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**Evaluation of the** Strengthening Marine and Coastal Protected Areas and Conservation Corridors to protect key Marine Megafauna and ensure sustainable livelihoods / Gigantes del Pacífico

***TERMS OF REFERENCE***

**DRAFT [August 19, 2019]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project/Programme Name(s)** | Strengthening Marine and Coastal Protected Areas and Conservation Corridors to protect key Marine Megafauna and ensure sustainable livelihoods / (henceforth ‘Gigantes del Pacífico’ or ‘the project’) |
| **Project/Programme Location(s)**  | Ecuador, Guayas and Manabí provinces |
| **Project/Programme Reference Number(s)** | BMZ bengo project No. 2016.98.45.5WWF Germany project No. 20743462/215 |
| **Names of Project/Programme Executants (WWF Office, name of project/programme manager)** | Project Executing Office: WWF EcuadorProject Manager: Jorge Samaniego, Oficial del Programa Océanos y Costas |
| **Project/Programme Duration (from start year)** | Jan 01, 2017 – Dec 31, 2019 |
| **Period to Be Evaluated** | Entire project duration |
| **Project/Programme Budget Sources and Amounts (for period to be evaluated)** | BMZ IKU: EUR 750,000Match funds WWF Germany: EUR 99,965.51Match funds WWF Ecuador: EUR 149,689.63 |
| **Names of Implementing Partners (if relevant)**  | FMME – Fundación Megafauna Marina Ecuador |

**PROJECT/PROGRAMME OVERVIEW**

Marine ecosystems in the Eastern Tropical Pacific (ETPO) region are under growing pressure from human activities, including unregulated and unsustainable tourism and fisheries practices. This has far-reaching impacts on the populations and habitats of marine megafauna, of which there is high incidence in the area. The ecosystems these species depend on and that provide a variety of services to the human population along the Ecuadorian coast, are constantly degrading which in turn affects communities that depend on fisheries and tourism as a primary source of income. Due to limited capacities, financial means and sometimes overlapping competencies, relevant governmental stakeholders are unable to effectively tackle the situation and balance the dynamics between human activities and marine conservation. In order to turn the situation around as well as effectively preserve marine megafauna and important ecosystem services, increased knowledge about these interrelationships and an improved management of the marine environment are necessary. Similarly, increased awareness and people’s genuine participation is required in order to safeguard the resource base and thus the income of the local population. *Strengthening the Connectivity of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas and Conservation Corridors to protect key Marine Megafauna and ensure sustainable livelihoods*‘ (henceforth‚ the project) aims at increasing the coverage of marine areas under effective conservation and management to maintain ecosystem services and conserve corridors for migratory species. In addition, governance and sustainable use of marine resources in the economically important fisheries and tourism sectors will be improved to follow sustainable practices beneficial for marine megafauna and local livelihoods. Both lines of action will be underpinned by the development of adaptive management strategies for conservation and effective science based tools that showcase the project area’s (conservation) status, establish innovation and scientific integrity and contribute to the reduction of conflicting resource uses.

**EVALUATION PURPOSE AND USE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE**

The main justification for this final evaluation is the verification of successes, completeness and context of the ‘Gigantes del Pacífico` project by assessing the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, adaptive capacity and sustainability of the project strategies over the entire implementation period. Although no immediate extension or second phase for the project is planned, it represents a cornerstone for cooperation between WWF Germany and WWF Ecuador in coastal and marine conservation. The evaluation results shall therefore be used as a basis for future cooperation in this field.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA AND GUIDING QUESTIONS**

## Criterion 1: Relevance and Quality of Design

**Relevance and quality of design is a measure of the extent to which the conservation project/ programme design represents a necessary, sufficient, and appropriate approach to achieving changes in key factors (e.g. direct and indirect threats, opportunities, stakeholder positions, enabling conditions) necessary to bring about positive changes in targeted elements of biodiversity/footprint (i.e. species, ecosystems, ecological processes, including associated ecosystem services that support human wellbeing).**

**Key Questions to Assess Relevance and Quality of Design**

1. **Focal conservation targets and related goals (manta rays and whale sharks, ecosystems represented in the two marine reserves, ecological processes, including associated ecosystem services that support human wellbeing):** *Is there a clear and relevant definition of ultimate conservation success in terms of improved status of conservation targets? Has the underlying assumption of the project contributing to the conservation of migration corridors for the targeted species (i.e. between and beyond the focus MPAs) been fulfilled?*
2. **Relevance to context, priorities of stakeholders, and objectives***:* *Has the project focused on and does it remain relevant to issues of highest priority?*
3. **Suitability of strategic approach:** *Has the project taken the best, most efficient strategic approach?*
4. **Coherence and sufficiency of project portfolio***:* *Does the project portfolio ‘add up’ to a necessary and sufficient approach to achieving programmatic success?*
5. **Relevance to WWF and donor priorities***: Given WWF’s priorities and what it is most needed to do, is the programme doing what it* should *do? Can WWF Ecuador provide relevant contributions at the national level through the approach and scope chosen in this project? In which way the project contributes to the priorities of BMZ / IKU?*
6. **Adherence to WWF social policies***.* *How well has the social context been understood by the project team? Particularly regarding the social sector most affected by the project, the fisheries sector, how well has WWF reacted to the need for participation in project design and implementation?*

## Criterion 2: Efficiency

**Efficiency is a measure of the relationship between outputs (i.e. the products or services of an intervention) and inputs (i.e. the resources that it uses), and may include a measure of ‘value for money.’**

**Key Questions to Assess Efficiency**

1. **Financial & Administrative Resources**
	* Are the budget of the project and the planned outputs and outcomes consistent with one another (i.e. have sufficient financial resources been budgeted to support planned activities)? What could have been done better in order to balance budget allocation and output/outcome achievement?
	* Are WWF Ecuador’s administrative structures and capacities sufficient to implement a project of this size or even larger, meet the requirements of the donor agency and ensure the quality that is needed? What are the decisive factors?
	* Is there a fundraising strategy being implemented resulting in sufficient match funds flowing to the project?
	* Is actual spend in line with the budget?
2. **Use of Time:** Are there thorough, well founded work plans being implemented according to plan, monitored, and adapted as necessary?
3. **Human Resources:** Are human resources (i.e. WWF Ecuador, FMME, WWF Germany) appropriate, adequate, efficiently organized and operating effectively (e.g. include considerations of capacity needs and gaps, communications, division and clarity of roles and responsibilities, processes for evaluation and improvement)?
4. **Resource use:** Is the project delivering value for money in that costs are reasonable given the outputs and outcomes generated?

## Criterion 3: Effectiveness

**Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which the intervention’s intended outcomes—its specific objectives or intermediate results—have been achieved.**

**Key Questions to Assess Effectiveness**

1. **Planned result verses 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)? In how far have unplanned achievements been a direct result of the project or external influences?
2. **Factors Affecting Effectiveness**: Which strategies are proving to be effective, and which are not? What anticipated and unanticipated factors have promoted or impeded the projects progress? What supporting or impeding factors might affect successful implementation in future projects? What structural and organizational factors within WWF Ecuador have helped or limited effectiveness? What are the main lessons learned?
3. **Coordination & Communication**: To what extent has coordination/communication been effective within and between the implementation team (WWF Germany and WWF Ecuador), stakeholders, partners and participants, as well as BMZ? Are there well developed internal and external communications strategies being implemented to good effect (e.g. providing reach and/or spread)? What factors have hindered good communication and coordination? What could be done differently to improve this?

## Criterion 4: Impact

**Impact is a measure of all significant effects of the conservation intervention, positive or negative, expected or unforeseen, on targeted biodiversity/footprint issues – e.g. species, habitats, and ecological processes (including those associated ecosystem services that support human well being).**

**Key Questions to Assess Impact**

1. **Evidence of Change**: To what extent has the project attained its stated vision and goals, in terms of outcomes effecting positive change in human wellbeing, biodiversity quality and ecosystem services? Discuss observed impacts at all appropriate scales—local, landscape, national, regional, global, and present evidence?
2. **Attribution:** How confident can we be that perceived changes can be attributed to WWF’s activities? 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?
4. **Increasing impact:** How might the project increase its impact and what would be the associated human and financial capacity needs? How was the process of increasing impact understood at the design stage (e.g. project replication, good practice guidelines through policy change, multi-stakeholder processes) and is there evidence that this has happened or is likely to happen?

## Criterion 5: Sustainability

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

**Key Questions to Assess Sustainability**

1. **Evidence for 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?
	* Necessary policy support measures, including resource use regulations, budget allocation to MPAs etc.
	* Adequate socio-cultural integration, including no negative impact on affect groups (e.g. by gender, religion, ethnicity, economic class) and/or on benefits realized by them, as well as ensuring necessary motivation, support, and leadership by relevant individuals and groups.
	* Did the project sufficiently address fundamental rights of resource users in the project area (i.e. access rights of fisherfolk, gender inclusion etc.)? What are the key strategies to ensure their proper consideration?
	* Adequate institutional and organisational capacity and clear distribution of responsibilities among those organisations or individuals necessary to ensure continuity of project activities or impacts. For example, provincial governments of Manabí and Santa Elena, MPA administrations in Cantagallo-Machalilla and El Pelado/Bajo del Copé and others.
	* Technical and economic viability and financial sustainability.
	* Technology (if applicable) that is appropriate to existing conditions and capacity.
	* The project was supposed to strengthen administrative and technical capacities within the partner organization Fundación Megafauna Marina (FMME), a specific concern of the donor BMZ. What evidence (visible, measurable) did the project create of that increased capacity? What are the lessons learned from that process?
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, overall level of development, natural disasters, climate change). Is the project 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)?
	* Has the project conducted appropriate knowledge management? Are the results, learnings and products of the project easily available to all relevant stakeholders, particularly including bio-monitoring results raised by FMME? What are recommendations for knowledge management?

## Criterion 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.**

**Key Questions to Assess Adaptive Capacity**

1. **Applying Good Practice:** Did the team examine good practice lessons from other conservation/ development experiences and consider these experiences in the project design?
2. **Monitoring of status:** Did the project establish a baseline status of conservation and development targets and key contextual factors? Is there ongoing systematic monitoring of these?
3. **Monitoring of efficiency, effectiveness, impact**:
	* Did the project track intermediate results that are part of a theory of change (including results chains) that clearly lay out anticipated cause-effect relationships and enable definition of appropriate indicators?
	* Has there been ongoing, systematic, rigorous monitoring of output delivery, outcome attainment, and impact measurement, with plausible attribution to WWF’s actions?
	* What percentage of overall staff time and funding has been dedicated to project monitoring, adaptation, and learning? Are there any staff positions dedicated more than half-time or full time to support these efforts?
4. **Learning**: Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted regarding what worked and didn’t work (e.g. case-studies, stories, good practices)?
5. **Risk Assessment**: How often were the original risks and assumptions revisited during the intervention cycle? Were the risks assessed adequately enough and were external assumptions identified realistically? How were mitigation strategies identified and responded to by the intervention team to optimize?

**METHODOLOGY CONSIDERATIONS**

**The final evaluation of the Gigantes del Pacífico project shall apply a mixed-method, in-depth approach, including a desk analysis of existing documentation**, new information collection via phones, surveys etc., *and* a visit to the project sites.

C**ore documents the evaluation should consult include:**

* The original project proposal to BMZ
* Progress reports submitted to WWF Germany
* Progress reports submitted to BMZ (‘Zwischennachweis’)
* Tangible Products presented by component
* • Elaborated Communication Materials
* • Interviews with authorities and other premises

**Key external partners and stakeholders to be consulted:**

* SGMC
* MAE
* Administrations of the Marine Reserves Cantagallo-Machalilla and El Pelado/Bajo del Copé
* Fisheries cooperatives in the areas
* Tourism service providers operating in the area
* NGO

**PROFILE OF EVALUATOR(S) AND WWF SUPPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES**

***Evaluators: WWF is looking for individual consultants or consulting teams to perform this service. Experience in impact evaluation of marine resource governance, MPA management, fisheries and sustainability is a must. English language skills are a prerequisite, as the report is expected to be delivered in English.***

***WWF Support: Main support and coordination will be provided by the Oficial de Océanos of WWF Ecuador, jointly with the Program Development Officer. Other key support will be provided by the responsible Project Manager at WWF Germany.***

**EVALUATION PROCESS, DELIVERABLES, AND TIMELINE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Major Evaluation Task/Output** | **Dates or Deadline** | **Who is Responsible** |
| Evaluation Terms of Reference finalised, including budget | Oct 15, 2019 | WWF Ecuador, based on first draft provided by WWF Germany |
| Evaluator(s) Contracted | Nov 01, 2019 | Jorge Samaniego (JS), Manuela Gonzalez (MG) |
| Evaluation information request sent to relevant sources | Oct 15, 2019 | Coordinated by JS  |
| Sources provide requested information | Usually requires at least 2 weeks– not full time work, but to pass around spreadsheets, get various pieces compiled, etc. | Supply of information: staff of project being evaluated; donors; WWF partner offices |
| Evaluation Team reviews project information | Nov 25, 2019 | Evaluation team, with JS&MG in coordination with staff of evaluated programme. |
| Project team arranges for evaluator’s visit, including WWF and stakeholder interviews, site visits, and logistics | Nov 12 | Local offices/partner and evaluation team negotiate dates taking into consideration local conditions. |
| Evaluation Team visits the region (if required).  | Nov 12 – 22 | JS, with support from project staff |
| Evaluation Team briefs those relevant on preliminary findings. | 1 day at end of region or country visit or within 1 week thereafter. | Evaluation Team briefs Evaluation Manager and programme leadership |
| Evaluation report drafted and circulated to relevant staff. | Usually requires 3 to 4 weeks. | Evaluation Team to write and pass to the Evaluation Manager. |
| Project/programme team review report findings | 2-week review and comment period | Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Team run process. |
| Evaluation report finalised and approved by person/people who commissioned the evaluation. | Date should be determined based upon when the evaluation results are needed. Evaluation manager can then work backwards to develop the rest of the timeline table. | Evaluation Team finalises the report based upon comments received. Evaluation Manager reviews and gives final approval of report. |
| Presentation of evaluation results to Evaluation Manager, evaluated programme, and relevant Network staff. | Dec 15, 2019  | Evaluation Team |

**BUDGET, FUNDING, AND PAYMENT TERMS**

|  |
| --- |
| **TABLE 1. AN EXAMPLE TABLE OF EVALUATOR PAYMENT TERMS.** |
| **Schedule of Payments to Team Leader** | **Due Date** | **Payment %** | **Total €** |
| Submission of Evaluation Plan  |  | 25% |  |
| Submission of draft evaluation outputs |  | 50% |  |
| Final payment on approval of evaluation outputs |  | 25% |  |
| **Total Payment** |  |  |  |

# Annex 1: Evaluation Reports

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.

## Part A - 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)***

1. **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
2. **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
3. **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
4. **Recommendations (3-5pages)**
	* 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).
5. **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
6. **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

## Annex 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  |  |  |

#