

WWF-UK Endangered Species Programme

Consultant Terms of Reference

Programme: CN00865

Panda programme and Minshan Mountain Landscape

Evaluation covering FY04 to FY06

# Table of Contents

2

1.	Introduction .....	3
2.	Programme Background and Context .....	3
3.	Giant Panda project .....	5
3.1.	Background .....	5
3.2.	Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation .....	6
3.3.	Audience for the Evaluation .....	6
3.4.	Evaluation Scope / Key Questions .....	7
3.4.1.	Quality and Relevance of Design .....	7
3.4.2.	Effectiveness and impact .....	7
3.4.3.	Efficiency of Planning and Implementation .....	7
3.4.4.	Potential for sustainability, replication and magnification .....	8
3.5.	Methodology .....	8
3.6.	Profile of the Evaluation Team .....	8
3.7.	Outputs and Deliverables .....	9
3.8.	Evaluation Timetable .....	9
3.9.	Cost .....	10
3.10.	Evaluation Support .....	10
	Annex 1. Evaluation Matrix .....	11
	Annex 2. Key Informants .....	15
	Annex 3. Documents to be Consulted .....	15
	Annex 4. Required Format for the Evaluation Report .....	15

## ACRONYMS

ESP	Endangered Species Programme of WWF-UK
GSP	Global Species Programme of the overall WWF network
SAP	Species Action Plan
TOR	Terms of Reference

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The current portfolio of species-related projects that are being funded within the Endangered Species Programme (ESP) are a result of the ESP strategy that was developed for FY04 to FY06. Given that we are now approaching the final time period covered by the strategy, it is important that we evaluate our progress in order to guide our future strategy. To achieve this, the intention is to carry out a desk evaluation of all species-related projects funded by WWF-UK. In addition, field evaluations will be carried out for three projects relating to giant pandas, black rhinos and tigers. This document sets out the Terms of Reference (TOR) to guide the field evaluations of selected projects within the WWF-UK. Separate TOR have been developed that describe how the assessment of the total portfolio will be carried out.

N.B. This is a draft document which will need to be refined in co-operation with the project executant and the evaluation team.

## 2. PROGRAMME BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Name	Endangered Species Programme (ESP)
Location	Various – see later in this section
Reference number	Various
Budget	TBD
Duration	The evaluation period is FY04 to FY06, in alignment with the WWF-UK ESP strategy. Many of the projects and programmes have a history before FY04 and may continue beyond FY06.

There are approximately 50,000 vertebrate species worldwide. Around 7% of these are threatened with extinction over the next 20 years. This includes a staggering 25% of all mammal species and 12% of all bird species. WWF-UK's ESP aims to secure the conservation of WWF's priority species in key locations worldwide. It therefore consists of a number of projects and programmes, all of which focus on priority species populations except for one - the TRAFFIC programme – which focuses on wildlife trade. In three cases, the Colombia Programme, the Eastern Himalayas Programme and the Cork Oak Programme, ESP funding complements other WWF-UK programme funding due to their species component.

The species addressed are:

### Africa:

- Black Rhino (Kenya)
- African elephant (Kenya)
- Mountain gorilla (Rwanda, Uganda, DRC)
- Chimpanzee (Nigeria)

### Asia

- Giant Panda (China)
- Orang-utan (Sabah)
- Sumatran and Javan Rhino (Indonesia)

- Greater one-horned rhino (Terai Arc Landscape – India & Nepal)
- Asian elephant (Terai Arc Landscape – India & Nepal)
- Indian / Bengal Tiger (Satpuda-Maikal Landscape)  
(Terai Arc landscape – India & Nepal)  
(Bhutan)
- Snow leopard \* (Nepal – Kangchenjunga – Sacred Himalayan Landscape)

Latin America

- Humpback whale (Colombia)
- Hawksbill Turtles (Colombia)

Europe:

- Iberian lynx \* (Spain) –not part of original FY04 to FY06 ESP strategy
- Amur Tiger (Russian Far East)

\* = not part of original FY04 to FY06 ESP strategy

Each of these areas of work support the WWF network's Global Species Programme (GSP). The GSP focuses its efforts on the following groups of well-known, charismatic "flagship" species: Giant panda, Asian big cats (tiger), African rhinoceros (Black, White), Asian rhinoceros (Javan, Sumatran, Greater one-horned), African elephant, Asian Elephant, marine turtles, African Great apes (gorilla, chimpanzee, orang-utan and bonobo), and marine cetaceans (whales and dolphins). The objective is that the conservation of all of the above species groups is co-ordinated globally via Species Action Plans (SAPs). The GSP targets and milestones also encompass:

- other priority species within WWF's priority ecoregions, such as the snow leopard;
- additional species that are threatened by over-exploitation e.g. bigleaf mahogany, chiru, musk deer, ginseng, sharks, sturgeon and toothfish.

The GSP has two main targets and a number of milestones that are for delivery up to 2010. These are available in a separate document.

The ESP strategy documented two targets in its FY04 to FY06 plan that support the GSP targets:

**ESP TARGET 1:** By 2006, key populations of the following key species of global concern are stabilised and their critical habitats safeguarded: Giant panda, tiger, rhinoceros (Black, Javan, Sumatran, Greater one-horned), elephants (African and Asian), great apes (gorilla, chimpanzee, orang-utan), turtles (hawksbill) and whales (humpback).

**ESP TARGET 2:** By 2006, prevent the endangerment of species of global concern from over-exploitation by rectifying gaps in national and international laws and improving enforcement capacity in priority countries.

Supporting goals, objectives and outputs were agreed for each of the projects funded within the ESP, as documented in their individual project logframes.

### 3. GIANT PANDA PROJECT

#### 3.1. Background

Name	Panda programme and Minshan Mountain Landscape
Location	China – northern Minshan Mountain Landscape in the Sichuan and Gansu provinces
Reference number	CN0865
Budget	Approximately £275,000 per year up to FY07, of which £225,000 per year is provided by a Vodaphone grant and the remainder from WWF-UK adopter funds.
Duration	The evaluation period is FY04 to FY06, in alignment with the WWF-UK ESP strategy. This programme is currently contracted and funded up to and including FY07.
Implementing office	WWF-China
Project executant	Fan Longqing

There are approximately 1,600 giant pandas remaining in the wild in highly fragmented habitats. Habitat loss and fragmentation are the greatest threats to the panda's survival. The panda lives on bamboo, which has very little nutritional value. In order to obtain enough nourishment, a panda has to eat for up to 14 hours each day. Very infrequently - sometimes once in ten years, sometimes once a century - the bamboo flowers en masse, dies back and takes years for the seedlings to mature. This phenomenon, coupled with land encroachment, poses an enormous threat to the panda's survival. In addition, the panda has a low reproductive rate and is therefore unable to withstand the poaching pressure driven by strong demand for ingredients used in traditional Chinese medicine. This problem is further compounded by inadequate enforcement of anti-poaching regulations for both giant pandas and the other species - the panda often becomes a casualty of poaching tools targeted at other species.

The Minshan mountain landscape is the location of WWF-UK's Panda Adopter Programme.

Goal: By 2010, giant panda populations in Minshan increase by 10%, and the forest area in Minshan is increased by 20%.

Purpose 1: By 2007, reduce illegal and unsustainable activities through the establishment and effective management of protected areas and corridors (additional protected habitat of 200,000 hectares)

Purpose 2: By 2007, reduce the disturbance to panda habitat through livelihood work in targeted communities, (increasing income by 5%).

This programme remains reliant on WWF-UK support, with WWF-US funding being reduced by 70% in FY03.

## 3.2. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

### 3.2.1. Purpose

The findings and recommendations from this evaluation will be used to:

a) provide input to the development of the next WWF-UK species strategic plan (FY07-09). This includes informing future funding commitments by WWF-UK as a donor to the panda programme.

Decisions on further funding will take account of:

- achievements to date (cost-benefit, quality of work, impact);
- potential for future achievements;
- conservation implications of reducing, expanding or ceasing funding;
- alignment with the GSP and ecoregional programmes;
- marketing/ fundraising potential from WWF-UK, other WWF donor NOs and external sources such as Vodaphone.

b) inform the programme on its strategy and operations for adaptive management, with the aim of optimising impact.

### 3.2.2. Specific Objectives

The evaluator will be required to:

- assess the project management processes and their compliance with network standards (design, planning, implementation and adaptation);
- assess the effectiveness and impact to-date of the project (progress against goals, objectives, outputs and activities), and assess what may be expected in terms of future impact;
- assess opportunities that have been taken for information sharing and learning between projects and organisations;
- assess key relationships e.g. between field offices and the China Programme Office, and with WWF-UK;
- assess alignment with the GSP and ecoregional targets and milestones;
- present options and recommendations for the future of the project, including capacity to deliver and use or expand the remaining contracted funding.

The specific questions to be addressed are detailed in section 3.4.

Following on from the evaluation:

- WWF-UK and WWF-China will work together to review the recommendations and take appropriate steps to refine plans, processes and operations to enhance project impact;
- the evaluation will be used to inform WWF-UK's ESP strategy for FY07-09.

N.B. The recommendations will be viewed alongside the results of the desk assessment carried out by staff at WWF-UK (see separate TOR for the overall ESP Programme).

## 3.3. Audience for the Evaluation

This evaluation is commissioned by WWF-UK and WWF-China, as well as being of interest to WWF's GSP. It will be used by:

- managers and programme staff at WWF-China and WWF-UK to inform the development of the ESP strategy for FY07-09;
- SRM staff at WWF-UK to inform the fundraising plan for pandas;
- WWF-China to support adaptive management of the panda project.

### 3.4. Evaluation Scope / Key Questions

The evaluation should address four fundamental criteria:

#### **3.4.1. Quality and Relevance of Design**

Assess the continuing appropriateness and relevance of the project design. The project context, threats and opportunities may have changed during the course of the project. Assess what adjustments have been made and what others might be necessary. In particular:

- Is the project team carrying out the most appropriate strategies to conserve giant pandas?
- Are there any major risks or 'killer assumptions' that are currently not being taken into account?
- What is the value of the intervention in relation to WWF's GSP targets and milestones, the ecoregional targets and milestones and to national priorities?

#### **3.4.2. Effectiveness and impact**

Assess the major achievements of the project to date in relation to its stated objectives and intended results. As far as possible this should be a systematic assessment of progress based on monitoring data for the planned goal, objectives and output / activities. (Data already collected by the project's monitoring and reporting systems should provide much of the basic information).

- Focus on the project's impact and higher level results that benefit for habitat/biodiversity conservation and livelihoods.
- Assess what has been achieved, the likelihood of future achievements, and the significance/strategic importance of the achievements.
- Refer to quantitative assessments as far as possible
- Include also qualitative evidence e.g. opinions on the project's effectiveness based on impressions and interviews with target groups, partners, government, etc.

Describe any major failures of the project to-date, explaining why they have occurred.

Describe any unforeseen impacts (whether positive or negative).

If time allows, identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted e.g. case-studies, stories, best practice.

#### **3.4.3. Efficiency of Planning and Implementation**

Assess to what extent resources are being used economically to deliver the project.

Are plans being used, implemented and adapted as necessary?

- Is the overall project action plan used and up to date?
- What % of activities in the workplan is being delivered?
- Is financial spend in line with plan?
- Is monitoring data being collected as planned, stored and used to inform future plans?

Assess other programme management factors important for delivery, including:

- Key capacity gaps (these could be in the project team, other internal functions such as HR or Finance, or external organisations).
- Operational difficulties or conflicts of interest in terms of the strategic approach between the different donors to the programme.
- Learning processes such as self-evaluation, coordination and exchange with related projects.
- Internal and external communication.

Assess working relationships with partners, stakeholders, donors and relevant parts of the WWF network:

- Review the relationship between the project, the GSP, WWF-I, WWF-UK, other donors and stakeholders.

Adaptation based on evaluations:

- Assess adaptations made based on previous evaluations of the project (if any).

### **3.4.4. Potential for sustainability, replication and magnification**

Assess the key factors affecting **sustainability** of the project, such as:

- What is the social and political environment/ acceptance of the project? Do stakeholders care about the project and believe it makes sense, such as the local communities and local government?
- Will the project contribute to lasting benefits? Which organisations could/ will ensure continuity of project activities in the project area?
- Is there evidence of organisations/partners/communities that have copied, magnified or replicated project activities beyond the immediate project area. Is such replication or magnification likely? What would make replication efforts more effective?

Assess whether the programme can be considered as delivering **value for money** for its present scope/ scale of impact (it is recognised this will be a somewhat subjective view)?

- Are there savings that could be made without compromising delivery?
- Assess the ratio of expenditure on administration and infrastructure versus spend on conservation and development activities.

Assess and make recommendations on the key **strategic options** for the future of the project. Specifically give considered opinion and recommendations for the following funding scenarios for WWF-UK: (a) continuation at present funding levels, (b) scale down, (c) exit.

- Comment on any existing plans
- Make recommendations.

These questions are listed in the evaluation matrix provided in Annex 1.

### 3.5. Methodology

Field evaluations should be conducted primarily using objective data, especially monitoring information, field observations and interviews, although the evaluator(s) may choose to also use focus groups, questionnaires, participatory methodologies, etc. The methodology developed by the evaluator(s) should be presented to the Project Executants and WWF-UK for comment before proceeding with the evaluation.

Lists of key informants and important background documents are attached as Annexes 2 and 3.

It should be noted that, whilst direct observation is critical for gathering evidence and opinion, the evaluation team will not collect primary data on populations, threats or socio-economic status. Therefore the precision of the evaluation results will depend to a large extent on the quality of the monitoring data already collected by the project. The Project Executant should supply the monitoring information for the evaluation team to review.

### 3.6. Profile of the Evaluation Team

The specific skills and characteristics needed in the evaluator(s) are as follows:

Essential:

- knowledge of natural resource management and/or policy and of sustainable development/livelihood issues;
- excellent verbal and written skills in the English language;
- demonstrated experience in project evaluation;
- familiarity with local/ country context, culture, and policy framework.

Preferred:

- excellent skills in the local language;
- proven facilitation and interviewing skills.

The lead evaluator should be external to WWF. It is under discussion whether an external local and international evaluator is required.

There will be an evaluation review group that will comment on and approve each draft and the final evaluation report. This review group will consist of:

- For WWF-China: Fan Longqing – Longqing - please specify other WWF-China staff as appropriate
- For WWF-UK: Diane Walkington, Will Beale, Sandra Charity, Mark Wright, new Head of Species if in post.

### 3.7. Outputs and Deliverables

Product	Start Date	End Date
Field trips and interviews		
Verbal presentation of findings to key staff in Implementing Office		
Draft report* (to be reviewed by the evaluation review group)		
Final report*		March

\*The required format for the evaluation report is included as Annex 4.

### 3.8. Evaluation Timetable

Activity	Duration (to be reviewed)	Date
Agreement of evaluation design with WWF*, including finalization of the evaluation matrix, methodology and dates	1 day	
Development of research instruments (questionnaires, interview guidelines, etc.)	1 day	
Review of documentation	2 days	
International travel; domestic travel	2 days	
Field and desk research	4 days	
Data analysis (usually half the number of days of the research)	2 days	
Meeting with project staff and stakeholders on the initial findings and recommendations	1 day (including 0.5 day preparation time)	
Preparation of the draft report	2 days	
Incorporation of comments and finalisation of the evaluation report.	1 days	

Total = 18 days

### 3.9. Cost

Item	Units	Cost
Consultant fees	18 days x per day	
Travel	1 international + internal return flight	
Subsistence	Hotel and food @ £100 per day	
	Total	

The above table will be refined once the evaluation team is determined.

### 3.10. Evaluation Support

Evaluator(s) in the field will be supported by the evaluation review group described in section 3.6.

An evaluation support team will be available within WWF-China, consisting of :

Fan Longqing Project Executant

Yan Zhang M&E Officer

Please specify others as appropriate

This team will a) ensure that all logistical arrangements are made for the evaluation, b) provide prior information to the people in annex 2 to be interviewed, and schedule the interviews, c) provide the background information listed in annex 3, d) engage with the consultants to assist them with any question or concern they may have on the work to be undertaken.

The evaluator(s) will be expected to provide their own computing equipment.

**Annex 1. Evaluation Matrix – to be further developed by WWF-China and the evaluators**

The evaluation matrix is an important tool for summarising the evaluation design. First the key questions for the evaluation are defined. These are then broken down into specific research questions. Then for each specific research question, data sources are identified, together with data collection tools or methods appropriate for each data source, such as interviews, questionnaires and/or documentation analysis. It may also be useful to specify indicators by which the specific questions will be evaluated.

Issues	Key Questions	Specific Research Questions	Data Sources	Methods / Tools	Indicators as appropriate
Design	Assess the continuing appropriateness and relevance of the project design. The project context, threats and opportunities may have changed during the course of the project. Assess what adjustments have been made and what others might be necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the project team carrying out the most appropriate strategies to conserve giant pandas?</li> <li>• Are there any major risks or ‘killer assumptions’ that are currently not being taken into account?</li> <li>• What is the value of the intervention in relation to WWF’s GSP targets and milestones, the ecoregional targets and milestones and to national priorities?</li> </ul>			
Effectiveness and impact	Assess the major achievements of the project to date in relation to its stated objectives and intended results. As far as possible this should be a systematic assessment of progress based on monitoring data for the planned goal, objectives and output / activities.	<p>Focussing on the project’s impacts and higher level results for habitat / biodiversity conservation and livelihoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess what has been achieved, the likelihood of future achievements, and the significance/ strategic importance of the achievements.</li> </ul> <p>Refer to quantitative assessments as far as possible</p> <p>Include also qualitative evidence e.g. opinions</p>			

		<p>on the project's effectiveness based on impressions and interviews with target groups, partners, government, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe any major failures of the project to-date, explaining why they have occurred.</li> <li>• Describe any unforeseen impacts (whether positive or negative).</li> </ul> <p>If time allows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted e.g. case-studies, stories, best practice.</li> </ul>			
Efficiency	<p>Assess to what extent resources are being used economically to deliver the project.</p> <p>Are plans being used, implemented and adapted as necessary?</p> <p>Assess other programme management factors important for delivery.</p> <p>Assess working relationships with partners, stakeholders, donors and relevant parts of the WWF network:</p> <p>Assess adaptation based on evaluations.</p>	<p>Resource usage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the overall project action plan used and up to date?</li> <li>• What % of activities in the workplan is being delivered?</li> <li>• Is financial spend in line with plan?</li> <li>• Is monitoring data being collected as planned, stored and used to inform future plans?</li> </ul> <p>Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any key capacity gaps. These could be in the project team, other internal functions such as HR or Finance, or external organisations.</li> <li>• Are there any operational difficulties or conflicts of interest in terms of the strategic approach between the different donors to the project.</li> <li>• What use is made of learning processes such</li> </ul>			

		<p>as self-evaluation, coordination and exchange with related projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal and external communication.</li> </ul> <p>Working relationships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the relationship between the project, the GSP, WWF-I, WWF-UK, other donors and stakeholders.</li> </ul> <p>Adaptation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess adaptations made based on previous evaluations of the project (if any).</li> </ul>			
Sustainability	<p>Assess the key factors affecting the <b>sustainability</b> of the project:</p> <p>Assess whether the programme can be considered as delivering <b>value for money</b> for its present scope/ scale of impact (it is recognised this will be a somewhat subjective view).</p> <p>Assess and make recommendations on the key <b>strategic options</b> for the future of the project. Specifically give considered opinion and recommendations for the following funding scenarios for WWF-UK: (a) continuation at present funding levels, (b) scale down, (c) exiting/phasing out.</p>	<p>Sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the social and political environment/ acceptance of the project? Do stakeholders care about the project and believe it makes sense, such as the local communities and local government?</li> <li>• Will the project contribute to lasting benefits? Which organisations could/ will ensure continuity of project activities in the project area?</li> <li>• Is there evidence of organisations, partners or communities that have copied, magnified or replicated project activities beyond the immediate project area? Is such replication or magnification likely? What would make replication efforts more effective?</li> </ul> <p>Value for money:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there savings that could be made without compromising delivery?</li> <li>• Assess the ratio of expenditure on</li> </ul>			

		<p>administration infrastructure versus spend on conservation and development activities.</p> <p>Strategic options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If continuing, scaling down or phasing-out, which are the most important components of the strategy to focus on?</li><li>• If phasing out, what are the key considerations and recommended time-scales to take into account as regards the sustainability of the Programme's actions, and the viability of Programme's operations (given current resource levels and other funders)?</li></ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

## **Annex 2. Key Informants**

Need to check who are the relevant WWF-China staff, WWF International (Species Prog) staff and local stakeholders in China

Group	Names	Function	Location	Contact details
Implementing office & partners	Fan Longqing	Project executant	CPO, Beijing	
	Yan Zhang	M&E officer	CPO, Beijing	
	Dermot O’Gorman	Acting country rep	CPO, Beijing	
WWF-UK	Sandra Charity	Species & Forests Unit Head	Godalming, UK	
	Callum Rankine	Species head	Godalming, UK	
	Nan MacHardy	Prog Support Officer	Godalming, UK	
	TBD	SRM	Godalming, UK	
	TBD	Comms	Godalming, UK	
WWF-Network	Karen Baragona		WWF-US	
	Amanda Nickson		GSP - Rome	
	Suzanne Hannef		WWF-DE	
Other stakeholders				

## **Annex 3. Documents to be Consulted**

Proposals and project description

- WWF-UK’s ESP FY04-06 strategic plan
- Project proposal.
- Project description.

Action and monitoring plans

- Most recent ecoregional plan.
- Most recent logframe.
- Most recent annual work plan.
- Most recent monitoring plan.

Monitoring data and analysis of that data.

Reports and agreements.

- FY05 and FY06 technical report
- Key outputs produced: research/ surveys conducted, regulations and policies developed
- Partnership arrangements e.g. agreements of cooperation with local governments.
- Newsletters and publicity information
- Other assessments e.g. self-assessments, previous evaluations.

Key network / donor information

- GSP targets and milestones.
- WWF standards of project and programme management.

## **Annex 4. Required Format for the Evaluation Report**

Title Page, including project title and number, date of report, authors and their affiliations, WWF contact point for the evaluation, etc.

#### Executive Summary (1-4 pages):

- Brief project description and context
- Purpose and expected use of the evaluation
- Objectives of the evaluation
- Summary of the evaluation methodology
- Principle findings and conclusions, especially relating to project goals / targets
- Key recommendations
- Summary of lessons learned

#### Acknowledgements

#### Table of Contents

#### List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

#### Main Report

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Audience for and use of the evaluation
- Objectives of the evaluation
- Evaluation methodology, including: rationale for choice of methodology, data sources, methods for data collection and analysis, participatory techniques, ethical and equity considerations, major limitations of the methodology
- Composition of the evaluation team, including any specific roles of team members
- Project description, including: context, underlying rationale, stakeholders and beneficiaries, conceptual model, results chain or logical framework, and project monitoring system
- Evaluation findings, documented by evidence:
  - Design: quality and relevance
  - Effectiveness (progress towards objectives and results); contributions of stakeholders; constraints or problems encountered
  - Efficiency of Planning and Implementation
  - Impact; progress towards Vision and Goals (often the impact on biodiversity and livelihoods)
  - Sustainability and replicability of project / programme impacts; capacity built; institutional and stakeholder issues
- Conclusions: insights into the findings; reasons for successes and failures; innovations
- Recommendations (based on evidence and insights)
- Lessons learned with wider relevance and that can be generalized beyond the project

#### Annexes to the evaluation report:

- Terms of Reference for the evaluation
- Evaluation matrix
- Timetable
- List of individuals interviewed and of stakeholder groups and/or communities consulted
- List of supporting documentation reviewed
- Research instruments: questionnaire, interview guide(s), etc. as appropriate
- Project logical framework
- Specific monitoring data, as appropriate
- Summary tables of progress towards outputs, targets, goals – referring directly to the indicators established for these in the project logframe
- Short biographies of the evaluators.