

**TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR) FOR FINAL EVALUATION OF THE
“PARTNERSHIP FOR IMPROVED ANTI-POACHING AND COMPATIBLE LAND USE IN COMMUNITY
LANDS OF LOWER ZAMBEZI-MANA POOLS TRANSBOUNDARY CONSERVATION AREA” PROJECT
FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION
CONTRACT NUMBER: (FED/2017/394-495).**

1. Introduction

African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) is an international non-governmental organization which has been implementing conservation of biodiversity interventions for the past 60 years, focusing exclusively on Africa's wildlife and wildlands. AWF's conservation programs and strategies are designed to protect Africa's wildlife and wildlands and to ensure a right based sustainable future for people in Africa. Since its inception in 1961, the organization has protected endangered species and lands, promoted conservation businesses that benefit local African communities, and trained thousands of African nationals in conservation. The AWF project management methodology is based on “Plan/Do/Check/Act” (PDCA) model, a simple, iterative and four step process for management control and improvement. The PDCA model covers all stages from project initiation to the project closure. The initiation starts when the Budget & Grants Management Team (BGMT) receives a signed agreement from either the Program Design (PD) or Philanthropy Teams. Before that, the PD team, goes through five (5) key steps that contribute to the design of a project proposal and budget. These include problem analysis, objective setting, development of results framework/ logical framework and finally plan for the implementation to arrive at the first technical and budget draft and an award notification serves as the kick-off to the project planning phase. The notification includes a summary of the general conditions and requirements of the award and indicates roles and responsibilities, in addition to upcoming deadlines. AWF is guided by donors' and development partners' guidelines to ensure effective internal control, accountability and management capacity with a strong focus on results.

2. Project Background and Context

The Lower Zambezi-Mana Pools Transboundary Landscape (LZMP TFCA) is critical for the survival of wildlife in a modern Africa. The region covers core conservation areas anchoring the larger landscape of around 40,000 km² centred around Mana Pools National Park in Zimbabwe (a World Heritage Site) and the Lower Zambezi National Park in Zambia. The wildlife and wildlands of the LZMP TFCA are potentially an important economic asset to the communities living around the TFCA, who are the final beneficiaries of this project. The project was implemented by AWF as the coordinating entity in partnership with Conservation Lower Zambezi (CLZ) based in Zambia, Zambezi Society (ZamSoc) and Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association (ZELA). The overall objective of this four year (2018 to 2021), 1.5-million-Euro project was to reduce illegal wildlife trade (IWT) and habitat conversion in the LZMP TFCA by establishing models for strengthened community engagement in sustainable natural resource management (NRM), anti-poaching efforts and integrated land use that ensures conservation and compatible land uses.

The project's specific objectives (SOs) were as follows:

- 1) SO 1: Engage fishers,
 - Implemented from Kariba dam wall in Zambia to the confluence of Zambezi and Luangwa Rivers in Rufunsa (Luangwa Feira) in Zambia by CLZ and in Kanyemba, Mbire Rural District Council by ZELA. The project sought to incentivize fishers to cooperate with wildlife authorities to help reduce wildlife crime along and across the Zambezi River. Activities involved a review and institutional analysis of the fishing practices and governance structures in place, identifying

opportunities to engage and gaps where governance structures need assistance or to be developed. In addition, development of local level by-laws, assessment of fish diversity and population abundances and related fishing techniques along the Zambezi River were conducted. Investigation on nature and scope of wildlife crime activities in the fishing communities was conducted. Strategies were developed and implemented to link support for ongoing improved governance within the fishing communities, and fisheries management for combating illegal wildlife poaching and trafficking activities. Hotlines with the relevant authorities in Zambia were established to allow anonymous tip offs of illegal wildlife activities and work with the authorities to assist in reviewing the information.

- 2) SO 2: Enhance capacity of community scouts,
 - The aim of this objective was to reduce poaching and wildlife crime of key species in Mbire Rural District by increasing community engagement in natural resources management, strengthening the capacity of community scouts and increasing joint collaboration with Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (ZPWMA). Activities included: procurement of necessary equipment for community scouts, relevant ranger training programs based on capacity needs to ensure ability for the community rangers to actively participate in joint patrols, develop SMART/CyberTracker monitoring system, facilitate joint patrols where appropriate for community scouts with ZPWMA to ensure better coordination, capacity development and improved morale.
- 3) SO 3a: Reducing deforestation,
 - While poaching presents a clear and present threat to the TFCA's exceptional wildlife, habitat loss poses a longer term and more permanent threat to the overall ecological viability of this landscape. One of the major drivers of habitat conversion is the adoption of tobacco farming in Zimbabwe as a commercial crop using wood fueled curing barns. SO 3a focused on strategies to slow deforestation by engaging the private sector and communities to co-develop demand-driven solutions to two major threats—deforestation for tobacco curing and wildlife corridor fragmentation. This activity was implemented by AWF and ZamSoc in Hurungwe Rural District Council. Specifically, ZamSoc worked with buyers and small-holder farmers to identify models for mainstreaming environmental practices into tobacco farming—in particular, energy-related initiatives that reduce the need to collect indigenous fuel wood for tobacco curing. ZamSoc piloted rocket barns that are wood fuel energy efficient to cure tobacco. The project also assisted with development of quid pro quo conservation agreements between the private sector company and the tobacco growers.
- 4) SO 3b: Securing a wildlife movement corridor,
 - AWF in partnership with ZELA worked with the Mbire Rural District Council to promote establishment of a community wildlife conservancy in a priority wildlife corridor area. The project built on existing plans and conservancy best practices to establish the appropriate governance mechanisms, infrastructure development and initiate and or support management plans.
- 5) SO 4: Human Wildlife Conflict (HWC) Mitigation
 - AWF implemented measures to reduce HWC by working with communities and wildlife law enforcement units to replicate successful mitigation practices. Implementation focused on

engaging communities around the concept of land use and corridors, understanding problem, hotspot areas and identifying non-lethal control measures; identified early adopters willing to pilot control measures such as use of chilies and providing them the support necessary to succeed; training local agencies and early adopters to scale up and replicate successful measures, and coordinating with authorities to understand the impact of mitigation measures and adapting accordingly in both Hurungwe and Mbire Districts.

6) SO 5: Transboundary collaboration

- Implemented by AWF and CLZ between Zambia and Zimbabwe, this SO involved supporting established platforms by relevant national governments for collaboration with clear mechanisms for decision making, identification of participants to ensure representation of all stakeholders, regular communication through formal meetings, joint capacity building and joint anti-poaching operations. This aimed to ensure transparent and consistent communication through regular transboundary meetings, joint security operations, effective sharing of information and effective engagement of communities in fishing villages.

The overarching theory of change of the project is that ‘IF we incentivize fishers to cooperate with wildlife authorities along the Zambezi River by improving their governance and fishing practices, STRENGTHEN law enforcement and cross-border collaboration, AND PROMOTE pro-conservation livelihoods, THEN we reduce wildlife crime, improve human well-being, AND RESULTANTLY secure viable wildlife populations. The final beneficiaries of this project were communities and local authorities, namely Hurungwe and Mbire Rural District Councils, Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (ZPWMA) within the Mid-Zambezi Valley on the Zimbabwe side. In Zambia, the beneficiaries include communities, local tour operators and local authorities in Siavonga, Chirundu, Chiawa and Luangwa as well as partner departments namely Department of National Parks and Wildlife (DNPW) and the Department of Fisheries (DoF).

3. Evaluation Scope and Purpose

The project was implemented from January 2018 to December 2021. The purpose of this evaluation is to provide an independent assessment of the project performance against set targets, document results, challenges, best practices, impact and to inform future similar projects. The evaluation shall also review recommendations of the project’s Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) report, and assess the extent to which these were implemented. The evaluation shall ensure accountability towards EU as a donor and the beneficiaries of the project and offer learning as a component for all stakeholders. The evaluation should identify key lessons learnt, challenges, sustainability and the flexibility of the project to adapt and respond to the changes and sustainability of the project.

The end of project evaluation has three objectives:

- i. Evaluate to what extent the project has delivered effective, efficient, relevant and timely activities to targeted beneficiaries as set in the project’s logical framework.
- ii. Assess project response from planning, inception, management, implementation, operational delivery, institutional dimensions working with partners, and project close out aspects of continuity and sustainability. This objective of the evaluation will include an accountability element, exploring how well the project responded in its areas of mandate and expertise, mobilized its strengths and knowledge, and worked in conjunction with partners.
- iii. Identify and assess key lessons learnt, challenges and draw recommendations for future project design and interventions.

The evaluation will organize questions it seeks to answer around the Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development (OECD)/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria. The criteria describe the desired attributes of an intervention or a project. The following are possible over-arching questions which will be reviewed during the inception phase.

Objective 1: Evaluate to what extent the project has delivered effective, efficient, relevant and timely activities to targeted beneficiaries as set in the project logical framework.

Effectiveness: The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, its results, including any differential results across groups:

- To what extent were the planned objectives of the EU LOZA project achieved?
- To what extent have the EU LOZA project outcomes contributed to the overall goal/ Impacts? What are some of the pointers that the potential impact of the project will be achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or not of the EU LOZA project objectives?
- Which approaches and modalities/ strategies, including the right communication and cooperation approaches, implementation modalities used, have been most effective?

Efficiency: The extent to which the intervention delivered or is likely to deliver results in an economic and timely manner.

- How efficient was the delivery of project by AWF and its partners, not only in terms of expenditure, but also in terms of implementation of activities? Were the right strategies such as capacity development strategies in place? Were they followed?
- Was the project activity implementation modality considered to have been cost-efficient, while not compromising quality?
- What would have been the opportunities within project to reach more target beneficiaries with the available resources such as staffing, logistical capacity or to reduce costs while reaching at least the same number of beneficiaries without compromising quality?
- What adjustments did the project make regarding the design, if any, in terms of collaboration during the implementation phase based on the reality on the ground? What were the outcomes of these choices for effective and efficient project implementation?
- How did the project build or optimize synergies with other projects in the landscape?

Relevance and Impact: The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

- How relevant were the project's objectives and activities in addressing intended conservation needs in the project area and national/international policies and commitments?
- How do beneficiaries perceive the relevance of the project and how have the activities implemented improved their lives? Are there any stories of change (positive or negative)?
- How has the collaboration between AWF and partners contributed to appropriate response of specific needs and priorities of the beneficiaries?
- To what extent was the project able to adapt and provide appropriate response to context changes, emerging local needs, or priorities of beneficiaries?

Quality: To assess the overall quality of implementation. It is important to include beneficiaries' opinion and feedback on the quality of the services received.

- What mechanisms are in place to track project implementation of the AWF? (i.e. internal monitoring, evaluation, accountability, learning (MEAL) and quality assurance mechanisms)?

- How have they been utilized to increase quality within the project?
- Did the quality and outcome of activities delivered by the project meet the needs and expectations of the beneficiaries? What do beneficiaries feel could be improved in contribution to improving local capacity?
- To what extent, did the project interventions contribute to build long-term community capacity?
- To what extent did the project take on a participatory throughout the project cycle?

Objective 2: Assess project response from planning, inception, management, implementation, operational delivery, institutional dimensions working with partners and project close out aspects of continuity and sustainability.

Coherence and learning: The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the area, sector or institution.

- To what extent has AWF and its partners played a facilitative role for collective response at the project level, coordinated and implemented the identified needs?
- Is there any substantial evidence on how project learning was generated and applied to improve the delivery, effectiveness or efficiency of the project and its activities?
- Who benefited from shared learning experiences (e.g. quarterly, joint field visits, workshops provision on best approaches and methodology)?
- How did the different actors learn from these experiences?

Complementarity and harmonization

- What are some of the concrete examples of successful models of collaboration between AWF other stakeholders/actors on a geographic level, not just in terms of avoiding duplication but increasing complementarity and integrated programs affecting the reach and impact on beneficiaries?
- What were barriers and/or enablers to this?
- To what extent did the activities of the project complement the work of others i.e. prevented duplication and contributed to the larger project activities in Zambezi Valley landscape?
- How best was the consortium composition given the potential challenges observed during the implementation. Which type of partner did the project miss in the consortium?

Visibility

- What measures were taken to create visibility of the project?
- What joint activities were undertaken during project implementation both at the landscape level as well as at the country office level? (Please provide concrete, short, substantial, cases of evidence).
- Did the project achieve the visibility criteria and expectations set by the donor?

Objective 3: Identify and assess key lessons learned, challenges and draw recommendation for future project design and implementation. The end term evaluation shall assess:

- The end line evaluation shall at least include one lesson learned and recommendation per evaluation category, i.e. effectiveness, efficiency, relevance etc.
- What are the key lessons learned per project objective? To what extent has the delivery of project activities contributed to effective, efficient, relevant and timely delivery of interventions and enhanced impact for the beneficiaries?

Sustainability

- Will the changes caused by this project continue beyond the life of the project? If not, why not? If partially or conditionally, why so and how?
- What mechanisms have AWF and partners put in place to sustain the key project outputs and outcomes?
- How has the project worked with local partners to increase their capacity in a sustainable way?
- What motivations /mechanisms exist for partners to continue playing these roles?
- What were the risks facing sustainability of project outputs and outcomes?

The evaluation shall cover the entire implementation project timeline from the start date to the end date (Jan 2018 – December 2021) and shall cover its implementation areas (Mbire District, Hurungwe District, Middle Zambezi Valley on both the Zambia and Zimbabwe side). The evaluation shall be guided by internationally agreed OECD/ DAC evaluation criteria.

4. Evaluation Methodology

The consultant will be expected to suggest a robust evaluation methodology that demonstrates how the evaluation questions above will be answered. This shall be firmed up with the successful vendor during inception meeting, which will include the vendor, AWF and EU representative, and the project key partners in implementation. The evaluation objectives will be assessed, including all evaluation questions under each. The proposed data collection should include the use of a number of qualitative and quantitative approaches to gain a deeper understanding of the outcomes of the project, including:

- Desk review of background documents (project document, project monitoring data, progress report, ROM report, field visit reports etc.).
- End term evaluation survey with project beneficiaries in project's target area.
- Key informant interviews (e.g. with project staff members, key community members/ beneficiaries, implementing partners, and representatives from Government departments) to gather substantial evidence on the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and timeliness of the project activities implementation and delivery
- Focus group discussions (e.g. with stakeholders, community members, target beneficiaries and local authorities' representatives) to serve as input for the narrative evidence.
- Validation and dissemination activity on evaluation findings and lessons learned through a presentation and a workshop facilitated by the consultant.

As a pre-requisite to data collection, an appropriate and strategic sampling method should be selected for the different audiences e.g. snowball sampling, purposeful random sampling, or mixed purposeful sampling methods.

Reference Materials

Various sources of information for the project will be made available to the consultant/team by the Project team. These will include relevant project documents such as: project contract, proposal, budget, work plans, logical framework, reports (narrative and financial) and M&E Indicators Tracking Table.

5. Evaluation Deliverables

The consultant is expected to lead, accomplish and submit the following deliverables within the agreed timeframe and budget:

- An inception report, which will serve as an agreement between parties on how the evaluation shall be conducted.
- Raw data in any of the following statistical packages (STATA, EXCEL, SPSS, CPro) and also transcribed qualitative scripts.

- A max 45-page draft and final evaluation report (in MS Word and PDF), excluding annexes in English. It should be in the format indicated below, to be submitted in electronic form by email to, AWF’s Senior Manager – Knowledge management, who is also the Evaluation manager for this assignment. AWF reserves the right to request a hard copy to be deposited at its office in Harare. The report should also include presentation of results by appropriate graphs, visuals, tables and/or a dashboard with an accompanied explanatory text. The report should consist of:
 - a) Executive Summary
 - b) Introduction
 - c) Methodology, including sampling and limitations
 - d) Analysis and findings of the evaluation (including an implementation strategy for the recommendations). The analysis should be done according to the objectives but follow the OECD/ DAC evaluation criteria.
 - e) Conclusions for each of the evaluation objectives
 - f) Recommendations
 - g) Annexes.

6. Evaluation Timeline and Implementation Arrangements

The consultancy will run for approximately 40 days, commencing in 4th April, 2022, with the submission of the final report not later than the 40th day from the date of signing contract. A tentative work plan will be agreed upon between the evaluator and AWF.

This consultancy shall build on previous work in the landscape to critically analyze AWF’s EU LOZA project Theory of Change to determine its validity and identify the critical assumptions to be tested with recommendations for data needs and gaps. For this work, the consultant will be required to implement a human-centric approach (process clearly articulated in the application) to deliver high quality, relevant, and actionable results. On account of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the consultant shall have the option of conducting virtual meetings when needed.

Roles and Responsibilities

Successful Consultant(s)	AWF Zimbabwe & Partners	AWF HQ
Develop an inception report, detailing the methodology-stakeholders to be interviewed, tools to be developed, time frame for the evaluation and budget.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide all required background materials to the consultant in a timely manner. • Providing data/ information for desk review. • Read and provide comments on the inception report including the proposed evaluation methodology, the information gathering techniques and the suggested target villages. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read and provide comments on the inception report including the proposed evaluation methodology, the information gathering techniques and the suggested target sites.
Holds the overall management responsibility of the review, including designing and carrying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and comment on deliverables. • Provide guidance where necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee the service provider by managing the consultancy contract; monitor adherence to specified guidelines and

<p>out the evaluation, drafting the final report and debriefing the project team and key stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support logistics for the evaluation team where necessary. • Facilitate contacts with partners, key beneficiaries and line ministries. • Arrange logistics and planning of the field visits, supporting the evaluation team during field work and bring evaluation team to partners and beneficiaries. 	<p>deadlines; facilitating access to required information; review and comment on deliverables.</p>
<p>Liaise with project staff throughout the process, providing weekly updates and seeking input and advice where necessary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance throughout all phases of execution, facilitation of the fieldwork, including interviews with local partners, stakeholders, government, communities, etc. • Review and provide feedback to the project evaluation draft and final report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and comment on draft report submitted by the consultant i.e. preliminary reports and the final report, providing feedback to draft data collection tools, quality/quantity and reports. • Approving all deliverables and facilitating access to any documentation (or any person) deemed relevant to the evaluation process.
<p>Sign the AWF rights-based conservation and social safeguards Policy and abide by the terms and conditions thereof.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the adherence to rights-based conservation and social safeguards policy

7. Qualification and Application procedures

i. Selection process

AWF will use its internal guidance, checklists and an interview process to select the successful consultant(s)/firm. The guidelines require the applicants to submit, a proposal explaining, their understanding of the Terms of Reference, and how they would approach this assignment, with a summary of their methodology, especially in terms of how they plan to meet the objectives, including a work plan and budget. This should include a team composition with a lead consultant and at least one other experienced evaluator and CVs of each person to be involved in the assignment, including relevant experience, a detailed budget, work plan, and time availability/anticipated starting date.

Competencies and qualifications

- An advanced degree in applied social sciences research, Natural Resource Economics, anthropology, natural resource management, or development studies.

- At least five years of proven experience in carrying out evaluations and systemic reviews in Southern Africa. Having experience with natural resource conservation will be an added advantage.
- Proven expertise in managing and/or demonstrable success in conducting EU grants project evaluation
- Proficiency in qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and analysis.
- Experience working in multicultural environments.
- Be able to communicate fluently using both verbally and in writing in English.

ii. Submission of application

Interested vendors are expected to submit via procurement@awf.org with a copy to eomondi@awf.org the following not later than 23 March, 2022, 1700hrs.

- A technical proposal with a company profile, explaining their understanding of the ToR, and how they would approach this assignment, summarizing, the methodologies, and approaches they plan to use, including a work plan.
- CVs of at least two key members of the evaluation team
- Two references/ referees of similar previous assignments. AWF reserves the rights to request sample work from these references.
- Their commitment and availability.
- A financial proposal and budget outlining their expected fees.

AWF will cover ground logistics expenses in Zimbabwe for the lead consultant during the duration of field travel as per AWF guidelines and procedures. The consultants will be responsible for their own meals, accommodation, vaccinations that may be required, security approvals and any payments to local research assistants that they may hire.