

WWF-KENYA, KENYA COUNTY SPATIAL PLANNING Program (KCSP)

MID TERM Program EVALUATION FOR THE PERIOD 2016-2017.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

August 2017

Project/Program Name(s)	Kenya County Spatial Planning (KCSP)
Project/Program Location(s)	Kenya (National, Lamu county, Narok county, Bomet county and Kwale county)
Names of Project/Program Executants (WWF Office, name of project/program manager)	Conservation Director: Jared Bosire Program Manager: Zachary Maritim ARL Program Manager: William Ojwang Spatial Planning Officer-CKP: Nathan Kiiti
Project/Program Duration (from start year)	2016-2019
Period to Be Evaluated	2016-2017
Project/Program Budget Sources and Amounts (for period to be evaluated)	WWF UK (Budget F16-£800k, Budget F17-£850k) Total £1,650
Names of Implementing Partners (if relevant)	MoL, NLC, FAO, County Governments (Lamu, Narok, Bomet and Kwale)

PROJECT/PROGRAM OVERVIEW

In 2016 WWF-Kenya endorsed an ambitious new FY16-20 Country Strategy which identifies key priority geographical areas and themes for engagement and specifically recognises the opportunity presented by the need for newly established counties to develop spatial plans to guide land use in the mid to long term. The Kenya County Spatial Planning (KCSP) Program is extensively engaged in spatial planning work in four counties and influence at the national level to help underpin the delivery of effective conservation work where WWF has invested funds for decades within WWF-Kenya's priority areas, and that overlap these counties.

Initial activities for spatial planning work have been undertaken in four counties – Lamu, Kwale at the coast and Narok, Bomet in the Mara landscape respectively. WWF-Kenya also recognizes that the rest of the 43 counties should as much as possible take sustainable development strategies. This is partly the reason the Program is continuously engaging with the National Government through which the other counties will be reached by way of influencing policies, legislation, regulations and guidelines which will inform land-use planning and ultimately sustainable development throughout the country.

Additionally, a critical focus for the program is capacity building at the national level

for effective guidance and supervision of spatial planning in Kenyan counties through the strengthening of the National Land Commission (NLC) and the Ministry of Lands (MoL), the lead institutions in the country for overall spatial planning. WWF-Kenya has signed MOUs with the NLC and MoL and the new National Spatial Plan and National Land-Use-Planning Law respectively will guide spatial planning throughout the whole country. Additionally the KCSP Program is now also reviewing the land-use planning curriculum in universities to reflect current trends and to infuse sustainable development in the long term through promoting the integration and adoption of natural capital scoping studies as a key approach.

Lamu County & Kwale County: Both are coastal counties in north east and south east Kenya respectively and contain the largest remaining areas of coastal forests in the country, pristine coral reefs, the majority of the nation's mangrove cover and Lamu is Kenya's most important marine turtle nesting site.

The coastal forests of East Africa are recognized as a global biodiversity hotspot containing over 500 endemic plant species as well as 37 endemic vertebrate species, including a variety of threatened large mammal species such as African hunting dogs, elephant, Roosevelt's sable, Aders' duiker and hirola (small antelopes listed by IUCN as Critically Endangered) as well as lion, leopard, buffalo, hippo, crocodiles and many others. Camera trap surveys by ZSL and WWF have found that the coastal forests in Lamu contain the largest and most important population of Aders' duiker globally and discovered a completely new species of elephant shrew.

Coastal waters are home to five species of marine turtles, all of which are regarded either as being endangered or critically endangered. Kenya's most pristine coral reefs, seagrass beds and mangroves are found in Lamu and a high diversity and abundance of reef fish, rich fishing grounds as well as the last refuge in the country for the dugong, regarded as vulnerable and headed for extinction globally, but highly threatened nationally.

Four protected areas have been gazetted in the two counties – Shimba Hills National Reserve, Boni National Reserve, Doodori National Reserve and Kiunga Marine National Reserve – which are managed by Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS). Additionally there are numerous, smaller, community-run marine protected areas and sacred "Kaya" forests which are recognized as national monuments by the National Museums of Kenya and managed by local communities, with some already listed as UNESCO WH sites. Local communities are heavily dependent on these natural resources, particularly fisheries, for their livelihoods and source of protein. The Aweer, a local indigenous group in Lamu and former forest dwelling hunter-gatherers, were forcibly settled in the 1970s along the road between two national reserves and remain very heavily dependent on the forests.

WWF has been working in these two counties area for many years. In Lamu initially focusing on marine turtle conservation, supporting KWS to effectively manage Kiunga Marine National Reserve and undertaking education and awareness raising activities. Since 2011, however, WWF has also begun working with KWS and Kenya Forest Service (KFS) on improved protection and management of the coastal forests within Boni and Dadori National Reserve as well as with the local indigenous Aweer community on establishing community based forest management in those areas not under official protection. This approach is combined with the enhancement and diversification of local livelihoods through beekeeping, supporting small enterprises through saving and loan groups and introducing measures to reduce crop destruction by wildlife. In Kwale we work with KWS on the effective management of Shimba Hills National Reserve (which has Kenya's only population of Roosevelt Sable antelope), on mitigating human wildlife conflict, supporting diversification of livelihoods and on recognizing and protecting sacred "kaya" forests.

With this wide portfolio of work, across both marine and terrestrial components, WWF is now regarded as the key non-governmental organization working with the government on environmental conservation in both these coastal counties. WWF is also moving from intervening at project level to a programmatic approach where the aim is to understand and address all the key drivers impacting the environment and those local communities dependent on natural resources across the whole of coastal Kenya. At the national level, WWF is working with government, private sector, academia and civil society as a convener to influence major policy and legislative processes relevant to natural resource management. Key partners include UNEP, Africa Development Bank and supporting the Kenyan government in its development of a Kenya's Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan.

Emerging Threats: The Lamu Port South Sudan Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) corridor project: The key emerging threat to natural resources and the culture and livelihoods of local people in Lamu County (and to a lesser extent Garissa County) is this proposed mega-infrastructure project with a projected total cost of USD \$23 billion. The aim of the project is to bring oil out of South Sudan and Ethiopia to be shipped from a new deep water port in Lamu and to bring economic development to this long neglected corner of Kenya. LAPSSET and associated projects proposes a new nine berth deep-water port and associated infrastructure including new roads, rail lines, an airport, a 1,050 megawatt coal-fired power plant, oil refinery, an industrial complex, domestic complex and new leisure / tourist resorts – and is overseen by the LAPSSET Authority. Although plans show that no construction will take place within any official protected areas its construction would involve the dredging of pristine seagrass beds and destruction of coral reefs – vital for marine wildlife as well as key fishing grounds for local communities; clearing of mangroves and forests and increase the risk of oil spills / pollution locally. Further, improved

access in the area and a significantly increased local population will increase the demand for fuelwood and charcoal, bush meat and seafood – significantly increasing pressure on local natural resources. Local people are also very concerned about the potential impact on their traditional culture, livelihoods and way of life.

The Kenyan government has approved finance to build the first three berths of the deep water port and construction is already underway, meanwhile government representatives continue to try to raise the remaining finance that is needed.

Narok County and Bomet County: are located in the south-west of the country, Narok borders Tanzania and contains the Kenyan side of the world famous Masai Mara-Serengeti landscape. The area contains large herds of elephants, buffalo, prides of lion, African hunting dog, leopard, black rhino and tens of thousands of mid to small sized mammals and birds and hosts the annual migration of tens of thousands of wildebeest. An estimated 25% of all wildlife in Kenya is found in the Mara basin the majority of which is in Narok County but a significant area is also within Bomet County (see map). However the majority of wildlife (~60%) is actually found outside of the Masai Mara National Reserve in the surrounding area which is a mixture of community conservancies and unprotected land. The area also includes important forests such as the Mau and Nyekweri Forests which although unprotected act as a refuge during drought for wildlife and is an elephant birthing and maternity site. They are also key water towers for Lake Victoria, Lake Natron, Lake Naivasha and Lake Nakuru whose basins include highly fertile soil for agriculture and a significant flower industry. Overall the general trend is a reduction in the number of wildlife since the late 1970's whilst livestock numbers have increased considerably. Rapid fragmentation and fencing off of land parcels around the reserve is threatening wildlife migration corridors and dispersal areas, making spatial planning more urgent and critical than at any time in the past.

Human population growth locally is high, for example it is 7% in Narok County compared to the national average of 2.5%, resulting in increased pressure on land for habitation, grazing, agriculture etc. The area draws ~350,000 tourists each year and generates tens of millions of USD \$ for both the county and the national economy and increasing numbers of tourist lodges are being built (both inside and outside the reserve). It's estimated that 80% of Narok County's budget is from revenue generated by the Masai Mara National Reserve. However, local communities are not receiving the stipulated 19% of revenue collected from the reserve through gate charges.

WWF has been working in the area for decades initially focused on black rhino, elephant and support for the Masai Mara National Reserve, the Program now however works at a landscape scale tackling issues concerning the reserve, conservancies – including establishing new conservancies, the Mau forest (Kenya's largest "water tower"), Nyekweri forest, large- and small-scale agriculture and

livestock rearing, freshwater use and allocation, human wildlife conflict, work around priority species and been engaging on spatial planning in both Bomet and Narok County.

Operating at sea/landscape level: To enable Programs to operate at a seascape and landscape effectively, there is need to engage a wide range of local stakeholders, particularly county governments, in initiatives that will drive improved and joint planning for the future of the county. This can be done through lobbying and advocacy on relevant policies, development planning, scenario planning, strategic/precautionary zoning of ecologically-sensitive areas and effective spatial planning. Additionally, the project needs to link with, and support as needed, national efforts led by WWF-Kenya in Nairobi to engage relevant government departments at national and county levels on spatial planning and promotion of a “green economy” including finance, planning, transport, infrastructure and the LAPSET Authority as well as the private sector.

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND USE

The main purpose of the KCSP Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to provide WWF and Program stakeholders with an independent assessment of the Program - exploring its achievements, challenges, lessons learnt, ways of working and how these are contributing to the overall Program goal. Recommendations are sought on how best to tackle the challenges identified by the programme and the evaluator(s) as well as how best to promote successes to date including innovative approaches such that these can be replicated in other counties in Kenya.

The evaluation will also serve as a guide to WWF in the design of similar multi-stakeholder Programs in the future and contribute to National and County governments and organizational learning. It also forms part of WWF’s work to ensure accountability. The evaluation document will be circulated to all our Program partners, not only to share the lessons but also to share milestones/results and approaches to realize targeted Program deliverables.

SCOPE AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The evaluation will cover the four counties (i.e. Lamu, Kwale, Narok and Bomet) where WWF has engaged on county spatial planning and WWFs engagement at the national level. It will involve key partners and beneficiaries in the four counties and at the national level.

WWF-Kenya in partnership with WWF-UK will support this consultancy and will provide final sign-off on the works. However, partners’ comments will be gathered in every critical step in each county and nationally as appropriate. The evaluation will cover the period from inception in July 2015 to end of June 2017.

The specific objectives of this evaluation will be:

1. To assess the quality and relevance of the Program design in order to assist in improving future Program design and management.
2. To critically evaluate the key outputs, outcomes and other achievements to end of June 2017 as indicators of success against the overall intended goal and objectives of the Program.
3. To explore the challenges faced by the Program and make recommendations on how best to tackle these.
4. To assess how effectively the Program has been supported and delivered including staffing, Program management, ways of working and WWF-UK support.
5. To assess value for money - using a framework of the 4Es: effectiveness, efficiency, economy and equity.
6. To critically evaluate the sustainability of the achievements beyond June 2017 and make recommendations to strengthen realized outcomes during the remainder of the current KCSP Program (i.e. to the end of FY19) and beyond KCSP.
7. To develop comprehensive and summarized documentation of lessons learned, including key recommendations for ongoing delivery of the KCSP Program as well as future multi-partner Program strategies and design, and coordination for potential for replication.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND GUIDING QUESTIONS

These criteria and guiding questions will be the focus of the evaluation for each result area and the overall Program:

4.1 Relevance and quality of design: To what extent did the Program design represent a necessary, sufficient, appropriate, and well-founded approach to bring about positive changes for the Program as originally conceived, as well as its future, assess the quality of design and the relevance of decisions and plans with regard to the following factors:

- What is the implicit ToC? is it fit for the current context?
- Was there an appropriate monitoring and evaluation system? are the existing assumptions relevant as per the current context?
- have the assumptions about buy in and support of stakeholders been correct? and has the programme met stakeholder expectations?

4.2 Effectiveness (Achievement of purpose): Have the outputs been delivered and to what extent are these translating/ expected to translate into outcomes in the

intermediate and longer term?

- What is the significance of the progress or any lack thereof made to date according to the workplan? To what extent have targeted key factors; drivers, opportunities, threats been affected
- Has the Program succeeded in reaching out to and influencing Sustainable natural resource management implementation by key policy institutions and stakeholders at county and national level?
- Which strategies proved to be effective, and which did not? What anticipated and unanticipated factors have promoted or impeded the Program's progress? What supporting or impeding factors might have affected successful implementation?
- Has Program monitoring data been appropriately recorded, stored and disseminated (documentation and communication)?
- To what extent has coordination/communication been effective within and between the implementation team, stakeholders, partners and participants, as well as external donor?
- What factors have enabled and or hindered good communication and coordination if any? What could be done differently in future to improve this?

4.3 Efficiency: Is the amount of investment in the processes (both human and financial) commensurate with the outputs delivered? Could there have been alternative ways of delivering same or better results at less human and financial resource investment?

Financial & Administrative Resources

- Were allocated financial resources consistent with expected results? Are there any recommendations on improvements to be made in financial planning and resourcing in future?
- Is actual spend in line with the budget?
- What % of available funding has been utilized (analyze by budget line and total expenditures)? Explain any over or under expenditures.
- Have funds been transferred efficiently from donor to the Program and then utilized efficiently?
- Are there thorough, well founded work plans being implemented accordingly, monitored, and adapted as necessary?
- Are human resources (i.e. WWF Program, partnerships) 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)?
- Has the Program delivered value for money in that the costs are reasonable

given the outputs and outcomes generated?

Management factors

- How has the working relationship within the team and with partners, stakeholders and donors been?
- How effectively have Program assumptions, issues and risks been managed/mitigated?
- Have adaptive measures been taken to remedy potential setbacks or changes in Program context or assumptions?
- Has UK support been timely and effective? Including all the consultants hired through that support? How could it improve?

4.4 Impact: A measure of all significant effects of the conservation intervention, positive or negative, expected or unforeseen, on targeted biodiversity and/or footprint issues.

- Are new county governments building spatial planning in their strategies and workplans (budgets)?
- What is the added value of the support provided to the 4 counties and at national level compared to other counties where WWF is not present?
- How much environmental sustainability was integrated in those plans and how much was intended originally?
-

4.5 Sustainability: Are the benefits of this conservation intervention likely to continue after external support has ended/intervention's lifetime.

1. Is there evidence that sustainability was built within the design process? how do we ensure our assumptions on sustainability will continue in the future? Including in this the viability of the Centre of excellence.

2. What external factors could have a high or medium likelihood of undoing, or undermining the future sustainability of Program positive impacts? (e.g. political stability, economic crises and shocks, overall level of development, natural disasters, climate change). Is the Program adequately anticipating and taking measures to ensure resilience to these?

3. Based upon existing plans and observations made during the evaluation, what are the key strategic options for the continuation of the Program (e.g., scale down, replicate, scale-up, and continue business-as-usual, major changes to approach)?

4. Does the Program have a clear exit strategy, including how to ensure continuity of Program activities and conservation gains?

5. To what extent is the social, legal and political environment conducive to sustainability and replicability of Program achievements?
9. Is there evidence of organizations/partners/communities that have copied, up-scaled or replicated Program activities beyond the immediate Program area, and is such replication or magnification likely?
10. Can some of the Program interventions if not all be replicated without additional donor funding and technical assistance?

4.6 Monitoring of efficiency, effectiveness, impact and adaptive capacity:

1. To what extent did the Program apply strong monitoring and adaptive management practice to ensure continued relevance, strong performance, and learning?
2. Were adequate steps taken to ensure regular reflection on efficiency, effectiveness, and impact by the Program management unit? Was monitoring information used to support regular adaptation of the strategic approach?
3. What percentage of overall staff time and funding was dedicated to Program monitoring, adaptation, and learning? Is there any staff positions dedicated more than half-time or full time to support these efforts?
4. Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted regarding what worked and didn't work (e.g. case-studies, stories, good practices)?
5. How often were the original risks and assumptions revisited? Were the risks assessed adequately enough and were external assumptions identified realistically? How was mitigation strategies identified and responded to by the intervention team to optimize?

4.7 Lessons learned: The evaluation should assess and document lessons for future activities, Programs and also lessons that can be relevant for influencing policies. It is important to analyze which factors have contributed to results, impacts, successes and failures such that the lessons can more easily be understood and applied by others.

What are the most important lessons learned and the good practices derived from this Program?

CONCLUSIONS AND OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Linked to the findings under the above sections, overall conclusions should be drawn

and listed in terms of importance. Based on the conclusions an overall assessment of the Program in terms of general performance and achievements and contributions to national, regional and global (WWF) conservation goals and socio-economic contributions should be made, providing explanations and justifications for any deviations and shortcomings or failures.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation is expected to make clear and detailed recommendations in terms of the way forward for Program partners and how to increase effectiveness of implementation and how to exit most strategically.

- a) *What are the key **strategic options** regarding the implementation of the remainder of the current Program (i.e. to end of FY19) and to ensure its sustainability beyond FY19*
- b) *What needs to be changed/improved at Program level, country/ donor level to improve Program performance if such Program was to be undertaken again in the future?*

METHODOLOGY CONSIDERATIONS

It is envisioned that the evaluation design will take a mixed-method approach to optimize the acquisition of the relevant information as well as to corroborate the same. This should include a review of relevant literature, including the original Program documents, internal review report, mid-term review recommendations and any other documents where applicable. The consultant will, therefore, be expected to design an evaluation with methodologies that include:

a) Desk review: Develop a good background on the Kenya County Spatial Planning Program objectives and the progress so far in achieving the targets set at the inception of the Program, through a comprehensive review of the Program documents and reports from both the Program lead (WWF) and the partners.

b) Facilitated, participatory self-evaluation and reflection: Lead and facilitate a participatory process of reflection, critical thinking and thorough analysis of the Program with the key partners and/or subcontracted partners

c) Primary data collection: Use a mix of methodological approaches (as would be deemed appropriate) to collect field data to establish the status of Program implementation and performance, including the perspective of beneficiaries and key stakeholders in the target counties.

d) Dissemination of information: Lead one workshop to disseminate the findings of the evaluation to encourage further reflection and adoption, and to improve on the final report.

Special attention will be paid to:

a) Systematically and objectively analyze KCSP's progress to clearly articulate evaluation statements on the current status.

b) Critically assess the achievements of the Program against the priorities that were articulated in the proposal/concept.

c) Comprehensively document the challenges faced and lessons learnt from the Program.

d) Comprehensively synthesize the Mid Term Evaluation findings and lessons learnt into actionable, operational and management recommendations for future corrective and adaptive actions.

EVALUATION PROCESS, DELIVERABLES, AND TIMELINE

Submission of Technical and Financial Proposals

The consultant will be expected to take complete responsibility for all the activities identified in the TOR. The Technical Proposal should contain:

- Consultant’s interpretation of the TOR
- Complete description and explanation of the proposed methodology
- Names and qualifications of allocated personnel and any other resources that the consultant will make available to execute the assignment and achieve the objectives
- The financial proposal that should stipulate all the fees and costs for the assignment expressed in Kenya shillings
- A detailed work plan within the stipulated timeline

Time Schedule

The Mid-term evaluation is intended to take place in the period between August and October 2017. On the basis of the proposed TOR, the consultant shall prepare a brief work plan. The work plan should set out the consultant’s approach for conducting the evaluation. The total number of days will not exceed 25 days, broken down as follows:

Item	No. of working days
Development of evaluation design and research instruments (questionnaires, interview guidelines, etc.)	2
Review of literature and other Program documents	3
International / domestic travel	2
Field research and meetings	7
Data analysis	3
Presentation of the initial findings and preliminary conclusions	1
Preparation of the draft report	5
Incorporation of comments and finalization of the evaluation report.	2
TOTAL No. Days	25

Budget and Resources Required

The budget to be submitted will only cover consultancy fees. WWF-Kenya will cover travel and accommodation costs for the consultant during the assignment where applicable. The consultant is responsible for government taxes and insurances. WWF will deduct the statutory 5% withholding tax.

Key Deliverables Expected and Milestones

- a) An inception report at the beginning of the exercise outlining the methodology to be used for the evaluation
- b) A draft report of the overall evaluation including evaluation of core partners, information gathered from beneficiaries and key stakeholders, and all other data collected
- c) A workshop to disseminate the content of the draft report where further reflection and adjustments can be gathered
- d) A final report including recommendations from the workshop and comments from reviewers, adopting the recommended WWF standard format as shown in Annex 5.

Milestones and Timelines

1. Inception report within the first seven days of the assignment commencing
2. Meeting with WWF KCSP MTE Steering Committee (this will be composed of WWF-Kenya and WWF-UK staff from Design & Impact and Program Management respectively) to discuss the methodologies and a more specific timeline for the works to be done within one week of submission of the inception report to WWF
3. Intermediary meeting half way through the field work (latest 8 weeks before the end of contract) with the KCSP MTE Steering Committee to capture any challenges and re-strategize as needed
4. A workshop to disseminate the content of the draft report where further reflection and adjustments can be gathered
5. Draft reports submitted latest 4 weeks before the end of contract
6. Final reports submitted latest 2 weeks before the end of contract

PROFILE OF EVALUATOR(S) AND WWF SUPPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES

Required Qualifications

Consultants expressing interest in undertaking this assignment will have:

- a) At least postgraduate degree in relevant fields including: Planning, Conservation, Environment, Social Science or a closely related discipline.
- b) Evidence of extensive experience and skills in facilitating participatory processes of evaluation, reflection and analysis involving a wide variety of stakeholders and

covering the core evaluation criteria outlined above.

- c) Proven knowledge of Program management and strategic planning.
- e) Experience in research (data collection and analysis), and evaluation in the area environmental conservation.
- f) Clarity of analysis, and written and verbal expression.
- g) Fluency in English.
- h) Two references who can attest to the consultant's ability to undertake the work responsibly, independently, and in a timely manner.

A clear understanding and interpretation of the TOR will be key for selection.

WWF Kenya's responsibility

WWF will be responsible for carrying out all the logistical arrangements to facilitate the consultant to carry out this assignment including:

- Availing all relevant documents and materials to facilitate desk review
- Arranging for field visits and meetings
- Organizing workshops with relevant stakeholders
- Providing field transport and accommodation

How to Apply

Those interested should send their proposals to WWF Kenya no later than Thursday, 31st August 2017 by 0800h to the email: **kenya.procurement@wwfkenya.org**

Schedule of Payments to the consultant	Payment %
Acceptance of inception report	20%
Acceptance of draft evaluation outputs	40%
Final payment on approval of evaluation outputs	40%
Total Payment	100%

Annex 1: Key Documents

1. Spatial planning programme concept document
2. Programme documentation including (maps, technical progress reports, activity reports, etc)
3. Relevant financial reports

Annex 2: Key Stakeholders and Beneficiaries

1. WWF Kenya (CEO, Conservation Director, Programme Manager, Landscape leads, and spatial planning technical team)
2. WWF-UK spatial planning team
3. Ministry of lands officials
4. National lands commission officials
5. Kenya institute of planners
6. Natural resource network officials
7. government officials (Bomet, Narok, Lamu, Kwale)
8. Community representatives
9. Others as will be advised

Annex 3: Evaluation Summary Table – Scoring against core evaluation criteria

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

- **Very Good/4:** The result area/ programme embody the description of strong performance provided below to a *very good* extent.
- **Good/3:** The result area/ programme embody the description of strong performance provided below to a *good* extent.
- **Fair/2:** The result area/ programme embody the description of strong performance provided below to a *fair* extent.
- **Poor/1:** The result area/ programme embody 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
Relevance	The result area/ 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The programme has rigorously applied key design tools 2. The result area/ programme is hitting the right 'pressure points' to meet necessary and sufficient conditions for success
Efficiency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most/all intended outcomes—stated objectives/intermediate results regarding key threats and other factors affecting result area targets— are going to be attained. 2. There is strong evidence indicating that changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the programme
Impact	1. Most/all goals—stated desired changes in the status of species, ecosystems, and ecological processes—are likely to be realised.
Sustainability	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Result area/ programme results (outputs, outcomes, impacts) are qualitatively and quantitatively demonstrated through regular collection and analysis of monitoring data.
2. The result area/ 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 programme and organizational learning

Annex 4: Principles for Ensuring Quality Evaluations

To be worth doing, evaluations must be carefully designed and carried out to ensure they are focused, responsive to audience needs and questions, and ultimately promote uptake of evaluation results for greater programme/organisational accountability, impact, and learning. It is, therefore, critical that evaluations adhere to the following principles:

- **Useful:** Evaluations must be tailored to respond to the questions and key information needs of those most likely to use the evaluation results.
- **Independent:** For an evaluation to be impartial and therefore more likely to be objective, respected, and accepted, it must be free from bias in findings, analysis, and conclusions.
- **Inclusive:** Evaluators and evaluation managers (those overseeing the evaluation process) must design and conduct the process with an eye to promoting programme team self analysis, learning, and constructive participation.
- **Timely:** Evaluations should be timed to inform key decision-making processes.
- **Respectful.** Evaluations and evaluators must respect the programme team and their stakeholders and supporters.
- **Credible:** To be viewed as credible, evaluations must be rigorous, impartial, and conducted by a well-qualified evaluator.
- **Transparent:** Findings must be readily available to all stakeholders; relevant stakeholders should have the opportunity to comment on the draft evaluation products.
- **Ethical:** Evaluations must adhere to relevant professional and ethical guidelines, be undertaken with integrity and honesty, and be respectful of human rights, differences in culture, customs, and practices of all stakeholders.

Annex 5: Evaluation Report format

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 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, programme title, and contract number (if appropriate), Date of report, Authors and their affiliation, Location, 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 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 programme information used in the exercise)
- Composition of the evaluation team, including any specific roles of team members

2. Programme Overview (max 5 pages)

- Concise summary of the 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 programme monitoring system as annexes)
- Essential characteristics: context, underlying rationale, stakeholders and beneficiaries
- Summarise WWF's main interest in this 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.
- programme performance rating tables to provide a quick summary of performance and to facilitate comparison with other programmes (see table on annex 3 on rating).

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 programme

6. Conclusions

General summation of key findings and recommendations

Annexes

- Terms of Reference
- Evaluation methodology detail
- Itinerary with key informants
- Documents consulted
- Program theory of change/ logical framework/ conceptual model/ list of primary goals and objectives
- Specific program and monitoring data, as appropriate
- Summary tables of progress towards outputs, objectives, and goals
- Maps
- Recommendations summary table

Annex 6: Spatial planning areas of intervention

