

Terms of Reference
Endline Evaluation and Final Learning Documentation of the MARVEL SEA Project
No. ToR: 080/AP/Simokerto/APM/V/FY26

1. Title of Assignment

Item	Description
Assignment title	Terms of Reference for the Endline Evaluation and Final Learning Documentation of the MARVEL SEA Project
Assignment type	External consultant
Project name	MARVEL SEA Project - Mangrove Adaptive and Resilient Village for Enhanced Livelihoods by Adopting Sustainable and Environmentally Friendly Aquaculture
Implementing organization	Wahana Visi Indonesia, Area Program (AP) Simokerto, Surabaya
Project location	Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia, particularly Wonorejo Urban Village and Keputih Urban Village
Project duration	15 November 2024 - 15 October 2026
Project end date	15 October 2026
Expected completion of assignment	No later than 10 October 2026, before project closure
Indicative level of effort	45-60 working days across the full consultant team
Proposal submission deadline	10 July 2026
Submission contact	Mangara Tua Sitohang, Project Team Leader, Mangara_sitohang@wvi.org

Acronyms, Abbreviations, and Key Terms

Acronym / Term	Indonesian Term	English Term	Explanation
AKSARA	Aplikasi Perencanaan dan Pemantauan Aksi Pembangunan Rendah Karbon Indonesia	Planning and Monitoring Application for Indonesia's Low Carbon Development Actions	Government platforms related to low-carbon development planning and monitoring.
AP	Area Program	Area Program	Refers to WVI's area-based programming structure, such as Area Program (AP) Simokerto.
DIP	Detailed Implementation Plan	Detailed Implementation Plan	Project implementation planning document to be reviewed by the consultant where available.
FGD	Focus Group Discussion	Focus Group Discussion	A qualitative data collection method expected in the evaluation.
GEDSI	Gender Equality, Disability, and Social Inclusion	Gender Equality, Disability, and Social Inclusion	Cross-cutting lenses for inclusion, participation, accessibility, safeguarding, and do-no-harm analysis.
GIS	Geographic Information	Geographic Information	Relevant to optional spatial

	System	System	data review, mapping, or triangulation of site and area claims.
IEC	Information, Education, and Communication	Information, Education, and Communication / Informasi, Edukasi, dan Komunikasi	Refers to educational, communication, awareness, and campaign materials.
ITT	Indicator Tracking Table	Indicator Tracking Table	Project monitoring tools used to track progress against indicators and targets.
KII	Key Informant Interview	Key Informant Interview	A qualitative data collection method is expected in the evaluation.
Log frame	Logical Framework	Logical Framework	Project logic documents containing goals, outcomes, outputs, indicators, assumptions, and means of verification.
MARVEL	Mangrove Adaptive and Resilient Village for Enhanced Livelihoods	Mangrove Adaptive and Resilient Village for Enhanced Livelihoods	Refers to the broader MARVEL program/project framing, including Phase 1 legacy results.
MARVEL SEA	Mangrove Adaptive and Resilient Village for Enhanced Livelihoods by Adopting Sustainable and Environmentally Friendly Aquaculture	Mangrove Adaptive and Resilient Village for Enhanced Livelihoods by Adopting Sustainable and Environmentally Friendly Aquaculture	Full project name.
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning	WVI functions related to project quality, monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning.
MoA	Memorandum of Agreement	Memorandum of Agreement	Formal agreement document with partners or stakeholders, where relevant.
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding	Memorandum of Understanding	Formal cooperation or understanding document with partners or stakeholders, where relevant.
MRV	Measurement, Reporting, and Verification	Measurement, Reporting, and Verification	Relevant to carbon, climate, monitoring, and readiness-related analysis.
MSME	Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise	Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise / Usaha Mikro, Kecil, dan Menengah	English term corresponding to UMKM in Bahasa Indonesia.
NRM	Natural Resource Management	Natural Resource Management	Relevant to mangrove, aquaculture, silvofishery, and community-based environmental

			management.
OECD-DAC	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee	Main evaluation framework referenced in the ToR: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.
PKK	Pemberdayaan dan Kesejahteraan Keluarga	Family Welfare Empowerment / Family Welfare Movement	Community/women’s structure is relevant to livelihood, women’s participation, and community activities.
Pokdarwis	Kelompok Sadar Wisata	Local Tourism Awareness Group / Tourism Awareness Group	Local community groups related to tourism or ecotourism activities.
ProKlim	Program Kampung Iklim	Climate Village Program	Government climate programs relevant to local climate action, registration, and readiness.
S4T	Savings for Transformation	Savings for Transformation	WVI/community-based savings and financial literacy mechanisms.
SRN-PPI	Sistem Registri Nasional Pengendalian Perubahan Iklim	National Registry System for Climate Change Control	Government registry system related to climate change reporting and registration.
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program	United Nations Environment Program	Environmental and social evaluation lenses are used to complement the OECD-DAC framework.

Key Technical and Evaluation Terms

Term	Meaning / Explanation	Notes for This ToR
Blue carbon	Carbon stored in coastal and marine ecosystems, including mangroves	Relevant to carbon learning, carbon stock assessment, MRV, and climate finance readiness.
Carbon market policy assessment	Assessment of relevant carbon market regulations, policy context, and applicability	Should be framed as policy learning/readiness unless stronger evidence is available.
Carbon stock assessment	Assessment of carbon stored in vegetation, soil, or ecosystem components	Should be framed as assessment/learning unless formal verification supports stronger claims.
Climate finance readiness	Preparedness to explore climate finance opportunities	Should not be treated as confirmed access to climate finance or carbon revenue.
Climate resilience	Capacity of communities, systems, or ecosystems to anticipate, cope with, adapt to, or recover from climate-related risks	Relevant to mangrove restoration, livelihood resilience, silvofishery, and governance.
Community-based natural resource management	Community participation in managing, protecting, monitoring, or using natural resources sustainably	Relevant to mangrove protection, monitoring, maintenance, and local ownership.

Dissolved oxygen	Amount of oxygen dissolved in water	Water quality parameters relevant to pond/silvofishery monitoring where data are available.
Gross margin	Sales revenue minus direct production costs	Relevant only where livelihood/MSME/silvofishery financial records are available.
Human interest story	Participant- or community-focused story showing change, constraints, contribution, and lessons	Must be subject to consent and WVI safeguarding approval.
Integrated model	A project model that links mangrove restoration, silvofishery, livelihood, GEDSI, child/youth engagement, governance, and carbon learning	The evaluation should assess which components are proven, promising, uncertain, or require further investment.
Most Significant Change	Qualitative technique to collect and analyze stories of significant change	Mentioned as a qualitative approach where relevant and feasible.
Outcome harvesting	Evaluation approach used to identify and analyze outcomes, especially emergent or unexpected changes	Useful for complex interventions such as governance, livelihood change, silvofishery adoption, or community ownership.
pH	Measure of acidity or alkalinity of water	Water quality parameters relevant to pond/silvofishery monitoring where data are available.
Phase 1 legacy results	Results associated with the earlier MARVEL phase	Must be distinguished from MARVEL SEA Phase 2-specific contributions.
Phase 2 contribution	Results produced, maintained, strengthened, or supported during MARVEL SEA implementation	Must be separated from cumulative MARVEL results to avoid double-counting.
ProKlim readiness	Readiness or progress toward engagement with the Climate Village Program	Should not be framed as formal recognition unless documented evidence supports it.
Salinity	Salt concentration in water	Water quality parameters relevant to pond/silvofishery monitoring where data are available.
Silvofishery	Mangrove-integrated aquaculture system	Central model linking mangrove rehabilitation and sustainable pond/aquaculture management.
Spatial data review	Review of maps, geotagged data, GIS layers, satellite imagery, or other spatial evidence	Used where feasible to triangulate restoration, site, or area claims.
Turbidity	Cloudiness or suspended particles in water	Water quality parameters relevant to pond/silvofishery monitoring where data are available.
Water quality monitoring	Monitoring of water parameters such as pH, salinity, dissolved oxygen, and turbidity	Relevant to silvofishery, pond management, and environmental learning.

2. Background and Project Overview

2.1 Organizational Background

Wahana Visi Indonesia is a Christian humanitarian organization dedicated to working and collaborating to empower the most vulnerable children, families, and communities

through community development, advocacy, and emergency response for sustainable transformation regardless of religion, race, ethnicity, or gender. Through its area programs and grant-funded projects, WVI promotes child well-being, community resilience, environmental stewardship, livelihood strengthening, disaster risk reduction, and inclusive local development.

The MARVEL SEA Project is implemented in Surabaya, East Java, and administered by the Simokerto Area Program. The project is designed as an urban coastal resilience and mangrove-based community development initiative. It integrates mangrove restoration with climate adaptation in community-based natural resource management, especially in the aquaculture sector. The design is intended to mainstream gender equality by emphasizing women's economic empowerment and children's participation in climate action.

The endline evaluation is expected to assess MARVEL SEA achievement following the description above. The evaluation should examine whether the project has generated credible outputs, outcome-level changes, emerging impact signals, sustainability pathways, model validation, and scale-up learning that can inform final donor reporting, institutional learning, and future resource mobilization.

2.2 Proposal-Approved Project Identity, Target Groups, and Area Coverage

The donor-approved project proposal defines MARVEL SEA as Mangrove Adaptive and Resilient Village for Enhanced Livelihoods by Adopting Sustainable and Environmentally Friendly Aquaculture. The project period is 23 months, from 15 November 2024 to 15 October 2026. The approved target population includes people who are active in the mangrove area, including pond owners, pond cultivators, pond operators or managers, tenants, laborers, and community members whose livelihoods are linked to the mangrove area but are not primarily based on pond cultivation or aquaculture. These may include women-owned MSMEs, mangrove product processors or sellers, food sellers, ecotourism actors such as Local Tourism Awareness Group (Pokdarwis), youth or community group members involved in environmental and livelihood activities, and other local livelihood actors operating in or around the mangrove areas of Wonorejo Urban Village and Keputih Urban Village.

The approved direct participant target is 540 people, consisting of 100 adult men, 200 adult women, 120 boys, and 120 girls, distributed across Wonorejo Urban Village and Keputih Urban Village. The approved proposal does not specify a separate numerical target for participants with disabilities. However, because the proposal commits to encouraging participation regardless of gender, ethnicity, religion, and physical barriers, the evaluation must verify actual reach against the approved target, disaggregated by sex, age, location, community group, intervention type, and level of participation where records allow. Where disability-related data is available or where it can be ethically and safely collected during the evaluation, the consultant should also assess participation of persons with disabilities and identify whether project activities were accessible and inclusive.

The proposal shows Wonorejo Urban Village and Keputih Urban Village as the main project sites. Both are coastal and mangrove-related areas in East Surabaya associated with aquaculture, mangrove ecosystems, community groups, women's groups, youth groups, ecotourism groups, and local stakeholder institutions. The proposal also refers to a total intervention landscape of approximately 73 ha, including previous/ongoing mangrove rehabilitation monitoring areas, government-owned silvofishery (a mangrove-integrated aquaculture system) assets, and demo plot areas. For endline reporting, the consultant must verify what this figure consists of, including the area covered by mangrove rehabilitation or

monitoring, silvofishery assets, demonstration plots, and other project-supported intervention areas. The consultant should clarify the basis of calculation and source of verification using the approved proposal, maps, monitoring records, WVI-validated site records, field observation, and triangulation with relevant stakeholders.

2.3 Attribution Boundary Between MARVEL Phase 1 and MARVEL SEA

This evaluation must clearly distinguish between MARVEL (Phase 1) legacy results and MARVEL SEA (Phase 2) contributions. Project documentation shows that the earlier MARVEL phase contributed approximately 21,000 seedlings and prepared approximately 58 ha of mangrove rehabilitation area. MARVEL SEA's distinct contribution may include maintenance, monitoring, protection, improved vegetation density, expansion or strengthening of silvofishery, carbon-related learning, livelihood interventions, child/youth engagement, and governance or sustainability work.

The consultant must set up an attribution boundary during the desk review and apply it consistently throughout the evaluation. The final report must distinguish between cumulative results of the wider MARVEL program, results directly produced during MARVEL SEA implementation, maintenance or monitoring contributions to Phase 1 restoration areas, new or additional interventions under MARVEL SEA, and outcome-level changes that reflect combined investments across both phases. This distinction is essential to avoid double-counting restoration achievements or overstating MARVEL SEA's standalone contribution.

2.4 Urban Coastal Context of Surabaya

Surabaya's eastern coastal areas face complex environmental and economic challenges. Mangroves were extensively changed into traditional aquaculture ponds, which degraded over time and in turn emerged as water quality issues due to sedimentation and tidal dynamics, marine debris, and climate-related variability. Dependence on aquaculture and natural resources has further added economic complexity to the communities. During implementation, identified problems became evident as several core challenges, including unintegrated mangrove and aquaculture management, low acceptance of mangrove rehabilitation in pond areas, limited knowledge and technical guidance on silvofishery, moderate to poor mangrove health in mangrove and pond areas, land-use change from mangroves to ponds, reluctance by some landowners to plant mangroves inside ponds, marine debris interfering with mangrove growth, lack of waste management systems or policies in mangrove areas, and limited options and access for mangrove product processing and market development. The endline evaluation must assess whether and how the project addressed these challenges.

2.5 Mangroves, Climate Resilience, and Child Well-Being

Mangroves contribute to coastal protection, biodiversity, nursery habitat, water quality improvement, sediment stabilization, climate adaptation, and carbon storage. In the MARVEL SEA proposal, mangrove rehabilitation is also linked to community resilience, household food security, and child well-being. The approved proposal frames mangrove areas as protective ecosystems that may help reduce exposure to climate-related hazards, support aquatic food resources, and contribute to safer and more resilient environments for children and families, subject to site conditions, implementation quality, and available evidence.

However, mangrove-related ecological, livelihood, and climate outcomes take time and should be interpreted according to the strength of available evidence. The evaluation

must avoid overstating long-term ecosystem recovery, household food security impact, child nutrition impact, verified emission reduction, carbon credit readiness, or verified climate mitigation results unless supported by robust and appropriate evidence. Carbon-related studies, carbon stock assessments, regulation mapping, SRN/AKSARA learning, or carbon market policy assessments may be reported as technical outputs, baseline evidence, learning products, or early climate-mitigation potential but should not be framed as verified mitigation impact or certified carbon results unless formal verification and sufficient monitoring evidence are available. In the absence of nutrition-specific data, the evaluation may only frame MARVEL SEA's child food security contribution at the level of enabling conditions, such as ecosystem improvement, livelihood support, and sustainable aquaculture learning.

2.6 Silvofishery and Sustainable Pond Management

A central feature of MARVEL SEA is the connection between mangrove rehabilitation and sustainable aquaculture through silvofishery. The donor-approved MARVEL SEA proposal, informed by previous project learning and contextual analysis in Wonorejo Urban Village and Keputih Urban Village, recognizes several key barriers, including low acceptance of mangrove rehabilitation in pond areas, limited silvofishery knowledge, lack of locally tested best practice evidence, and weak technical guidance for integrating mangrove protection with pond-based aquaculture. Traditional aquaculture practices in the project areas are highly dependent on natural conditions such as tides, seasonal changes, salinity, and pond water quality. Climate variability further increases pond vulnerability, particularly where coastal protection functions, mangrove buffers, and other natural barriers are degraded or insufficient.

The project aims to support improved knowledge and practice in silvofishery, sustainable pond management, mangrove protection, and natural resource management. The proposal also refers to the development of a comprehensive contextualized silvofishery guideline and to support shrimp seeds, eco-enzymes, and aquaculture technology through aquaculture-based startup collaborations.

The endline evaluation must assess whether these elements were implemented, what evidence they generated, and whether they are technically, environmentally, socially, and economically useful for replication. Replication potential should not be assessed only from an ecological or technical perspective. The evaluation should also examine whether the silvofishery model shows credible economic value or early economic signals for pond farmers, such as improved harvest quantity or quality, reduced production costs, reduced feed or input dependency, improved survival or growth of fish/shrimp, reduced risk of crop failure, additional income opportunities such as seedling production or related activities, or improved farmer confidence in the business case.

The evaluation should not assume that silvofishery has been fully proven. It should examine what has been demonstrated, what remains uncertain, what constraints persist, and what changes emerged over time during the project period. The consultant should analyze silvofishery progress by year, implementation phase, and, where data are available, by pond production cycle. The evaluation should not automatically claim increased income or productivity unless supported by reliable harvest, cost, sales, or farmer record data. Where complete income or production-cycle data is unavailable, the evaluation should identify available proxy indicators and clearly distinguish between proven economic results, early indications, perceived benefits, cost-saving potential, and areas requiring further monitoring across additional production cycles. Finally, this evaluation should also function

as a learning document on implementation progress, including stalled progress, rerouted approaches, and terminated interventions.

2.7 Livelihoods, Financial Literacy, Savings for Transformation (S4T), Women's Economic Empowerment, and MSME Development

The proposal emphasizes livelihood strengthening, financial literacy, financial management, access to financial services, market access, and economic empowerment. Communities in the project areas face constraints related to limited financial management knowledge, limited access to capital, reliance on personal savings or family loans, limited insurance or risk-transfer mechanisms, and limited market access for mangrove and fisheries-related products.

Women's participation in mangrove-related activities and pond management is described as relatively low in some contexts due to social norms, male ownership patterns, and low bargaining position of female workers. The project includes women's groups, livelihood activities, savings mechanisms, Savings for Transformation (S4T) where implemented, financial service provider linkages, MSME-related support, and climate-adaptive income-generating activities.

The evaluation must identify constraints and enabling factors affecting livelihood, savings, and MSME outcomes, including production-related factors; market-related factors; financial factors; GEDSI-related factors; and institutional and sustainability factors. Detailed areas for review are provided in Annex 1 and Annex 3.

The evaluation should assess whether women's participation in livelihood, savings, or MSME activities created additional unpaid workload or household tension or whether household members, including men, provided support that enabled women's meaningful and safe participation. The evaluation should also examine how S4T or project-supported savings mechanisms have contributed to livelihood activities, women's economic participation, and mangrove-related implementation, maintenance, or community action.

The evaluation should also examine the two-way relationship between livelihood interventions and mangrove restoration. On one side, it should assess whether livelihood, S4T, MSME, and group-based economic activities have contributed to mangrove restoration, protection, maintenance, or sustainability through increased community ownership, group commitment, collective action, institutional strengthening, financial contribution, behavior change, or stronger motivation to protect mangrove areas. On the other side, the evaluation should assess whether mangrove restoration and protection have contributed, or have the potential to contribute, to the livelihoods and economic resilience of coastal communities, including through improved pond conditions, aquatic resources, mangrove-based products, ecotourism opportunities, environmental services, or reduced climate-related livelihood risks. The evaluation should also identify unintended negative effects or risks, including potential conflict over land or resource use, unclear ownership or management responsibility, unequal access to benefits, increased expectations of economic return, or tension where mangrove restoration takes place on land or assets not owned by pond farmers or community groups.

2.8 Children, Adolescents, Youth, and Environmental Education

MARVEL SEA engages children, adolescents, and youth in environmental protection activities, including learning, awareness, campaigns, and other age-appropriate participation pathways. The proposal references youth groups, children/youth forums, community mobilization, campaigns for mangrove protection, World Mangrove Day and/or National

Children Day activities, climate and mangrove learning materials, educational board game development, IEC materials, and wider public awareness.

The endline evaluation must assess child and youth engagement with strong safeguarding discipline. It should examine whether engagement was meaningful, age-appropriate, ethical, inclusive, and sustainable, using appropriate qualitative data collection where relevant and ethically feasible. The evaluation should look beyond attendance numbers and examine evidence of learning, participation quality, campaign outputs, leadership, environmental awareness, and realistic pathways for continued engagement. Claims about youth empowerment or child-led environmental action must be carefully qualified and evidence-based.

2.9 Governance, Policy Engagement, Waste Advocacy, and Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration

The proposal positions government-owned mangrove land, city government collaboration, community groups, financial institutions, and technical partners as important assets. The project was designed to build collaboration between WVI and the Surabaya City Government for mangrove rehabilitation, including permission and cooperation for rehabilitation activities on government asset land that were documented and applicable. The proposal also links the project to waste-related advocacy, environmental policy engagement, climate mitigation platforms, and government climate programs.

The endline evaluation must assess the quality and significance of governance and partnership results, including community-government coordination, city and provincial engagement, technical collaboration, university involvement, financial institution linkages, waste management advocacy, policy or regulatory mapping, and climate-related institutional readiness. The evaluation must avoid overstating policy influence, government ownership, or institutionalization unless there is documented evidence of follow-up, resource commitment, formal adoption, budget allocation, or continued implementation. Nonetheless, to give a holistic learning reference, the evaluation should also fairly document challenges and issues in governance-related interventions.

2.10 Carbon, MRV, SRN/AKSARA/ProKlim, and Climate Finance Readiness

The approved project design includes annual assessment to measure potential carbon sequestration, carbon stock measurement, program registration into government platforms such as Climate Village Program/National Registry System for Climate Change Control/Planning and Monitoring Application for Indonesia's Low Carbon Development Actions (ProKlim/SRN-PPI/AKSARA), a study on Indonesia's carbon market policy with a focus on applicability in the Surabaya context, and coordination with potential carbon market stakeholders at national and sub-national levels.

The evaluation must assess carbon-related learning and readiness carefully. It should examine what has been achieved in terms of carbon stock assessment, baseline information, monitoring systems, annual assessment cycles, MRV-related learning, government platform registration, ProKlim readiness, institutional roles, carbon market policy analysis, and future climate finance potential. It must clearly distinguish between carbon-related learning/readiness and verified carbon credits or certified emission reductions. Unless supported by formal verification and approved carbon methodology, the report must not claim carbon credits, monetizable carbon assets, certified emission reduction, or fully verified mitigation impact.

2.11 Need for the Endline Evaluation

MARVEL SEA will end on 15 October 2026. A structured endline evaluation is needed before project closure to consolidate evidence, validate achievements, assess outcome-level changes, document lessons, verify data quality, assess sustainability, and generate credible donor-facing learning. Without a rigorous endline process, important learning from silvofishery, adaptive mangrove restoration, women-centered livelihood mechanisms, child/youth engagement, governance coordination, carbon-related readiness, and community ownership may remain fragmented across activity reports, monitoring sheets, staff memory, and informal documentation.

3. Rationale for the Endline Evaluation

3.1 Donor Accountability

The evaluation will assess achievement against the donor-approved proposal, approved log frame, outcomes, outputs, indicators, targets, assumptions, and any approved revisions. It will identify which commitments were achieved, partially achieved, delayed, adapted, or not achieved. This is essential for transparent donor reporting and responsible project closure.

3.2 Outcome Measurement and Emerging Impact

Many project results are expected to occur at the level of knowledge, practice, coordination, institutional readiness, community ownership, and livelihood behavior. Some long-term impacts, particularly ecological recovery, carbon outcomes, household income changes, child well-being, child nutrition, and policy influence, may not be fully measurable within the project period. The evaluation must therefore assess outcome-level change and emerging impact signals rather than loosely claiming final long-term impact.

3.3 Model Validation

MARVEL SEA is expected to test an integrated urban coastal resilience model linking mangrove restoration, silvofishery, livelihood strengthening, women's empowerment, child/youth engagement, governance, and carbon-related learning. The endline evaluation must assess which elements of the model are well-supported by evidence, which are promising but require further validation, which remains uncertain, and which should not be scaled without redesign or additional investment.

3.4 Learning and Adaptive Management

The project has operated in a complex implementation environment involving ecological uncertainty, tidal and weather conditions, community perceptions, livelihood pressures, administrative processes, technical learning, and multi-stakeholder coordination. The endline must document what worked, what did not work, why, and how the project was adapted. This learning is essential for future WVI programming and for avoiding repeated design or implementation weaknesses.

3.5 Sustainability and Exit Planning

The evaluation must assess which results are likely to continue after project closure, which require further technical support or funding, and which depend on community ownership, government follow-up, market linkages, financial mechanisms, or partner engagement. The evaluation should provide clear recommendations for final closure actions and post-project follow-up.

3.6 Future Donor Engagement and Resource Mobilization

The endline report should generate credible evidence that can support future donor engagement, concept notes, proposals, advocacy, and institutional learning. This should not be written as promotional material. The resource mobilization value of the evaluation will depend on honest evidence: what is proven, what is promising, what remains uncertain, what investment gaps exist, and what minimum conditions are needed for scale-up.

4. Objectives of the Assignment

4.1 General Objective

The general objective of this assignment is to conduct a rigorous, independent, proposal-informed, and evidence-based endline evaluation of the MARVEL SEA Project in order to assess project achievements, outcome-level changes, emerging impact signals, implementation learning, sustainability prospects, and the validity of the integrated mangrove-silvofishery-livelihood-governance model, while producing donor-ready final documentation that supports accountability, institutional learning, sustainability planning, and future scale-up or resource mobilization.

4.2 Specific Objectives

1. Assess project achievement against the donor-approved project proposal, approved log frame, outcomes, outputs, indicators, targets, and any approved project revisions, while reviewing the validity of key design and log frame assumptions and analyzing how fulfilled, partially fulfilled, or unmet assumptions affected project implementation, results, sustainability, and scale-up potential.
2. Verify project achievement against the approved direct participant target of 540 individuals, consisting of 100 adult men, 200 adult women, 120 boys, and 120 girls, disaggregated by sex, age, community group, intervention type, and location. Although the approved proposal does not specify a separate numerical target for persons with disabilities, the evaluation must also review the availability and quality of disability-related participant data where captured, assess whether persons with disabilities or participants facing physical barriers were meaningfully and safely included, and identify whether project activities applied reasonable accessibility and inclusion measures. Any deviations from approved participant targets or gaps in disaggregated data should be documented and analyzed.
3. Verify final intervention area figures against the approved 73 ha intervention landscape, including mangrove rehabilitation monitoring areas, government-owned silvofishery assets, and demo plot areas, and document any deviations, inconsistencies, or revised figures with explanation.
4. Distinguish between cumulative results from the wider MARVEL program, including MARVEL Phase 1 legacy results, and specific contributions made during MARVEL SEA Phase 2, particularly in relation to mangrove planting, maintenance, monitoring, protection, survival rates, vegetation density, restored or monitored areas, silvofishery expansion, community engagement, livelihood activities, and governance outcomes. Analyze ecological restoration progress, mangrove survival, site suitability, vegetation density, maintenance practices, species performance, adaptive planting methods, and technical learning.
5. Assess the implementation, adoption, and viability of silvofishery and sustainable pond management, including farmer knowledge, acceptance, practice change,

productivity indications, technical constraints, financial constraints, and replication readiness.

6. Evaluate the quality, use, and replication value of the contextualized silvofishery guideline, if developed, and assess whether aquaculture technology inputs, shrimp seeds, eco-enzymes, or startup partnerships contributed to silvofishery results.
7. Assess community-based natural resource management, including community participation, local leadership, monitoring, protection, maintenance, collective action, and post-project ownership.
8. Evaluate how livelihood interventions function as an enabling pathway for sustainable mangrove restoration, protection, and coastal community resilience. The evaluation should assess whether financial literacy, S4T where implemented, savings mechanisms, women's economic empowerment, circular economy activities, mangrove-based and aquaculture-based MSMEs, nursery-related livelihood activities, and relevant livelihood linkages with silvofishery have generated economic incentives or early economic signals, strengthened community capacity, encouraged community ownership, and increased willingness and ability to maintain and protect restored mangrove areas. The evaluation should also identify any unintended negative effects or risks, including unequal access to benefits, increased workload, unrealistic expectations of economic return, unclear maintenance responsibility, or potential conflict related to land, assets, or resource use.
9. Review and use the results of the GEDSI assessment conducted under Activity 3.1.5 (GEDSI Assessment) and assess whether GEDSI findings were incorporated into project implementation, particularly in livelihood design, women's group activities, and inclusive participation strategies.
10. Assess child, adolescent, and youth engagement in environmental protection, including quality of participation, learning outcomes, safeguarding, campaign outputs, board game/learning material use, inclusive IEC material, and sustainability beyond one-off events.
11. Examine governance, policy engagement, partnership, and institutional ownership, including cooperation with local government, technical partners, universities, financial institutions, community structures, and waste management for advocacy stakeholders.
12. Assess carbon-related learning, annual carbon stock/baseline work, MRV readiness, SRN/AKSARA/ProKlim-related progress, carbon market policy assessment, and realistic future climate finance opportunities and limitations.
13. Document unintended outcomes, implementation barriers, original risk assumptions, adaptive management decisions, and lessons learned.
14. Assess sustainability, exit readiness, and the likelihood that key results will continue after 15 October 2026.
15. Identify replication and scale-up potential for future donor proposals, government adoption, technical partnerships, neighboring districts, or future WVI programming.
16. Develop practical and prioritized recommendations for WVI, communities, local government, technical partners, donors, and future programming.
17. Produce a donor-ready final report, executive summary/donor brief, presentation deck, proposal-to-endline alignment matrix, endline evidence matrix, clean documentation package, case studies, and learning/scale-up notes.

5. Scope of Work

5.1 Geographic Scope

The evaluation will cover MARVEL SEA implementation areas in Surabaya, East Java, particularly Wonorejo Urban Village and Keputih Urban Village. The geographic scope includes:

- mangrove rehabilitation and monitoring areas supported by the project;
- silvofishery ponds, demo plots, and pond-based intervention sites;
- coastal/open-area restoration sites where relevant;
- community activity locations in Wonorejo Urban Village and Keputih Urban Village;
- women's group, savings/livelihood, and MSME activity locations;
- child/youth environmental engagement locations;
- locations of disability-inclusive initiatives, where applicable;
- relevant urban village, sub-district, city government, provincial government, university, technical partner, financial institution, and market actor locations.

The consultant must review project maps, approved proposal figures, monitoring records, Phase 1 records, and field realities to determine the most relevant site sample. The consultant must verify any inconsistency between proposal figures, implementation records, maps, and final monitoring data.

5.2 Programmatic Scope

The evaluation will cover all major project outcomes, outputs, and cross-cutting areas.

5.2.1 Outcome 1: Mangrove Rehabilitation, Carbon Learning, and Carbon Programming Readiness

The evaluation will assess activities related to annual carbon stock assessment, potential emission reduction estimation, government climate mitigation platform registration, SRN/AKSARA/ProKlim-related learning, MRV readiness, ProKlim orientation or registration progress, and contribution to climate resilience or low-carbon development narratives. It must assess whether Output 1.1 activities were completed, including carbon stock measurement and registration into government platforms.

The evaluation must also assess Output 1.2 activities, specifically whether national carbon market regulations were identified and mapped, whether a Surabaya-context assessment of carbon market policy applicability was conducted, and whether coordination with potential carbon market stakeholders at national and sub-national levels took place and produced any outcomes. The evaluation must distinguish between carbon learning/readiness and verified carbon credits or certified emission reductions.

5.2.2 Outcome 2: Improved Mangrove Ecosystem and Natural Resource Management

The evaluation will assess mangrove rehabilitation, protection, monitoring, survival, maintenance, vegetation density, species suitability, site conditions, community knowledge, silvofishery-related NRM training, seedling growth, protection practices, and improved natural resource management practices among men and women.

This scope includes Output 2.1 on training in improved sustainable practices, NRM, ecosystem restoration, sustainable fisheries, and mangrove planting/monitoring, as well as Output 2.2 on strengthening community-based NRM organizations, institutional arrangements, community consultation, and community commitment.

5.2.3 Outcome 3: Livelihood Strengthening, Silvofishery, S4T, Financial Literacy, and Women's Economic Empowerment

The evaluation will assess whether men and women in the community improved livelihood knowledge, financial literacy, access to savings or financial mechanisms, S4T group functioning, market access, MSME capacity, and willingness to protect the environment. It will examine evidence of change in behavior, capacity, group functioning, livelihood activity, and household relevance.

The evaluation must cover Output 3.1 on individual and group application of environmental conservation and improved NRM practices, including livelihood design, silvofishery replication, improvement of silvofishery practice, contextualized silvofishery guideline development, GEDSI assessment, and any aquaculture technology/startup elements such as shrimp seeds, eco-enzymes, or other inputs.

The evaluation must also cover Output 3.2 on increasing the capacity of men and women regarding income-generating activities adaptive to climate change. This includes financial literacy, savings/S4T, linkage to financial service providers, MSME development, circular economy training, climate-adaptive livelihood practices, and relevant market access efforts.

5.2.4 Outcome 4: Community Knowledge and Environmental Protection Actions

The evaluation will assess community, child, adolescent, and youth engagement in environmental protection, including campaigns; education; World Mangrove Day and/or National Children Day activities; digital and onsite campaigns; learning materials, educational board games, or equivalent child/youth learning products; IEC/media outputs; public awareness activities; and documentation of results, learning products, success stories, and environmental advocacy or waste management-related actions.

The evaluation must also clarify that this external endline evaluation contributes to the project's own endline/final documentation commitment under Output 4.3, while maintaining independence and professional evaluation standards.

5.2.5 Governance, Partnership, Sustainability, and Scale-Up

The evaluation will assess stakeholder coordination, institutional ownership, government follow-up, technical partnership, university collaboration, financial institution engagement, market linkages, community ownership, sustainability, and scale-up potential. This includes assessing MARVEL SEA's relevance to WVI's broader mangrove roadmap and potential replication in nearby coastal areas such as Gresik, Sidoarjo, and Pasuruan, only to the extent that evidence and WVI strategy documents support such an analysis.

5.3 Temporal Scope

The evaluation will cover the full MARVEL SEA project period from 15 November 2024 to 15 October 2026. It should analyze cumulative progress, year-by-year changes, final-stage sustainability readiness, and available evidence up to the final data collection period. The evaluation must account for any approved changes, delays, adaptations, or revisions during implementation.

Where relevant, the evaluation must also review MARVEL Phase 1 data and baseline documents to establish attribution boundaries and compare baseline-to-endline changes.

5.4 Stakeholder Scope

The evaluation will engage relevant stakeholder groups, including:

- pond owners, pond cultivators, tenants, laborers, and community livelihood actors connected to the mangrove area;
- community members in Wonorejo Urban Village and Keputih Urban Village;
- fishermen/pond farmer groups, including relevant groups such as Kelompok Trunojoyo and Kelompok Cahaya Keputih Urban Village where applicable;
- silvofishery participants, demo plot farmers, and less active or non-adopting farmers where feasible;
- women's groups, PKK members, S4T group members, livelihood participants, MSME actors, and women leaders;
- youth groups, Forum Anak, adolescents, and child participants where appropriate and ethically feasible;
- parents, teachers, facilitators, and child protection focal points where relevant;
- Pokdarwis, ecotourism-related groups, community organizations, and local leaders;
- urban village and sub-district representatives;
- relevant Surabaya City Government offices;
- relevant East Java Provincial Government offices;
- universities, technical partners, consultants, financial institutions, startup partners, and market actors involved in the project;
- WVI project team, AP management, MEAL, technical specialists, finance/procurement, and donor/internal WVI stakeholders where relevant.

6. Key Evaluation Questions

The consultant will refine the evaluation questions during the inception phase. The evaluation should be structured primarily around the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. Given the environmental and coastal resilience nature of MARVEL SEA, the evaluation should also apply an environmental and social lens informed by UNEP evaluation practice, particularly in relation to strategic relevance, external context, environmental results, stakeholder participation, gender and inclusion, sustainability, and factors affecting project performance.

The questions below provide the core evaluation framework. Detailed thematic sub-questions on mangrove restoration, silvofishery, sustainable pond management, livelihood, S4T, MSME development, GEDSI, child and youth engagement, carbon learning, governance, replication, and scale-up are provided in Annex 1 and should be further refined and operationalized by the consultant in the inception report, evaluation matrix, data collection tools, and analysis plan. These detailed sub-questions should not be treated as an exhaustive checklist to be answered separately in the final report. The final evaluation matrix should avoid excessive duplication and should prioritize questions that are feasible, evidence-based, and directly relevant to project accountability, learning, sustainability, and future programming. To ensure that the final report remains strategic and not merely descriptive across many thematic areas, the consultant must identify a focused set of priority evaluation questions and key learning themes during the inception phase. These priority questions and learning themes should guide the depth of analysis, synthesis, and reporting, while still ensuring that the full scope of this ToR is adequately covered.

6.1 Relevance and Strategic Relevance

- To what extent was MARVEL SEA relevant to the original problems identified in the approved proposal, the needs and priorities of coastal communities in Wonorejo Urban Village and Keputih Urban Village, and the environmental, livelihood, climate resilience, and institutional context of the project area?

This should include relevance to unintegrated mangrove-aquaculture management, low acceptance of mangrove rehabilitation in pond areas, limited silvofishery knowledge, mangrove health concerns, marine debris, limited livelihood and market options, community-based natural resource management, women's economic participation, child and youth environmental engagement, local government priorities, and the broader urban coastal context of East Surabaya.

The evaluation should also assess whether the integrated approach combining mangrove restoration, silvofishery, sustainable pond management, livelihood strengthening, governance, carbon learning, and community engagement was appropriate for the ecological, social, economic, and institutional realities of Wonorejo Urban Village and Keputih Urban Village.

6.2 Coherence

- To what extent was MARVEL SEA coherent with the donor-approved proposal, approved log frame, local government priorities, coastal management initiatives, climate adaptation agendas, mangrove restoration efforts, livelihood and MSME development priorities, technical partner initiatives, financial service actors, market actors, universities, and community-based institutions?

This should include assessment of whether project components reinforced each other, particularly the linkages between mangrove restoration, silvofishery, sustainable pond management, livelihood strengthening, S4T, MSME development, circular economy, GEDSI, child and youth engagement, carbon learning, waste advocacy, governance, and partnership-building.

The evaluation should also examine whether project adaptations remained coherent with the approved project design, field realities, technical evidence, community needs, administrative constraints, and approved changes.

6.3 Effectiveness

- To what extent did MARVEL SEA achieve its intended outcomes, outputs, indicators, targets, deliverables, and approved project revisions?

This should include assessment of mangrove rehabilitation and monitoring, ecological restoration progress, seedling survival, species performance, vegetation density, site suitability, maintenance practices, adaptive planting methods, silvofishery and sustainable pond management, contextualized silvofishery guidance, aquaculture inputs, shrimp seed support, eco-enzyme use where relevant, livelihood strengthening, financial literacy, S4T where implemented, savings mechanisms, women's economic participation, MSME development, circular economy training, child and youth engagement, GEDSI integration, governance and partnership, waste advocacy, carbon-related learning, MRV readiness, SRN/AKSARA/ProKlim-related progress, documentation, and knowledge products.

The evaluation should distinguish between outputs completed, outcome-level changes achieved, results partially achieved, delayed interventions, results with limited

evidence, and results that require further evidence or longer-term monitoring. It should also assess whether project assumptions were valid, partially valid, or no longer valid, and how these assumptions affected implementation and results.

6.4 Efficiency and Implementation Quality

- How efficiently were project resources, staffing, procurement processes, technical assistance, training, community facilitation, partnerships, aquaculture inputs, livelihood support, carbon-related work, and coordination mechanisms converted into project outputs and emerging results?

This should include analysis of implementation sequencing, timeliness, procurement or administrative constraints, staffing capacity, partner contribution, value for money, coordination burden, quality of technical inputs, monitoring quality, adaptive management, and whether alternative implementation approaches could have produced better, timelier, or more sustainable results.

The evaluation should also assess whether administrative, operational, technical, or partnership-related processes affected field implementation, community trust, output quality, or the achievement of expected results.

6.5 Impact and Emerging Outcomes

- What intended and unintended changes have occurred, or are beginning to emerge, as a result of MARVEL SEA?

This should include ecological, social, institutional, livelihood, economic, GEDSI, child and youth, governance, and climate-related changes. The evaluation should examine changes in mangrove condition, community maintenance behavior, pond farmer attitudes, silvofishery adoption, sustainable pond management, productivity indications, cost-saving potential, income potential, women's participation and decision-making, group functioning, community ownership, child and youth environmental participation, government and partner engagement, carbon learning, and climate resilience awareness.

The evaluation should clearly distinguish between direct outputs, outcome-level changes, early signs of impact, perceived benefits, plausible project contribution, and long-term impact claims that require further verification. It should avoid overstating long-term ecological impact, verified climate mitigation results, income impact, child nutrition impact, women's empowerment transformation, or attribution to MARVEL SEA alone unless supported by robust evidence.

The evaluation should also examine the two-way relationship between livelihood interventions and mangrove restoration: whether livelihood, S4T, MSME, circular economy, silvofishery, nursery-related livelihood activities, or ecotourism activities contributed to community ownership and sustainability of mangrove protection; and whether mangrove restoration has contributed, or has the potential to contribute, to coastal livelihood resilience.

6.6 Sustainability

- To what extent are MARVEL SEA results likely to continue beyond 15 October 2026?

This should include sustainability of mangrove maintenance and protection, community ownership, silvofishery and sustainable pond management practices, livelihood and MSME models, S4T or savings mechanisms, women's economic participation, child and youth engagement, local government support, technical partnerships, market linkages,

carbon-related learning, institutional arrangements, financial service linkages, and future funding or scale-up pathways.

The evaluation should identify which results are likely to continue independently, which require further accompaniment or investment, and which are at risk of declining after project closure. It should also assess sustainability risks related to technical capacity, community ownership, land or resource-use arrangements, market viability, group governance, government follow-up, partner commitment, financing, and financial sustainability. Where relevant, the evaluation should examine who may be responsible for financing key activities after project closure, whether there are significant resource gaps that could affect continuity, and what minimum financial, institutional, and technical conditions are required to sustain key results.

6.7 Learning, Adaptive Management, Replication, and Scale-Up

- What lessons can be drawn for future WVI programming, government adoption, donor proposals, technical partnerships, and possible scale-up to other coastal areas?

This should include analysis of MARVEL Phase 1 and MARVEL SEA Phase 2 contribution boundaries, assumptions, external factors, implementation barriers, adaptive management decisions, data quality, unintended negative effects, GEDSI and safeguarding considerations, land or resource-use risks, ownership issues, conflict potential, replication readiness, and the minimum conditions required for livelihood interventions to support sustainable mangrove restoration and for mangrove restoration to support coastal livelihood resilience.

The evaluation should identify which components are proven, promising, still uncertain, not yet sustainable, scale-ready, or requiring additional investment. During the inception phase, the consultant should propose a simple replication and scale-up assessment framework, including the criteria that will be used to determine whether a component is ready for replication, requires further validation, needs redesign, or depends on additional technical, financial, institutional, market, community, or policy conditions. The final report should provide practical and prioritized recommendations for WVI, communities, local government, technical partners, donors, and future programming.

7. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation will use a mixed-methods approach combining desk review, quantitative data analysis, qualitative inquiry, field observation, contribution analysis, outcome harvesting, case studies, data quality verification, and validation. The consultant must propose a detailed methodology in the inception report for WVI review and approval.

7.0 Responsibility for Data Collection and Analysis

The external consultant or consulting firm will be responsible for designing the detailed evaluation methodology, developing data collection tools, conducting primary qualitative data collection, reviewing and analyzing quantitative and administrative data, verifying data quality, conducting triangulation, and producing all evaluation deliverables.

WVI will provide available project documents, monitoring data, administrative records, contact lists, field coordination support, safeguarding guidance, and logistical facilitation where needed. However, to maintain evaluation independence, WVI project staff should not serve as primary data collectors, interviewers, or FGD facilitators for the endline evaluation. Their role should be limited to coordination, introduction, document provision,

clarification of project records, and participation as respondents or reviewers where appropriate.

Quantitative analysis will primarily use existing project monitoring and administrative data provided by WVI and partners. If the consultant proposes any additional primary quantitative data collection, such as a short participant survey, this must be clearly justified in the inception report, including sampling approach, tools, enumerator roles, data quality controls, safeguarding measures, and feasibility within the evaluation timeline.

Qualitative data collection, including KIIs, FGDs, case study interviews, outcome harvesting, most significant change interviews, and field observation, must be conducted by the consultant team or trained research assistants/enumerators under the consultant's direct supervision. All data collectors must be oriented on informed consent, confidentiality, safeguarding, GEDSI-sensitive facilitation, do-no-harm principles, and WVI's ethical requirements before fieldwork begins.

7.1 Desk Review

The consultant must review relevant projects; monitoring; technical, financial, activity, partner, government, GEDSI, youth/child engagement, carbon/MRV, ProKlim/SRN/AKSARA, procurement, finance, communication, and learning documents. A detailed document/data preparation list is provided in Annex 3. The consultant must prepare a document review matrix summarizing document source, date, theme, key evidence, data quality issues, and implications for the evaluation.

7.2 Quantitative Data Review

The consultant must review, clean, analyze, and verify relevant quantitative and administrative data provided by WVI, project partners, community groups, and relevant stakeholders. This is expected to be primarily a secondary data review using existing project records. The consultant may propose limited additional quantitative data collection only if it is necessary, feasible, ethically sound, and approved by WVI during the inception phase. Detailed quantitative data areas are provided in Annex 3 and Annex 5.

The consultant must assess data reliability, completeness, consistency, and limitations. Where figures conflict, the consultant must document inconsistencies and recommend the most defensible figures for final reporting. The consultant should review available silvofishery economic and productivity data and, where complete financial or harvest data is unavailable, identify available proxy indicators and clearly document data gaps, limitations, and future monitoring needs.

7.3 Qualitative Data Collection

The consultant must collect qualitative data through:

- at least 15-20 key informant interviews, covering WVI, community, technical, government, partner, and donor/internal stakeholders where relevant;
- at least 6-8 focus group discussions across major stakeholder categories, including separate women's groups and children where appropriate;
- outcome harvesting for at least one major thematic area, such as silvofishery adoption, women's livelihood change, governance outcomes, or community ownership;
- most significant change or case study interviews;
- field observation;

- validation of discussions.

The exact number of KIIs and FGDs may be adjusted during inception based on feasibility, but any reduction must be justified and approved by WVI. Qualitative inquiry must include positive, mixed, and critical perspectives. The consultant should not only interview highly active or successful participants.

7.4 GEDSI-Sensitive Qualitative Design

The consultant must apply a GEDSI-sensitive qualitative design. This may include separate women's FGDs, women-only case study interviews, female facilitators or note-takers for women's groups, accessible timing for women and vulnerable groups, and facilitation methods that reduce elite dominance. The evaluation should examine whether poorer, less active, or less visible participants were meaningfully reached or excluded.

For questions related to women's experience of resistance, backlash, household tension, control over benefits, or harmful attitudes, the consultant must apply safe and gender-sensitive data collection methods. These issues should not be explored in mixed-gender settings if doing so may expose women to discomfort, retaliation, stigma, or social pressure. The consultant should consider separate women's FGDs, women-only interviews, female facilitators, confidential note-taking, and careful wording to ensure do-no-harm.

7.5 Field Observation

The consultant must visit selected project locations to observe mangrove restoration sites, silvofishery ponds or demo plots, pond-based and coastal/open-area planting conditions, community maintenance or protection practices, livelihood/MSME activity sites where relevant, S4T/savings group documentation practices where relevant, youth/child environmental engagement outputs where observable, and visible signs of ownership, sustainability, site stress, marine debris, sediment, hydrology, maintenance, or ecological recovery. Field observation must be triangulated with records, interviews, and monitoring data.

7.6 Optional Remote Sensing or Spatial Data Review

Where feasible, the consultant should use remote sensing, satellite imagery, GIS layers, Ministry of Environment/Ministry of Forestry or government spatial data, or other available spatial evidence as a triangulation tool for mangrove cover, site condition, and area verification. This is not expected to replace field monitoring data but may strengthen the credibility of area and restoration claims.

7.7 Case Studies / Human Interest Stories

The consultant must develop at least 2–3 concise, evidence-based case studies. These must not be promotional stories only. Each case study must include evidence of change, constraints, contribution, and lessons. Suggested case study themes are provided in Annex 7. The consultant should identify at least 2–3 human interest stories that can support WVI's Output 4.4 communication and learning commitments, including documentation, stories, and knowledge/communication products related to project results and learning, subject to consent and WVI safeguarding approval. The consultant is not responsible for producing promotional videos unless explicitly included in the contract.

7.8 Contribution Analysis

The consultant must assess the extent to which observed changes can reasonably be linked to MARVEL SEA's contribution. The analysis should consider the project theory of change or change pathway, evidence supporting MARVEL SEA's contribution, Phase 1 versus Phase 2 attribution boundaries, external factors or alternative explanations, strength and consistency of evidence, plausibility of contribution, and remaining evidence gaps.

The final report must categorize findings as direct project output; outcome-level change; plausible project contribution; emerging impact signal; promising but not yet proven; insufficiently evidenced; or requiring longer-term monitoring.

7.9 Triangulation

All key findings must be triangulated across multiple sources where possible, including documents, monitoring data, interviews, FGDs, observation, community testimony, government/partner perspectives, technical records, and spatial evidence where available. Findings based on one source must be clearly identified as limited or indicative.

7.10 Verification

The consultant must conduct a structured data quality check covering final approved logframe and target revisions, participant figures, 540 direct participant target versus actual reach, disability-related data where captured, child/adolescent/youth disaggregation where available, seedlings/species/survival/vegetation/restoration area, 73 ha intervention landscape, Phase 1 versus Phase 2 attribution, silvofishery and productivity/economic figures, training and attendance data, S4T/savings/livelihood/MSME data, GEDSI findings, youth/child engagement, carbon/MRV/SRN/AKSARA/ProKlim documentation, government and partner outputs, and any figures used in donor-facing claims. A detailed verification checklist is provided in Annex 5.

8. Sampling and Respondent Strategy

The consultant must propose a sampling matrix during the inception phase. The sampling strategy should be purposive and designed to cover major project components, locations, stakeholder categories, gender, age, active and less-active participants, and critical perspectives. The sample should include WVI teams, pond farmers and aquaculture actors, women's groups and livelihood actors, community groups, children/youth where appropriate and ethical, parents/facilitators, government stakeholders, technical and university partners, financial/market/startup actors, and donor/internal WVI stakeholders where relevant. Detailed respondent guidance is provided in Annex 4.

Sampling principles must include both successful and less successful cases; women and men meaningfully; persons with disabilities or participants facing physical barriers where relevant, feasible, and ethical; vulnerable or less visible groups where feasible and ethical; active and less-active participants; avoidance of elite capture and over-reliance on positive respondents; child and adult safeguarding standards; and documentation of final respondent numbers, locations, categories, sex/age disaggregation where appropriate, and rationale.

9. Ethical Considerations and Safeguarding

9.1 Informed Consent

All participants must be informed about the purpose of the evaluation, the voluntary nature of participation, the use of data, confidentiality, risks, benefits, and their right to

decline or withdraw. Consent must be obtained before interviews, FGDs, photos, recordings, or use of quotes.

9.2 Child Safeguarding

If children or adolescents are involved, the consultant must apply child safeguarding procedures, including parental/guardian consent, child assent, age-appropriate tools, safe spaces, trained facilitation, no unsupervised one-on-one engagement, and protection of identity. Direct engagement with children should only occur when necessary and ethically justified.

9.3 Adult Safeguarding and GEDSI Sensitivity

The consultant must ensure safe and respectful engagement with women, vulnerable adults, and marginalized groups. Separate FGDs, female facilitators, adjusted schedules, and safe spaces may be required to support meaningful participation.

9.4 Data Privacy and Confidentiality

All data must be stored securely. Personal identifiers must be removed unless explicit consent is obtained. Photos, videos, names, and stories may only be used with documented consent and WVI approval. Both raw and analyzed data should be shared openly with WVI.

9.5 Avoidance of Unrealistic Expectations

The consultant must not imply that participation will lead to future project benefits, funding, employment, or assistance. Consent scripts must clearly explain that the evaluation is for learning and accountability.

10. Deliverables

All final donor-facing deliverables must be submitted in English. Field tools, consent forms, interview guides, FGD guides, and selected data collection materials may be prepared in Bahasa Indonesia as needed for fieldwork. A Bahasa Indonesia version of the executive summary or donor brief is not required under the base assignment unless agreed during contracting. If WVI later requires additional translation for government or community dissemination, this will be discussed separately in accordance with WVI procedures. The final endline report should not exceed 80 pages, excluding annexes, unless otherwise agreed by WVI. The executive summary/donor brief should be 4-6 pages and readable as a stand-alone document.

10.1 Inception Report

The inception report must include methodology, evaluation matrix, workplan, sampling plan, tools, data quality protocol, safeguarding approach, risk mitigation, case study strategy, document review matrix, proposal-to-endline alignment approach, Phase 1/Phase 2 attribution approach, baseline-to-endline comparison plan, analysis plan, a focused set of priority evaluation questions or key learning themes, and a simple framework for assessing sustainability, replication, and scale-up potential.

Acceptance criteria: Methodology is feasible and rigorous; questions are aligned with the proposal and donor accountability; priority evaluation questions or key learning themes are clearly identified; the proposed sustainability, replication, and scale-up assessment

framework is practical and evidence-based; sampling is justified; data quality and safeguarding protocols are clear; and the work plan is realistic before project closure.

10.2 Data Collection Tools

Tools must include KII guides, FGD guides, surveys/questionnaires if used, observation checklists, case study templates, consent forms, child assent/guardian consent forms if needed, data extraction templates, outcome harvesting templates, and data quality checklists.

Acceptance criteria: Tools are neutral, practical, tailored to respondent groups, safeguarding-compliant, GEDSI-sensitive, and linked to evaluation questions.

10.3 Preliminary Findings Presentation

The consultant must present early findings to WVI before drafting the full report.

Acceptance criteria: Presentation includes method coverage, emerging findings, data inconsistencies, evidence gaps, preliminary conclusions, case study themes, and issues requiring clarification.

10.4 Draft Endline Report

The draft report must be complete and include methodology, limitations, achievement analysis, thematic findings, data tables, case studies, contribution analysis, baseline-to-endline comparison, Phase 1/Phase 2 attribution note, sustainability, model validation, lessons learned, and recommendations.

Acceptance criteria: Findings are evidence-based, triangulated, balanced, not overstated, and ready for meaningful WVI review.

10.5 Validation Workshop / Presentation

The consultant must facilitate a validation session with WVI and selected stakeholders. The consultant will be responsible for preparing the validation materials, facilitating the session, documenting key feedback, and incorporating agreed revisions into the final deliverables.

Acceptance criteria: The session validates factual accuracy, discusses contested interpretations, records feedback, and supports final revisions without compromising evaluation of independence.

10.6 Final Endline Report

The final report must be polished, donor-ready, and suitable for internal and external use subject to WVI approval.

Acceptance criteria: Final report incorporates feedback, uses defensible figures, distinguishes outputs/outcomes/emerging impact/future potential, includes model validation, and avoids unsupported claims.

10.7 Executive Summary / Donor Brief

A 4-6-page donor-facing brief must summarize credible achievements, outcome-level changes, model validation, sustainability, scale-up potential, lessons, and recommendations.

Acceptance criteria: Concise, evidence-based, non-promotional, visually clear, and suitable for donor or leadership discussion.

10.8 PowerPoint Presentation

A professional, editable deck must summarize methodology, achievement of snapshot, findings, case studies, model validation, sustainability, lessons, and recommendations.

Acceptance criteria: Clear, donor-ready, visually readable, accurate, and aligned with WVI branding guidance provided.

10.9 Proposal-to-Endline Alignment Matrix

The consultant must prepare a proposal-to-endline alignment matrix showing how the evaluation assessed the approved project goal, outcomes, outputs, indicators, targets, key activities, assumptions, risks, and sustainability commitments.

Acceptance criteria: The matrix clearly links approved proposal commitments to endline evidence, achievement status, data source, confidence level, and limitations.

10.10 Endline Evidence Matrix

The matrix must link each key finding to evidence sources, indicators, documents, data, quotes, observations, triangulation status, limitations, and confidence level.

Acceptance criteria: Evidence is traceable, confidence ratings are justified, and the matrix can support donor reporting and future proposals.

10.11 Clean Data and Documentation Package

The consultant must submit anonymized transcripts/notes, datasets, tools, observation checklists, consent records, photos with consent documentation, a document review matrix, coding/analysis files, and case study documentation.

For qualitative data, structured interview and FGD notes are acceptable, provided they are complete, anonymized, organized, and sufficient to support the evaluation's findings. Verbatim transcription and full translation of all raw qualitative data are not required unless specifically agreed during the inception phase and reflected in the approved workplan and budget.

Acceptance criteria: Organized, anonymized, secure, complete, and usable by WVI after the assignment.

10.12 Learning and Scale-Up Note

A short strategic note must identify proven, promising, uncertain, not-yet-sustainable, scale-ready, and investment-requiring components of MARVEL SEA. The note should explain the criteria used to classify each component, including evidence strength, technical feasibility, community ownership, financial sustainability, institutional readiness, market viability, safeguarding/GEDSI considerations, resource gaps, and minimum conditions required for replication or scale-up.

The learning and scale-up notes should not exceed 4–6 pages and should be structured as a standalone strategic brief, not as a repetition of the main report's recommendations section.

Acceptance criteria: Practical, evidence-based, useful for donor engagement and future program design, clear on investment and resource gaps, and explicit about which components are proven, promising, uncertain, not yet sustainable, scale-ready, or requiring further validation, redesign, or additional investment.

11. Proposed Endline Report Structure

The final report should follow the proposed structure provided in Annex 6. The report structure includes a cover page, acknowledgements, acronyms, an executive summary, project background and approved project logic, evaluation purpose/scope/methodology, limitations, achievement overview, data quality and figure verification, Phase 1/Phase 2 attribution boundary, a baseline-to-endline comparison, findings by thematic area, cross-cutting analysis, contribution to outcomes and emerging impact, model validation, case studies, lessons learned, recommendations, a conclusion, and annexes.

12. Timeline

The assignment must be completed before project closure on 15 October 2026. The following timeline reflects the planned procurement and evaluation schedule based on a proposal submission deadline of 10 July 2026. The schedule should be confirmed by WVI Procurement and Management before issuance and may be adjusted only where necessary, provided that all final deliverables remain due before project closure.

Phase	Activities	Responsible Party	Target Dates
1. Term of Reference (TOR) finalization	Finalize TOR, internal review including WVK, procurement readiness, budget envelope, submission deadline, contact details	WVI Project Team, MEAL, Management, Procurement, and WVK	19 June 2026
2. Internal approval	Approve TOR, budget, procurement method, selection panel	WVI Management, Procurement, Finance	19 June 2026
3. Procurement launch	Advertise/invite proposals, share ToR, answer clarifications	WVI Procurement	19 June 2026 – 10 July 2026
4. Proposal submission	Consultants submit separate technical and financial proposals	Consultants/firms	19 June 2026 – 10 July 2026
5. Evaluation and selection	Technical/financial evaluation, shortlisting, interview if needed	WVI Evaluation Panel	11 July 2026 – 17 July 2026
6. Contracting	Final negotiation, contract, safeguarding/admin requirements	WVI and selected consultant	18 July 2026 – 26 July 2026
7. Kick-off meeting	Confirm expectations, timeline, documents, communication, data access	WVI and consultant	27 July 2026
8. Desk review	Review proposal, log frame, baseline, Phase 1 data, reports, monitoring data, evidence gaps	Consultant	27 July 2026 – 31 July 2026
9. Inception report and tools	Submit methodology, matrix, sampling, tools, data protocol	Consultant	31 July 2026
10. WVI review of inception	Review and approve inception report/tools	WVI	1 August 2026 – 9 August 2026
11. Field preparation	Finalize respondents, schedule, consent, logistics	Consultant and WVI	10 August 2026 – 16

			August 2026
12. Field data collection	KIIs, FGDs, observation, case study interviews, outcome harvesting, data verification	Consultant	17 August 2026 – 31 August 2026
13. Follow-up/gap filling	Clarify missing data, follow-up interviews, data checks	Consultant and WVI	17 August 2026 – 31 August 2026
14. Data cleaning and analysis	Analyze quantitative/qualitative data, baseline comparison, attribution analysis, evidence matrix, case studies	Consultant	1 September 2026 – 6 September 2026
15. Preliminary findings	Present preliminary findings and data issues to WVI	Consultant	7 September 2026
16. Draft report	Submit complete draft endline report	Consultant	8 September 2026 – 14 September 2026
17. WVI review	Consolidated review by project, MEAL, management, technical teams	WVI	15 September 2026 – 23 September 2026
18. WVK review	Consolidated review by WVK	WVK	24 September 2026 – 5 October 2026
19. Validation workshop	Present and validate findings with WVI/selected stakeholders	Consultant and WVI	6 October 2026
20. Final revision	Incorporate feedback and finalize deliverables	Consultant	7 October 2026 – 10 October 2026
21. Final submission	Submit final report, donor brief, deck, alignment matrix, evidence matrix, data package	Consultant	10 October 2026
22. Project closure use	Use outputs for donor reporting, learning, sustainability follow-up	WVI	Before 15 October 2026

13. Consultant Qualifications

The consultant should demonstrate:

- at least 8-10 years of experience in evaluation, international development, environmental/climate programming, livelihood programming, governance, or related fields;
- proven experience conducting endline evaluations or final project evaluations for international NGOs or donor-funded programs;
- strong understanding of mixed-methods evaluation, contribution analysis, outcome harvesting, data quality review, and donor reporting;
- technical familiarity with mangrove restoration, coastal resilience, silvofishery, community-based NRM, blue carbon/MRV, livelihoods, women's economic empowerment, disability inclusion, youth engagement, and governance;

- strong safeguarding and ethical research capacity, especially where children or vulnerable groups may be involved;
- excellent English report writing and presentation skills;
- documented ability to conduct fieldwork in Bahasa Indonesia and engage respectfully with community and government stakeholders.

13.1 Consultant Team Composition

The proposed team should include:

Role	Minimum Requirement
Team Lead / Senior Evaluation Specialist	Minimum 10 years of evaluation experience, strong English writing, donor reporting experience, and experience leading mixed-methods evaluations
Mangrove / Coastal / Silvofishery Specialist	Minimum 5 years of relevant technical experience in mangrove restoration, coastal ecosystem management, silvofishery, aquaculture, or related fields
Livelihood / Gender / GEDSI Specialist	Minimum 5 years of experience in livelihood, savings groups, women's economic empowerment, GEDSI, MSME, or community finance
Qualitative Research / Field Coordinator	Experience conducting KIIs, FGDs, participatory research, and community-based fieldwork in Indonesia
Data / MEAL Specialist	Experience with log frame review, indicator tracking, data quality verification, quantitative analysis, and evidence matrices

Qualified consultants or consulting firms may propose a lean team structure in which one team member covers more than one specialist competency listed above, provided that the relevant CV clearly demonstrates documented experience for each competency assumed. WVI will assess the credibility of the proposed team structure and competency coverage during the technical evaluation.

At minimum, two team members must be fluent in Bahasa Indonesia and have documented experience conducting qualitative and participatory research in Indonesian communities. The team lead must be able to produce high-quality donor-facing English reports.

13.2 Conflict of Interest

Consultants or firms that have previously provided technical assistance, training, evaluation, or consulting services directly to MARVEL Phase 1 or MARVEL SEA must declare this in a conflict-of-interest statement. WVI will assess whether the declared relationship affects independence or requires mitigation.

14. Management and Reporting Arrangement

The consultant will report to WVI through the MARVEL SEA Team Leader or assigned contract manager. Coordination will involve the MARVEL SEA Project Team, MEAL staff, technical specialists, AP management, procurement/finance, and other relevant WVI stakeholders as needed.

WVI will provide relevant documents, facilitate access to project staff and stakeholders, support field scheduling, provide safeguarding guidance, review deliverables,

and consolidate feedback. The consultant remains responsible for independent analysis, quality of tools, data collection, data protection, report writing, and timely delivery.

WVI will review each deliverable within 10 working days and provide consolidated feedback. The consultant is expected to revise deliverables within 7 working days of receiving consolidated feedback. Any change to the timeline must be discussed and agreed in writing. The consultant must provide regular progress updates and immediately notify WVI of delays, data access issues, safeguarding concerns, respondent availability constraints, or risks to deliverable quality.

15. Quality Assurance and Acceptance Criteria

All deliverables must be:

- evidence-based and triangulated;
- aligned with the donor-approved proposal and approved log frame;
- clear about methods and limitations;
- internally consistent;
- free from unsupported claims;
- careful in distinguishing outputs, outcomes, contributions, emerging impact, and future potential;
- donor-ready in tone and presentation;
- practical in recommendations;
- useful for sustainability planning and future resource mobilization;
- safeguarding compliant and respectful data privacy.

WVI may request revisions or withhold approval if deliverables are generic, poorly evidenced, not aligned with the proposal, analytically weak, visually unreadable, inconsistent, or contain overstated claims. WVI may request a light technical peer review of the draft report by an internal or external technical specialist, particularly for carbon/MRV, mangrove restoration, and silvofishery findings.

16. Indicative Budget and Payment Milestones

16.1 Indicative Budget Envelope

The indicative budget envelope is including of professional fees, applicable taxes, fieldwork, travel, accommodation, communication, meetings, data collection, analysis, reporting, and all costs required to complete the assignment, unless otherwise agreed in writing by WVI. Consultants must submit a detailed financial proposal aligned with the proposed methodology and level of effort. WVI expects value for money and a realistic work plan.

16.2 Level of Effort

The estimated level of effort is approximately 45-60 working days across the full consultant team, including desk review, field data collection, data cleaning, analysis, report writing, presentation preparation, validation, and final revisions.

16.3 Payment Milestones

The final payment schedule will follow WVI procurement and finance procedures. An indicative schedule is provided below.

Milestone	Deliverable / Condition	Indicative Payment
First payment	Approved inception report and tools	25%

Second payment	Completion of field data collection and preliminary findings presentation	25%
Third payment	Submission of acceptable draft endline report	25%
Final payment	Approval of final report, donor brief, PowerPoint deck, proposal-to-endline alignment matrix, evidence matrix, learning note, and handover package	25%

17. Proposal Submission Requirements

Interested consultants should submit separate technical and financial proposals in PDF format to the submission channel designated by WVI Procurement. All proposals must be submitted by 10 July 2026, 23:59 WIB (GMT+7), in accordance with WVI procurement instructions. Technical clarification questions may be directed to the designated WVI in contact during the clarification period, while formal proposal submission must follow the procurement-designated submission channel.

Consultants may submit clarification questions no later than 3 July 2026, 17:00 WIB (GMT+7). WVI will provide consolidated responses to relevant clarification questions by 6 July 2026. Any clarification shared by WVI will form part of the procurement of communication and should be considered by consultants in preparing their proposals.

The technical proposal should include:

- understanding of assignment and project context;
- proposed methodology and evaluation matrix;
- sampling strategy;
- workplan and timeline;
- team composition and CVs;
- relevant experience and examples of similar work;
- writing sample;
- safeguarding statement;
- conflict of interest statement;
- quality assurance approach.

The financial proposal should include:

- professional fees by team member and number of days;
- travel and fieldwork costs;
- data collection costs;
- transcription or translation costs;
- workshop or presentation costs, if applicable;
- report design or formatting costs, if applicable;
- taxes and administrative costs;
- any other relevant expenses.

Technical proposals will be evaluated first. Financial proposals will only be considered for consultants or firms that meet minimum technical quality requirements, in line with WVI procurement procedures.

18. Technical Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Indicative Weight
Understanding of assignment and MARVEL SEA context	15%
Quality, rigor, and feasibility of methodology	25%
Relevant technical expertise in evaluation, mangroves, climate resilience, silvofishery, livelihoods, gender/GEDSI, governance, and donor reporting	20%
Team composition, role clarity, and language capacity	15%
Safeguarding, ethics, and data quality approach	10%
Writing quality / previous report sample	5%
Timeline feasibility	5%
Value for money	5%

19. Key Risks and Mitigation Measures

A detailed risk and mitigation table is provided in Annex 8. The consultant must account for key risks, including limited time before project closure, data inconsistency, Phase 1 versus Phase 2 attribution confusion, weather/tide/site access constraints, respondent availability, over-representation of positive cases, safeguarding and GEDSI risks, overclaiming, incomplete carbon/MRV evidence, incomplete economic data, and procurement or administrative delays.

20. Required Framing Discipline to Avoid Overclaiming

The consultant must handle evaluation findings carefully and must not overstate results beyond available evidence. In particular, the final report must clearly distinguish direct outputs, outcome-level changes, plausible project contribution, emerging impact signals, sustainability signals, future scale-up potential, and areas still uncertain or requiring further investment. Detailed overclaiming safeguards are provided in Annex 9.

21. Annexes Integral to This ToR

The Annex / SoW Companion forms an integral part of this ToR. It provides detailed technical guidance for the consultant and should be read together with the main ToR. It includes:

- Annex 1. Indicative thematic sub-questions for inception and evaluation matrix development;
- Annex 2. Indicative endline evaluation matrix;
- Annex 3. Detailed data/document preparation list;
- Annex 4. Sampling/respondent guidance;
- Annex 5. Detailed verification checklist;
- Annex 6. Proposed endline report structure;
- Annex 7. Case study / human interest story themes;
- Annex 8. Risk and mitigation table;
- Annex 9. Required framing discipline to avoid overclaiming;
- Annex 10. WVI internal preparation list before consultant mobilization;
- Annex 11. Annexes to Be Included or Prepared by Consultant.

22. Ownership, Confidentiality, and Use of Outputs

All data, reports, tools, presentations, photos, recordings, transcripts, and other products generated under this assignment will be the property of Wahana Visi Indonesia unless otherwise agreed in writing. The consultant may not publish, share, or use evaluation data or outputs for other purposes without prior written approval from WVI.

The consultant must maintain confidentiality of all project documents, participant information, internal discussions, donor correspondence, and evaluation findings until WVI approves their use or dissemination. Any external use of findings, case studies, photos, or quotations must be approved by WVI and must comply with safeguarding and consent requirements.