**Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) Request for Proposal Letter of invitation**

RFP:  Mid-Term Technical Review for the Kiwa WISH+ project

February 18, 2025

Dear Sir/Madam:

1. Wildlife Conservation Society (hereinafter called “Client”) has received financing (hereinafter called “the funds”) from the Agence Française de Développement through the Financing Agreement AFD CZZ.2749 02 L dated 22nd August 2022 (hereinafter "the Agreement") in support of the *Kiwa WISH+ (Watershed Interventions for Systems Health Plus)* Project. The Client intends to apply a portion of the funds to eligible payments under the contract for which this Request for Proposals is issued.
2. Wildlife Conservation Society now invites proposal from a consultant to provide the following consulting services (hereinafter called “Services”): “Mid-Term Technical Review for the Kiwa WISH+ project”.More details on the Services are provided in the Terms of Reference.
3. A Consultant shall be selected under the selection method based on quality and cost.Namely, the ideal consultant should possess expertise in evaluation of public development project/programmes financed by AFD or other international development donors with similar standards (UE, WB, GEF, etc.), specialized expertise in climate change adaptation, biodiversity conservation and nature-based solutions and prior experience working in the Pacific Islands and with the main stakeholders in the region.

Proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation criteria** | **Score** |
| Relevant experience |  /40 |
| Response to ToR – robust methodology and planfor executing contract |  /40 |
| Financial proposal |  /20 |
| Total score |  /100 |

 The indicative budget for those Services is 35,000 Euros.

1. The RFP includes the following documents:
* This Letter of Invitation
* The Proposal Submission Letter
* Technical Proposal Template
* Financial Proposal Template
* Terms of Reference
* Declaration of integrity
1. Please inform us upon receipt by email to alatinne@wcs.org
	1. That you have received the Letter of Invitation; and
	2. Whether you intend to submit a Proposal or not
2. Your proposal shall comprise of:
3. Proposal Submission letter,
4. Technical Proposal (including your CV)
5. Financial Proposal net of taxes and
6. the signed Declaration of Integrity

The proposal documents must be sent to alatinne@wcs.org by **7 March 2025**.

If necessary, you may request any clarifications by sending an email to the same email addresses.

Yours sincerely,

Alice Latinne

***Proposal submission letter***

*[Location, Date]*

To: Alice Latinne

Wildlife Conservation Society

Dear Madam:

We, the undersigned, offer to provide the consulting Services for “Mid-Term Technical Review for the Kiwa WISH+ project” in accordance with your Request for Proposal dated 18 February 2025*,* and my attached Technical and Financial Proposals.

I understand you are not bound to accept any Proposal you receive.

We remain, Yours sincerely,

Name and Title of Signatory:

Name of Firm:

Address:

Contact information (phone and email):

***Technical Proposal Template***

1. Expert’s Curriculum Vitae (CV) or company history detailing relevant experience

A detailed and up-to-date CV or company profile including information on the team that will be allocated to the project shall be provided. An indication of the key staff, their experience and what they would be responsible for in the delivery of this proposal will help us evaluate the proposal. Please also include a sample of a previous relevant project.

1. Description of Approach, Methodology, and Work Plan in accordance with the Terms of Reference

Please note the following:

1. Approach and methodology. Specify your understanding of the objectives of the assignment, your approach and methodology for carrying out the activities and meeting the expected outputs that shall be detailed. Issues to be addressed and their consequences shall be highlighted, and the methodology to tackle them shall be provided. Please include under this section any comments and suggestions on the TORs provided by the Client if any.
2. Work Plan. Specify the nature and duration of each activity of the assignment, phasing and interrelations, milestones (including interim approvals by the Client), and delivery dates of the reports. The proposed work plan should evidence clear understanding of the TORs and ability to translate them into a realistic working plan. A list of the final documents, including reports to be delivered as final output, should be included here.

***Financial Proposal Template***

Please include both your professional fees for management and execution as well as unit costs for other expenses such as travel, meeting cost etc. (*Please note the following table is an example*)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Unit**price (USD)* | *Quantity* | *Total\* (USD)* |
| Remuneration /Professional fees | (fee net of taxesper day) | (to be specified) |  |
| Other expenses:*For example* Per diems Billboard Video(specify list of items) | (for each item specify if Lump sum or reimbursable) | (to be specified) |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Consultant’s signature:

Address:

**Terms of Reference: Kiwa WISH+ project mid-term evaluation**

1. **Preamble / Objectives of the evaluation**

In the framework of its evaluation mechanism, Agence Française de Développement (AFD) evaluates at mid-term the projects it finances. This approach responds to AFD’s concern to promote an enhanced dialogue on the results with its partners, to learn lessons from past operations and to provide objective information on the proper use of the funds that it is responsible for implementing.

The main objective is to formulate a credible and independent judgement on the **key questions** raised by the adequacy, implementation and impacts of the project. They may focus on specific aspects that AFD and WCS want to learn from because they are of key importance for the future. The approaches and methodologies proposed by the consultant(s) must align with international normative quality standards, notably the OECD-DAC standards. In addition, the evaluations must adhere to the principles outlined in AFD’s evaluation policy.

The consultant(s) must give a fair representation of the different legitimate views that may be expressed and carry out the evaluation impartially. In order to take into account the plurality of views, the different project stakeholders must, whenever possible, be associated with the evaluation process.

The mid-term review seeks to provide WCS and AFD with valuable input on the Kiwa Watershed Interventions for Systems Health Plus (Kiwa WISH+) project progress. The goal is to offer insights on how to optimize the potential for achieving the intended results and enhance learning during the remaining timeframe until the project's conclusion on June 30th, 2026. The anticipated outcome is that the insights and recommendations gathered from this mid-term review will provide suggestions on any necessary adjustments in the project's approach and activities. The evaluation will cover the period from August 2022, when the project was signed, until March 2025 and will focus on delivery of the Kiwa WISH+ outcomes and outputs as described in the project logical framework.

The main goal of Kiwa WISH+ is: “Successful implementation of integrated watershed management (IWM) for biodiversity, climate resilience and human health co-benefits at focal sites in Fiji, Solomon Islands and PNG provides a model for managing systems health for the Pacific that is upscaled through decision-support tools, long-term sustainable financing and effective public policy.”

Kiwa WISH+ has three core project components:

**Component 1: Targeted and scaled implementation of watershed interventions to improve systems health**

Objective 1.1. Implement high priority watershed interventions in existing project sites and monitor impacts

**Component 2. Creation of opportunities to scale and sustainably finance IWM**

Objective 2.1. Develop integrated watershed models to prioritize other geographies within countries for investment in targeted nature-based solutions (NbS) and water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) interventions

Objective 2.2. Build the case to establish and operationalize a national Watershed Fund for Fiji

Objective 2.3. Strengthen capacity and opportunities for sustainable financing of IWM in PNG

Objective 2.4. Identify options for public and private sector financing of IWM in Solomon Islands

**Component 3. Knowledge sharing to seed regional replication of innovations**

Objective 3.1. Facilitate transmission of lessons learned through regional networks to influence policy and practice

1. **Description of the project to be evaluated**

Melanesia (Fiji, Papua New Guinea [PNG], and Solomon Islands) is globally renowned for its high levels of biological diversity and endemism, which underpin all aspects of sustainable development across its natural resource-dependent economies. Yet Melanesia’s biodiversity and the human well-being that it supports are extremely vulnerable to forest loss, with rates far exceeding global averages. Loss of intact forest systems within Melanesian coastal watersheds is linked to multiple, adverse impacts to biodiversity and human health and well-being, as well as increased vulnerability to climate shocks. In Melanesia, outbreaks of water-related diseases are common, amplified by environmental factors related to climate change, land use change, and changing social conditions. Pacific Island Countries, including those in Melanesia, have the lowest coverage of improved drinking water and sanitation on earth, with two-thirds of people relying on unprotected water sources for drinking and cooking that are influenced by environmental contamination. This contaminated water leads to declines and disease in freshwater and coral reef organisms.

The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), with partners from the University of Sydney (USyd) and University of Queensland (UQ), is implementing the Kiwa WISH+ project, a multi-country project funded by the Kiwa Initiative. The overall goal of the project is to successfully implement IWM for biodiversity, climate resilience and human health co-benefits, as well as provide a model for managing systems health for the Pacific that is upscaled through decision-support tools, long-term sustainable financing and effective public policy. WCS and its partners are implementing IWM at key sites in Fiji, Solomon Islands and PNG, while developing financial vehicles to enable scaled delivery of co-benefits for humans and ecosystems. These vehicles aim to facilitate investment in natural and built infrastructure for safely managed drinking water, sanitation, and wastewater in high-risk watersheds, identified through innovative decision-support tools, while simultaneously delivering on outcomes for multiple sustainable development goals (SDGs).

The Project is contracted through a financing agreement between the AFD and WCS signed in August 22nd, 2022 for an amount of EUR 4,788,228. The agreement was amended in September 2023.

On-granting agreements with USyd and UQ were signed in February 2024. The two first tranches of funding from AFD were received by WCS in April and June 2024 after all conditions precedent were fulfilled by WCS. The first advances to USyd and UQ were made The project logical framework tracks indicators related to each project component (see Annex 1). The list of main project documents is available in Annex 2

WCS is the main beneficiary and overall Project Manager and oversees project implementation designed to directly benefit 41 communities in Fiji, PNG and Solomons Islands. The project is administered through the WCS Melanesia Regional Program, directly overseen by the Project Management Unit (PMU). WCS provided on-grants to USyd and UQ as key implementing partners. The PMU and Technical Leads coordinate annual dialogues with: a Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) made up of representatives from regional organizations with interest in IWM, WASH and One Health approaches; and National Consultation Groups (NCGs), made up of key government, civil society and private sector partner organizations. The PMU coordinates with Technical Leads to oversee delivery of activities under each Component. Component 1 is led by WCS programs in Fiji, Solomon Islands and PNG. Modelling work under Component 2 of the project is spearheaded by UQ and a consultant (Bayesian Intelligence) while sustainable financing work under Component 2 is led by WCS. Knowledge dissemination and sharing under Component 3 is led by USyd and WCS.

.

The Kiwa WISH+ project contributes to climate change adaptation through risk reduction from floods and water-related disease and improved institutional governance for responding to shocks. The project is designed around a conceptual framework whereby human activity within watersheds changes local exposure and sensitivity to climate change impacts resulting from higher frequency of intense rainfall events. These events create vulnerabilities through transmission of water-related diseases, displacement, and food insecurity and are caused by multiple, overlapping mechanisms. The project team works with disease risk and ecological experts to better understand the level of system risk reduction that can be expected from various NbS and WASH interventions.

The Kiwa WISH+ project also provides co-benefits for Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion (GEDSI) in communities where the project is implemented. As women and girls are disproportionately impacted by water-related disease given gendered aspects of water collection, food preparation and sanitation, investments in NbS and WASH interventions to improve water safety and wastewater management significantly benefit women and girls. The project team facilitates planning process for Sustainable Land Managenemnt Plans (SLMPs) and Water and Sanitation Safety Plans (WSSPs) that use best-practice GESI approaches to meaningfully involve women and other marginalized groups in environmental management.

The project also directly results in preservation of biodiversity and management of environmental resources by implementing NbS with landowners, including: (1) designating intact forests for protection; (2) developing and/or adapting SLMPs and Ecosystem-Based Management plans covering allowable and restricted activities within project watersheds; (3) restoring degraded lands to improve water quality and nutrient cycling, particularly along sensitive riparian corridors and wetlands; and (4) ecological engineering solutions arising as priority actions in WSSPs. These actions should also lead to positive changes to water quality and downstream ecosystem conditions, which are monitored through water sampling and ecological surveys.

Funding leveraged from other donors by WCS, UQ, and USyd for a total amount of EUR 1,050,831 was used to co-finance activities complementary to those funded by the Kiwa Initiative. This co-financing includes funding from Bloomberg Philanthropies (EUR 327,435 – Integrated watershed management/Blue Health and Blue Food), Rainforest Trust (EUR 290,678 – Protected area development on Kolombangara Island, SI), DFAT Incentive Fund (EUR 111,027 – Conservation deed development on Manus Island, PNG), and UNDP (EUR 41,304 – Biodiversity and Climate Fund in PNG) to WCS, from DFAT (EUR 272,194 - Integrated watershed management) to USyd and from the Australian Research Council (EUR 8,193 – Modelling work) to UQ.

1. **Method and approach for the evaluation exercise**

The evaluation exercise is based on a three-stage approach:

* 1. Structure the evaluation process;
	2. Data collection and conduct of the evaluative analysis;
	3. Present the conclusions of the evaluative analysis and recommendations.

Please note that in the case of the mid-term evaluation, a **specific focus is needed on the practical aspect of the recommendations** to be proposed by the consultant(s) so that they can be implemented before the end of the project implementation phase.

1. **Structure the evaluation process**

During this preparatory phase, the consultant(s) shall:

* + Gather and consult all information and documentation relevant to the project being evaluated (design, implementation, supervision) and necessary in order to provide an understanding of its context. The documents to be consulted will be made available (see Annex 2.); they will be provided by WCS and AFD.
	+ Identify all project stakeholders and, through discussion with core members of the Project Management Unit (PMU) and AFD, determine a list of key stakeholders from the project team, partner organizations, government and key beneficiaries in each country as part of the scoping note;
	+ Conduct interviews with key stakeholders involved or who have been involved in the design, management and supervision of the project; Prepare **a concise but accurate description of the project (maximum 2 pages)** outlining project objectives, operating methods, stakeholders, timelines, and contextual changes, while highlighting the main challenges. It should, in particular, retrace the history of the project in order to reconstruct its progress at its various stages, from the appraisal phase to the date of evaluation. It must be included in the evaluation report (as per the Evaluation Report Template in Annex 4).
	+ Reconstruct and assess **the logic behind the project intervention[[1]](#footnote-1)** by examining i) the project’s logical framework; ii) the evolution in the logical framework over the course of the project and iii) the alignment with the project’s sustainable development opinion, which characterizes the project’s ambition.
	+ Produce an evaluation framework (i) based on the OECD criteria and the associated evaluation questions listed below for each key criteria ; (ii) highlighting the methodology and stages in the reasoning process that will make it possible to come up with answers to each evaluation question and(iii) specifying the information sources for documenting these criteria, hypotheses, or indicators (documents, interviews, focus groups, surveys…) in order to answer the evaluation questions

The consultant shall provide a scoping note summarising the framework of the evaluation after the beginning of the assessment. **This preparatory phase is key and the scoping note should be shared with WCS and AFD, in order for the proposed evaluation framework and methodology to be validated**.

1. **Data collection and conduct of the evaluative analysis**

On the basis of the findings and the information available, the consultant will have to answer the evaluation questions below. Particular attention will be paid to **the evaluator's ability to mobilize various sources**, to triangulate them and to take a critical look at their reliability: documentary review, semi-directive interviews, focus groups (thematic discussion groups), existing data, ad hoc surveys, field observations and satellite data analysis (see Annex 6).

*Relevance*

1. Are the Kiwa WISH+ activities designed to adequately achieve the outputs and outcomes in the logical framework, in particular regarding i) impact at scale for each targeted community and watershed in terms of human health and biodiversity (both upstream and downstream) and ii) enabling conditions for scaling-up and sustainably finance IWM after project closure?
2. What are the effective contributions of Nature-based Solutions in planned and implemented WASH (water, sanitation and hygiene) activities including WSSP (Water and Sanitation Safety Plans)?
3. To what extent have the needs, interests and opinions of beneficiary communities and national and provincial stakeholders been assessed and incorporated in the design, planning and implementation of project activities and interventions so far (including through meetings of the NCGs and RAC)?

*Consistency/Coherence*

1. To what extent have comparable approaches and methods been applied across the three project countries?

*Effectiveness*

1. How far are the initial objectives addressed? Please provide a separate assessment for each project component.
2. Which activities should be given priority to until the end of the project to ensure maximum impact and best use of remaining project funds?

*Efficiency*

1. Do project partners work together effectively? Are there any recommendations for ways to improve partner coordination?
2. Is project management and team efficient in its ability to implement activities? Are the required resources implemented?
3. Have baseline monitoring costs and timing been appropriately managed? Are there ways to improve cost-efficiency in monitoring activities?

*Impact*

1. What are the contributions and (potential) impact of the proposed interventions to reduce communities’ vulnerabilities to climate change (See Annex 8) and deliver co-benefits for public health and biodiversity in each of the project sites?
2. What are the contributions and (potential) impact of the proposed intervention on gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) in beneficiary communities?
3. Have the environmental and social risks and impacts been properly assessed? To which extent has the implemented environmental and social risk management approach been relevant (See Annex 8)?
4. What are the synergies/complementarities with other existing initiatives at the national and regional scales linked to WISH approaches? How does Kiwa WISH+ align with national and regional priorities for biodiversity conservation, climate resilience and WASH?

*Sustainability*

1. Is the approach likely to ensure continued benefits after the end of the Kiwa WISH+ project in project sites and beyond given planned activities for component 2 in particular?

*Added value of Kiwa Initiative’s action and visibility*

1. What was the added value of being part of the Kiwa Initiative community so far for WISH+?
2. What is the visibility of the Kiwa initiative’s financing in WISH+ activities?

These evaluation questions refer to the evaluation criteria as follows:

* + **DAC criteria** *(Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability).* The **added value and visibility of the Kiwa Initiative** in implemented activities will also be specifically examined and will constitute a sixth evaluation criterion (see Annex 7)

**Identification of evaluation questions by criteria**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria****Questions** | **Relevance** | **Consistency/ Coherence** | **Effectiveness** | **Efficiency** | **Impact** | **Sustainability** | **Added value of Kiwa initiative and visibility** |
| Question 1 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Question 2 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Question 3 | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Question 4 |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Question 5 |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |
| Question 6 |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| Question 7 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Question 8 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Question 9 |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Question 10 |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Question 11 |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Question 12 |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Question 13 |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| Question 14 |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| Question 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Question 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |

Data collection is to be conducted from Fiji (Suva) where the WCS Regional office is located. A field mission to the project field sites in Fiji is required. A field mission in Solomon Islands is also possible if budget allows.

**Rating of program performance**

In order to enhance the clarity of the positioning of the analysis, the consultant(s) shall assign a rating for each OECD criterion (A: highly satisfactory; B: satisfactory; C: unsatisfactory; D: highly unsatisfactory) based on its judgment and on the responses to the evaluative questions and present the results in a comprehensive way. It is important to be able to relatively "score" the results in order to identify the more and less impactful/efficient aspects of the project.

1. **Present the conclusions of the evaluative analysis and recommendations**

Following the data collection phase and drawing upon the analysis of the information and data gathered in the field, the consultant(s) will prepare the draft evaluation report and articulate the conclusions of the evaluation. Once the consultant(s) have conducted their analysis, then formulated their conclusions and judgments on the project on the basis of each evaluative questions, the consultant(s) shall provide in this section general conclusions in order to make an overall assessment of the intervention being evaluated.

The consultant(s) shall make a distinction between the specific conclusions, the validity of which is restricted to the project being evaluated, and the conclusions of more general relevance. These conclusions must be ranked by order of importance and classified by order of reliability. This exercise aims to bring out the messages of the evaluation that may be intended for AFD, WCS and for all the stakeholders. The consultant must make sure to mention for whom the recommendations are intended.

The consultant will identify lessons and/or strategic and/or operational recommendations. The latter must be linked to the conclusions and grouped together and organized by order of priority.

In their final report, the consultant(s) will identify and differentiate between strategic and/or operational lessons and recommendations. These lessons and recommendations may relate to the intervention itself, future cycles of the intervention, similar interventions in other contexts, general project cycle practices at AFD (regarding design, implementation, monitoring, etc.), or the operating methods of the contracting authority.

-“Lessons” denotes insights gained from the evaluation that extend beyond the project’s scope (with potential applicability in broader contexts) and do not necessarily mandate follow-up actions.

- “Recommendations” encompasses decisions to be made or measures to be applied in order to improve operational methods, governance systems, arrangements, etc., particularly for subsequent phases of the evaluated project; unlike “lessons,” their implementation may be overseen by AFD following the evaluation. Recommendations demand particular attention; they should be linked to the conclusions, grouped, and prioritized. Furthermore, they should be practical, thus: very limited in number, specific, directed explicitly to one or more mentioned actors (WCS, project partners, other stakeholders…), and include a relevant time frame (short, medium, or long-term).

1. **Deliverables**

1. **Evaluation framework Scoping note**

The **evaluation framework scoping note** shall be 10 to 15 page long (excluding annexes). It shall include the description of the project as mentioned above (maximum 2 pages) and summarize the way in which the consultant(s) intend to structure the evaluation process (main issues, reasoning processes and indicators, information sources).

It will be accompanied by the **semi-structured questionnaires/interview guidelines** and will **summarize the evaluation exercise and main evaluative questions for the project stakeholders to be interviewed**.

Each of the prepared documents will be **shared with and validated by the evaluation steering committee** before the consultants can proceed with the subsequent phases of the evaluation exercise.

1. **Draft final report (and power point)**

A **draft final report, which should not exceed 15 pages** outside the appendices (see proposed plan and in more details in Annex 4) will be produced at the end of the consultant's work, as well as a **Power Point presentation format***.*

Proposed plan for the draft final report

* Cover page: project overview, comprised of one paragraph summarizing the project objectives, and one paragraph outlining the conclusions of the evaluation
* Rationale, objective, and methodology of the evaluation
* Initial approach and actual progress of the project
* Evaluation results (5–7 pages, structured according to the OECD-DAC criteria and evaluation questions).
* Lessons learned
* Recommendations

An unpublished annex document will complement the report. Refer to the provided report template in Annex 5 for guidance.

The draft final report will include the evaluation methodology, a detailed project narrative, reconstructed and updated logical framework, the project performance, conclusions, lessons and/or recommendations, and annexes to the report. It will be sent by WCS to AFD who will also be able to provide comments. AFD will provide their comments and observations to the consultant within two weeks of receiving the draft report.

1. **Final Report**

The final report, incorporating these observations, should be available within two weeks after receiving comments. The final report must be available on 6 June 2025 at the latest. If these observations express differences of assessment not shared by the consultants, they may be annexed to the final report and commented on by the consultants. The report will be made available for public access on the AFD website. An unpublished annex document with more details will complement the report.

The report will be drawn up in accordance with the standard plan attached as Annex 4. The draft and final reports should be submitted in electronic format to the following e-mail addresses: alatinne@wcs.org, sjupiter@wcs.org, pclyne@wcs.org, guinganda@afd.fr, ahmim-richarda@afd.fr, and kiwa\_initiative@afd.fr.

**The evaluation report should not exceed 15 pages, excluding annexes**. A good report must be synthetic. All additional useful material may be annexed.

1. **Organisation & Schedule**

- kick-off meeting: 25 March 2025

- submission of the scoping note: 8 April 2025

- submission of the draft final report: 9 May 2025

- presentation of results: 22 May 2025

- submission of the final report: 6 June 2025

- (potentially) a presentation to Kiwa donors and Steering Committee members

An evaluation steering committee composed of representatives from WCS, AFD and the Kiwa Secretariat will be established. The steering committee is tasked with: (i) ensuring the smooth progress of the evaluation, (ii) facilitating the retrieval of key documents and stakeholder-consultant communication, and (iii) reviewing, providing feedback on, and signing off on deliverables.

The evaluation process will require holding the following milestone meetings:

* A steering committee meeting at the launch of the evaluation, scheduled at the start of the evaluation to discuss evaluation-related matters and organizational issues (documentation requirements, potential field mission dates, etc.).
* A steering committee meeting convened for the presentation and discussion of the scoping note (TBC)
* A steering committee meeting held to deliberate on the draft evaluation report.
* A steering committee meeting organized for discussions on the revised report.
* Final presentation (“report-out” meeting or dissemination workshop) as part of the Kiwa Steering Committee (TBC)
1. **Required expertise and budget**

The successful execution of this evaluation demands a team of experts proficient in the following domains:

* Substantial knowledge and professional experience in project, program, or public policy evaluation (financed by AFD or other international development donors with similar standards (EU, WB, GEF, etc), with a minimum of 10 years of experience.
* Proven track record in development cooperation.
* Technical and sector-specific knowledge and expertise in the following areas:
* Specialized expertise in climate change adaptation, biodiversity conservation, public health and nature-based solutions
* Significant knowledge and deep understanding of the technical and institutional functions, environment and procedures of large NGOs
* Prior experience working in the Pacific Islands and main stakeholders in the region.
* Appreciable experience in leading participatory reflections and discussions.
* Critical Thinking and Problem Solving: capacity to think critically and identify underlying issues; skill in problem-solving, offering actionable recommendations based on evaluation findings

# Duration of the evaluation

The start date is planned on 24 March 2025 and the final report should be delivered by 6 June 2025.

# Annexes

1. Annex 1 – Logical framework of the project being evaluated
2. Annex 2 – Indicative list of documents to be consulted
3. Annex 3 – Indicative list of organizations/ stakeholders to be met
4. Annex 4 – Template for the evaluation report
5. Annex 5 – Template for the annex to the evaluation report
6. Annex 6 – Information sources
7. Annex 7 – DAC criteria
8. Annex 8 – Addressing E&S risk management and climate co-benefits

##

## Annex 1– Logical framework of WISH+ project

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Indicator** | **Linked Kiwa indicators** | **Baseline value** | **Targets** | **Value Annual Report March 2024** | **Current valueas of 30th September 2024** | **Means of verification** | **Notes** |
| **General objectives** |
| Specific objective 1 : Targeted and scaled implementation of watershed interventions to improve system health | (1) Total number of beneficiaries across all project components  |   | 0 | 7447 | Fiji – 4,032PNG – 2,981SI – 1,779 | Fiji – 4,032PNG – 2,981SI – 1,779 | Sex-disaggregated demographic statistics collated for populations downstream from project watershed interventions; attendance lists from trainings and Planetary Health Forum; webinar registration; distribution lists for guide |  |
| Specific objective 2 : Create opportunities to scale and sustainably finance IWM | (2) Total number of CSOs benefiting from capacity building |   | 0 | 4 | Fiji – 0PNG – 0SI – 0 | Fiji – 0PNG – 0SI – 0 | Collation of attendance lists at training workshops |   |
| Specific objective 3 : Knowledge sharing to seed regional replication of innovations | (3) Total number of (formal and informal) civil society partners involved in the project |   | 0 | 42 | Regional - 8Fiji – 2PNG – 1SI – 6 | Regional - 14Fiji – 4PNG – 3SI – 7 | Collation of meeting and activity reports |   |
| (4) Total number of civil society partners funded (giving rise to financial on-granting) |   | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | On-granting agreements | UQ and USyd signed agreements |
| **Specific objectives** |
| Specific Objectives | Results expected | Indicator | Linked Kiwa indicators | Baseline value | Targets | Current value  |   | Means of verification | Notes |
| SO1: Targeted and scaled implementation of watershed interventions to improve system health | R.1.1.1 Sustainably managed watersheds are protecting terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity | R1.1.1a. By 2026\* 40,745 ha of forest will be protected  | Linked to Kiwa Logframe Output 2 indicator on areas (ha) benefit from biodiversity conservation by key areas i) Invasive Alien Species (IAS) management, ii) agriculture, iii) marine and coastal governance; iv) IWM-Integrated Watershed Management/ IWRM- Integrated Water Resources management/ ICZM-Integrated Coastal Zone Management v) terrestrial and marine managed/ protected areas  | Fiji – 392 haPNG – 3951 ha (to be updated when FPIC is completed)SI – 0 ha | Fiji – 10,734 haPNG – 23,001 ha (to be updated when FPIC is completed)SI – 3,414 ha | Fiji – 1,364 haPNG – 4,321 haSI – 0 ha | Fiji – 1,364 haPNG – 4,321 haSI – 0 ha | GIS calculation of spatial areas under committed protection at start and end of project |   |
| R1.1.1b. By 2026\*, 22,000 seedlings will be planted in high priority areas for erosion control and flood mitigation  |   | Fiji – 0PNG – 0SI – 0 | Fiji – 8,000PNG – 9,000SI – 5,000 | Fiji – 2,750PNG – 0SI – 0 | Fiji – 3,857PNG – 0SI – 0 | Annual records of seedlings planted  |   |
| R1.1.1c. By 2026\*, 14 watersheds are sustainably managed covering 61,540 ha | Linked to Kiwa Logframe Output 2 indicators on areas (in ha) benefiting from sustainable resource and/or land and marine management programmes by key areas i) terrestrial/freshwater and ii) marine ecosystems | Fiji – 3, 18,743 haPNG – 0, 0 haSI – 0, 0 ha  | Fiji – 4, 20,612 haPNG – 3, 21,556 haSI – 7, 11,180 ha | Fiji – 4, 21,898 haPNG – 0, 0 haSI – 0, 0 ha  | Fiji – 4, 21,898 haPNG – 0, 0 haSI – 0, 0 ha  | GIS calculation of spatial areas under endorsed management at start and end of project |  |
| R1.1.2 Sustainably managed watersheds are mitigating climate change  | R1.1.2a.\_1. By 2026\*, forest protection will result in 470,680 Tonnes CO2 sequestered (S)  |   | Fiji – 5,387 SPNG – 52,197 SSI – 0 | Fiji – 124,085 SPNG – 265,635 SSI – 45, 396 S | Fiji – 17,442 SPNG – 55,9780 SSI – 0  | Fiji – 17,442 SPNG – 55,9780 SSI – 0  | Calculations using methodology in Maxwell et al. (2019) covering spatial areas under committed management at the start and end of project |   |
| R1.1.2a.\_2. By 2026\*, forest protection will result in 21,775,7031 Tonnes CO2 emissions averted (EA) |   | Fiji – 188,972 EAPNG – 2,354,633 EA SI – 0 | Fiji – 4,614,306 EAPNG – 12,556,534 EASI – 2,193,967 EA | Fiji – 598,239 EAPNG – 2,493,429 EASI – 0  | Fiji – 598,239 EAPNG – 2,493,429 EASI – 0  | Calculations using methodology in Maxwell et al. (2019) covering spatial areas under committed management at the start and end of project |   |
| R1.1.3 Sustainably managed watersheds are benefiting downstream marine biodiversity  | R1.1.3a.\_1 By 2026\*, incidence of coral disease has decreased by 10%  |   | Fiji: Mean incidence of coral disease TBD based on surveys PNG: Mean incidence of coral disease TBD based on surveys SI: Mean incidence of coral disease TBD based on surveys | 10% reduction in coral disease prevalence from baseline | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD | Fiji – TBD PNG – analysis in progress SI – Lolobo 1.3%. Kiuai-Viuru 1.7%, Kolbangara-Babatana 2.5% | UVC surveys conducted within first and final six months of project  | Surveys carried out in PNG, analysis of results in progressSurveys will be carried out in Fiji in October/November 2024 |
| R1.1.3a.\_2 By 2026\*, incidence of healthy coral has remained stable or increased by 10% over baseline  |   | Fiji: Mean coral cover TBD based on surveys PNG: Mean coral cover TBD based on surveys SI: Mean coral cover TBD based on surveys  | 10% reduction in coral disease prevalence from baseline; coral cover has increased up to 10% over baseline  | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – Lolobo 35.3% CC. Kiuai-Viuru 21.3% CC, Kolbangara-Babatana 21.6% CC | Fiji – TBD PNG – analysis in progress SI – Lolobo 35.3% CC, Kiuai-Viuru 21.3% CC, Kolbangara-Babatana 21.6% CC | UVC surveys conducted within first and final six months of project  | Surveys carried out in PNG, analysis of results in progressSurveys will be carried out in Fiji in October/November 2024 |
| R1.1.3b.\_1 By 2026\*, 80% of measures of turbidity will fall within environmental standards  |   | Fiji – 84.4%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | 80% of measures fall within environmental standards  | Fiji – 84.4%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – 72%PNG – 81%SI – 97% | Environmental water quality and microbiology samples taken during first and final six months of project |  |
| R1.1.3b.\_2 By 2026\*, 80% of measures of nitrate will fall within environmental standards  |   | Fiji – 98.4%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | 80% of measures fall within environmental standards  | Fiji – 98.4%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – 80%PNG – 92%SI – 100% | Environmental water quality and microbiology samples taken during first and final six months of project |  |
| R1.1.3b.\_3 By 2026\*, 80% of measures of nitrite will fall within environmental standards  |   | Fiji – 100%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | 80% of measures fall within environmental standards  | Fiji – 100%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – 100%PNG – 100%SI – 100% | Environmental water quality and microbiology samples taken during first and final six months of project |  |
| R1.1.3b.\_4 By 2026\*, 80% of measures of ammonia will fall within environmental standards  |   | Fiji – 95.3%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | 80% of measures fall within environmental standards  | Fiji – 95.3%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – 88%PNG – 100%SI – 97% | Environmental water quality and microbiology samples taken during first and final six months of project |  |
| R1.1.3b.\_5 By 2026\*, 80% of measures of *E.coli* will fall within environmental standards  |   | Fiji – 84.4%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | 80% of measures fall within environmental standards  | Fiji – 84.4%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – 62%PNG – 77%SI – 100% | Environmental water quality and microbiology samples taken during first and final six months of project |  |
| R1.1.3c. By 2026\*, improved downstream water quality will provide downstream ecosystem benefits to 9,615 ha of coral reef and adjacent coastal habitat | Linked to Kiwa Logframe Output 2 indicators on areas (in ha) benefiting from sustainable resource and/or land and marine management programmes | Fiji – 7,520 ha PNG – 0 ha SI – 0 ha  | Fiji – 7,101 ha PNG – 2,169 ha SI – 345 ha  | Fiji – 7.722 haPNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 7.722 haPNG – 0 SI – 0  | GIS calculation of areas of reef from Allen Coral Atlas downstream of watersheds under improved management based on interventions implemented in this project  |  |
| R1.1.4 Sustainably managed watersheds are improving people’s health, particularly for women and girls  | R1.1.4a.\_1 By 2026\*, 80% of measures of turbidity will fall within drinking water standards  |   | Fiji – 88.9%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | 80% of measures fall within drinking water standards  | Fiji – 88.9%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – 82%PNG – 97%SI – 100% | Drinking water quality and microbiology samples taken during first and final six months of project  |  |
| R1.1.4a.\_2 By 2026\*, 80% of measures of nitrate will fall within drinking water standards |   | Fiji – 100%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | 80% of measures fall within drinking water standards  | Fiji – 100%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – 100%PNG – 100%SI – 98% | Drinking water quality and microbiology samples taken during first and final six months of project  |  |
| R1.1.4a.\_3 By 2026\*, 80% of measures of nitrite will fall within drinking water standards |   | Fiji – 100%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | 80% of measures fall within drinking water standards  | Fiji – 100%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – 100%PNG – 100%SI – 100% | Drinking water quality and microbiology samples taken during first and final six months of project  |  |
| R1.1.4a.\_4 By 2026\*, 80% of measures of ammonia will fall within drinking water standards |   | Fiji – 100%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | 80% of measures fall within drinking water standards  | Fiji – 100%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – 98%PNG – 100%SI – 100% | Drinking water quality and microbiology samples taken during first and final six months of project  |  |
| R1.1.4a.\_5 By 2026\*, 80% of measures of *E.coli* will fall within drinking water standards |   | Fiji – 39.4%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | 80% of measures fall within drinking water standards  | Fiji – 39.4%PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – 45%PNG – 83%SI – 95% | Drinking water quality and microbiology samples taken during first and final six months of project  |  |
| R1.1.4b. By 2026\*, syndromic health metrics related to water quality (e.g., # diarrhoea cases in local health facility in last two weeks) have decreased by 20% over baseline (including across men and women)  |   | TBD based on surveys of health clinics adjacent to sites   | At least 20% fewer diarrhoea cases in last 2 weeks on average compared with mean values for baseline surveys for both men and women  | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Health clinic surveys (or compiled EWARS data) conducted fortnightly for 2 months during wet season and 2 months during dry season in first and final year of project  | Surveys in progress in Fiji.Delays with ethics approval in PNG and SI. |
| R1.1.4c. By 2026\*, 5,806 people will have access to improved water and sanitation based on project interventions | Linked to Kiwa Logframe Specific Objective indicators: # people (women/men/indigenous women /indigenous men) benefiting from climate adaptation, resilience and biodiversity measures through Kiwa; and total # of Kiwa project beneficiaries | Fiji – 1,640 adults (848 men, 792 women, 999 children) PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 3,088 (1,544 men,  1,544 women) PNG – 2,188 (1,094 men,  1,094 women) SI – 530 (265 men,  265 women)  | Fiji – 4,032 (2,525 adults - 1,292 men, 1,233 women + 1,507 children)PNG – 2,981 (1,573 adults - 873 men, 700 women + 1,408 children)SI – 1,779 (955 adults - 473 men, 482 women + 824 children) | Fiji – 4,032 (2,525 adults - 1,292 men, 1,233 women + 1,507 children)PNG – 0SI – 0 | Sex-disaggregated demographic statistics collated for populations downstream from project watershed interventions  |  |
| R1.1.5 Sustainably managed watersheds improve local perceptions of well-being  | R1.1.5a.\_1 By 2026\*, localized measures of well-being will have increased over baseline against at least 5 well-being dimensions  |  | TBD based on focal group discussion scores for each community  | Mean well-being scores for each country are at least 1 point higher (on average) across 5 Pacific well-being dimensions for both male and female respondents | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – Women score 25.4, Men score 30.1 PNG – Women + Men score 33.8SI – Women score 25.7, Men score 26 | Separate focus group discussions will be held with men and women (to enable sex-disaggregated data analysis) during first and final 6 months of project  | PNG data doesn’t allow gender disagregation |
| R1.1.5a.\_2 By 2026\*, at least 80% of both male and female-led groups attribute positive change as associated with project implementation |   | TBD based on focal group discussion scores for each community  | At least 80% of both male and female-led groups attribute positive change as associated with project implementation | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Separate focus group discussions will be held with men and women (to enable sex-disaggregated data analysis) during first and final 6 months of project  | This indicator will be evaluated at the end of the project |
| R1.1.6 Sustainably managed watersheds improve factors that drive local adaptive capacity  | R1.1.6a.\_1 By 2026\*, localized measures of community-adaptive capacity have increased by over baseline against at least 3 adaptive capacity dimensions  |   | TBD based on focal group discussion scores for each community  | Mean adaptive capacity scores for each country are at least 1 point higher (on average) across 3 adaptive capacity dimensions for both male and female respondents | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Organisation:Fiji - Women score 13.2, Men score 13.9PNG - Women + Men score 14.1SI -Women score 15.9, Men score 12Learning:Fiji - Women score 2.9, Men score 3.3PNG - Women + Men score 2.3SI -Women score 3.7, Men score 3.6Agency:Fiji - Women score 1.5, Men score 2.4PNG - Women score 6.9, Men score 19SI -Women score 10.3, Men score 5.5 | Separate focus group discussions will be held with men and women (to enable sex-disaggregated data analysis) during first and final 6 months of project  | Some PNG data doesn’t allow gender disagregation. |
| R1.1.6a.\_2 By 2026\*, at least 80% of both male and female-led groups attribute positive change as associated with project implementation |   | TBD based on focal group discussion scores for each community  | At least 80% of both male and female-led groups attribute positive change as associated with project implementation | Fiji – 0%PNG – 0% SI – 0%  | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD | Separate focus group discussions will be held with men and women (to enable sex-disaggregated data analysis) during first and final 6 months of project  | This indicator will be evaluated at the end of the project |
| R1.1.7 Sustainably managed watersheds support soil health  | R1.1.7a.\_1 By 2026\*, 95% of soil samples from agricultural areas receiving NbS interventions will fall within optimum pH threshold to support growth of microorganisms  |   | TBD based on baseline surveys  | 95% of pH samples from each country are within optimum ranges  | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD | Soil pH measurements taken during first and final six months of project  |  |
| R1.1.7a.\_2 By 2026\*, 95% of soil samples from agricultural areas receiving NbS interventions will fall within optimum electrical conductivity (EC) threshold to support growth of microorganisms  |   | TBD based on baseline surveys  | 95% of EC samples from each country are within optimum ranges  | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD | Soil EC measurements taken during first and final six months of project  |  |
| R1.1.8 IWM planning and implementation supports gender equality  | R1.1.8a. By 2026\*, 11 new or adapted SLMPs/EBM plans and 49 WSSPs, developed using GESI approaches, will be endorsed and implemented  |   | Fiji – 2 existing EBM plans, 14 existing WSSPs PNG – 0 SLMPs, 0 WSSPs SI – 0 SLMP, 0 WSSPs  | Fiji – 2 adapted EBM plans, 1 new EBM plan; 12 adapted, 12 new WSSPs PNG – 7 SLPMs, 15 WSSPs SI – 1 SLMP, 10 WSSPs  | Fiji – 2 existing EBM plans, 1 new EBM plan; 13 adapted, 7 new WSSPs PNG – 0 SLMPs, 0 WSSPs SI – 0 SLMPs, 0 WSSPs | Fiji – 2 existing EBM plans, 1 new EBM plan; 13 adapted, 13 new WSSPs PNG – 0 SLMPs, 0 WSSPs SI – 0 SLMPs, 0 WSSPs | All completed/adapted plans to be collated during first and final six months of project  |  |
| R1.1.8b. By 2024\*, 416 landowners, including 126 women, will be engaged as part of village committees to coordinate development and/or adaptation and implementation of SLMPs and WSSPs through participatory, gender-sensitive and inclusive processes |   | Fiji – 85 men, 40 women PNG – 0 men, 0 women SI – 0 men, 0 women  | Fiji – 276 (185 men, 91 women) PNG – 90 (60 men, 30 women) SI – 50 (40 men, 5 women)  | Fiji – 166 (117 men, 49 women)PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 197 (139 men, 58 women)PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Records collated of committee membership during first and final six months of project  |  |
| R1.1.8c. By 2026\*, 147 priority actions implemented from endorsed WSSPs, including NbS, will be implemented (3 per plan)  |   | Fiji – 15 actions already implemented PNG – 0 actions SI – 0 actions  | Fiji – 72 actions PNG – 45 actions SI – 30 actions  | Fiji – 35 actions already implemented PNG – 0 actions SI – 0 actions | Fiji – 49 actions already implemented PNG – 2 actions SI – 7 actions | Databases of implemented actions to be maintained through the project lifetime  |   |
| R1.1.8d. By 2026\*, women will have reduced the time invested in gathering/securing clean water to meet basic needs by 1 hour per week on average. |   | TBD based on focal group discussions with women for each community  | Mean reported time spent on securing clean water will have decreased by 1 hour per week  | Fiji – TBD PNG – TBD SI – TBD  | Fiji – Bureta 1.3 hour, Dama 1.7 hour, Kubulau 1,7 hourPNG – North Coast 0.8 hour, South Coast 16.9 hours SI – Lolobo 12.4 hours, Kolbangara 7 hours, Kiuwai 14.8 hours | Focus group discussions held with and women during first and final 6 months of project  |  |
| SO2: Create opportunities to scale and sustainably finance IWM | R2.1.1 Decision-support tools indicate priorities for investment in IWM  | R2.1.1a. By 2024\*, 6 virtual workshops are convened with national and international experts to identify relationships that drive cumulative risk, which will be used to inform risk mapping and the decision-support tools for intervention selection  |   | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 2PNG – 2 SI – 2 | Fiji – 1PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 5PNG – 1SI – 0  | Collation of workshop reports and NCG minutes through project  |   |
| R2.1.1b. By 2025\*, 3 integrated, spatially-explicit land-sea-health models are developed to identify priorities for action where investment will be most likely to yield multiple benefits |   | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 1 PNG – 1 SI – 1 | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0 | Collation of publications (e.g., articles, reports, summary briefs) on models  |  Models in development |
| R2.1.1c. By 2025\*, 3 Excel-based decision-support tools are produced to assist in design of watershed interventions based on local conditions  |   | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 1 PNG – 1 SI – 1 | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0 | Collation of Excel files  |   |
| R2.1.1d. By 2025\*, maps of high priority areas for investment in IWM for multiple benefits are produced and distributed to government partners in Fiji, PNG and Solomon Islands with Excel-based decision-support tools  |   | 0 maps disseminated  | 3 sets of maps (1 per country) produced and distributed in each country to key project partners through NCGs  | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0 | Collation of map products during project term  |   |
| R2.1.2 Provincial and national government agencies and other funding bodies in Fiji, PNG and Solomon Islands have improved understanding of where to direct resources for IWM and what specific interventions to use under different contexts  | R2.1.2a. By 2025\*, 6 trainings are held with 30 national and provincial government staff, and 1 training is held with 11 PNG Fund Board members, on use of decision-support tools | Linked to Kiwa Logframe Output 1 Indicator: # institutions benefiting from capacity building (ministerial / sub-ministerial level) | Fiji – 0 trainings, 0 trained PNG – 0 trainings, 0 trained SI – 0 trainings, 0 trained  | Fiji – 2 trainings, 10 trained (5 men, 5 women), 2 institutionsPNG – 2 trainings, 21 trained (18 men, 7 women), 3 institutionsSI – 2 trainings, 10 trained (6 men, 4 women), 2 institutions | Fiji – 0 trainings, 0 trained, 0 institutionPNG – 0 trainings, 0 trained, 0 institutionSI – 0 trainings, 0 trained, 0 institution | Fiji – 0 trainings, 0 trained, 0 institutionPNG – 0 trainings, 0 trained, 0 institutionSI – 0 trainings, 0 trained, 0 institution | Collation of attendance lists at training workshops  |   |
| R2.1.2b. By 2026\*, 90% of national and provincial government staff and fund board members polled indicate understanding of high priority areas to direct resources for IWM and what specific interventions to use under different contexts based on outputs of decision-support tools  |   | 0% in each country | 90% of government staff polled in each country of and of Fund Board members in PNG  | Fiji – 0% PNG – 0% SI – 0% | Fiji – 0% PNG – 0% SI – 0% | Collation of questionnaires distributed during trainings  |   |
| R2.X Sustainable financing mechanisms are endorsed and funding is mobilized for IWM  | R2.Xa. By 2026\*, there are commitments to operationalize at least 3 vehicles for long-term financing of IWM and financing/ investment has been mobilized and secured for at least 2 vehicles  |   | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 1 committed & mobilized PNG – 1 committed & mobilized SI – 1 committed  | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0  | Collation of stakeholder letters of support, financial statements showing mobilization of resources, and contracts committing financing  |   |
| R2.2.1 Data on foregone costs incentivizes endorsement of and private sector engagement with a Watershed Fund for Fiji  | R2.2.1a. By 2025\*, foregone healthcare and productivity costs and annual investment needs have been projected and included in a business plan and resource mobilization strategy for establishment, operationalization and capitalization of a Fiji Watershed Fund, including engagement and participation of the private sector  |   | No business plan exists  | A business plan and resource mobilization strategy is developed  | No business plan exists  | No business plan exists  | Business plan collated  |   |
| R2.2.1b. By 2025\*, 4 high level dialogues will be held with key ministries to garner support for a Fiji Watershed Fund  |   | 0 dialogues  | 4 dialogues  | 0 dialogues  | 0 dialogues  | Collation of meeting minutes and summary report  |   |
| R2.2.1c. By 2025\*, 8 meetings/interviews will be had with potential investors, including private sector organizations, to review cost projections and initiative investment plans to incentivize investment  |   | 0 meetings/interviews  | 8 meetings/interviews  | 0 meetings/interviews  | 0 meetings/interviews  | Collation of meeting minutes and initial investment plans  |   |
| R2.2.2 The structure is developed for a Watershed Fund for Fiji that ultimately will provide financing to priority high risk sites with interventions prioritized using decision-support tool  | R2.2.2a. By 2025\*, the structure and financing plan for a Fiji Watershed Fund is developed and agreed by relevant stakeholders  |   | No identified structure  | Appropriate fund structure identified and agreed  | No identified structure  | No identified structure  | Collation of meeting minutes  |   |
| R2.3.1 Support for IWM is built into the overall objectives of the PNG Biodiversity and Climate Fund, including through offsets financing, to enable long-term resourcing of IWM needs in priority sites  | R2.3.1a. By 2025\*, a special funding window is developed for sustainable financing of watersheds within the PNG Biodiversity and Climate Fund  |   | No funding window for IWM  | Funding window for IWM  | No funding window for IWM  | No funding window for IWM  | Collation of Fund prospectus with IWM funding window  |   |
| R2.3.1b. By 2025\*, a business plan and resource mobilization strategy that considers offsets financing is established for the operation of the watershed investment window of the PNG Fund  |   | No plan and resource mobilization strategy  | Business plan and resource mobilization strategy developed  | No plan and resource mobilization strategy  | No plan and resource mobilization strategy  | Collation of plan and resource mobilization strategy  |   |
| R2.3.1c. By 2025\*, 8 meetings/interviews will be held with potential investors, including private sector organizations, to attract investment to special funding window  |   | 0 meetings  | 8 meetings  | 2 meetings | 2 meetings | Collation of meeting minutes  |   |
| R2.3.2 Fund Board members are equipped to manage and disburse financing, including from offsets  | R2.3.2a. By 2025\*, 11 Board members are capable of effectively disbursing funds, evaluating investments, and managing finances, including from offsets | Linked to Kiwa Logframe Output 1 indicator: # institutions benefiting from capacity building (ministerial / sub-ministerial level) | 0 Board members trained  | 11 Board members trained and effectively implementing SOPs  | 0 Board members trained  | 0 Board members trained  | Collation of training reports and rules written into the Fund and Fund grant agreements  |   |
| R2.4.1 Support is mobilized for long-term financing for IWM in Solomon Islands  | R2.4.1a. By 2025\*, there is support for long-term financing of IWM, ideally linked to the national PATF  |   | 0 stakeholders support  | 5 key stakeholders support  | 0 stakeholders support  | 0 stakeholders support | Collation of stakeholder letters of support and results of key informant surveys |   |
| R2.4.2 Financing arrangements and sources are identified to support long-term management of IWM on Kolombangara according to business plan needs  | R2.4.2a. By 2025\*, a business plan and resource mobilization strategy is produced for site-based finance mechanisms for Kolombangara Island  |   | No plan  | Business plan and resource mobilization strategy for Kolombangara collated  | No plan  | No plan  | Business plan and resource mobilization strategy guided by best practice from the Conservation Finance Alliance  |   |
| R2.4.2b. By 2025\*, 8 meetings/interviews held with key stakeholders in Solomon Islands to determine appropriate financing arrangements  |   | 0 meetings  | 8 meetings  | 0 meetings  | 0 meetings  | Collation of meeting minutes  |   |
| R2.4.2c. By 2025\*, 8 meetings/interviews will be had with potential investors, including private sector organizations, to identify financing sources  |   | 0 meetings  | 8 meetings  | 0 meetings  | 0 meetings  | Collation of meeting minutes  |   |
| SO3: Knowledge sharing to seed regional replication of innovations | R3.1.1 A systems approach to IWM is promoted by regional health and environment sector agencies and embedded in regional policy statements; countries outside of Fiji, Solomon Islands and PNG initiate IWM through systems approaches, informed by project lessons  | R3.1.1a. By 2026\*, at least 6 new projects/programs in the region (external to our project) are planning or implementing a systems approach to IWM based on learning shared from this project  |   | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0 Region – 0  | Fiji – 1PNG – 1 SI – 1Region – 3  | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0 Region – 0  | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0 Region – 0  | Collation of online survey of government and civil society practitioners; questionnaire distribution to government and civil society practitioners  |   |
|  | R3.1.1b. By 2026\*, 5 regional policy statements that call attention to a systems approach to IWM using NbS for climate change adaptation | Linked to Kiwa Logframe Specific Objective Indicator: # of national and regional policy frameworks/strategy documents that mention NbS for climate change adaptation and/or integrate climate change adaptation and biodiversity conservation as interlinked objectives | 0 statement | 5 statements  | Statements - 0 | Statements - 0 | Collation of relevant regional policy statements  |   |
|  | R3.1.1c. By 2026\*, IWM implementation at project sites will be aligned with national and regional policy and coordinated with other initiatives through meetings of the NCGs and RAC  |   | 0 meetings NCGs and RAC  | Fiji – annual NCG meetings PNG – annual NCG meetings SI – annual NCG meetings Regional – annual RAC meeting  | Fiji – 1 (2023)PNG – 1 (2023)SI – 1 (2023)Regional - 1 (2023) | Fiji – 2 PNG – 2SI – 1 Regional - 2 | Collation of meeting minutes  |   |
| R3.1.2 Best practice knowledge on NbS in the context of IWM is shared widely throughout the region  | R3.1.2a. By 2025\*, 1,000 people have accessed the regional webinar platform to share knowledge about NbS and One Health | Linked to Kiwa Logframe Output 1 indicator: # representatives (women/men/ indigenous women/indigenous men) of local and national authorities and civil society accessing on a regular basis regional knowledge platforms or other existing tools used to share Kiwa results (disaggregated by sex and country) | 0 people (0 men, 0 women)  | 1,000 people (500 men, 500 women, of which at least 60% of both groups are Indigenous)  | People - 0Men - 0Women - 0Indigenous % - 0 | People - 0Men - 0Women - 0Indigenous % - 0 | Collation of webinar participation lists  |   |
|  | R3.1.2b. By 2026\*, host second Oceania Planetary Health Forum to disseminate learning with attendance by 100 regional participants  | Linked to Kiwa Logframe Output 3 indicator: # regional events/workshops | 0 events, 0 participants  | 1 event, 100 participants (50 male, 50 female, of which at least 50% of both groups are Indigenous)  | Events - 0Participants - 0 | Events - 0Participants - 0 | Collation of attendance lists and forum proceedings  | OPHF will be held in Feb 2025 |
|  | R3.1.2c. By 2026\*, project staff participate in 4 relevant regional environment, WASH and health sector policy dialogues to disseminate policy brief and project learning  |   | 0 policy dialogues, 0 briefs  | 4 policy dialogues, 1 brief  | Policy dialogues - 3Brief - 0 | Policy dialogues - 11Brief - 0 | Collation of presentations and policy brief  |   |
|  | R3.1.2d. By 2025\*, develop a practitioner's guide of integrated watershed management for multiple benefits distributed to over 50 stakeholder groups  |   | 0 groups receiving guide  | 50 stakeholder groups receiving guide  | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0 | Fiji – 0 PNG – 0 SI – 0 | Stakeholder distribution list  |   |

##

## Annex 2 – Indicative list of documents to be consulted

*Establish the indicative list of key documents to be consulted, giving if possible the title, the author (if applicable) and the date.* *Specify any missing documents.*

*It is advisable the consultancy have access to:*

* *All important documents that retrace the appraisal, formalisation and implementation monitoring of the project, in particular:*
* *identification note or debriefing report of the identification mission*
* *concept note*
* *financing agreement together with any amendments*
* *on-granting agreements with USyd and UQ*
* *environmental and social management plan (ESMP);*
* *project implementation manual*
* *operator contracts, contracts of assistance to the contracting authority or contracts with the management contractor*
* *Trip reports*
* *Project deliverables*
* *summary table extracted from disbursement software*
* *all semi-annual and annual reports*
* *Counterparty presentation documents (master agreement, status, activity report, financial statements, organisation chart, monitoring document, etc.) ;*

## Annex 3 – Indicative list of organizations and stakeholders to be met

* WCS project team: SEAP Regional Director, Regional Project Coordinator, Regional Business Manager, Country Directors, Program Managers, Field officers.
* Project on-grantees: University of Sydney and University of Queensland
* Members from communities participating in the project: Ovalau Island (Lovoni and Bureta districts), Kolombangara Island, Manus Island
* National government: Fiji Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, SI Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology
* Local level government: Fiji Ovalau Province, SI Western Province, PNG Manus Province
* Partners: Fiji National University, Solomon Islands Kolombangara Island Biodiversity Conservation Association (KIBCA), SI LIFER project, SPREP, Talanoa Consulting, PNG Biodiversity and Climate Fund
* Consultants: Owen Woodberry, TBD
* Members of the Regional Advisory Committee: Tony Capon (Monash University), Sione Tu’itahi (Health Promotion Forum New Zealand), Margot Parks (University of Northern British Columbia), Pierre Horwitz (Edith Cowan University)

## Annex 4 –Template for the evaluation report

# Project Evaluation

Name of project(s) (without acronyms)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Country: | Sector:*use the nomenclature of AFD’s technical divisions*  |

Evaluator: Coordinator of the evaluation:

Validation date of evaluation report:

|  |
| --- |
| **Project number:** **Contracting authority:** **Amount:** *AFD financing and type – grant/loan***Disbursement rate:** **Commitment date:** **Completion date:** *operational completion date* |

## Project objectives

Add the project fiche if available on afd.fr

## Conclusions of the evaluation

*This should not be an overall summary of the main observations of the evaluation. Consultants should highlight the key conclusions crosscutting the evaluation questions (distinguish the essential from the important).*

## Rationale, objectives and methodology of the evaluation (0.5 p)

*For the methodology, answer the following questions in two sentences:*

* *Has this evaluation involved a specific methodology? If so, what is it?*
* *Have all the project stakeholders (AFD, contracting authority, civil society, companies, beneficiaries…) been able to express their views about the project* via *the evaluation comitology, or* via *on-site or online data collection tools? If not, what has prevented the consultation of some of these stakeholders? What methods have been used to collect data from the various stakeholders (interviews, questionnaire survey, focus groups, observation, documentary sources?)*
* *What are the main limits and methodological biases of this exercise and did the consultants encounter any difficulties in conducting the evaluation?*
* *What gaps are there between the intended method and the method finally used?*

## Initial project logic and actual implementation (2 p)

*The intervention logic (objectives and means to achieve them): Indicate what the initially intended project objectives were and the path of change (*i.e.*, the organization of the changes and the intermediate results that should logically have enabled – or contributed to – the achievement of the objectives) and the assumptions underlying them. Indicate whether this intervention logic was comprehensive at the start of the project, or how it was completed or established during the evaluation. Also indicate whether this intervention logic was appropriate during the project implementation and in what way. Clearly indicate the planned objectives, targets and indicators.*

*Operating scheme and stakeholders: By “operating method”, we mean the preparation and organization of the project. You should indicate the financial arrangements (financial product, fiduciary arrangements, co-financiers), as well as the operational arrangements. You should indicate the project stakeholders and their responsibilities (contracting authority, implementing agency/operator, any assistance to the contracting authority, etc.), as well as the coordination and governance mechanism (coordination bodies, decision-making procedures, etc.).*

*Project process and evolution of the context: In ½ page, highlight the main points that have had consequences for the project, including: the key dates of the project and AFD’s financing, the key events in the phases for the appraisal, implementation (indicate in particular how the implementation monitoring was conducted), and completion (or post-completion), the project’s progress since its start-up (main achievements), the main difficulties encountered, and the contextual elements that led to the project being modified.*

**Table 1: Project budget**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Overall project amount** | **AFD contribution**  |
| Planned | Implemented | Planned | Implemented |
| Component 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Component 2 |  |  |  |  |
| … |  |  |  |  |

Optional note on the table: local currency, co-financiers, reasons for variances, etc.

## Results of the evaluation (5 to 7 p)

*This section should be organized following the structure indicated in the Terms of Reference,* i.e.*: according to the evaluation questions AND according to the DAC criteria used.*

### EQ 1 and Relevance, coherence

### EQ 2 and Effectiveness

**Table 2: Project output and results indicators (optional)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Target at the appraisal** | **Value after project** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### EQ 3 and Efficiency

### EQ 4 and Impacts and sustainability

### EQ 5 and AFD Added value

**FOCUS on…**

*This box is optional. It serves to complete or illustrate an evaluation question, or highlight a particularly interesting result of the evaluation.*

## Lessons

N.B.*: The conclusions are presented on the first page.*

*The lessons (what may be useful in other contexts): this involves the observations made and lessons learned by the evaluator that go beyond the project context, as well as key messages, which do not necessarily need to be followed up with action. The evaluator may use their experience and expertise to look at the general application potential.*

## Recommendations

*The recommendations (what needs to be improved in this project/this type of project – how to do things differently): this involves proposals for improvements, decisions that need to be made or measures that need to be applied which are based on the conclusions of the evaluation, to change operating methods, governance systems, mechanisms, etc. The recommendations should have a normative form, be clearly worded, and focus on identifiable and achievable actions (this actor should…). Where appropriate, it would be useful to make a distinction between the recommendations that are easy to implement in the short term and the more structural recommendations that should be considered over a longer period of time.*

*There should be a very small number of recommendations.*

**FIND OUT MORE:**

**- Understanding evaluations at AFD**

**- Consult the Evaluations report**

**- Download project evaluation reports**

## Annex 5 –Template for the Annex to the evaluation report

KIWA WISH + project evaluation

**Contents**

[Additional information on the context and initial situation 1](#_Toc153769852)

[Project context (sectoral, social, political, economic and/or security) 1](#_Toc153769853)

[Project process 1](#_Toc153769854)

[Origin of the project 2](#_Toc153769855)

[Intervention logic for the project (if specified) 2](#_Toc153769856)

[Timeline and key events of the project implementation 2](#_Toc153769857)

[Analyses 2](#_Toc153769858)

[Analysis 1 underlying the conclusions of evaluation question 1 or of the relevance criterion 2](#_Toc153769859)

[Analysis 2 underlying the conclusions of evaluation question 2 or of the effectiveness criterion 2](#_Toc153769860)

[Future prospects and risks for the project (optional) 2](#_Toc153769861)

[More developed conclusions (optional) 2](#_Toc153769862)

[Details on the lessons and recommendations (optional) 2](#_Toc153769863)

[Appendix 2](#_Toc153769864)

[Documentation consulted 3](#_Toc153769865)

[List of persons met 3](#_Toc153769866)

[Evaluation frame of reference and detailed methodology (including limits) 3](#_Toc153769867)

[Qualitative/quantitative survey reports, focus group reports, etc. 3](#_Toc153769868)

## Additional information on the context and initial situation

### Project context (sectoral, social, political, economic and/or security)

*Indicate the situation at the start of the project and its progress, in the relevant country, region and sector (sectoral organization, financing, strategy). You should only provide background information here which has affected the project and which is useful for the evaluative analysis or the understanding of the project.*

*What is the central issue targeted by the project and how has it developed over the period?*

## Project process

*In this section, the following points* ***may*** *be specified if necessary, and if too sensitive to be included in the public the evaluation report.*

### Origin of the project

### Intervention logic for the project (if specified)

*The intervention logic includes the explicit or implicit assumptions underlying the project strategy and the choices made during its design phase.*

### Timeline and key events of the project implementation

## Analyses

*This section is organized in accordance with what is indicated in the Terms of Reference and based on the outline of the main report using evaluation questions or DAC criteria.*

### Analysis 1 underlying the conclusions of evaluation question 1 or of the relevance criterion

### Analysis 2 underlying the conclusions of evaluation question 2 or of the effectiveness criterion

*Where relevant, specific analyses underlying the conclusions on gender, sustainable development, climate…*

**FOCUS on…**

*This box is optional. It serves to complete or illustrate an analysis, or highlight a particularly interesting result of the evaluation.*

## Future prospects and risks for the project (optional)

## More developed conclusions (optional)

## Details on the lessons and recommendations (optional)

## Appendix

*Limit the appendix to essential information only.*

### Documentation consulted

### Sans titre-1.pngList of persons met

### Evaluation frame of reference and detailed methodology (including limits)

### Qualitative/quantitative survey reports, focus group reports, etc.

## Annex 6 – Information sources

**- Document review**: indicate the list of documents that have actually consulted and specify to which they are referred when they provide important elements in the argument.

- **Semi-directive interviews**: specify how the interlocutors were selected, how the interviews were conducted and whether any could not be met. Refer as much as possible to the original comments by quoting the interlocutor who mentioned them. It is possible not to mention the names of the interlocutors if they raise sensitive issues, but it is then necessary to provide indications on their status and function to allow the reader to reposition the subject.

- **Focus groups**: encouraged from a learning perspective, but to be used with discernment, in addition to other methods. Ensure that the manner in which the work was carried out (who was invited and how, how the exchanges were conducted) is well documented

- **Existing data**: many sources can be mobilized: household surveys, satellite data, etc.

- **Ad hoc surveys**: Use only if other data sources are not available. Specify the sampling method, pay attention to the design of the questionnaire, ensure quality control during agent training, supervision during collection and at the time of entry.

- **Field observations**: The way in which the sites visited are selected, the duration and conditions of observation must be briefly described. It is recommended to take the GPS points of the locations and represent them on a map at the end of the mission. Taking pictures to illustrate the purpose is also recommended.

All the methods below must preserve the principle of informed consent (the interlocutor must be informed of the reason for which he or she is being questioned and explicitly express his or her agreement). Anonymity must also be preserved when dealing with sensitive subjects or when the environment raises security risks for partners and beneficiaries.

## Annex 7 – DAC criteria

* **Relevance**

The consultant shall first examine the consistency of the intervention with respect to the objectives and issues determined at the outset (relevance of the project at its origin). When appropriate, it will also assess the founding hypotheses that led to the construction of the intervention logic. He shall also assess how this consistency has evolved over time (evolution of the project over time).

In this framework, the consultant will systematically examine to what extent the project is consistent with:

* + Kiwa initiative’s objectives
	+ national guidelines *(define which as appropriate);*
	+ the definition, needs and expectations of the final beneficiaries (beneficiaries to be defined depending on the project). On this specific point, and particularly in order to judge the relevance at the origin of the project, the consultant may, for example, examine the efforts that were made at the time of the appraisal in order to define the final beneficiaries and take into account their points of view);
	+ the strategies and interventions of the other stakeholders (*to be defined as appropriate: NGOs, donors, local authorities…*).
* **Coherence**

The consultant will assess both the internal and external consistency of the project:

* + **the internal coherence** of the project. This will involve reconstructing and judging the consistency of the various resources and tools mobilised to help achieve the objectives on the basis of the logic of the intervention;
	+ the capacity to integrate the situation and the respective interests of men and women at the time of the project design via preliminary analyses;
	+ **the external coherence** of the project (consistency with the interventions of the other actors : to be defined as appropriate—bilateral and/or multinational donors, public administrations, NGOs…).
* **Effectiveness**

The consultant shall first assess the achievement rate of the project (comparison between the expected outcomes and actual outcomes).

The consultant shall then assess the extent to which the project’s objectives were fulfilled (particularly the specific objectives).

The consultant shall analyse the differences observed for both of these assessments, and shall seek to analyse the project’s contribution to the results achieved.

If necessary, the consultant may give an assessment of the project's ability to adapt to changing circumstances; this may lead a project to change the initial results and objectives (articulation with the relevance criterion).

*If the sustainable development opinion made recommendations*

[Within this framework, the consultant will analyze the implementation of the recommendations contained in the sustainable development opinion].

*For projects that include gender as the main or secondary objective (notes 1 and 2 of the OECD-DAC marker)*

[the results shall by systematically presented for men and women.].

*If aggregatable indicators have been defined ex ante.*

[The consultant will pay particular attention to the analysis of the aggregatable indicators]

* **Efficiency**

Efficiency examines the relationship between the resources implemented and their costs, on the one hand, and the funded outcomes achieved, on the other hand. This will involve assessing whether the resources of the project (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted into results in an optimal manner.

The evaluation carried out by the consultant must make it possible to:

- assess whether the required resources were actually implemented, in a timely fashion and provide an optimal cost/efficiency ratio;

- analyse any observed delays or cost overruns;

-*In cases where this is feasible* [measure the unit costs of the projects financed, as well as the per capita investment amounts for the project (i.e. the total amount of investments, or of a category of investment, compared to the number of beneficiaries concerned) and, if possible, to situate these costs and these amounts per capita compared to those observed in other projects.]

*Depending on the case, it may be useful to specify in the ToR the levels of analysis that could be specifically examined, particularly concerning the procurement procedures, the financial management procedures, the institutional arrangement, the conditions precedent, etc.*

* **Impact**

Impact measures the benefits of the intervention on the relevant stakeholders and, particularly, the final beneficiaries. Here, the consultant will analyse the long-term effects (or the perspective of effects), both positive and negative, primary and secondary, that can be reasonably attributed either partly or entirely to the intervention under evaluation, whether directly or not (direct and indirect effects), or intentionally or not (expected and unexpected effects).

*This criterion is only relevant in cases where we have some hindsight after the completion of the activities. It is therefore not always relevant to include it in the evaluation process. The project’s contribution to the sustainable development objectives (economic development, poverty reduction, reduction of inequalities, including gender inequalities, biodiversity preservation and fight against climate change) as set out in the sustainable development opinion, can serve as a framework to evaluate the impact of the project.*

The consultant shall systematically evaluate the project’s impacts on gender equality and relationships. This will specifically involve evaluating the impacts of the distribution of responsibilities, access to and the control of resources, the workload of women…].

The evaluation will include an analysis of the results and impacts achieved in terms of mitigation and/or adaptation. *For mitigation projects including an ex-ante carbon footprint,* [the consultant will analyse (i) the relevance of the assumptions made ex-ante to establish the carbon balance and (ii) the feasibility of an ex-post carbon footprint. The consultant shall, if possible, carry out the ex-post carbon footprint and comment on it or justify missing data for carrying out this assessment].

E&S risk control *-*

The assessment will include a component related to the E&S risk management approach implemented in the project. The consultant shall include in the assessment an analysis of the compliance of the project's E&S risk management approach with the AFD E&S procedural corpus (refer to "ope-R1066 - Environmental and Social Risk Management Approach for AFD-Funded Operations"). Beyond the compliance analysis, the consultant shall verify the extent to which the environmental and social risk management approach implemented has been relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable. The consultant will study the conditions under which this approach was implemented and the results obtained in terms of E&S risk control and reduction of the project's negative E&S impacts. In particular, this evaluation will have to assess (i) whether the E&S risks and impacts have been properly assessed and anticipated through the various studies carried out ex-ante, (ii) whether the E&S operational documents (Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), Environmental and Social Action Plan (ESAP) or others) have identified appropriate E&S risk control measures, (iii) whether these measures have been effectively implemented and have achieved the objectives of E&S risk control and reduction of adverse E&S impacts, and (iv) whether the Owner has responded adequately to unanticipated E&S impacts and risks.]

*The Assessment Coordinator will ensure that the Consultant is provided with the operational documents for E&H risk management (ESMP, PAR, ESAP or others), the Environmental and Social Scorecard (ESSP) and, if available, the Environmental and Social Engagement Plan (ESEP) annexed to the Agreement. It may refer to document ope-U2038, which recalls the main principles of AFD's environmental and social risk management approach and proposes an indicative list of specific evaluation questions, by criterion, for assessing the E&S risk management approach.*

 *If he wishes so, the evaluation co-ordinator may also request specific support from the ERS/EVA Division more specifically oriented towards questions relating to the impact.*

* **Sustainability**

Sustainability is defined as being the continuation of benefits resulting from a development action after the intervention has reached completion. It is consequently assimilated to the likelihood of obtaining sustainable, long-term benefits.

The consultant will therefore examine here whether the fulfilment of the objectives that were set and the results already obtained, or in the process of being obtained, are of a sustainable nature, or even likely to be amplified, over the long term, and, if so, under what conditions. In this framework, he will ensure he assesses the sustainability of the structures/institutions initiated or supported under the project, as well as the sustainability of the effects created by the Kiwa initiative-financed project.

The main aspects to be analysed may be defined by the coordinator of the evaluation according to the project evaluated. It could particularly be useful to differentiate between the different levels of sustainability (institutional, technical, financial, environmental) that the analysis should cover.

* **Added value of Kiwa initiative’s action**

*In this section, the consultant will assess Kiwa initiative’s specific contribution and added value with respect to other interventions or ways of proceeding available to the contracting authority. It will be necessary here to make a critical judgment that shall highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of AFD’s action. This analysis may focus on the different stages in the project cycle, the characteristics of the financial resources provided by Kiwa initiative, the cross-cutting issues (partnership and dialogue, capacity building, etc.) or on any other issue identified by the consultant.*

*This discussion on the “added value” brought by Kiwa initiative shall be clarified by the evaluation coordinator, particularly with respect to the specificities of the project, the sector concerned, the financial product and the nature of the support provided by Kiwa initiative. Depending on the case in point, this may involve:*

* + *the nature of Kiwa initiative’s influence on the strategies of local actors;*
	+ *the appraisal process*
	+ *the involvement of actors (and final beneficiaries)*
	+ *the partnership between the local actors and Kiwa initiative;*
	+ *the operating method and the implementation methods;*
	+ *the supervision mechanism;*
	+ *Kiwa initiative’s eventual contribution to capacity-building;*
	+ *possible input from Kiwa initiative in the area of environmental and social risk control;*
	+ *Kiwa initiative’s potential contribution to gender equality;*
	+ *the leverage or catalyzing effect of Kiwa initiative funding on the behavior of other actors;*

*This list of criteria is not restrictive: partnership, participation, gender equity, capacity-building, conservation of natural resources, etc. may also be specific complementary themes for study depending on the nature of the interventions being evaluated.*

*Given the scope of decentralised evaluations and their design basis, as well as the technical limits that make it impossible to provide answers of a suitable quality to an excessive number of questions,* ***it is recommended to thoroughly check the potential usefulness of expected answers to questions on complementary themes*** *(and the feasibility of the additional workload that the consultant must take on to deal with such questions within the given timeframe), and to limit any such question to a small number.*

## Annex 8 – Addressing E&S risk management and climate co-benefits

***E&S risk control*** *-*

The assessment will include a component related to the E&S risk management approach implemented in the project. The consultant shall include in the assessment an analysis of the compliance of the project's E&S risk management approach with the AFD E&S procedural corpus (refer to "ope-R1066 - Environmental and Social Risk Management Approach for AFD-Funded Operations" and document "ope-U2038-4" which recalls the main principles of AFD's environmental and social risk management approach). Beyond the compliance analysis, the consultant shall verify the extent to which the environmental and social risk management approach implemented has been relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable. The consultant will study the conditions under which this approach was implemented and the results obtained in terms of E&S risk control and reduction of the project's negative E&S impacts. In particular, this evaluation will have to assess (i) whether the E&S risks and impacts have been properly assessed and anticipated through the various studies carried out ex-ante, (ii) whether the E&S operational documents (Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), Environmental and Social Action Plan (ESAP) or others) have identified appropriate E&S risk control measures, (iii) whether these measures have been effectively implemented and have achieved the objectives of E&S risk control and reduction of adverse E&S impacts, and (iv) whether the Owner has responded adequately to unanticipated E&S impacts and risks.]

*The Assessment Coordinator will ensure that the Consultant is provided with the operational documents for E&H risk management (ESMP, PAR, ESAP or others), the Environmental and Social Scorecard (ESSP) and, if available, the Environmental and Social Engagement Plan (ESEP) annexed to the Agreement. It may refer to document ope-U2038, which recalls the main principles of AFD's environmental and social risk management approach and proposes an indicative list of specific evaluation questions, by criterion, for assessing the E&S risk management approach.*

***Climate.*** The evaluation will include an analysis of the results and impacts achieved in terms of mitigation and/or **adaptation**. *For mitigation projects including an ex-ante carbon footprint,* [the consultant will analyse (i) the relevance of the assumptions made ex-ante to establish the carbon balance and (ii) the feasibility of an ex-post carbon footprint. The consultant shall, if possible, carry out the ex-post carbon footprint and comment on it or justify missing data for carrying out this assessment.

**Declaration of Integrity**

Reference name of the Services Agreement: Mid-Term Technical Review for the Kiwa WISH+ project (The "**Contract**" or “**Agreement**”)

To: Wildlife Conservation Society (The "**Contracting Authority**")

1. We recognise and accept that *Agence Française de Développement* ("AFD") only finances projects of the Contracting Authority subject to its own condition, which are set out in the Financing Agreement which benefits directly or indirectly to the Contracting Authority. As a matter of consequence, no legal relationship exists between AFD and our organization, company, our joint venture or our suppliers, contractors, subcontractors, consultants or subconsultants. The Contracting Authority retains exclusive responsibility for the preparation and implementation of the selection process and performance of the Contract.
2. We hereby certify that neither we or any of our suppliers, contractors, subcontractors, consultants or subconsultants are in any of the following situations:

2.1) Being bankrupt, wound up or ceasing our activities, having our activities administered by the courts, having entered into receivership, reorganisation or being in any analogous situation arising from any similar procedure;

2.2) Having been:

a. convicted within the past five years by a court decision, which has the force of *res judicata* in the country where the Contract is implemented, of fraud, corruption or of any other offense committed during a selection process or performance of a contract (in the event of such conviction, you may attach to this Statement of Integrity supporting information showing that this conviction is not relevant in the context of this Contract);

b. subject to an administrative sanction within the past five years by the European Union or by the competent authorities of the country where we are constituted, for fraud, corruption or for any other offense committed during a selection process or performance of a contract (in the event of such sanction, you may attach to this Statement of Integrity supporting information showing that this sanction is not relevant in the context of this Contract);

c. convicted within the past five years by a court decision, which has the force of *res judicata,* of fraud, corruption or of any other offense committed during the selection process or performance of an AFD-financed contract;

2.3) Being listed for financial sanctions by the United Nations, the European Union and/or France for the purposes of fight-against-terrorist financing or threat to international peace and security; For information purposes only, the Contracting Authority is providing the following references: For the lists maintained by the United Nations, the following website may be consulted: <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/fr/content/un-sc-consolidated-list>; For the lists maintained by the European Union, the following website may be consulted: <https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/8442/consolidated-list-sanctions_fr>; For the lists maintained by France, the following website may be consulted: <https://www.tresor.economie.gouv.fr/services-aux-entreprises/sanctions-economiques/dispositif-national-de-gel-des-avoirs.>

2.4) Having been subject within the past five years to a contract termination fully settled against us for significant or persistent failure to comply with our contractual obligations during contract performance, unless this termination was challenged and dispute resolution is still pending or has not confirmed a full settlement against us;

2.5) Not having fulfilled our fiscal obligations regarding payments of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of either the country where we are constituted or the Contracting Authority's country;

2.6) Being subject to an exclusion decision of the World Bank and being listed on the website http://www.worldbank.org/debarr (in the event of such exclusion, you may attach to this Statement of Integrity supporting information showing that this exclusion is not relevant in the context of this Contract);

2.7) Having created false documents or committed misrepresentation in documentation requested by the Contracting Authority as part of the selection process of this Contract.

1. We hereby certify that neither we, nor any of the members of our joint venture or any of our suppliers, contractors, subcontractors, consultants or subconsultants are in any of the following situations of conflict of interest:

3.1) Being an affiliate controlled by the Contracting Authority or a shareholder controlling the Contracting Authority, unless the stemming conflict of interest has been brought to the attention of AFD and resolved to its satisfaction;

3.2) Having a business or family relationship with a Contracting Authority's staff involved in the selection process or the supervision of the resulting Contract, unless the stemming conflict of interest has been brought to the attention of AFD and resolved to its satisfaction;

3.3) Being controlled by or controlling another bidder or consultant, or being under common control with another bidder or consultant, or receiving from or granting subsidies directly or indirectly to another bidder or consultant, having the same legal representative as another bidder or consultant, maintaining direct or indirect contacts with another bidder or consultant which allows us to have or give access to information contained in the respective applications, bids or proposals, influencing them or influencing decisions of the Contracting Authority;

3.4) Being engaged in a consulting services activity, which, by its nature, may be in conflict with the assignments that we would carry out for the Contracting Authority;

3.5) In the case of the Contract involving my purchase of goods, works or plants:

1. Having prepared or having been associated with a consultant who prepared specifications, drawings, calculations and other documentation to be used in the selection process of this Contract;
2. Having been recruited (or being proposed to be recruited) ourselves or any of our affiliates, to carry out works supervision or inspection for this Contract;
3. If we are a state-owned entity, and to compete in a selection process, we certify that we have legal and financial autonomy and that we operate under commercial laws and regulations.
4. We certify that the origin of the funds of the company legal entity and the company founder(s) and chief executive officer is not due to a crime or misdemeanour, including any act or omission intended to damage the European Union budget and involving (i) the use or presentation of false, inaccurate or incomplete statements or documents, which has as its effect the misappropriation or wrongful retention of funds or any illegal reduction in resources of the general budget of the European Union; (ii) the non-disclosure of information with the same effect; and (iii) misappropriation of such funds for purposes other than those for which such funds were originally granted .
5. We undertake to bring to the attention of the Contracting Authority, which will inform AFD, any change in situation with regard to points 2 to 5 here above and will take all necessary measures to remedy the situation.
6. In the context of the selection process and performance of the corresponding contract:

7.1) We have not and we will not engage in any dishonest conduct (act or omission) deliberately indented to deceive others, to intentionally conceal items, to violate or vitiate someone's consent, to make them circumvent legal or regulatory requirements and/or to violate their internal rules in order to obtain illegitimate profit;

7.2) We have not and we will not engage in any dishonest conduct (act or omission) contrary to our legal or regulatory obligations or our internal rules in order to obtain illegitimate profit;

7.3) We have not promised, offered or given and we will not promise, offer or give, directly or indirectly to (i) any Person who holds a legislative, executive, administrative or judicial mandate within the State of the Contracting Authority regardless of whether that Person was nominated or elected, regardless of the permanent or temporary, paid or unpaid nature of the position and regardless of the hierarchical level the Person occupies, (ii) any other Person who performs a public function, including for a State institution or a State-owned company, or who provides a public service, or (iii) any other person defined as a Public Officer by the national laws of the Contracting Authority’s country, an undue advantage of any kind, for himself or for another Person or entity, for such Public Officer to act or refrain from acting in his official capacity;

7.4) We have not promised, offered or given and we will not promise, offer or give, directly or indirectly to any Person who occupies an executive position in a private sector entity or works for such an entity, regardless of the nature of his/her capacity, any undue advantage of any kind, for himself or another Person or entity for such Person to perform or refrain from performing any act in breach of its legal, contractual or professional obligations;

7.5) We have not and we will not engage in any practice likely to influence the contract award process to the detriment of the Contracting Authority and, in particular, in any anti-competitive practice having for object or for effect to prevent, restrict or distort competition, namely by limiting access to the market or the free exercise of competition by other undertakings;

7.6) Neither we nor any of the members of our joint venture or any of our suppliers, contractors, subcontractors, consultants or subconsultants shall acquire or supply any equipment nor operate in any sectors under an embargo of the United Nations, the European Union or France;

7.7) We commit ourselves to comply with and ensure that all of our suppliers, contractors, subcontractors, consultants or subconsultants comply with international environmental and labour standards, consistent with laws and regulations applicable in the country of implementation of the Contract, including the fundamental conventions of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and international environmental treaties. Moreover, we shall implement environmental and social risks mitigation measures when specified in the environmental and social commitment plan (ESCP) provided by the Contracting Authority.

7.8) In the context of the project financed through the Contracting Authority, we undertake to bring to the attention of the Contracting Authority, which will inform AFD, any acts in relation to sections 7.1 to 7.7 above which we become aware or suspect that any third party has committed in relation to the project, and to take all necessary measures to remedy the situation.

1. We, as well as members of our joint venture and our suppliers, contractors, subcontractors, consultants or subconsultants authorise AFD to inspect accounts, records and other documents relating to the selection process and performance of the contract and to have them audited by auditors appointed by AFD.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ In the capacity of: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Duly empowered to sign in the name and on behalf of: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Dated:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. The logic for the intervention is composed of all the activities implemented, resources mobilized, the adapted monitoring method (including indicators), the achievements, results and expected outcomes, as well as all hypotheses that explain how the activities have led to the outcomes in the context of the intervention. The reconstruction of the logic of the intervention must particularly allow the evaluator to: (i) clarify the objectives of the intervention and express them as a hierarchy of expected outcomes, and (ii) help to appreciate the internal coherence of the intervention. It should also help to identify the initial hypotheses (or assumptions, often implicit) that guided the project's design a priori, and to assess its validity a posteriori. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)