



WF Central Africa Regional
Programme Office, CARPO
Cameroon Country Programme
Office
Immeuble Panda,
Rue La Citronelle,
BAT Compound, Bastos
BP 6776 Yaounde
Republic of Cameroon

Tel: (237) 22 21 70 84 / 83
22 00 77 03
77 50 00 35
99 50 36 21
Fax: (237)22 21 70 85
22 21 42 40
HNjiforti@wwfcam.org
www.panda.org

Terms of Reference: Project Evaluation

Project Title: Securing the Nki and Boumba-Bek National Parks in the Cameroon Segment of the TRIDOM Landscape

Donor: WWF-Netherlands (NL)

ToRs by: Gilles Etoga

Date: 25 November 2016

1 Background and Context

Project Location	Cameroon, East Province, TRIDOM tri-national Landscape, Western Congo Basin Moist Forest Eco-region
Project Name	Securing the Nki and Boumba-Bek National Parks in the Cameroon Segment of the TRIDOM Landscape
Project Vision	The biodiversity and ecological functionality of the Cameroon segment of the TRIDOM Landscape are conserved through secured protected areas and sustainable use of natural resources in the surrounding areas
Project reference number	CM205600
Project Budget	WWF NL: € 900,000 [July 2014 – June 2017] Total program co-funding raised from other donors for the period [FY15-FY17] is approximately € 500,000
Donors/funding sources	Beside WWF NL, for [FY15 – FY17]: EU TRIDOM (96,000 €), WWF Germany /Bengo (XXX Euro), WWF US / Save the elephants 200 000 USD), WWF Int /AEP (35 000 CHF), FWS (Cameroon Transborder Elephant Security 100 000 USD).
Project Duration	July 2014 → June 2017 But note that this was preceded by other phases of WWF NL funding
Implementing agency and partners	Implementing agency : WWF ROA/Cameroon Country Office Main implementing partner: the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MINFOF). Other partners: WWF RoC / ETIC, logging companies, local communities
Project Manager	Gilles Etoga

History

From 2002 to 2009, through its Jengi program, WWF provided management support for the three National Parks Lobeke, Boumba Bek and Nki and their surrounding areas from its office at Yokadouma, the capital of the Boumba-et-Ngoko Department. In 2009 it was decided to split the Jengi Program into three project components and to adjust WWF's management structure accordingly. Until 2009 WWF technical and financial management staff had been based at Yokadouma with additional technical and petty cash accounting staff attached to the MINFOF headquarters at Mambele (Lobeke NP), Ngatto (Boumba Bek NP) and Ngoyla (Nki NP). In 2009 separate WWF management units to provide Park support were established at Mambele (Lobeke) and Ngoyla (Nki and Boumba Bek National Park) while a management unit at Djoum provides support for the Ngoyla-Mintom Forest Block (EU funded LUP/REDD project). The Mambele unit mainly provides support to Lobeke NP, which is part of a separate Landscape (TNS).

The new de-centralized structure provides for better alignment with the administrative and management structures of MINFOF and the transfer of WWF management staff from Yokadouma to offices in closer proximity to the parks was expected to strengthen management support for individual parks and to facilitate supervision, coordination and financial management of field activities.

For the evaluation, only the WWF NL-funded program at Boumba Bek and Nki NP/TRIDOM is targeted.

Threats

The biodiversity and ecological process in the project area are threatened by a number of anthropogenic effects, including: killing of elephants primarily for ivory; unplanned ribbon development along roads; poaching (shooting and trapping) of various species for bushmeat for subsistence needs and supplying external markets; climate change; and forest conversion for domestic fuelwood and by extractive industries (including logging and mining companies). These direct threats are underpinned by a number of root causes and, in addition, there are further barriers to effective conservation in the area – including: general capacity issues with the government organisation with the mandate to manage protected areas, and oversee commercial logging and community forests (MINFOF); global demand for timber; low capacity of local communities; poor development planning; demand for ivory; demand for bushmeat.

The most imminent direct threat in TRIDOM Cameroon is rampant elephant poaching as demonstrated by WWF surveys. Nki and Boumba Bek (and TRIDOM Cameroon) are on the way of losing all of their elephants. The core task of the evaluation is to dig into this challenge and recommend how MINFOF and WWF can do things differently.

The current project

The project was developed as a response to the threats, root causes and barriers, and builds on the foundations of previous work. The wider "Jengi" program vision:

"The biodiversity and ecological functionality of the Cameroon segment of the TRIDOM Landscape are conserved through secured protected areas and sustainable use of natural resources in the surrounding areas"

And the (WWF NL) **project goal** linked to that vision, is *"By 2020, elephant and great ape populations have stabilised in Nki and Boumba Bek National Parks which are effectively managed, and in the surrounding areas which are under responsible forest management."*

This goal is to be achieved through the implementation of three strategies, which, in turn, will lead to the achievement of five objectives all of which contribute to the programme goal:

Strategy I: Support for improved park management

OBJECTIVE 1: By 2017, staff of the protected area management body (MINFOF or Agency) in Nki and Boumba Bek meets at least 80% of the annual performance objectives set by management and annual work plans

Strategy II: Support for improved law enforcement

OBJECTIVE 2: By 2017, improved intelligence, anti-poaching/trafficking strategies and judicial processes have enhanced the effectiveness of law enforcement as deterrent

OBJECTIVE 3: By 2017, the number of logging companies in surrounding areas of the National Parks that have met at least legality standards in the process towards FSC certification has increased both in absolute terms and as proportion of targeted landscape

Strategy III: Support for responsible forest management

OBJECTIVE 4: Models for partnerships to promote more profitable and conservation-related community-based activities incl. community forests catalysed

OBJECTIVE 5: By 2017, migration corridors between Boumba bek, Nki and neighbouring parks have been mapped and are integrated in forest and environmental management plans

2 Evaluation Purpose and Use, Objectives and Scope

The primary client of the evaluation is WWF Netherlands, who formally requested the evaluation (as the program funding is higher than € 500,000 threshold). The timing of the evaluation is *triggered* by the coming end of the current phase of WWF NL funding (June 2017). WWF NL has agreed “in principle” to a new 3Y phase of funding, and a proposal will be developed in February-May 2017.

In general the evaluation should have the following purposes:

- 1) An evaluation of what has been achieved and what not in the NL funded TRIDOM Cameroon program so far (and WWF’s role in this) and what lessons can be learnt
- 2) The drafting of recommendations for a new WWF NL funded phase of the program that will continue to focus on large mammal conservation in Nki and Boumba Bek, as a critical component of a wider TRIDOM conservation program.

Specific to the context of the evaluation is the dramatic decline of elephants in Nki and Boumba Bek NP as documented by WWF’s wildlife surveys or observer reports. It is expected that the evaluation will provide specific recommendations on what to change and how to help address this decline in a further phase of the project. **Given the key role that MINFOF plays in elephant protection, the consultant will involve MINFOF in all steps of the evaluation (before going to the field, in the field and during debriefing) as recommendations and lessons learned will address MINFOF as much as WWF.**

Important sub-objectives are:

1. How well have the three main strategies in the program been covered, have they all been covered and if so, have they been covered equally well? What was their impact on elephant conservation ?
2. How effective has the collaboration between WWF and MINFOF been and has it successfully contributed to reducing elephant poaching in the Parks?

3. Recommendations for identified weak points and shortfalls, in the context of dramatic elephant poaching affecting the site. *In particular what would be key elements and conditions of a next phase that in particular would focus on halting the decline of elephants in Nki and Boumba Bek?*
4. What are possible additional and innovative approaches to collaborative park management for Nki and Boumba Bek NP's?

Individuals who have commissioned the evaluation:	Gunilla Kuperus & Jaap van der Waarde, WWF NL
Those responsible for the oversight of the evaluation:	Gilles Etoga, WWF Program Manager
Those responsible to act on the results, including the writing of a management response:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gilles Etoga WWF Program Manager - Cleto Ndikumagengue, WWF Cameroon Conservation Director - Pauwel De Wachter, TRIDOM Coordinator
Secondary audiences that benefit from learning generated by the evaluation:	MINFOF
Dissemination of results:	MINFOF, WWF CCPO, WWF NL, WWF US, WWF TRIDOM
Scope:	
Period of project implementation:	July 2014- June 2017 project implementation period
Geographical scope	Nki Boumba Bek and periphery
Funders:	WWF NL and other funding sources that target the same program objectives

3 Evaluation Criteria and Guiding questions

It will be necessary to evaluate the extent to which activities conducted between July 2014 up to date were able to make progress towards the project goal and the project objectives. The evaluation should adhere to the following criteria:

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

3.1 Relevance and Quality of Design

Related questions:

- What are the current threats to elephant conservation and how are they inter-related?
- Did project plans and activities sufficiently correspond to the identified threats and drivers of elephant depletion , where are gaps to be addressed?
- Are project plans and activities aligned with and contribute to strategic objectives and plans of the Cameroonian Government?

3.2 Efficiency

A measure of the relationship between outputs—the products or services of the intervention—and inputs—the human and financial resources the intervention uses.

- Appropriateness of the resources (both material and human) used for the programme ;
- An analysis of whether certain costs could be reduced without threatening the programmes key objectives and goals?
- An analysis of the results achieved in relation to the duration of the project.
- Analysis in how far the project has been successful in raising other funding for the program.

3.3 Effectiveness

A measure of the extent to which the intervention's intended outcomes—its specific objectives or intermediate results—have been achieved.

- What has and has not been achieved (both intended and non-intended).
- What is the effectiveness of the park's anti-poaching service. How is corruption dealt with?
- Identification of possible external factors that may have impeded successful management of the project and achievement of objectives, including working relationships with partners;
- Quality of the monitoring during implementation (including large mammal monitoring, law enforcement monitoring).
- Evaluation of the relationship with MINFOF in relation to effective park management.
- Were project interventions able to reduce or mitigate the identified biodiversity threats?
- To what extent were project interventions able to improve environmental awareness, participation and livelihoods of the local population?
- To what extent did project interventions improve the sustainable management of targeted National Parks and surrounding multiple use zones?
- To what extent did project support improve the capacity of MINFOF to effectively manage protected areas?
- How were project activities coordinated with related cross-border activities in neighbouring countries, e.g. joint anti-poaching and illegal wildlife trade activities?

3.4 Impact

- Does MINFOF manage the protected areas more effectively and in line with developed park management plans, in particular with regard to anti-poaching and law enforcement strategies?
- Does the local population support conservation objectives, do they benefit from conservation activities and livelihood improvements and are they sufficiently involved in decision-making processes related to protected area and land use management?

3.5 Sustainability

A measure of whether the benefits of a conservation intervention are likely to continue after external support has ended.

Related questions:

- Are sustainable financing mechanisms established (or concepts developed) that allow MINFOF to effectively manage protected areas with regard to human resource and equipment needs and related management costs?
- Are communities supporting conservation (in particular elephant conservation)?
- Is the level of benefits local communities receive through active involvement and benefit sharing from park management sufficient to ensure long-term conservation support and are livelihood improvements sustainable with regard to local management capacities and product marketing potentials?
- Are best practises applied by the private sector and local farmers sustainable with regard to management capacities, cost-benefit ratios and effective monitoring mechanisms?
- Were important stakeholders sufficiently involved in project planning and implementation and what mechanisms been established to ensure their participation in the long-term?

3.6 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 is needed in the collaboration with MINFOF to render law enforcement in the Parks effective?
- What are possible new or aggravated threats to biodiversity conservation that should be addressed?
- What are possible additional and innovative approaches to collaborative park management?

4 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/CCPO management staff in Yaoundé
- d) Skype interviews with relevant WWF Staff (ETIC program in Northern Congo, TRIDOM coordinator)
- e) **Full involvement of MINFOF in the evaluation as elephant poaching is the key challenge (before going to the field, in the field, debriefing). The consultant will assess with WWF CPO the need (or not) to have a MINFOF staff working closely with the consultant.**

- f) Field trip to the program area and visits of selected project sites
- g) Interviews with private sector representatives (e.g. logging industries)
- h) Interviews with local communities
- i) Interviews with other relevant stakeholders (other projects, ministries)
- j) Workshop with WWF CCPO staff Yaoundé to present and discuss evaluation findings

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

4.1 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 staff and relevant stakeholders/partners of the project. The evaluator should also have proven experience with the evaluation of conservation projects implemented by non-governmental organisations, as well as significant experience with the issues surrounding wildlife conservation, PA management, and fight against wildlife crime & poaching. Central African experience would be much appreciated but is not obligatory.

4.2 WWF Support.

Gilles Etoga will consolidate the necessary information (documents) for the evaluation. Gilles will be responsible for planning meetings in Yaounde and the field and logistical arrangements.

4.3 Proposed Evaluation timeline

Activity	Target Date (Duration)
Selection of Evaluator	December 16 th
Start date	January XXX, 2016
Review of WWF materials provided	(1.5 days)
- Interviews with WWF management (phone/skype)	(0.5 days)
Visit to Cameroon and field site	XXX January 2016 (12 days)
Debriefing meeting with management	(1 day)
Preparation of draft report	(4 days)
Submission of Draft report to WWF (allow 5 days for comments by WWF ROA and WWF NL)	February 15, 2016
Preparation of final report	(1 day) February 22, 2016
Total number of professional days	20 days

The following indicative 12-day itinerary would allow the evaluator to visit the project site as well as to conduct in-depth discussions with the project manager, field staff, partners and stakeholders.

Location	Activity	Days												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	1	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	1	2

Travel to YDE	Arrival in Cameroon (evening probably)	■											
YDE	Interviews with WWF staff and in depth presentation and discussion on the program (program manager, conservation director). Visit Government Partners and other partners.		■										
YDE → Ngoyla	Drive to Ngoyla			■									
Ngoyla	Presentation by full project team followed by questions and one to ones.				■								
Nki-BBK	Field site visit to the Nki BBK site and periphery (discussions with stakeholders including logging companies, communities and ecoguards)					■	■	■	■				
Nki-BBK → YDE	Return to YDE										■		
YDE	Last meetings with staff/ govt officials/ partners in YDE & debriefing with project team.											■	■

4.4 Preparation and organisation of Evaluation

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

- Project Description (appendix 1);
- Technical and Financial reports for FY15, FY16, and mid-term FY17 (if already available)
- Report of the last on-site evaluation of the project (2014).
- Other technical reports (large mammal inventory report, USFWS proposal,...).

The evaluator will conduct a preparatory briefing meeting by phone/skype with relevant WWF Netherlands staff charged with overseeing the TRIDOM Cameroon project prior to his/her site visit to Cameroon.

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

- WWF staff responsible for the management and implementation of the project both in the Netherlands and Central Africa (Jaap van der Waarde, Gilles Etoga)
- Key WWF network staff (TRIDOM Coordinator, IWT Coordinator, Bio-monitoring coordinator, conservation director, national director)
- **MINFOF Staff and Directors**
- Project technical team.
- WWF partners in government administrations. .
- Private sector players;
- Selected communities.
- ETIC project in RoC

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

At the end of the site visit, and before taking off a feedback meeting in Yaounde will take place with the program manager responsible for implementation and monitoring of the project. A debriefing meeting with WWF Netherlands staff and WWF TRIDOM Coordinator (with skype) will be scheduled following the site visit. A first draft of the evaluation report should be submitted no longer than two weeks following the site visit.

4.5 Financial Terms

The costs of an international flight will be covered by the project. All domestic travel within Cameroon will also be arranged and paid for by the project transport, hotel, food (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.

4.6 Deliverables

1. Draft and Final Reports, 25 pages (maximum), with clear, tangible recommendations for the next phase conform chapter 6.1.
2. Feedback session on First Draft Report with WWF management

5 Expression of Interest

All candidates interested in conducting this evaluation on a consultant basis should submit, no later than December 15, 2016 a detailed & short technical proposal including:

- A curriculum vitae detailing his/her experience in project evaluation and NGO led conservation project implementation in Africa;
- The proposed evaluation plan (description of approach, suggestions for interview questions, timeline and time allocation, etc.) and comments on the Terms of Reference;
- A proposed date for the site visit in Cameroon.
- The length of time the proposal will be valid.
- A detailed budget proposal which takes into account the financial conditions specified in these ToR and specifies the honorarium (daily rate) as well as any other costs.

The estimated end date of the study will be February 22, 2017.

The proposal and all supporting material should be sent in electronic form to Hanson Njiforty, Country Director at WWF CCPO (email: HNjiforty@wwfcam.org) with CC to Getoga@wwfcam.org with reference "Nki-BBK evaluation"

Technical and financial proposals should be submitted as separate files.

6 Report template and ratings table

To support more systematic recording of evaluation findings to advance WWF's broader organisational learning, all

evaluators should follow, to the extent possible, the evaluation report structure below and complete the following table (Part B), to be attached to the evaluation report.

6.1 Report Table of Contents 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 organised, 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, organised 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 use 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 synthesis tables containing project/programme information used 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 theory of change including conceptual model, results chain or logical framework and project monitoring system as annexes)
- Essential characteristics: context, underlying rationale, stakeholders and beneficiaries
- Summarise WWF's main interest in this project or programme

C. Evaluation Findings (3-5 pages)

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

D. Recommendations (3-5 pages)

- 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 the Summary Table Part B, below).

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 generalised beyond the project

F. Conclusions

- General summation of key findings and recommendations

Annexes

- ♦ Terms of Reference
- ♦ Evaluation methodology detail
- ♦ Itinerary with key informants
- ♦ Documents consulted

- ♦ Project/programme theory of change/ 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
- ♦ Recommendations summary table

6.2 Evaluation Summary Table – scoring against core evaluation criteria

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

- **Very Good/4:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *very good* extent.
- **Good/3:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *good* extent.
- **Fair/2:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *fair* extent.
- **Poor/1:** The project/programme 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 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.

Rating/Score	Description of Strong Performance	Evaluator Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
Relevance	The project/programme addresses the necessary factors in the specific programme context to bring about positive changes in conservation targets – biodiversity and/or footprint issues (i.e. species, ecosystems, ecological processes, including associated ecosystem services supporting human wellbeing).		
Quality of Design	1.The project/programme has rigorously applied key design tools (e.g. the WWF PPMS).		
	2. The project/programme is hitting the right 'pressure points' to meet necessary and sufficient conditions for success		
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—stated objectives/intermediate results regarding key threats and other factors affecting project/programme targets—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, and ecological processes—were realised.		
	2. Evidence indicates that perceived changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the WWF project or programme.		
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.		
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 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 organisational learning		