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# BACKGROUND

## Region and sector background

The Strengthening Community Law Enforcement and Sustainable Livelihoods in Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area (KAZA TFCA) is a three year action that focuses on three key nature conservation sites in the KAZA TFCA with high poaching pressure: the Silowana complex bufferzone of the Sioma Ngwezi National Park in **Zambia**, the Chizarira - Sengwa complex (within the Sebungwe complex) in **Zimbabwe** and the Lake Liambezi Trust in Zambezi region of **Namibia**). These areas experience high poaching pressures but are also characterized by low human development (high poverty indices) with people relying almost entirely on natural resources for their survival. Yet, these areas are still high in biodiversity and pristine habitat constituting important wildlife corridors – which are of great importance for achieving the KAZA TFCA Vision “To establish a world-class transfrontier conservation and tourism destination area in the Okavango and Zambezi River Basin regions of Angola, Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe within the context of sustainable development.”. Situated in the low rainfall areas characterised by inherently nutrient deficient Kalahari sands, the project area is also strongly affected by climate change impacting negatively on the livelihoods of small farmer households and their subsistence agricultural production. Zimbabwe suffered extensively from droughts and subsequent extreme flooding events in 2016, making it one of the three countries in the world most affected by climate change (UNFCCC COP 23). Equally, Zambian farmers in the project area nearly lost the entire maize harvest due to prolonged droughts in 2015/16 requiring government food aid interventions. There is an urgent need to diversify crops and introduce drought resistant varieties and cultures, as planned by the action. During the first year of action implementation, Zimbabwe and Zambia was once again affected by droughts. The Southern and Western parts of Zambia have also received less than 50% of the normal annual precipitation and crop was being estimated to be around 70%.

## The Action to be evaluated[[1]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of the Action to be evaluated | Strengthening Community Law Enforcement and Sustainable Livelihoods in Kavango Zambezi TFCA (KAZA) |
| Budget of the Action to be evaluated | 1,200,000 Euro |
| Names of implementing partners | World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) Germany, WWF Zambia, WWF Zimbabwe, and the Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation Trust (IRDNC) |
| Dates of the Action to be evaluated | * Start: 01/03/2018
* End: 31/08/2021
 |

The objectives of the action is to promote long-term sustainable ecosystem management and sustainable livelihood approaches among local communities in KAZA TFCA, such that their improved benefits from natural resources contribute to biodiversity conservation and the reduction of illegal killing and trafficking of wildlife, especially elephants. To achieve this, the action enables 4,100 small farmer households in Zambia and Zimbabwe to implement **climate smart conservation agriculture**, improving their food security, increasing resilience and adaptation capacity to climate change and improve their household income. This reduces shifting cultivation, encroachment on national parks and biodiversity loss by conserving wildlife habitats and directly contributing to long-term sustainable ecosystem management. The action also improves the **effective participation of communities in anti-poaching and law enforcement** in and around key conservation areas in Namibia, Zimbabwe and Zambia. This is achieved by increasing the number of equipped and trained community guards in the areas as well as supporting the implementation of joint patrols with national park rangers. The coordination between community scouts across borders will also be improved. Additionally, the project operationalises one performance based reward system for community anti-poaching in Zambia, providing blue prints for replication across the KAZA landscape.

In terms of activities, the action **(1)** builds capacity of rural farming households, community institutions and selected local government officials in the Zambian and Zimbabwean project areas in implementing climate adapted conservation agriculture. Prior to activities, a participatory baseline study was carried out to assess the community’s socio-economic situation, household income and climate adaptation capacity including the identification of climate resilient crops and suitable conservation agriculture methodologies. A village based extension system is being established and/or strengthened to provide support and ensure adoption of these methods. **(2)** Community seed multiplications schemes are being established / strengthened in Zambia and Zimbabwe to reduce HH costs for seeds and increase income from seed commercialisation. **(3)** A new community anti-poaching system will be established in Namibia and Zimbabwe with the recruitment and training of additional community guards. In Zambia the existing scheme with 22 community guards is being strengthened and improved. Community and joined patrols with state rangers in and around the national parks in Zimbabwe, Zambia and Namibia are being supported. The existing yet insufficiently functioning performance-based reward scheme in Zambia will be operationalised and assessed for its replicability into other areas in KAZA TFCA. **(4)** To enable better cross border collaboration between community scouts, workshops will be held in the second and third year of the project to support the harmonization of methods, exchange experience and nurture networking across the TFCA.

The Logical Framework Matrix (Logframe) is included in Annex VI. Additionally, documents containing further information on Intervention Logic described in this chapter will be provided to the evaluator and will be subject to his scrutiny and reconstruction during Inception.

## Stakeholders of the Action

Key stakeholder groups, namely the KAZA secretariat, the respective Ministries of the Environment and Tourism as well as Ministries of Agriculture in Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe and their local district offices, national NGOs, Community Based Organisations (CBO), such as community resource boards (Zambia), and local communities themselves have a strong interest in the action and have been consulted during its development and implementation. All activities are part of the KAZA integrated development plan, the KAZA anti-poaching strategy as well as the SADC Law enforcement strategy (2015). They therefore contribute to the implementation of the Vision of the KAZA TFCA (as mentioned above) and SADC regional strategies. Further information is provided in the stakeholder map attached in Annex VII.

## Other available information

A list of documents containing further information that will be provided to the evaluation team is attached in Annex II.

# DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of evaluation | Final evaluation  |
| Coverage | The Action in its entirety |
| Geographic scope | The Silowana complex - bufferzone of the Sioma Ngwezi National Park in **Zambia**, the Chizarira - Sengwa complex (within the Sebungwe complex) in **Zimbabwe** and the Zambezi region in **Namibia** (Lake Liambezi area)  |
| Period to be evaluated | from 01/03/2018 to 31/08/2021 |

## Objectives of the evaluation

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide to WWF Germany, the relevant services of the European Union and the interested stakeholders with:

* an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the Strengthening Community Law Enforcement and Sustainable Livelihoods in Kavango Zambezi TFCA (KAZA) Action*,* paying particular attention to its results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results; also, the most important impacts of the project should be highlighted.
* key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations, in order to improve future Actions.

The main users of this evaluation will be WWF Germany, WWF Zambia, WWF Zimbabwe, the Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation Trust (IRDNC) and the Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Zambia and COMESA.

## Requested services

### Specific aspects to be evaluated

The analysis to be conducted should specifically evaluate the materialisation of the expected results and their facilitating and contrasting factors. Unintended results and impacts of the projects should be evaluated too.

The evaluation will assess the Action using the five standard evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and perspectives of impact.

### Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific Evaluation Questions as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluator team will propose in his Evaluation plan a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Evaluation plan, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

*Relevance*

1. Relevance to context, priorities of stakeholders, and objectives*:* Has the design of the Action focused on and does it remain relevant to issues of highest priority?
2. Theory of Change: Is the theory of change clear? Has the project taken the best, most efficient strategic approach or strategy mix at time of the planning and form the today´s point of view?

*Efficiency*

1. Use of time**:** Are there thorough, well founded work plans being implemented according to plan, monitored, and adapted as necessary?
2. Resource use**:** Is the Action delivering value for money in that costs are reasonable given the outputs and outcomes generated?

*Effectiveness*

1. Planned results versus achievement: Focusing on stated objectives, desired outcomes, and intermediate results (as opposed to delivery of activities and outputs), what has and has not been achieved (both intended and unintended)? To what extent have targeted key factors – drivers, opportunities, threats – been affected to the degree they need to be to achieve the stated goals? Which strategies are proving to be effective, and which not? Why?
2. Stakeholder Engagement: Are the stakeholder engagement processes inclusive, gender-sensitive and accessible for all community members? Have stakeholders been engaged at the right level for each of them throughout the project cycle? Is there an effective complaint mechanism in place (usage of entry points, follow-up process, documentation, etc.)? How did stakeholder engagement processes supported result achievement?
3. Coordination & communication: To what extent has coordination/communication been effective within and between the implementation team, partners and participants, as well as donor offices in the Network and external donors? What factors have hindered good communication and coordination? What could be done differently to improve this?

*Sustainability*

1. Evidence of sustainability**:** Is there evidence that the following key ingredients are being established or exist to the extent necessary to ensure the desired long-term positive impacts of the project or programme?
	* Adequate socio-cultural integration, including no negative impact on affect groups (e.g. by gender, economic class) and/or on benefits realized by them, as well as ensuring necessary motivation, support, and leadership by relevant individuals and groups.
	* Adequate capacity and clear distribution of responsibilities among organisations or individuals necessary to ensure continuity of Action activities or impacts. For example, extension officers, Community Resource Boards, etc .
	* Technical and economic viability and financial sustainability.
	* Incentives for relevant individuals for continuation of activities.
2. Risk and Mitigation: What external factors could have a high or medium likelihood of undoing or undermining the future sustainability of project positive impacts? (e.g. political stability, economic crises and shocks, human rights situation, overall level of development, natural disasters, climate change). Is the project/programme adequately anticipating and taking measures to ensure resilience to these?
3. Exit-Phase Out Plan: Based upon existing plans and observations made during the evaluation, what are the key strategic options for the future of the project (e.g. exit, scale down, replicate, scale-up, continue business-as-usual, major changes to approach)?

*Impact*

1. Evidence of change: To what extent are the Action’s goals likely to be achieved, in terms of outcomes effecting positive change in biodiversity quality, ecosystem services and, in turn if relevant, human wellbeing? Discuss observed impacts at all appropriate scales—local, landscape, national, regional, global, and present evidence?
2. Contribution: How confident can we be that that the action’s activities contributed to the perceived change? What is the likelihood that these changes would have occurred in the absence of the project?
3. Unforeseen consequences: Were there any unforeseen impacts (whether positive or negative)? Could anything have been done differently to repeat or avoid these unforeseen consequences and to have acknowledged them earlier as emerging consequences?

## Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in three phases:

* Inception& Desk
* Field or remote meeting
* Synthesis

The outputs of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

### Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 5.

| **Phases of the evaluation** | **Key activities** | **Outputs and *meetings*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Inception& Desk Phase**  | * Initial document/data collection
* Background analysis
* Stakeholder analysis
* Reconstruction of the Intervention Logic, and / or description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews)
* Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix
* In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions)
* Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase
 | * *Kick-off meeting with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group* (see point 2.5.1.) - face-to-face in WWF office in Berlin or via remote conference, depending on location of the evaluator
* *Inception Note*
* Evaluation plan
 |
| **Field or remote meeting** **Phase**  | * Gathering of primary evidence with the use of the most appropriate techniques (interviews, focus groups, storytelling sessions, surveys etc.)
* Data collection and analysis
 | * *Initial meetings at country level with* WWF and IRDNC staff, CBOs, Community members, EU-Delegation
* Presentation of key findings of the field phase – Slide presentation
* *Debriefing with the Reference Group* and EU-Delegation face-to-face or via remote conference
 |
| **Synthesis phase**  | * Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions)
* Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations
* Reporting
 | * Draft Final Report
* Executive Summary
* Final Report
* *Meeting with Reference Group* (face-to-face in WWF office in Berlin or via remote conference)
 |

### Inception& Desk Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed as well as analysing documents.

The phase will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluator from home. It will then continue with a kick-off session in Berlin or via teleconference, depending on location of the evaluator, between the Reference Group and the evaluator. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex II)

Based on the Intervention Logic or the Theory of Change the evaluator will finalise i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases.

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception Note. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager (see point 2.5.1).

Selected phone interviews with the project management and key partners in Zambia, Zimbabwe and Namibia may be conducted during this phase to support the analysis of secondary sources.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Evaluation plan**; its content is described in Chapter 5.

### Field or Virtual Meeting Phase

This Phase starts after approval of the Evaluation Plan by the Evaluation Manager and no objections of the EU-Delegation to Zambia and COMESA.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation or not respecting the end of the validity of the specific contract, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the project management and the EU-Delegation.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the field / virtual meeting phase, the evaluation team will summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the project management.

At the end of the field / virtual meeting phase a Slide Presentation will be prepared and shared with/ presented to project management and the EU-Delegation; its content is described in Chapter 5.

### Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of the **Final Report** incl. an **Executive Summary**, whose structures are described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluator will present, in a single Report with Annexes, his findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the structure in Annex III.

The evaluator will make sure that:

* His assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
* When drafting the report, hi will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
* The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluator will deliver and then present in the WWF office in Berlin or via remote conference, (the **Draft Final Report** to the Reference Group (see point 2.5.1) to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Having shared an electronic copy of the Draft Final Report with the EU-Delegation in Zambia the Evaluation Manager consolidates the comments expressed by the Reference Group members and EU and sends them to the evaluator for the report revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the QAG will be discussed with evaluator to verify if further improvements are required, and the evaluator will be invited to comment on the conclusions formulated in the QAG.

The evaluator will then finalise the **Final Report** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluator must explain the reasons in writing.

## Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

The invited Contractors will submit their specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer including CVs of the proposed evaluator).

Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference.

## Management and Steering of the evaluation

### At the EU and WWF level

The evaluation is managed by Evaluation Manager of WWF-Germany, who has also been the Project Manager of the Action; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of WWF Germany, WWF Zambia, WWF Zimbabwe, IRDNC, and the EU-Delegation to the Republic of Zambia and COMESA.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

* To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
* To facilitate contacts between the evaluator, WWF, the EU services and external stakeholders.
* To ensure that the evaluator has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.
* To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluator. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluator.
* To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
* To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

### At the Contractor level

The contractor is responsible for the quality of: the process; the evaluation design; the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

* Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood.
* Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluator’s work throughout the assignment.

Ensure that the evaluator is adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

## Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English

# EXPERTISE REQUIRED

## Number of experts and of working days

At least one expert is required. He is expected to possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than 15 working days.

##  Expertise required

**Minimum requirements of the team/the evaluator:**

* At least five (5) years of experience in evaluating integrated Conservation and livelihoods Actions in Sub Saharan Africa
* experience in development interventions in the sector of Wildlife Conservation and/or Climate Smart Agriculture including the relevant policy / strategic frameworks of the three countries through at least two (2) projects.

**Language skills of the team:**

* English: C1 expertise

Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at <https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr> and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.

WWF pursues an equal opportunities policy.

# LOCATION AND DURATION

## Starting period

Provisional start of the assignment is beginning of August 2021.

## Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar days

Maximum duration of the assignment: 60 calendar days.

This overall duration includes working days, week-ends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, and distribution of outputs.

## Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must provide a timetable, the table in the Annex IV can be used. The ‘Indicative dates’ are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as ‘0’).

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with national / local or other stakeholders.

## Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will probably take place remotely with virtual meeting with the different teams. An assignment in Lusaka or Harare or any other suitable town/city in the region is favourable. If the covid-19 situation allows, field visits to Lake Liambezi and Katima Mulilio in Namibia, Silowana Complex (Sioma and Sesheke) in Zambia and Chizarira Complex (Binga in district) in Zimbabwe. Field visit briefing and debriefing meetings with WWF and EU will take place in Lusaka.

# REPORTING

## Content, timing and submission

The outputs must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the areas of Action is required (to be attached as Annex).

List of outputs:

|  | **Number of Pages *(excluding annexes)*** | **Main Content** | **Timing for submission** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation plan**  | 1-2 pages | * Methodology for the evaluation, incl.:
* Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods
* Field visit approach or sources of data collection
* Work plan
* Data gaps to be addressed, issues still to be covered
 | End of Inception& Desk Phase |
| **Draft Final Report Incl. Executive Summary** | 20-30 pages | * Cf. detailed structure in Annex III
* Quality assessment grid (Annex V)
 | End of Synthesis Phase |
| **Final report Incl. Executive Summary** | 20-30 pages | * Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted
 | 10 calendar days after having received comments to the Draft Final Report. |

##

## Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 5 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluator should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

## Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluator using the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) provided in Annex V. The Contractor is given the possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. The QAG will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

## Language, copies and formatting

All reports shall be submitted in English.

All reports will be produced using a standard Font such as Arial or Calibri with letter size 11 or 12, single spacing. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

Annexes

# Annex I: Technical Evaluation Criteria

1. **Technical evaluation criteria**

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price.

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Maximum** |
| ***Total score for Organisation and Methodology*** | ***50*** |
| * Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided
 | **10** |
| * Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges
 | **25** |
| * Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium
 | **5** |
| * Organisation of tasks including timetable
 | **10** |
| ***Score for the expertise of the proposed team***  | ***50*** |
| ***Overall total score*** | ***100*** |

1. **Technical threshold**

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

# Annex II: Information that will be provided to the evaluator

* Action baseline study for Zambia and Zimbabwe
* Description of the Action
* Action’s work plans and M&E plans
* Action Communication and Visibility Plan
* Calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the Action
* Action’s annual progress reports, financial and technical
* Communication outputs (press releases, newsletters, webpages)
* Relevant documentation from Local partners
* List of suggested main interview partners

***Note***: The evaluator has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action.

# Annex III: Structure of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The contractor will deliver the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary**. They must be consistent, concise and clear and free of linguistic errors.

The Final Report should not be longer than 25 pages (excluding annexes). Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The presentation must be properly spaced and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

‘’*This evaluation is supported and guided by WWF-Germany and the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of WWF-Germany or the European Commission*’’.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Executive Summary** ***(between 2 to 4 pages)*** | A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should be a professionally designed brief with pictures and focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. |

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Introduction (max 3 pages)** | A description of the Action, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant. |
| **2. Answered questions / Findings****(4-6 pages)** | A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning. |
| **3. Overall assessment** **(2-4 pages)** | A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. |
| **4. Conclusions and Recommendations** |  |
|  | **4.1 Lessons learnt****(max 4 pages)** | Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.  |
|  | **4.2 Conclusions****(max 3 pages)** | This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion. In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.  |
|  | **4.3 Recommendations****(3-5 pages)** | They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle. Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure. |
| **5. Annexes to the report** | The report should include the following annexes:* The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
* The name of the evaluator (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
* Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses.
* Evaluation Matrix
* Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)
* Relevant geographic map(s) where the Action took place
* List of persons/organisations consulted
* Literature and documentation consulted
* Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
* Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators
 |

# Annex IV: Planning schedule

This annex must be included by Contractors in their Contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it. Contractors can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

| **Activity** | **Location** | **Indicative Duration in working days** | **Indicative Dates** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inception phase: total days** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Desk phase: total days** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Field phase: total days** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Synthesis phase: total days** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Dissemination phase: total days** |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL working days (min. 15)** |  |  |

# Annex V: Quality Assessment Grid

Evaluators are to assign the project/programme a score assessing the extent to which the project/programme embodies the description of strong performance as described in the table below:

 5 – Excellent, 4 – Very Good, 3 – Good, 2 – Fair, 1 – Poor

 N/A – Not Applicable

D/I – The criterion was considered, but data were insufficient to assign a rating or score.

Evaluators are also to provide a brief justification for the rating and score assigned. Identify most notable strengths to build upon as well as highest priority issues or obstacles to overcome. Note that this table should not be a comprehensive summary of findings and recommendations, but an overview only. A more comprehensive presentation should be captured in the evaluation report and the management response document. Even if the report itself contains sensitive information, the table should be completed in a manner that can be readily shared with any internal WWF audience.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Description of Strong Performance** | **Evaluator Score** | **Evaluator Brief Justification** |
| **Relevance and Quality of Design** | 1. The project/programme addresses the necessary factors in the specific programme context to bring about positive changes in conservation elements – biodiversity and/or footprint issues (i.e. species, ecosystems, ecological processes, including associated ecosystem services) and human wellbeing.  |  |  |
| 2. The project/programme has rigorously applied key design tools including involvement of partners and community members, as appropriate, in the design |  |  |
| 3. The project/programme has identified the right opportunities or strategies to respond to key threats |  |  |
| **Coherence** | The project/programme interventions are synergistic with and provide value to other interventions by the same actor in-country. They also are harmonized and consistent with other actors’ interventions in the same context.  |  |  |
| **Efficiency** | 1. Most/all programme activities have been delivered with efficient use of human & financial resources and with strong value for money.  |  |  |
| 2. Governance and management systems are appropriate, sufficient, and operate efficiently. |  |  |
| **Effectiveness** | 1. Most/all intended outcomes were attained. |  |  |
| 2. There is strong evidence indicating that changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the WWF project or programme |  |  |
| **Impact** | 1. Most/all goals—stated desired changes in the status of species, ecosystems, ecological processes, human wellbeing—were realised. |  |  |
| 2. WWF actions have contributed to the perceived changes |  |  |
| **Sustainability** | 1. Most or all factors for ensuring sustainability of results/impacts are being or have been established.  |  |  |
| 2. Scaling up mechanisms have been put in place with risks and assumptions re-assessed and addressed - as relevant. |  |  |
| **Adaptive Management** | 1. Project/programme results (outputs, outcomes, impacts) are qualitatively and quantitatively demonstrated through regular collection and analysis of monitoring data.  |  |  |
| 2. The project/programme team, involving key stakeholders, uses these findings, as well as those from related projects/ efforts, to strengthen its work and performance |  |  |
| 3. Learning is documented and shared for project/programme and wider learning  |  |  |

#

# Annex VI: logical framework matrix (logframe) of the evaluated action

|  | **Results chain** | **Indicators** | **Baseline** **(2017)** | **Current value** **Reference date 2019** | **Targets****(incl. reference year)** | **Sources and means of verification** | **Assumptions**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **Overall objective: Impact** | The promotion of long-term sustainable ecosystem management and sustainable livelihood approaches among local communities contributes to the reduction of illegal killing and trafficking of wildlife in KAZA TFCA.  | Number of illegally killed elephants in the KAZA TFCA  | 17 elephants poached in the Zambezi Region, Namibia15 Elephants poached in Silowana Complex, Zambia5 elephants poached in Chizarira National Park, Zimbabwe | 3 elephants poached in Zambezi region of Namibia 0 elephants poached in Zambia Silowana Complex 4 elephants poached in Chizarira National Park,  | Less than 3 elephants in the Lake Liambezi Area, NamibiaLess than 10 elephants in Silowana Complex, Zambia (in 2020)Less than 4 elephants in Chizarira National Park, Zimbabwe | National government reports on illegally killed elephants in conservation areas for Zambia, Zimbabwe and Namibia Reports from Monitoring of Illegally Killed Elephants (MIKE), KAZA and other project reports such as the Combatting Wildlife Crime project |  |
| **Specific objectives:****Outcomes** | **Outcome 1**Local communities in two conservation sites in KAZA have increased their food security and contribute to sustainable ecosystem management.  | Percentage of farmers that are food secure throughout the year (disaggregated by country) | Zam: 23% Zim: 41 % |  |  |  | Zam: 40%Zim: 50%  | Survey by external specialist in the target communities at the beginning (i.e. project baseline survey) and the end of the project  | -Extreme weather events, disease and pest outbreaks do not adversely impact on the measures-Farmers learn and adopt practices with interest and willingness to implement |
| Yield (T/ha) (disaggregated by crop and country) | Silowana (Zambia): 1 t/ha maize[[2]](#footnote-3)Binga (Zimbabwe): 0,83 t/ha maize0.49t/ha Sorghum | Silowana: Maize 2.6 t/ Ha 2019Binga: .0.3 t/ha |  |  | Zam: Maize 2.8 t/haZim: Maize 1.24t/haSorghum: 1.5 t/ha | Crop yield assessment survey and crop yield reports Project baseline survey |
|  | **Outcome 2** Local communities in three conservation sites in KAZA participate effectively in law enforcement through enhanced collaboration, capacity building and incentive schemes.  | Number of Community anti poaching staff disaggregated by sex. | Namibia (Liambezi): 0 Zambia (Silowana): 22 Zimbabwe (Binga): 7  | Nam: 10 (6 male, 4 female)Zam: 22 (20 male, 2 female)Zim: 15 (12 male, 3 female) |  |  | Nam: 10 Zam: 33 (2 got promoted to become rangers)25 Male, 8 FemaleZim: 15(with at least 2 women for each country) | Patrol reports  | - KAZA Governments sustain their support for Community LE efforts in communal conserved areas -Communities are not threatened to participate in anti-poaching- Poaching mafia does not spread in the area - Communities agree to cooperate with NGO´s and PA managers-Trained community rangers employment is sustained. |
| Number of patrols conducted with involvement of community scouts disaggregated by country | Namibia: 0 Zambia: 83 per year Zimbabwe: 0  | Nam: 444 Patrol daysZam: 659 patrolsZim: 282 patrol men-days |  |  | Nam: 400 patrol days Zam: 760 Zim: 500 men days per year  |
| Number of arrests of poachers & traffickers contributed by community scouts, disaggregated by country | Nam: 0Zam: 91Zim: 0 | Nam: 0Zam: 52Zim: 3 |  |  | Nam: 5Zam: 80Zim: 5 |
| Number of confiscations of illegal wildlife products and weapons, disaggregated by country and type of confiscation | Nam: 0Zam: 22 (firearms and wildlife products)Zim: 0 | Nam: 0Zam: 28 |  |  | Nam: 5Zam: 30Zim: 5 |
|  |  | Cumulative amount of performance incentive payouts made (disaggregated by category for payout) in Euros | 0 | 0 |  |  | €5000 | Project reports |  |
| **Output 1.1** | **Output 1.1.** Farmers’ capacities to practice climate-adapted, arable farming in non-shifting fields is strengthened | Number of farmers with enhanced skills in Climate –smart agriculture disaggregated by sex, country, type of crop, and topic | 0 in 2017 | 2,368 in Zambia400 in Zimbabwe   | 550 in Zambia 250 in Zimbabwe  | 594 in Zambia 350 in Zimbabwe  | 3,500 in Zambia 600 in Zimbabwe (with at least 50% women) | Post training tests/assessments  | - Farmers are interested and willing to learn- Momentum of improvements are maintained securing farmers interest and commitment |
| Number of farmers provided with improved seed and farming equipment, disaggregated by sex, country, type of crop | 0 in 2017 | 2,368 in Zambia413 in Zimbabwe  | 550 in Zambia 250 in Zimbabwe  | 594 in Zambia 350 in Zimbabwe  | and 3,500 in Zambia 600 in Zimbabwe(with at least 50% women) | Seed and equipment distribution lists |
| **Output 1.2.** | **Output. 1.2.** Community seed multiplication schemes produce Certified seed locally adapted and draught resistant seeds reducing costs to farmers in the Sioma Ngwezi National park buffer zone (Zambia) and the Chizarira - Sengwa complex (Zimbabwe).  | Number of operational seed production schemes disaggregated by country  | Zimbabwe: 0 Zambia : 1  | 1 in Zam1 in Zim | 1 in Zimbabwe and 1 in Zambia | 1 in Zimbabwe and 2 in Zambia | 1 in Zimbabwe, 2 in Zambia | Seed Certification Institute Report | -Expertise nationally available, markets for seeds continue to exist-Seed certification authority continues to allow farmers to market seeds |
| Number of seed growers trained in seed multiplication, disaggregated by sex & country | Zambia: 18 Zimbabwe: 0  | Zam 25 in Imusho and 20 in Sesheke associationZim 5 |  |  | Zambia: 35Zimbabwe: 15 | Training Logs/Lists |
| Amount of Parent seed in kg distributed, disaggregated by crop & country | 0 | Zam: 100 kg maize 40 kg sorghum40 kg Pearl millet60 kg Groundnuts 40 kg cowpeas Zim: Sorghum 25 kg |  |  | Zambia:maize: 350 kg Sorghum 175 kgMillet 175 kgGroudnuts 350 kgCowpeas 175 kgZimbabwe:Sorghum 100 kg | Distribution Lists |
| **Output 2.1.** | **Output 2.1** An effective community anti-poaching system has been established and is functional  | Number of community scouts trained under the project disaggregated by gender  | Nam: 0 Zambia: 0 Zimbabwe: 0 |  |  |  | Nam: 10 Zam: 14Zim: 8 | District government reports, training reports, patrol reports, evidence books  | - Community Institutions continue to secure funding for salaries of community scouts trained and recruited - Communities feel secure in participating in ant poaching activities are safe and not threatened to participate in anti-poaching - Other LE agents do not frustrate community scouts through collusion with poachers and wildlife tracking groups  |
| Status of performance incentive scheme including transparent governance system for community scouts in Zambia  | 1 exists in Zambia but is not fully functioning | Performance scheme under development in Zambia | Zam: incentive scheme initiated |  | Zam: 1 functioning transparent incentive scheme | Project reports | -The incentive scheme will result in improved performance and pride of community scouts There is transparency in the award of the incentives  |
| **Ouptut 2.2.** | **Output 2.2.** Community scouts from three KAZA countries have established information exchanges and harmonized their anti-poaching experiences | Status of community law enforcement exchange platform  | No community scout communication exchange platforms  | 1 in Zim | 0 |  | 1 in each country | Workshop and Project reports  | * Supportive political environment
* Information exchange is acceptable by all the countries
 |
| Number of exchange workshops held | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Workshop and Project reports | * Cross border travel is possible for community scouts
 |

# Annex VII: ROLES AND ATTITUDES OF STAKEHOLDERS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ministries / Government institutions** | **Ministry of Tourism, Hospitality Industry and Environment (Zimbabwe),** Environment Department ***Role*:** General management of natural resources (wildlife, forestsand land) including policy development and implementation ***Attitude***: Topic high on the agenda; action is aligned to the ministry’s mandate, objectives and international commitments (e.g. CBD, CITES, SDG) |
| **Ministry of Agriculture (Zimbabwe),** Department of Agricultural Technical & Extension Services (Agritex) ***Role*:** Development and implementation of relevant policies for enhanced food production and security, technical and advisory services, farmer training ***Attitude*:** Action is aligned to the ministry’s mandate, economic blueprints (Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation (Zim Asset), national development plans), and international commitments (e.g. SDGs) |
| **Ministry of Tourism and Arts (Zambia),** Department for National Parks and Wildlife (DNPW) ***Role*:** Development of tourism sector & management of wildlife and law enforcement, related policy development and implementation ***Attitude*:** Topic high on the agenda; action is complementary to the ministry’s mandate and objectives |
| **Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (Zambia)**, Department of Agriculture ***Role*:** Development & implementation of relevant policies for enhanced food production & security ***Attitude*:** Action is aligned to the ministry’s mandate, economic blueprints (7th national development plan) and international commitments like SDGs |
| **Seed Control and Certification Institute (SCCI)** under the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (Zambia) ***Role***: Development of standards for seeds, certification & seed breeding. ***Attitude***: Action aligned to SCCI’s mandate as to promotion of the use of adaptive seeds to local farmers  |
| **Ministry of Land, Environmental Protection and Natural Resources (Zambia),** Department of Forestry ***Role*:** Management of forestry and biodiversity conservation, law enforcement and related policy development and implementation ***Attitude*:** Potential conflictual towards the actionespecially in giving out timber concessionswithin Game Management Areas (GMA) |
| **Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET, Namibia),** Department of Wildlife & Parks***Role*:** General management of natural resources (wildlife, forestsand land) including policy development and implementation. ***Attitude****:* Topic high on the agenda; action is aligned to the ministry’s mandate, objectives and international commitments (e.g. CBD, CITES, SDG) |
| **Local government (all countries),** Rural District Councils, district government departments ***Role*:** Management of local development and natural resources. ***Attitude:*** Action complements Rural District Councils’ efforts in natural resource/wildlife management in buffer zones |
| **KAZA Secretariat: *Role:*** Provision of leadership and policy direction in management of natural resources in the KAZA regions**. *Attitude:*** Action is aligned to the secretariat’s mandate and objectives; supportive to funding of natural resource management |
|  |
|  |
| **Private Sector** |  |
| **Seed Company (Zimbabwe & Zambia),** Zamseed Company in Zambia (in Zimbabwe tbd). ***Role:*** Seed breeding/ production and technical expertise on seed multiplication. ***Attitude:*** positive towards the action because of increase of the company’s seed base and coverage (markets)  |
| **Professional Hunters (Namibia): *Role:*** Wildlife management. ***Attitude:*** Positive towards the action due to commercial interest in increase of wildlife  |
| **Lodge Operators (Namibia): *Role:*** Advisory services on wildlife management to conservancies ***Attitude:*** Positive towards the action (anti-poaching measures) due to interest in increase of wildlife |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| **CBOs / NGOs** | **Agricultural Technical and Extension Services (Agritex, Zimbabwe):** ***Role:*** field implementing partner for conservation agriculture with long standing experience in implementing community-based conservation agriculture in Zimbabwe. ***Attitude:*** Action complementary to ORAP’s efforts and objectives regarding improvement of livelihoods of target groups |
| **Community Resource Boards (Zambia): *Role:*** CBO mandated by DNPW for the management of natural resources in the project area ***Attitude:*** Positive towards the action as CBRs are interested in improvement of livelihoods and conservation of wildlife and get income from ecotourism  |
| **Salambaala Conservancy (Namibia): *Role:*** CBO mandated by MET for the management of natural resources in the project area ***Attitude:*** Positive towards the action as interested in improvement of livelihoods and conservation of wildlife and get income from ecotourism |
| **Environmental Sub-Committees (Zimbabwe): *Role:*** Environmental and wildlife management and recovery of wildlife at community level, **Attitude*:*** Positive towards action as direct beneficiaries  |
| **Other** | **Traditional Authority (Zambia):** Barotse Royal Establishment (BRE): ***Role:*** Custodians of natural resources (land, forest, water, wildlife) within western part of the country, very strong influence on the people. ***Attitude:*** Appreciative towards the action because of livelihood benefits for the farmers/target group within the BRE |
| **Traditional Authority (Namibia):** Masubia (Eastern Zambezi): ***Role:*** Custodians of natural resources (land, forest, water, wildlife) within Eastern Zambezi region, very strong influence on the people. ***Attitude:*** Appreciative towards the action because of livelihood benefits for the farmers/target group within the Masubia |

1. The term ‘Action’ is used throughout the report as a synonym of ‘project’. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Baseline data for other crops is available but not analyzed. This will be assessed at endline. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)