



Terms of Reference: Project Evaluation

Project Title: Protecting biodiversity by tackling wildlife crime - Implementation of the wildlife law enforcement action plan (PAPECALF) through strengthened capacity of governments and civil society in Central Africa

Donor: German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) through WWF Germany (GE)

ToRs by: Alain Bernard ONONINO

Date: 16th January 2017

Project Background and Context

Project Location	Five countries of the Congo Basin: Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Republic of the Congo
Project Name	Protecting biodiversity by tackling wildlife crime - Implementation of the wildlife law enforcement action plan (PAPECALF) through strengthened capacity of governments and civil society in Central Africa
Project reference number	9F203100
Project Budget	€ 935,762
Donors/funding sources	German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) through WWF Germany (GE)
Project Duration	March 2013 – April 2017

Illegal wildlife trade is the 4th most profitable illicit trade worldwide worth approximately US\$ 19 billion, is a serious transnational crime on a global scale, and poses a major threat to rule of law at national and international levels. The year 2011 witnessed the highest ever recorded levels of elephant poaching in Africa, as well as more large scale ivory seizures than any year since records began over 20 years ago¹. The increasing number of large scale ivory seizures indicates the increasing involvement of criminal syndicates in the illegal ivory trade. Estimates indicate that elephants in Central Africa declined by more than 60% in ten years between 2002 and 2011, primarily due to poaching. The decimation of elephants in Africa deprives governments and communities of a potentially valuable resource. Overhunting is furthermore a significant contributing driver to the degradation of forest carbon storage, as large-seeded trees with high wood density are deprived of their seed-dispersing animals. Furthermore, there is compelling evidence that the scale of current overhunting in Central Africa is tremendous: six times greater than sustainable levels.

¹ (<http://www.cites.org/eng/com/SC/62/E62-46-01.pdf>)

Overhunting is thus a serious threat to many forest species and ecosystems, and to the capacity of forest carbon storage.

One of the main challenges in implementing wildlife law in Central Africa is the inadequate technical and operational capacities of law enforcement agencies associated with poor collaboration between these agencies within a same country and also between countries, resulting in an inadequate response to a transnational problem. In response to this challenge, the Central African countries have developed, under the aegis of the Central African Forest Commission (COMIFAC), a sub-regional action plan to strengthen the enforcement of national wildlife laws (PAPECALF) for the period 2012-2017.

Project Goal, Objectives and Components

The project's objective is to enhance the capacity of governments, civil society and partner organisations in Central Africa to fight poaching and illegal wildlife trade.

The aim is to mitigate negative impacts on biodiversity, national security and economic development opportunities in Central Africa that are caused by massive illegal killing of its elephant populations. This will be achieved through efficient national and regional support to key objectives of PAPECALF (*Plan d'Action sous-régional des Pays de l'Espace COMIFAC pour le renforcement de l'Application des Législations nationales sur la Faune sauvage*).

4 project components are implemented for this purpose:

Component 1: National Coordination Units (NCU) to combat wildlife crime are operational in Cameroon (CAM), Republic of Congo (RoC), Central African Republic (CAR), Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Gabon;

Component 2: Provide support to the Government of the Central African Republic (CAR) with the development and implementation of an elephant protection strategy;

Component 3: Increase capacity in DRC to implement PAPECALF;

Component 4: COMIFAC convenes a regional meeting with PAPECALF signatory countries.

Project Evaluation Purpose and Use, Objectives and Scope

The project evaluation is a contractual requirement and the primary client of the evaluation is BWZ. It was initially planned to carry out an internal project review during the last year of the project's implementation, but the main project implementers (WWF Germany and WWF Cameroon) finally agreed to carry out an external evaluation for more transparency and objectivity. The timing of the evaluation is triggered by the coming to an end of the project (April 2017).

Key Objectives of this evaluation:

1. Evaluate what has been achieved so far based on the defined aim, objectives and components contained in the project document in terms of strengthening enforcement capacities and inter-agency collaboration in the 05 target countries and what lessons can be learnt; and
2. Provide recommendations that will help the various stakeholders (COMIFAC, target countries, WWF offices etc.) to improve wildlife law enforcement in general and inter-agency collaboration in the region

and in each country in particular, so as to permit the attainment of the objectives of the Wildlife Practice strategy (especially outcome 3 - *Illegal wildlife trade is eliminated for priority species*).

Beneficiaries of the Evaluation findings:

- WWF ROA Yaoundé Hub
- WWF offices in Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Republic of the Congo
- TRAFFIC Central Africa
- COMIFAC
- The different key enforcement (Wildlife, Police, Gendarmerie, Customs) and Justice agencies in Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Republic of the Congo;
- The INTERPOL Regional Bureau for Central Africa.

Offices that have commissioned the evaluation:	WWF Germany and WWF Cameroon
Those responsible for the oversight of the evaluation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alain Bernard Ononino, Head of Policy Wildlife Crime Programme (WWF Cameroon) - Cleto Ndikumagenge, WWF Cameroon Conservation Director - Jean Bernard Yarrissem, WWF CAR Country Coordinator - Pauwel De Wachter, WWF TRIDOM Coordinator (WWF Gabon), - Bruno Perodeau, WWF DRC Conservation Director - Paulinus Ngeh, TRAFFIC CAF Director
Those responsible to act on the results, including the writing of a management response:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marc Languy, Deputy Director ROA in charge of Central African Offices - Hanson Njiforti, Country Director WWF Cameroon - Alain Bernard Ononino
Secondary audiences that benefit from learning generated by the evaluation:	COMIFAC Executive Secretariat, Law enforcement and Justice agencies of Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Republic of the Congo
Dissemination of results:	WWF offices in Germany, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Republic of the Congo; TRAFFIC offices in Cameroon and DRC

Evaluation Criteria and Guiding questions

The evaluation shall cover the period March 2013 (when the project began) to April 2017 and it will be focusing on evaluating the extent to which the different activities realized and to be realized over this period have been able to contribute or not contribute towards attaining the goals and objectives. It is expected that the evaluator in carrying out this assignment will use the WWF Evaluation Guidance for report structuring and performance rating.

The evaluator will have to travel to all the five target countries to meet with those responsible for the execution of the project but also with the different stakeholders. It is also expected that the evaluator may organize e-meetings with those stakeholders he/she may not be able to physically meet during the trip to the countries. The travels and meetings in those countries will be facilitated respectively by the different WWF country offices.

Related to the evaluation objective, it is expected that the consultant is to assess the relevance and the contribution of the project in delivering effectively and efficiently on both WWF IWT/wildlife crime program in each country and at the regional level as well as PAPECALF's objectives and key actions related to strengthening wildlife law enforcement and inter-agency collaboration in particular.

Relevance

- Appropriateness of the project with respect to the halting of illegal and unsustainable wildlife offtake in the Congo Basin.
- Coherence and/or complementarity of the project with respect to other government initiatives, such as the National Ivory Action Plans (NIAPs) in Cameroon, Gabon, Congo and DRC, National Strategy of Forestry and Wildlife Controls in Cameroon etc.

Efficiency

A measure of the relationship (i) between outputs, the products or services of the intervention, and input and (ii) the human and financial resources the intervention uses:

- Appropriateness of the resources (both material and human) used for the project;
- An analysis of whether certain costs could be reduced without threatening the project's key objectives and goals?

Effectiveness

A measure of the extent to which the intervention's intended outcomes, its specific objectives or intermediate results has been achieved:

- What has and has not been achieved (both intended and non-intended) in relation to the duration of the project;
- Identification of factors that have or may have negatively affected the project effectiveness.
- Quality of the monitoring during implementation ;

Impact

A measure of all significant impacts (positive or negative) of the project's intervention on targeted biodiversity and/or footprint issues.

- Analysis of the project's contribution to the reduction of massive killings of flagship species especially elephants and illegal trade in wildlife products including ivory and pangolin scales;
- Analysis of the project's impact on the involvement of other enforcement (Police, Gendarmerie, Customs) and Justice agencies in wildlife law enforcement efforts;
- Analysis of the project's perceived impact on relevant policies and legal frameworks in the 5 countries.
- Analysis of the project's perceived impact on the capacity to deliver technical tools for combatting poaching and IWT;

- Analysis of secondary/unintended impacts of the project – both negative and positive;
- Measure of concrete impacts/changes on the ground showing trends over time (using graphs).

Sustainability

A measure of whether the project benefits are likely to continue after support has ended:

- Are the results of the project sustainable in the long-term?
- Does the project have the right measures in place to ensure WWF conservation work is sustainable in the Congo Basin?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?
- 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 or major changes to approach)?
- What is the potential for WWF to support wildlife law enforcement through improvement of enforcement capacity and inter-agency collaboration?

Adaptive Capacity

Adaptive Capacity is a measure of the extent to which the project or programme regularly assesses and adapts its work, and thereby ensures continued relevance in changing contexts, strong performance, and learning.

Related questions:

- Applying Good Practice: Did the team examine good practice lessons from other conservation/development experiences and consider these experiences in the project/programme design?
- What joint planning procedures have been applied and how did stakeholders contribute?
- How was the project monitored and how were activities adapted according to monitoring results?
- How were project funds managed and project disbursements monitored against budget provisions and procurement regulations?
- Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted regarding what worked and didn't work (e.g. case-studies, stories, good practices)?
- What are possible new or aggravated threats to biodiversity conservation that should be addressed?

Methodology Considerations

The evaluation methodology should consist of:

- a) The compiling and review of all relevant project documents (will be provided by CCPO)
- b) Review of relevant legal and regulatory framework (will be provided by CCPO)
- c) Induction meeting and interviews with WWF and TRAFFIC management staff in Yaoundé, Libreville, Bangui, Brazzaville and Kinshasa
- d) Skype interviews with relevant WWF and TRAFFIC Staff
- e) Interviews with key project stakeholders (COMIFAC, Interpol, law enforcement and Justice agencies)
- f) Interviews with other relevant stakeholders (other projects, ministries)
- g) Workshop with WWF staff in Yaoundé to present and discuss evaluation findings

The consultant may propose additional methodological components to be agreed upon with WWF CCPO.

The evaluator uses the WWF Evaluation Guidance for report structure and performance rating.

Qualifications of Evaluator

The Evaluator should be bilingual (English/French) in order to be able to evaluate all of the texts and reports, as well as to communicate with WWF and TRAFFIC staff and relevant stakeholders/partners of the project. The evaluator should also have proven experience with wildlife law enforcement support work in the region and in the evaluation of conservation projects implemented by non-governmental organisations.

Proposed Evaluation timeline

Activity	Target Date (Duration)
Selection of Evaluator	By 27 January 2017
Start date	February 6, 2017
Preparing for the evaluation, reading documents and preparing questions for the team (desktop study)	02 days
Meeting with project team, WWF and TRAFFIC management team, COMIFAC and Interpol Regional Bureau in Yaounde	03 days
Meeting with key stakeholders in Libreville, Kinshasa, Brazzaville and Bangui including travel times	20 days (05 days per country)
Debriefing meeting with project management team	1 day
Preparation of draft report	3 days
Submission of Draft report to WWF	By 24 th March 2017
Allow 5 days for comments by WWF	By 31 st March 2017
Preparation of final report	2 days
Submission of final report	By April 7th 2017
Total number of professional days	31 days

Deliverables

- A draft evaluation report in English of maximum 25 pages (without annexes).
- Report on Feedback session on First Draft Report with WWF management
- Final Evaluation report

Preparation and organisation of Evaluation

The following shall be required pre-reading material for the evaluator:

- Project Description (appendix 1);
- Technical and Financial reports for FY14, FY15, FY16, and mid-term FY17 (if already available);
- Annual reports CY 2014, CY 2015, CY 2016 (if available).

The evaluation will be based in great part on interviews and discussions with the following individuals and organisations including:

- WWF and TRAFFIC staff responsible for the management and implementation of the project both in Germany and Central Africa (Alain Ononino, Ilka Herbingner, Pauwel De Wachter, Luc Evouna, Corneille Moukson, Hubert Yamande, Alfred Yoko, Brave Nzamba, François Abessolo, Sone Nkoke, Denis Mahonghol, Cleo Mashini etc.);

- Key WWF network staff (ROA Deputy Director Yde Hub, Country Directors – Cameroon, Gabon, DRC, RoC, CAR; Conservation Director – Cameroon, Gabon, DRC, RoC, CAR);
- COMIFAC representative (Chouaibou Nchoutpouen);
- Interpol (Oumar Algadi);
- Representatives of enforcement (Wildlife, Police, Gendarmerie, Customs) and Justice agencies (at least one per agency and per country having participated and/or benefitted from project activities)
- Other conservation NGO's active in the 05 countries (EAGLE Network, ZSL, AWF etc.);

Depending on availability, some of these meetings could take place by skype or telephone.

Financial Terms

The costs of international flights will be covered by the project. All domestic travels within countries will also be arranged and paid for by the project (local transportation, hotel and food will be based on WWF per diem rates). An honorarium will be offered based on the estimated number of days of work. Visa cost will be reimbursed based on real cost.

Expression of Interest

All candidates interested in conducting this evaluation on a consultant basis should submit, no later than January 25th 2017 a detailed technical proposal including:

- A curriculum vitae detailing his/her experience in project evaluation and wildlife law enforcement support work in Central Africa;
- The proposed evaluation plan (description of approach, suggestions for interview questions, timeline and time allocation, etc.) and comments on the Terms of Reference;
- Proposed date for visits in Cameroon, Gabon, RoC, CAR and DRC;
- A detailed budget proposal which takes into account the financial conditions specified in this ToR and specifies the honorarium (daily rate) as well as any other costs.

The estimated end date of the evaluation will be April 7, 2017.

All applications should be sent to recruit-roaydehub@wwfarica.org , with CC to aononino@wwfcam.org with reference "BENGO project evaluation" not later than January 25th, 2017.

ANNEXS

Annex 1. Part A: REPORT SAMPLE TEMPLATE

The following provides a basic outline for an evaluation report. While this should be easily applied to evaluations of simpler projects or programmes, adaptation will be needed to ensure reports of more complex programmes (e.g., Country Offices, multi-country regions, eco-regions, Network Initiatives) are well organized, easy to read and navigate, and not too lengthy.

Title Page

- ♦ Report title, project or programme title, and contract number (if appropriate), Date of report, Authors and their affiliation, Locator map (if appropriate)

Executive Summary (*between 2 to 4 pages*)

- ♦ Principal findings and recommendations, organized by the six core evaluation criteria
- ♦ Summary of lessons learned

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Body of the report (no more than 25 pages)

A. Introduction (max 3 pages)

- Concise presentation of the project/programme characteristics
- Purpose, objectives, and intended utilization of the evaluation (reference and attach the ToR as an annex)
- Evaluation methodology and rationale for approach (reference and attach as annexes the mission itinerary; names of key informants; a list of consulted documents; and any synthetic tables containing project/programme information utilized in the exercise)
- Composition of the evaluation team, including any specific roles of team members

B. Project/Programme Overview (max 5 pages)

- Concise summary of the project or programme's history, evolution, purpose, objectives, and strategies to achieve conservation goals (attach conceptual model, results chain or logical framework and project monitoring system as annexes)
- Essential characteristics: context, underlying rationale, stakeholders and beneficiaries
- Summarize WWF's main interest in this project or programme

C. Evaluation Findings (5-8 pages)

- Findings organized by each of the six core evaluation criteria, including sufficient but concise rationale.
- Tables, graphics, and other figures to help convey key findings

D. Conclusions and recommendations (5-8 pages)

- Conclusion and recommendation organised each of the six core evaluation criteria, including sufficient but concise rationale – recommendations should be specific, actionable and numbered.
- Project/programme performance rating tables to provide a quick summary of performance and to facilitate comparison with other projects/programmes (see Annex A, Table B)

E. Overall Lessons Learned (max 3 pages)

- Lessons learned regarding what worked, what didn't work, and why
- Lessons learned with wider relevance, that can be generalized beyond the project

Annexes

- ♦ Terms of Reference
- ♦ Evaluation methodology detail
- ♦ Itinerary with key informants
- ♦ Documents consulted
- ♦ Project/programme logical framework/ conceptual model/ list of primary goals and objectives
- ♦ Specific project/programme and monitoring data, as appropriate
- ♦ Summary tables of progress towards outputs, objectives, and goals
- ♦ Maps
- ♦ Table Annex 1 Part B

Annex 1. Part B. EVALUATION SUMMARY TABLE - SCORING OF THE PROJECT/PROGRAM AGAINST THE SIX CORE EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluators are to assign the project/program a Rating and Score for each criterion as follows:

- Very Good/4: The project/program embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *very good* extent.
- Good/3: The project/program embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *good* extent.
- Fair/2: The project/program embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *fair* extent.
- Poor/1: The project/program embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *poor* extent.
- N/A: The criterion was *not assessed* (in the 'Justification,' explain why).
- D/I: The criterion was considered but *data were insufficient* to assign a rating or score (in the 'Justification,' elaborate).

Evaluators also are 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.

Rating/Score	Description of Strong Performance	Evaluate or Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
Relevance	The project/program addresses the necessary factors in the specific program context to bring about positive changes in conservation targets (i.e., species, ecosystems, ecological processes, including associated ecosystem services supporting human wellbeing).		
Quality of Design	The project/program has rigorously applied key design tools (e.g., the WWF PPMS).		
Efficiency	1. Most/all program activities have been delivered with efficient use of human & financial resources.		
	2. Governance and management systems are appropriate, sufficient, and operate efficiently.		

Effectiveness	1. Most/all intended outcomes—stated objectives/intermediate results regarding key threats and other factors affecting project/program targets—were attained..		
	2. There is strong evidence indicating that perceived changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the WWF project or program		
Impact	1. Most/all goals—stated desired changes in the status of species, ecosystems, and ecological processes—were realized.		
	2. Evidence indicates that perceived changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the WWF project or program.		
Sustainability	1. Most or all factors for ensuring sustainability of results/impacts are being or have been established.		
	2. Scaling up mechanism put in place with risks and assumptions re-assessed and addressed.		
Adaptive Management	1. Project/program results (outputs, outcomes, impacts) are qualitatively and quantitatively demonstrated through regular collection and analysis of monitoring data.		
	2. The project/program team 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/program and organizational learning		