**Terms of Reference**

**Evaluation of the Counter Illegal Wildlife Trade Ranger Training Programme**

**Contest needed**

**Table of abbreviations / definitions needed**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Abbreviations / Terms** | **Definition** |
| The Authority | The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs |
| CITES | Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora |
| CIWT | Counter Illegal Wildlife Trade |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| FCDO | Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office |
| IWT | Illegal Wildlife Trade |
| MOD | Ministry of Defence |
| NAPTF | National Anti-Poaching Taskforce (Zambia) |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| ODA | Official Development Assistance |
| The Programme | Counter Illegal Wildlife Trade Ranger Training Programme |
| SDGs | Sustainable Development Goals |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |

1. **Introduction & Background**

*The Authority*

* 1. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (the “**Authority**”) is the UK government department responsible for safeguarding our natural environment, supporting our world-leading food and farming industry, and sustaining a thriving rural economy. The Authority also helps to deliver the government’s international poverty reduction and sustainable development priorities through our breadth of international programming using Official Development Assistance (“**ODA**”).
	2. The Authority has three overarching international objectives centred on:
1. **The global environment:** Our strained relationship with nature affects the climate, global health, the economy and national resilience. This objective focuses on halting biodiversity loss, scaling up the use of nature-based solutions, protecting and enhancing ocean health and resilience, conserving endangered species, and sustainable land-use and wider resource use.
2. **Global trade:** Increasing secure, high-quality trade will be fundamental to supporting our stakeholders and UK consumers, projecting the UK’s global reputation for excellence, and safeguarding our national interest.
3. **Global health:** Improving human, animal and environmental health, based on a One Health approach, will be essential if the UK is to reduce the public health and economic impact of future disease emergence at home and abroad.
	1. Delivering on these objectives is essential for achieving 13 of the 17 UN Sustainable Development Goals (“**SDGs**”) which the UK committed to in 2015 and which provide a roadmap for achieving a better and more sustainable future for all.

*The Illegal Wildlife Trade*

* 1. The illegal wildlife trade (“**IWT**”) is a widespread and lucrative criminal activity causing major environmental and social harm globally. IWT can be defined as the unlawful trade, smuggling, poaching, capture of live animals and plants, or parts and products derived from them, that does not conform with either national or international laws and regulations governing its trade, for example the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (“**CITES**”).
	2. The IWT has been estimated to be worth up to £17 billion a year[[1]](#footnote-2). Nearly 6,000 different species of fauna and flora are impacted, with almost every country in the world playing a role in the illicit trade[[2]](#footnote-3). IWT threatens species, ecosystems, livelihoods, security, national economies and public health as well as fuelling corruption and undermining good governance and the rule of law.
	3. The UK is a long-standing global leader in efforts to eradicate the IWT and is a respected convener and advocate on the issue. The springboard for this was the UK’s support for the ground-breaking IWT conference series, which in London 2018 secured ambitious commitments from 65 governments across the globe to take urgent, coordinated action and has been hailed as a turning point in international efforts to tackle IWT.
	4. A significant limiting factor in tackling IWT in source countries is often the meeting of simple, yet fundamental needs around enforcement. Basic capacity, poor infrastructure, and a lack of suitable equipment can all severely hinder enforcement efforts. A lack of enforcement capacity, resulting in lower deterrents, is a key enabler of the IWT. Some actors that may otherwise refrain from engaging in illicit trade do not because the perceived risk of being caught and punished is low.
	5. Rangers are a key component in helping to protect species in their natural habitats from the threat of poaching. However, while counter-poaching efforts have been demonstrated to reduce poaching, success is characteristically limited by capacity, corruption and a lack of state and donor funding[[3]](#footnote-4). Therefore, addressing such capacity gaps is an important way to support and strengthen frontline enforcement efforts, focused on early interception by rangers, which is considered a determining factor for law enforcement success[[4]](#footnote-5).

*The Counter Illegal Wildlife Trade Ranger Training Programme*

* 1. Since 2015, the Authority has provided funding for the Counter Illegal Wildlife Trade (“**CIWT**”) Ranger Training programme, which is delivered by the UK Ministry of Defence (“**MOD**”). The Programme aims to reduce the number of poaching incidents in targeted African countries through the deployment of British Army counter-poaching operatives to train African park rangers in more effective and safer counter-poaching techniques. The CIWT Ranger Training Programme began in January 2015 following a request from President Ali Bongo Ondimba of Gabon for UK MOD assistance in combating IWT.
	2. The UK has been working in Gabon, Malawi and Zambia to provide support for local rangers in intelligence mapping, interception tracking tactics, medical skills, operations management and establishing an information network between protected areas to improve coordination of national and cross-border international efforts to disrupt IWT.
	3. The Authority has supported the following:
1. Ranger training was delivered in Gabon from 2015-2018.
2. Ranger training was delivered in Malawi from 2017-2019.
3. Funding was allocated in 2018 to the delivery of the CIWT “Taskforce” in Malawi and Zambia from 2018-2021.
4. Ranger Training has continued in Zambia from 2021 to the present day.
	1. The overall goal is to help reduce the impact of poaching by securing animals at their source and facilitate a skills-sharing exercise between troops and rangers to deliver sustainable outcomes.
5. **Evaluation Scope and Objectives**
	1. This section is comprised of the following sub-sections:
6. Overview
7. The Programme Outcomes
8. Evaluation Objectives
9. Risks and Challenges
10. Methodology

*Section 2 Sub-section A: Overview*

* 1. This Terms of Reference (“**ToR**”) sets out the Authority’s requirements for a Supplier to undertake an independent evaluation of the CIWT Ranger Training Programme activities in Malawi and Zambia from 2017-2022. The purpose of this Contract is to assess the extent to which the CIWT Ranger Training programme has achieved its outcomes as well as the sustainability and overall impact of the training provided.
	2. The evaluation will consider lessons learned, synergies with other regional management plans and programmes operating in the region, potential scope for scalability, value for money, viable cost-effective options for addressing known gaps and, if there is misalignment with regional programming, recommendations on where future activities can be embedded into regional management plans and other projects (including IWT Challenge Fund projects).
	3. The evidence gained through the evaluation on the programme’s effectiveness will be used to feed into decisions on how the Authority’s future IWT programming can best support long term wildlife management in the region.
	4. The evaluation will cover CIWT programme activities implemented by the British Army over the period of 2017-2022. This will include the initial training delivered in Malawi (2017-18), the CIWT ‘Taskforce’ delivered in Malawi and Zambia (2018-21) and the most recent programme in Zambia (2021-22). The evaluation will not consider the ranger training delivered in Gabon.

*Section 2 Subsection B: The Programme Outcomes*

* 1. The Supplier will determine the extent to which the CIWT Ranger Training Programme has met its outcomes. The Programme outcomes, outlined below, have evolved as the programme has progressed and moved across countries.
	2. The CIWT ‘Taskforce’ (2018-21) in Zambia and Malawi planned to deliver the following outcomes:
1. Expanded counter poaching work, delivered by the MOD, which results in safer, more effective counter poaching in African National Parks (specifically Liwonde National Park, Malawi and Kafue National Park, Zambia).
2. Better integration of counter poaching work and local communities leading to a more sustainable future for counter poaching efforts.
3. More effective communication and intelligence sharing between national parks and governments, fitting with the ambitions of the Green Corridor.
4. Better supported and more professional park rangers.
	1. The CIWT Ranger Training programme in Zambia (2021-22) aims to deliver the following high-level outcomes:
5. Outcome 1: All Kafue National Park rangers and National Anti-Poaching Taskforce (“**NAPTF**”) personnel enhance their tactical and operational field skills in order to more effectively counter poaching.
6. Outcome 2: Operations room staff and rangers at Kafue National Park enhance their intelligence-led patrolling capability and support sharing across a network of Zambian parks to aid enforcement of wildlife laws.
7. Outcome 3: Sustained, long-term capacity is built in Zambia and this is measured. Future work is scoped to allow for the programme to successfully move onto the next stage of the strategic plan.

*Section 2 Sub-section C: Evaluation Objectives*

* 1. The four main evaluation objectives and associated research questions in relation to this tender are outlined below. In consultation with the Authority, the Supplier will be responsible for refining the proposed research questions under each of the four evaluation objectives and identifying the most suitable approach and methodologies to respond to them.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Objective** | **Research Questions** |
| **Objective 1:** **To assess the extent to which the CIWT Ranger Training programme delivered the programme outcomes. This includes identifying the strengths, weaknesses and value for money of the approach taken.**  | The Supplier should assess this objective by understanding:1. Whether the programme has achieved the outcomes and objectives outlined in the approved business cases (to be provided by The Authority). Are there any differential results across countries, national parks and targeted groups and what can these be attributed to?
2. The extent to which the training was adapted to the local context, national parks and needs of the park rangers (where there is an appropriate baseline).
3. While this was not a direct objective of the training delivery, is there any evidence of:
	1. The programme providing a more effective deterrent to poaching and/or a reduction in poaching following UK support?
	2. The programme supporting an increased proportion of arrests or prosecutions of poachers?
	3. Changes in the types of poaching that are occurring in the parks?
4. How confident can we be that the programme caused any observed changes?
5. What is the value for money of the intervention and chosen delivery model? Of particular interest is the sustainability of this type of investment, and the impact in relation to this type of investment.
6. How were lessons learned incorporated across the various iterations of the programme?
	1. What worked well, or less well, for whom and why?
	2. Could the format, delivery or content of the training be improved?
	3. Is additional / other support needed?
 |
| **Objective 2:** **To assess the extent to which the improvement in ranger capacity has delivered sustainable longer-term outcomes for national parks and local communities.**  | The Supplier should assess this objective by understanding:1. What has the impact of the programme been on rangers’ approaches to tackling poaching? Consider levels of motivation, impacts on their job and any changes in activities for tackling IWT.
2. To what extent have local community groups (disaggregated by gender) been impacted, how and why?
3. How have African Parks, Civil Society Organisations (“**CSO**”s), Non-Governmental Organisations (“**NGO**”s), Government officials and key stakeholders in each country perceived the programme and its wider impact?
4. Has the programme generated, or is it expected to generate, any significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, outcomes?
 |
| **Objective 3: To assess how the programme complements[[5]](#footnote-6) other interventions and programmes in the region, including holistic consideration of its fit with Malawian and Zambian national wildlife management plans.** | The Supplier should assess this objective by understanding:1. How this programme complements other poaching, IWT and wildlife management interventions in Malawi and Zambia?
2. How does the programme fit with the government of Malawi’s and Zambia’s national wildlife management and national park / nature plans?
3. What are the wider benefits of the programme?
 |
| **Objective 4:** **To take lessons learned from the programme evaluation objectives 1-3 to: (a) make recommendations to inform if and how this approach can be improved and transferred to other contexts (locations; ecoregions), and (b) how this type of intervention can be better integrated into wildlife management and counter IWT work?** | The Supplier should assess this objective by understanding:1. What are the fundamental and context specific causal factors which led to the observed impacts?
2. Can the programme be expected to work in other contexts and countries? What factors need to be considered?
3. What has been learned about training and capacity building to reduce poaching and protect species at source and how can this learning be used for, and transferred to, future programming?
4. Do other interventions need to take place alongside the ranger training to address gaps (e.g. community engagement, gender) and maximise the impact on tackling poaching and IWT?
5. How can ranger training be effectively embedded with other IWT funded programmes and interventions in Malawi and Zambia e.g. the UK funded Biodiverse Landscape Fund and IWT Challenge Fund?
6. How can data collection and monitoring on impact be improved to better evaluate the programme in the future?
 |

*Section 2 Sub-section D: Risks and Challenges*

* 1. The Authority is aware that the Supplier may face a number of challenges while meeting the requirements of this Contract. Therefore, different approaches and methodologies may be required for each country to ensure that the training delivered is assessed against the objectives and outcomes that they set out to achieve.
	2. Evaluation challenges may include:
1. The programme objectives and requirements have changed and evolved over time and are different for each country.

1. Implementation has been completed in Malawi but continues in Zambia.
2. The quality and amount of data and evidence available to measure the outcomes and impacts of the programme.
3. Collecting data on sensitive topics such as poaching.
4. Attribution of programme impacts within a complex environment and given the different drivers and influencing factors that contribute to the scale of poaching and IWT.
5. Attribution of long-term impacts of the programme beyond the programme.
	1. While there has been a range of efforts to measure the effectiveness of the programme by the MOD and the Authority, and mechanisms put in place to capture qualitative and quantitative data, there are likely to be some gaps in data and available evidence.
	2. Data and evidence available for the evaluation includes:
6. Project documents, e.g. business case, training curriculums and reports, baseline reports.
7. Pre/post knowledge/attitude surveys of trainees
8. Qualitative feedback from trainees and trainers
9. Limited poaching data
	1. The Supplier must consider and propose how to address these challenges in their submission and describe what they understand to be in-scope, considering both time period, breadth/depth and cross-cutting issues.

*Section 2 Sub-section E: Methodology*

* 1. The Supplier must outline their approach to:
1. Primary data collection
2. Secondary data analysis
3. Evaluation design to address the above Evaluation Objectives and Research Questions set out in Section 2 Sub-section C.
4. Risks and issue management including proposed mitigations.
	1. The Supplier is expected to use mixed methods for the evaluation, as different methodologies and analysis may be required for each objective to ensure the reliability of findings, generate new knowledge and insights, and triangulate information obtained to ensure analytical rigour.
	2. The Supplier must provide a clear evaluation framework to be further refined in the inception phase, showing how each of the Evaluation Objectives and Research Questions will be addressed, including key data sources and methods. The Evaluation Framework used must be rigorous and sufficiently robust in order to identify changes that may be plausibly associated with the programme and that may contribute to the desired outcomes and impact. The analytical framework must identify pathways through which these changes have and could happen.
	3. The Supplier must pay clear and specific attention to hearing and learning from direct beneficiaries within their approach and methodology. Considerations regarding the representative participation of beneficiary groups and key stakeholders will be further discussed during the inception phase.
	4. The Supplier must work with the programme implementors (MOD), programme funder (the Authority), and other influencing departments (Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (“**FCDO**”) during the inception phase to identify and confirm in-country delivery partners, direct beneficiaries, and opportunities to include a range of data sources for the evaluation.
5. **The Recipient**
	1. The primary audience for the evaluation is the Authority policy and programme staff, the MOD, British Army and FCDO. It is envisaged that these primary audiences will use the findings to learn across the programme to understand what has worked, how and why.
6. **The Requirements**
	1. This section is comprised of the following sub-sections:
7. Implementation requirements
8. Data Sources
9. Summary of outputs and indicative workplan
10. Key Deliverable 1: Inception workshop
11. Key Deliverable 2: Inception Report
12. Key Deliverable 3: Workshop to present early findings
13. Key Deliverable 4: Final Report

*Section 4 Sub-Section A: Implementation requirements*

* 1. The Supplier must assign staff to deliver this Contract who have the skills, knowledge and experience required to meet the requirements of this Contract. The Supplier’s expertise must include:
1. Knowledge and experience of undertaking evaluation/ impact assessment projects in African countries, using mixed methods approaches that meet recognised standards for credibility and rigour.
2. A strong understanding of various quantitative and qualitative evaluation methodologies, including conducting research on sensitive or illegal subjects such as poaching.
3. Extensive skills in qualitative data collection and analysis.
4. Knowledge of environmental crime in African countries.
5. A strong understanding of the Malawi and Zambia contexts.

*Section 4 Sub-Section B: Data Sources*

* 1. The Supplier must use a mixture of data sources to deliver this Contract.
	2. The Supplier will undertake a mixture of:
1. Document reviews
2. Literature reviews
3. Data analysis of existing data
4. New data generation via:
	1. Field visits to selected national parks in Malawi and Zambia.
	2. Key informant interviews and focus groups (utilising virtually as well as face to face approaches) with a wide variety of stakeholders. Key informants and stakeholders will include Park Rangers, National Parks and Government personnel, civil society and local NGOs, community members, the British Army and FCDO Country Posts.
	3. Information provided by interlocutors may require double-checking before being presented as fact.
	4. The Supplier will engage openly and constructively with the MOD, British Army and FCDO Country Posts. MOD, British Army, Embassies / High Commissions may choose to accompany the Supplier to some meetings, e.g. with government officials or to provide introductions with stakeholders.
	5. The Supplier must seek approval from British Ambassadors or High Commissioners, as relevant, or their authorised representatives, prior to arranging meetings with foreign government officials.

*Section 4 Sub-Section C: Summary of outputs and indicative workplan*

* 1. The table below outlines the proposed outputs for the evaluation, and the required timelines for their delivery. A full workplan will be proposed by the Supplier.
	2. The following sub-sections set out each output in further detail.
	3. Table 1: Workplan and timelines

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outputs** | **Description** | **Audience** | **Indicative timings** |
| Inception workshop | The Supplier to facilitate a workshop with the Authority, British Army, MOD and FCDO to kick off the evaluation. | The Authority, MOD, British Army, FCDO posts | 1 week after contract is signed |
| Inception report | An inception report containing a detailed methodology and approach to the evaluation.  | The Authority policy and programme teams | 3 weeks after contract is signed |
| Workshop to present early findings | The Supplier will facilitate a workshop to present early findings, key lessons, and initial recommendations. | The Authority, MOD, British Army, FCDO posts | 3.5 months after contract is signed |
| Draft Final Report | Draft final report presenting analysis, key findings and targeted recommendations. | The Authority policy and programme teams | 4.5 months after contract is signed |
| Final Report | Full evaluation report following feedback. | The Authority, MOD, British Army, FCDO posts | 5 months after contract is signed |

*Section 4 Sub-Section D Key Deliverable 1: Inception Workshop*

* 1. An inception workshop will be held to kick off the evaluation with key stakeholders – the Supplier, the Authority, MOD, British Army and FCDO. This will provide an opportunity for an initial discussion on:
1. Identification of programme and wider documentation available and additional data required to meet evaluation needs.
2. Timings and recommendations for the fieldwork and data collection in Malawi and Zambia.
3. Plans for any HMG support to be provided during the evaluation work.

*Section 4 Sub-Section E Key Deliverable 2: Inception report*

* 1. The Inception Report must describe the conceptual framework the evaluation team will use in undertaking the evaluation and contain the methodology, quantitative and/or qualitative data collection methods and instruments, the assessment questions, sampling methodology, framework for analysis, workplan, etc.
	2. The Inception Report must reflect the Supplier’s review of literature, programme documents and the gaps that the fieldwork will fill.
	3. The Inception Report must outline any ethical and/or safeguarding considerations. A template for the inception report will be provided. We anticipate the inception report to be approximately 6-12 pages in length.
	4. Fieldwork will only commence once this report has been reviewed and agreed with the Authority and is expected to take place weeks 4-8.

*Section 4 Sub-Section F Key Deliverable 3: Workshop to present early findings*

* 1. Upon completion of the fieldwork and primary data collection in Malawi and Zambia, and before the final draft evaluation report is submitted, the Supplier will produce a presentation to provide an overview of the fieldwork and the preliminary key findings.
	2. The presentation must include any methodological and logistical challenges affecting the findings and outline initial recommendations.
	3. The presentation must be delivered to the Authority, the British Army, MOD and FCDO, to allow for reflection on the emerging key learnings.

*Section 4 Sub-Section G Key Deliverable 4: Final Report*

* 1. A draft final report, using a provided template, must be produced on the agreed date for review by the Authority.
	2. The Final Report must clearly summarise the methodology, challenges faced, analysis and key findings under each of the evaluation objectives, lessons learned and targeted recommendations. We anticipate the final report to be approximately 25-40 pages in length and would include introduction, methodology, results including statistical analysis, data representation in graphs/tables, and conclusion including recommendations. Annexes must be used for more detailed information and analysis as required.
	3. Having responded appropriately to feedback given by the Authority, the Supplier must produce a Final Report by the agreed deadline, which will be approved and signed off by the Authority.
	4. The Final Report will be shared with the British Army, MOD and FCDO to ensure that learnings are shared and disseminated as appropriate.
1. **Logistics and procedures**
	1. The Supplier will be responsible for all logistic arrangements for themselves and members of the evaluation team. The Authority, MOD and FCDO will facilitate convening of meetings and national park visits where necessary. All relevant expenses must be covered by the Supplier budget.
2. **Due diligence**
	1. Due to the sensitivity of this work, the successful bidder awarded the contract will undergo due diligence checks before the contract is signed and will be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement (NDA).
1. Nellemann, C. et al. (2016) The Rise of Environmental Crime: A Growing Threat to Natural Resources, Peace, Development and Security, A UNEP-INTERPOL Rapid Response assessment. Whilst there are many uncertainties, various estimates place the 2016 global value of illegal wildlife trade between $7bn and $23bn. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. UNODC (2020) World Wildlife Crime Report: Trafficking in protected species. Nearly 6000 different species of fauna and flora were seized between 1999 and 2018, as recorded by The World WISE Database. Suspected traffickers of some 150 citizenships have been identified. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Illegal Wildlife Trade: Scale, Processes, and Governance Michael ‘t Sas-Rolfes,1,2 Daniel W.S. Challender,1,3 Amy Hinsley,1,3 Diogo Veríssimo,1,3,4 and E.J. Milner-Gulland1,3 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Milner-Gulland EJ, Leader-Williams N. 1992. A model of incentives for the illegal exploitation of black rhinos and elephants: poaching pays in Luangwa Valley, Zambia. J. Appl. Ecol. 29:388–401. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Complement may be addressing a clear and important gap in action or solutions, or adds value to, or synergises. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)