community livelihoods. The findings and recommendations will guide future projects design and evidence-based decision-making for future programming, stakeholder engagement, and long-term project sustainability planning.

The endline evaluation will utilise DAC OECD criteria to assess the project achievement.

Main Purposes:

1. Assess the project's achievements/ impact against its stated goals.
2. Generate insights to improve future programming and scale-up of wetland conservation initiatives.
3. Provide recommendations for sustaining project outcomes post-implementation.
4. Inform policy advocacy to enhance wetland and fisheries management.
5. Identify lessons learned and areas for improvement to strengthen similar initiatives and program learning
6. provide analysis of project accountability on the project's resources.
7. Enhance WWF and implementing partners credibility and transparency

Objectives

1. Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the project strategies in addressing biodiversity threats and promoting sustainable fishing practices.
2. Evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of fisheries co-management plans and their impact on fish diversity and stocks.
3. Analyze the role of community participation, particularly women and vulnerable groups, in fisheries management and value chain development.
4. Examine the impact of project interventions on community livelihoods and resilience.
5. Analyse the the adaptive capacity of the project during the implementation
6. Evaluate the sustainability and enabling conditions, such as financing strategies and governance frameworks, for long-term conservation and scale-up of the initiative

Scope



The evaluation will focus on:

1. The Mara Wetlands area, covering 27 villages in five districts (Butiama, Tarime, Rorya, Musoma, and Serengeti).
2. All activities conducted during the 2 years and 10 months of the project's implementation period.
3. Key interventions, including habitat restoration, biodiversity monitoring, fisheries co-management, and value chain enhancement.
4. Community engagement efforts, particularly those directly and indirectly engaged including women and vulnerable groups, in sustainable wetland and fisheries management.
5. Stakeholder collaboration, including roles of stakeholders (WWF-Tanzania, TAFIRI, LVBWB, and local authorities and communities, WWF UK, IHE Delft, etc)

Target Audience and Evaluation Framework

Target Audience of Final Report	Objectives of the Evaluation Regarding the Target Group	Relevance, Added Value, and Benefit of the Evaluation Report for the Target Audience	Actions to Be Considered at the Level of the Target Audience
Project Team	Assess implementation effectiveness and identify best practices and gaps.	Enhances operational efficiency and aligns activities with objectives.	Use findings to inform adaptive management and strengthen execution of remaining activities.
Project Stakeholders/Target Groups	(WUAs, IHE, TAFIRI, VIFAFIO, BMUs or CMUs, LGAs, women groups, LVBWB, and village government)	Ensure interventions address community needs and foster inclusivity.	Strengthen stakeholder participation and refine strategies to meet localized needs.
WWF Implementing Office	WWF Tanzania	Inform organizational learning and strategic alignment in future projects.	Integrate findings into internal reviews and planning processes.
External Donor	DARWIN	Demonstrate project impact and alignment with DARWIN's strategic objectives.	Consider findings to guide policy advocacy and scaling of successful interventions.
General Public	(Community Members, Academic Institutions)	Provide transparent access to project outcomes and foster awareness of sustainable water management.	Share findings through public dissemination channels, encouraging engagement and replication of best practices.



Potential Areas for the Dissemination of Results

- **Responsible Parties:** The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) unit, supported by communication and policy teams.
- **Methods:** Stakeholder workshops, policy briefs, digital reports, and community-level meetings.
- **Audience-Specific Dissemination:**
- **Donors:** Detailed impact reports and executive summaries.
- **Communities:** Simplified presentations in local languages.
- **General Public:** Social media and press releases.

EVALUATION AND GUIDING QUESTIONS

The evaluation will address key aspects focusing on criteria most relevant to the project's maturity, objectives, and contextual needs. Below is a detailed development of the criteria and corresponding guiding questions, customized for the Mara Wetland Conservation project.

Evaluation Criterion	Guiding Questions
Relevance	To what extent are the project's objectives aligned with local, national, and global conservation priorities?
	How well does the project address the needs and priorities of key stakeholders, including WUAs, BMUs, and community members?
	Are the project's strategies appropriate for addressing overfishing and habitat degradation?
Effectiveness	To what degree have the project's planned outputs and outcomes been achieved (e.g., fisheries co-management plans, biodiversity monitoring, and sustainable fishing practices)?
	How effective has the project been in building the capacity of WUAs, BMUs, and women's groups?
	What are the main barriers or facilitators to achieving intended outcomes?
Efficiency	Were resources (time, funds, and human capacity) used optimally to achieve the project's outcomes?
	How effectively were project activities coordinated among implementing partners (WWF Tanzania, IHE, TAFIRI, etc.)?
	Are there opportunities to improve cost-effectiveness for future initiatives?
Coherence	How well does the project align with national, regional, and local policies on fisheries and wetland management?
	How effectively has the project contributed to coordinating efforts between different stakeholders (e.g., government, local communities, NGOs, international organizations)?
	Are there any overlaps or synergies with other ongoing or past initiatives? How have these been addressed in project design and implementation?
Impact	What are the measurable changes in fish biodiversity, fishery practices, and community livelihoods as a result of the project interventions?
	Has the project contributed to improving the resilience of wetland ecosystems and communities?
	Are there unintended positive or negative outcomes from the project?

Sustainability	To what extent are the project's outcomes likely to be sustained beyond the funding period?
	Are local governance structures, such as BMUs CMUs and WUAs, equipped to continue fisheries management and biodiversity conservation efforts?
	What measures have been taken to ensure financial and institutional sustainability?
Adaptive Capacity	How well has the project adapted to unexpected challenges (e.g., climate change, changes in community dynamics, or new legal frameworks)?
	To what extent has the project demonstrated flexibility in its approach to wetlands management and fisheries co-management?
	Have feedback mechanisms been established to incorporate lessons learned and adjust activities accordingly?
	Are there systems in place to enable continuous improvement and long-term adaptation of conservation practices?

Rationale for Selection of Criteria

- a) **Relevance:** Ensures alignment with the needs of stakeholders and conservation priorities.
- b) **Effectiveness:** Assesses the achievement of objectives and identifies success factors.
- c) **Efficiency:** Reviews resource utilization and coordination among stakeholders.
- d) **Impact:** Examines tangible changes in biodiversity, livelihoods, and governance.
- e) **Sustainability:** Focuses on the durability of outcomes and structures post-project.
- f) **Coherence:** Evaluates how the project interacts with and complements other policies and initiatives to avoid duplication and ensure coordinated efforts.
- g) **Adaptive Capacity:** Measures the project's ability to respond to change, learn from experience, and adjust its approach in order to enhance its outcomes and sustainability.

METHODOLOGY CONSIDERATIONS

The evaluation methodology for the **Community Led fishery management of Mara Wetlands Project** should provide a comprehensive understanding of the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, coherence, and adaptive capacity. Given the complexity and scope of the project, a **mixed-methods approach** will be used, combining both qualitative and quantitative data collection that will include field observations, interviews, focus groups, questionnaires, participatory methodologies, etc. This will help ensure that both the subjective experiences of stakeholders and the objective measurements of project outcomes are captured effectively.

Evaluation Approach

Mixed-Methods Approach:

- a) **Desk Analysis:** The evaluation will begin with a thorough desk review of existing project documentation, including technical reports, monitoring tool, and relevant background literature (e.g., policy documents, government strategies, and past evaluations). This will provide the context and foundation for the evaluation.
- b) **Data Collection:** In addition to the desk review, new data will be collected through:



- i. **Surveys:** Surveys targeting community members, local authorities, and project stakeholders will be used to gather quantitative data on key project indicators, such as the adoption of sustainable fishing practices, changes in fish stocks, and livelihood improvements.
- ii. **Interviews:** Semi-structured interviews will be conducted with project staff, key partners (e.g., WWF Tanzania, IHE-Delft, TAFIRI, VIFAFIO), and local stakeholders (e.g., BMUs, WUAs, village leaders, women's groups). These interviews will focus on project outcomes, challenges, and lessons learned.
- iii. **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs):** FGDs with local community members, including women and marginalized groups, will be used to understand their perceptions of the project's impact, as well as to explore their engagement in the project and the sustainability of its interventions.
- iv. **Site Visits:** The evaluators will visit selected villages and wetlands areas within the Mara Wetlands to observe the project's interventions, including co-management practices, fish breeding grounds protection, and livelihood-enhancing activities. This will also allow for direct engagement with community members and local authorities to collect evidence and opinion, validate the findings from the desk review and data collection.

Level of Engagement with Community Members

Community Engagement:

The evaluation will involve the direct participation of local communities, including Indigenous Peoples, in both the data collection process and the reflection on the project's outcomes. Where required, **Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)** will be obtained from community members to ensure their active participation in the evaluation process.

Community members, especially women and persons with disabilities, will be consulted through accessible formats such as interviews, surveys, and focus groups to ensure inclusivity and representation of vulnerable groups.

Core Documents to Consult

The evaluation should refer to the following core documents:

- A. **Project Documents:** Project proposal, logical framework, work plans, progress reports, and technical reports.
- B. **Monitoring Data:** Available monitoring data, including project monitoring reports and baseline assessments reports.
- C. **WWF Policies:** Relevant WWF policies, such as those related to biodiversity conservation, stakeholder engagement, and gender equality.
- D. **Previous Evaluations:** Any prior evaluations or assessments of WWF's projects in the Mara Wetlands or similar projects.
- E. **Government and Partner Documents:** National and local government policies related to fisheries management, wetlands protection, and sustainable livelihoods, as well as reports from partner organizations (e.g., IHE-Delft, TAFIRI).

Key Partners and Stakeholders to Consult

The evaluation will involve consultations with the following key stakeholders:



- **WWF-Tanzania and WWF-UK:** For insights into project implementation, strategic direction, and partnership coordination.
- **IHE-Delft:** To understand the technical support provided in monitoring fish biodiversity and habitat protection.
- **TAFIRI:** For information on fisheries management, biodiversity monitoring, and data collection.
- **VIFAFIO:** To assess the role of fisheries organizations and women's groups in sustainable fisheries management.
- **LVBWB:** To understand the involvement of regional bodies in water governance and transboundary coordination.
- **Mara RS and Local Government Authorities:** Including Mara Regional – fishery department, district authorities from Butiama, Tarime, Rorya, Musoma, and Serengeti for their role in supporting and implementing project interventions.
- **Community Representatives:** Including members from the WUAs, BMUs, CMUs, women's groups, and village governments to gather insights into project impact and local-level sustainability.

Principles for Ensuring Quality Evaluations

Evaluators will adhere to the OECD DAC quality standards, ensuring that the evaluation is:

- **Relevant:** Focused on issues that matter most to stakeholders and that contribute to understanding project impact.
- **Valid:** Based on solid data and sound analysis techniques, ensuring that the conclusions are well-supported.
- **Reliable:** Reproducible results, ensuring consistency across different data collection points and methods.
- **Credible:** Accurate and trustworthy, incorporating feedback and verification from stakeholders.
- **Sustainable:** Providing recommendations that support long-term outcomes and learning for future programming.

Key Deliverables

1. **Inception Report:** To be submitted at the start of the evaluation process, detailing the workplan, evaluation methodology, timeline, and data collection plan.
2. **Presentation of Initial Findings:** A presentation summarizing the initial analysis and key insights gathered during the evaluation process.
3. **Data Collected:** Newly collected data from surveys, interviews, and site visits will be documented and shared.
4. **Draft Report:** A draft report of the evaluation, summarizing findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
5. **Final Report:** The final evaluation report incorporating feedback from stakeholders, with clear recommendations for the future of the Mara Wetlands conservation efforts.

Once evaluators are contracted, they will provide an **Inception Report** elaborating on the specific evaluation methodology, including detailed research questions, data sources, and data collection tools. This report will serve as the foundation for the evaluation process, ensuring that the evaluation is credible and aligned with the project's objectives and criteria.



PROFILE OF EVALUATOR(S) AND WWF SUPPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES

Evaluators

The evaluation team for the Mara Wetland Conservation (MWC) project should comprise a combination of international and local evaluators with diverse expertise to ensure a comprehensive and contextually relevant evaluation. The team composition, roles, and required expertise should be clearly outlined:

Team Composition (To be defined by the consultancy)

1. Lead Evaluators (Consultant)

Responsibilities:

- a) A contact person for the assignment
- b) Overall coordination of the evaluation process.
- c) Lead the design of the evaluation methodology and tools.
- d) Conduct interviews with key stakeholders, local stakeholders and communities.
- e) Analyze data and develop the evaluation report.
- f) Ensure adherence to OECD DAC quality standards.

Required Expertise:

- a) Proven experience in leading evaluations of conservation, natural resource management, or community-based projects.
- b) Strong understanding of wetland conservation and sustainable water resource management.
- c) Demonstrated capacity to work with international donors and NGOs, especially in biodiversity conservation contexts.
- d) Excellent writing and presentation skills in English.
- e) Familiarity with the Mara Wetlands and the socio-political environment context is an asset.
- f) In-depth knowledge of the Mara Wetlands region, including cultural, social, and political dynamics.
- g) Experience in evaluating community-based conservation and livelihood projects.
- h) Fluency in Kiswahili and local languages.
- i) Strong facilitation and participatory techniques for engaging with diverse stakeholders.



1. WWF Supporting Responsibilities

A. WWF Staff Support

- 1) Project Manager/CoP: Primary contact for providing all necessary project documentation, monitoring reports, and technical studies.
- 2) Monitoring and Evaluation Officer: Responsible for sharing past evaluations, analyzed data, and relevant policy documents.
- 3) Project officers: Handles logistical arrangements, including travel, accommodation, and scheduling meetings with stakeholders.

B. Key Responsibilities of WWF Staff

1) Pre-Evaluation Support:

- Provide all core documents and background information as outlined in the ToR.
- Evaluation of the evaluators on WWF policies, including ESSF and social safeguards.
- Assist in identifying and connecting with key stakeholders.

2) During Evaluation:

- Coordinate field visits by coordinating with local partners and ensuring community engagement is culturally appropriate.
- Address logistical challenges and provide troubleshooting support if needed.

3) Post-Evaluation:

- Facilitate feedback on draft findings and coordinate responses from key stakeholders.
- Support dissemination of the final report to relevant parties.

EVALUATION PROCESS, DELIVERABLES, AND TIMELINE

Evaluation Process

The evaluation process begins with preparing the Terms of Reference (ToR), recruiting evaluators, and providing them with essential project documentation. The evaluators conduct a desk review of materials, develop an Inception Report, and may carry out field visits to gather additional data through interviews, surveys, or focus groups. Data is analyzed using the evaluation criteria, and findings are compiled into a draft report for review. The process concludes with the submission of a final report, incorporating feedback, and a presentation of key findings to stakeholders.

Timeline

The evaluation typically spans several weeks to months, with ToR finalization and evaluator recruitment taking the initial weeks. The desk review and field visit follow, lasting a few days. Draft reporting and stakeholder feedback require an additional weeks, coming to a peak in the submission of the final report and presentation immediately after the fieldwork.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Eligible proposals will be evaluated based on full and open competition, in strict adherence to the Combined Score Method, where the qualifications and proposed methodology will be weighted 70%, and combined with the price offer, which will be weighted 30%.

#	Criteria	Marks (%)
A	Technical Proposal	Factor 70%
1	The ToR - Understanding and comments on the ToR	10
2	Experience - Proven experience in conducting Endline evaluation (10 years of experience) particular for Natural resources, water resources, inland fisheries and sustainability, climate variability and adaptation experiences	20
3	Methodology: - Ability to engage all stakeholders, especially government staff, communities, implementing partners, international stakeholders.	20
4	Approaches: Proficiency in participatory approaches, qualitative and quantitative data collection, and data analytics.	10
5	Practices/Tools - Familiarity with OECD evaluation criteria, the location – the Mara River catchment, Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), inland/freshwater fishery management and Nature based Solution.	10
6	Qualification/Education - Evidence of combination of the team with different skillsets in the fields of natura resources management, water resources management, community engagement, inland/freshwater fisheries and climate change.	20
7	Writing skills - Excellent writing and communication skills, with a history of producing high-quality reports.	10
	Total	100
B	Financial Proposal	Factor 30%
	<p>All financial qualified proposals will be scored out of 30 based on the formula provided below. The maximum points (30) will be assigned to the lowest financial proposal. All other proposals receive points according to the following formula:</p> $p = y (\mu/z)$ <p>where: p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal μ = price of the lowest priced proposal z = price of the proposal being evaluated.</p>	
	A +B	100%

Proposed Evaluator Payment Terms

Payment Schedule	Due Date/Condition	Payment %	Total (€)
Submission of Evaluation Plan	Upon submission and approval of the inception report	25%	
Submission of Draft Evaluation Outputs	Upon delivery of draft evaluation report	50%	
Final Payment	Upon approval of the final evaluation report	25%	
Total Payment		100%	



How to apply and deadlines?

1. Interested evaluators/Consultants should submit their proposal including a technical and financial proposal to procurement@wwftz.org (only electronic application will be accepted) and please, also remember that, for uniformity reasons, the title of the assignment be **“ENDLINE EVALUATION OF THE WWF TANZANIA MRC & MWC PROJECTS, 2022–2025”** and addressed to; The Secretary, Procurement Committee, WWF Tanzania Country Office, Plot 252 Kiko Street Mikocheni, P. O. Box 63117, Dar es Salaam;
2. The application should be submitted to the above email by or before 1700hrs local time, Monday 10th February 2025.
3. WWF has a principle of zero tolerance for fraud and corruption, if you encounter such an incident, then report by sending an email to fcci@wwftz.org

ANNEXES - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Annex I - EVALUATION PROCESS, DELIVERABLES, AND TIMELINE

Below is a proposed evaluation process and timeline, detailing the key tasks, responsible parties, and deliverables.

Major Evaluation Task/Output	Target Dates	Who is Responsible	Deliverable(s)
1. Finalize Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)	07/12/2024	WWF Bunda field office	Final ToR, including scope, budget, and evaluation questions
2. Recruit and contract Evaluator(s)	13-30/12/2024	PMEL and Operational department	Evaluator selection (CVs, interviews, contracts signed)
3. Information Request Sent to Relevant Sources and review of Project/Programme Information	03-08/01/2025	Project and evaluation team	Official information request document and Summary of initial insights and clarification of ToR
4. Deliver Inception Report	10/01/2025	Evaluation Team	Inception report with detailed methodology and revised timeline
5. Arrange Field Visit Logistics and conduct field visit for data collection	21 Days from 15/01/2025	Project staff, evaluation team, local partners, stakeholders	Confirmed visit schedule, Completed site visits and data collection
6. Presentation on Findings	10/02/2025	Evaluation Team	Presentation of initial findings to Evaluation Manager, partners, and community representatives



7. Present Evaluation Report	21/02/2025	Evaluation Team	Draft report
8. Present Final Findings and evaluation report	28/02/2025	Evaluation Team	Final evaluation report presentation
9. Develop Management Response	Within 1 month of report	Programme leadership, supported by Evaluation Manager	Management response annexed to final report

Annex II - Deliverables

1. Inception Report:
 - a) Evaluation plan, methodology, research questions, data sources, and tools
 - b) Revised timeline and logistics plan
2. Preliminary Findings Brief:
 - a) Key observations from field visits and initial data analysis
3. Draft Evaluation Report:
 - a) Part A: Context, progress, and findings
 - b) Part B: Conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned
4. Final Evaluation Report:
 - a) Incorporating feedback and including a management response annex
5. Presentations:
 - a) Final findings presented to key audiences

Key Considerations

- Timeliness: Deadlines should align with project milestones and decision-making cycles.
- Stakeholder Engagement: Ensure participation in review processes, particularly for management response development.
- Adaptive Management: Recommendations should feed directly into project adjustments and future planning.

Additional Notes

- 4) Cost Efficiency:

Evaluators are encouraged to propose cost-efficient approaches while maintaining quality, including remote data collection methods where applicable.
- 5) Financial Proposal:

Applicants should submit their financial proposal based on the maximum available budget, detailing their proposed costs for each line item.
- 6) Quality Assurance:

The final payment will only be processed upon approval of high-quality deliverables. A portion of the payment is retained to ensure timeliness and quality.



7) Currency and Taxes:

- All costs should be quoted in [TZS].
- Taxes are to be specified and included in the budget.

FORMAT OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

This structure ensures comprehensive documentation while maintaining clarity and brevity, suitable for systematic evaluation and organizational learning.

Part A - Report Table of Contents

1. Title Page

- **Report Title:** Clear and descriptive.
- **Project/Programme Title:** Relevant project/programme name.
- **Contract Number** (if applicable).
- **Date of Report:** Include submission date.
- **Authors and Affiliation:** Names and organizations of report authors.
- **Locator Map:** Optional but recommended for geographically specific projects.

2. Executive Summary (2-4 pages)

- **Principal Findings and Recommendations:** Organized by the core evaluation criteria (e.g., relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability).
- Summarize key takeaways for quick reference by stakeholders.

3. Table of Contents

- Include page numbers for sections and annexes for easy navigation.

4. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

- Provide definitions of all acronyms used in the report for clarity.

5. Body of the Report

A. Introduction (Max 3 Pages)

- **Project/Programme Characteristics:** Concise description, scope, and goals.
- **Purpose and Objectives of Evaluation:** Why the evaluation was conducted and intended use.
- **Evaluation Methodology:** Brief rationale for the approach, including data collection methods, analysis techniques, and limitations (reference annexes for detailed methods and tools).
- **Evaluation Team Composition:** Identify team members, roles, and any specific expertise brought to the process.

B. Project/Programme Overview (Max 5 Pages)

- **History and Evolution:** Timeline and key milestones.
- **Purpose, Objectives, and Strategies:** High-level summary of conservation and development goals.
- **Context and Rationale:** Explain the project's need and its alignment with stakeholder priorities.
- **Stakeholders and Beneficiaries:** Who was involved and who benefited.
- **WWF's Main Interest:** The organization's key reasons for engagement.

C. Evaluation Findings (3-5 Pages)

- **Core Criteria Findings:** Detailed insights for each evaluation criterion (e.g., relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, etc.).
- **Lessons Learned:** Highlight what worked, what didn't, and why.
- Use **tables, graphics, or figures** to succinctly illustrate key points.

D. Recommendations for the Project/Programme (3-5 Pages)



- **Actionable Recommendations:** Organized by evaluation criteria and findings, including rationale.
- **Modifications to Theory of Change:** Suggestions for refining project logic, strategies, or objectives.
- **Performance Ratings:** Use summary tables for a quick overview (see Part B below).

Part B - Summary Table

A standardized framework to summarize evaluation findings, ensuring consistency and comparability across WWF projects/programmes.

Core Evaluation Criteria	Rating	Summary of Findings	Key Recommendations
Relevance	[1-5]*	[Insert Findings]	[Insert Recommendations]
Effectiveness	[1-5]	[Insert Findings]	[Insert Recommendations]
Efficiency	[1-5]	[Insert Findings]	[Insert Recommendations]
Coherence	[1-5]	[Insert Findings]	[Insert Recommendations]
Sustainability	[1-5]	[Insert Findings]	[Insert Recommendations]
Impact	[1-5]	[Insert Findings]	[Insert Recommendations]

Note: Use a rating scale (e.g., 1 = Poor, 5 = Excellent).

Annexes on the final report

- 1) Terms of Reference (ToR).
- 2) Detailed Methodology (e.g., tools, approaches, limitations).
- 3) Mission Itinerary.
- 4) List of Key Informants.
- 5) Consulted Documents and Data Sources.
- 6) Project/Programme Theory of Change or Logical Framework.
- 7) Project Monitoring Indicator reference sheet.