**Cover Page**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **POSITION DETAILS** | |
| Location | Flexible |
| Reporting to | Amelia Kissick, WWF-US |
| Preferred timeframe | June - August 2025 |
| Potential sites to visit | TNS-Cameroon (Salapoumbe and Moloundou municipalities, Lobeke NP HQ), TRIDOM-Cameroon Lomié (2-3 villages), Ngoyla and Mintom municipalities (visit to their councils), and Campo Ma’an -Campo municipality (visit to Ebodje and Campo) |
| **PROJECT DATA** | |
| Project/Program Title | Integrated management of Cameroon’s forest landscapes in the Congo Basin |
| GEF Project ID | 10287 |
| WWF (Agency) Project ID | G0021 |
| Implementing Agency(s) | WWF GEF |
| Executing Agency | Ministry of Environment, Nature Protection and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED) |
| Executing Partner(s) |  |
| Countries | Cameroon |
| Focal Area(s) | BD, SFM Congo |
| GEF Operational Program | GEF-7 |
| Total GEF Approved Budget | $9,608,257 |
| Total Co-financing Approved | $74,329,704 |
| **RELEVANT DATES** | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | 8/6/2021 |
| Agency Approval Date | 3/23/2022 |
| Implementation Start | 1/1/2022 |
| Project Completion Date (proposed or actual) | 09/30/ 2028 |
| Period to Be Evaluated | 8/6/21 to time of review |

# INTRODUCTION and Project overview

World Wildlife Fund, Inc. (WWF) policies and procedures for all GEF financed full-sized projects require a midterm evaluation (MTE). The following terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for the MTE for the project: Integrated management of Cameroon’s forest landscapes in the Congo Basin, hereafter referred to as the “Project.” The technical consultant selected to conduct this evaluation will hereafter be referred to as “evaluator.”

The Project seeks to strengthen the integrated management of Cameroon’s globally important forest landscapes in the Congo Basin to secure its biological integrity and increase economic and livelihood opportunities for forest dependent people. Over a six-year period, the project will address key barriers and tackle the drivers of deforestation, forest degradation and biodiversity loss through the concurrent execution of multiple complementary strategies: (i) progressing informed and inclusive LUP; (ii) improving the effectiveness of management and governance systems for high value conservation forests, and undertaking targeted actions to protect their endangered species; (iii) developing sustainable forest-based value chains that engage the private sector and deliver benefits to IPLCs; and (iv) and promoting the scaling deep, out and up of best practices through knowledge management. Achieving and sustaining the effective participation and empowerment of IPLCs, while respecting human rights and reinforcing their resilience, is core to the project’s overall objective.

The Project was organized into the following components:

* Component 1: Mainstreaming integrated land use planning (LUP) and management
  + Outcome 1.1 Participatory, informed, and integrated land use planning establishes a framework to plan, monitor and adapt land management across approximately 1,200,000 ha in TRIDOM
* Component 2: Improving management effectiveness and governance of high conservation value forests, and targeted interventions to protect their endangered species
  + Outcome 2.1: Management effectiveness of Campo Ma'an and Lobéké national parks is improved through inclusive governance and management systems
  + Outcome 2.2: The effectiveness of forest and wildlife management in the peripheries of Campo Ma'an and Lobéké national parks is strengthened through increased engagement and capacity, and the establishment and adaptive management of equitable and transparent management agreements between local stakeholders
  + Outcome 2.3: The long-term zoonotic disease surveillance systems in Campo Ma'an and Lobéké national parks and their peripheries are strengthened to minimize the risks of disease transmission between humans and wildlife and vice versa
* COMPONENT 3: Advancing sustainable forest management (SFM) through non-timber forest product (NTFP) and hardwood value chains
  + Outcome 3.1: Strengthened and/or established sustainable NTFP value chains that engage IPLCs and the private sector reduce the impacts of unsustainable natural resource use and deliver benefits to at least 30 communities (IPLCs) in the Cameroon segments of three transboundary landscapes
  + Outcome 3.2: Public-private partnership (Ebony Project) to create a sustainable and socially-responsible value chain for tropical hardwood species is expanded and delivering tangible benefits, including restoration and income generation, in the TRIDOM landscape
* COMPONENT 4: Increasing benefit generation from biodiversity through sustainable tourism development
  + Outcome 4.1: Sustainable tourism value chain that engages IPLCs and the private sector is strengthened, reducing the impacts of unsustainable natural resource use and delivering benefits to IPLCs in the Cameroon segment of the CMRC landscape
* COMPONENT 5: Monitoring and evaluation (M&E), knowledge management (KM), and regional coordination
  + Outcome 5.1: Program results monitored and lessons learned inform adaptive management and outreach in support of SFM at landscape, national and regional levels

# Scope and objectives

WWF-US is seeking an independent consultant to undertake a Midterm Review of the Project. The scope of the MTR will cover the WWF GEF financed components.

The objectives of this evaluation are to:

* Assess progress towards project objective, outputs and outcomes;
* Examine the extent, magnitude, sustainability and potential for project impacts to date;
* Identify any project design problems and challenges
* Draw lessons learned that can improve the project effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of project benefits.

Based on this assessment, it is expected that the evaluator will provide feasible and actionable recommendations that could be applied for the remaining duration of the project.

# APPROACH AND METHODS

The evaluation will adhere to the relevant guidance, rules and procedures established by WWF[[1]](#footnote-1) and align with guidance from the GEF Terminal Evaluation[[2]](#footnote-2) and Ethical Guidelines.[[3]](#footnote-3) The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is independent, participatory, transparent, and ethical. The evaluator must be unbiased and free of any conflicts of interest with the project. The evaluator is expected to reflect all stakeholder views and follow a participatory and consultative approach. There should be close engagement with government counterparts, the GEF operational focal points in each country, the Executing Agency project management unit (PMU), partners and key stakeholders. Contact information will be provided.

The Evaluation process will include the following, with deliverables marked by “\*”:

1. Kickoff
2. Desk review consisting of, but not limited to:
   * Project Document and CEO Endorsement Letter;
   * Relevant safeguards documents;
   * Annual Work Plans (AWP) and Budgets;
   * Project Progress Reports (PPR) including Results Framework and AWP Tracking;
   * GEF Agency reports, including Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) and Supervision Mission Reports (PrISM);
   * Relevant financial documents, including financial progress reports; co-financing monitoring tables and co-financing letters;
   * Meeting minutes (Project Steering Committee (PSC)) and relevant virtual meetings with the WWF- GEF Agency and support team; and
   * Other relevant documents provided by the Executing Agency and partners.
3. Inception meeting and Inception report that outlines evaluation methodology;\*
4. Field visits with PMU and project partners, as necessary and feasible;
5. Interviews, discussions and consultations at local levels, national and international levels, including executing partners, GEF Operational Focal Points (OFP), Project Steering Committee (PSC) members and beneficiaries, including project supported IP&LCs groups, Ngoyla/Mintom councils;
6. Presentation\* of initial findings to project management team and other partners;
7. Draft report\* not to exceed 60 pages (excluding annexes) shared with GEF AMU, PMU and others for review and feedback. A sample outline will be provided; and
8. Final MTE report\* package that has incorporated feedback and comments. Data collected should also be submitted to WWF-US at conclusion of exercise.

# CONTENT OF EVALUATION REPORT

The Midterm Evaluation report will include:

* + Information on the evaluation process, including when the evaluation took place, sites visited, participants, key questions, summary of methodology and rating rubric, and feedback log showing how comments on draft were incorporated;
  + Assessment of Relevance (project design , theory of change);
  + Assessment of project Effectiveness and rating of project objective and outcomes (individual and overall);
  + Assessment and rating of risks to the Sustainability of project outcomes;
  + Assessment and rating of Monitoring and Evaluation design and implementation;
  + Assessment of knowledge management approach, including activities and products;
  + Assessment of replication and catalytic effects of the project;
  + Assessment of Relevance of the project (e.g. with WWF and GEF priorities) and Coherence;
  + Assessment of stakeholder engagement and gender-responsive measures;
  + Assessment of any environmental and social impacts and safeguards used for the project. A review of risk category classification and mitigation measures;
  + Assessment of Efficiency, financial management and summary of co-financing delivered;
  + Assessment and ratings of Implementation and Execution;
  + Summary table of key findings by core criteria[[4]](#footnote-4) and GEF ratings, including justification and/or indicators for their determination;
  + Key lessons tied to identified strengths or issues;
  + Recommendations that include: practical and short-term corrective actions by evaluation criteria to address issues and findings; and best practices towards achieving project outcomes, and knowledge sharing / replication for other projects of similar scope.

# QUALIFICATIONS

**Required Qualifications and Experience**

* Have 8+ years relevant professional experience (e.g. leading evaluations, designing monitoring and evaluation plans, etc);
* Previous experience with diverse evaluation methodologies (e.g. social surveys, outcome harvesting, etc);
* Excellent written and oral communication in English and French.

**Preferred Qualifications and Experience**

* Masters Degree in relevant field, such as Monitoring and Evaluation, International Development, Natural Resource Management, etc.;
* Recent experience conducting evaluations (for GEF financed projects is an advantage);
* Technical knowledge in the targeted GEF Operational Focal Area, Indigenous people and local communities, protected area management, integrated land use planning, sustainable forest management, benefit sharing from sustainable tourism;
* Knowledge of GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
* Experience with WWF Project and Program Management Standards, Conservation Standards or use of theory of change for project cycle;
* Experience with social assessments, participatory techniques, and gender mainstreaming;
* Knowledge and experience in implementing or reviewing application of social and environmental safeguards policies in GEF (or similar) projects;
* Regional and national experience an asset.

# QUALITY ASSURANCE

Bidders are required to submit a quality assurance plan that sets out the systems and processes for ensuring that the evaluation deliverables and all evaluation activities are of a high quality and meet ethical standards from inception to the end of the contract. It is highly recommended to include a senior evaluation consultant to serve as a Quality Assuror to advise on the evaluation process and revise the evaluation deliverables as part of the consultancy, however there may be other mechanisms built into the process as an alternative or addition.

# PAYMENT MODALITIES

Payment, expense reimbursement, and other contractual terms and conditions will be outlined in the consultant agreement made between WWF and the evaluator. Contracts may be made with an individual or organization. Payments will be made following submitted and approved deliverables and once invoices are sent. Twenty-five percent of the fee will be paid after submission and approval of the Inception Report. Fifty percent of the fee will be paid following submission and approval of the debrief presentation, Draft Report and related documents. The final twenty-five percent will be paid following the submission and approval of the Final Report and related documents. Reimbursement for expenses, if separated from fee, will be paid separately. Evaluator should submit receipts for expenses over $25.

# PROPOSAL PROCESS

Interested consultants are invited to submit a technical and financial proposal with their *curriculum vitae,* a relevant writing sample and three professional references*.* Only complete proposals will be accepted.The financial proposal should include fee and reimbursable expenses, if applicable. The total budget shall not exceed USD $35,000. Individual, team or consulting firm proposals are welcome. Women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Interested consultants are requested to send their proposals to EvaluationsWWFGEF@wwfus.org by May 2nd, 2025. All questions about the requirements or process should be submitted to this e-mail address by April 24, 2025. Responses to frequent and submitted questions will be available until the proposal deadline to all interested consultants in the final annex of this live document: <https://worldwildlifefund-my.sharepoint.com/personal/amelia_kissick_wwfus_org/_layouts/15/guestaccess.aspx?share=EcUqwbI6o-FKh5pKVIKUY4sBst3dg4S2cU0_iqfyvyUwrA>

The technical proposal and qualifications/experience of the individual or team will account for 90% of the weighted score of the proposal. The technical score will be based on how the proposal reflects an understanding of the work and adherence to the TOR and quality of the proposal (readability, depth/breadth and suitability of the methodology), as well as the degree to which the candidate meets desired and required qualifications/experience mentioned in the terms of reference above. The financial elements of the proposal will account for 10% of the weighted score of the application.

Once all proposals have been scored by the review committee, a shortlist of proposals will be determined, and the candidates notified. Shortlisted candidates will have their references contacted, proposal reviewed by project stakeholders and will participate in an interview. Shortlisted candidates who are not selected will be provided with information on relative strengths and weaknesses of their proposal, but specific scores and the identity of other candidates will not be shared.

The selection process will be in compliance with WWF and GEF requirements. Any questions or concerns about non-compliance or irregularities in the process can be raised through WWF’s mechanism for reporting concerns available here: https://wwfus.ethicspoint.com.

# ANNEX A: EVALUATION CRITERIA

**Criteria for Overall Evaluation of Project**

The evaluation should assess the project against the following GEF and WWF criteria:

1. **Relevance** – the extent to which the project design, outcomes, indicators and targets remain valid and consistent with local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including the context of the changing circumstances of the country (e.g. political context);
2. **Coherence** - the compatibility of a project intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution. This can include internal coherence and external coherence. Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the project interventions and those carried about by the same sector or institution in-country. External coherence measures consistency and compatibility of the interventions among different sectors, but in the same context.Were there effective collaborations and synergies, was there alignment with development plans or initiatives in the region and how did this contribute to the success of the project;
3. **Effectiveness** - the extent to which the outputs, outcomes and project objective have been or are likely to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Identify the major factors which have facilitated or impeded this achievement. Review the management structure of the project and determine whether the organizational structure of the project, the resources, the distribution of responsibilities and coordination mechanisms are appropriate for achieving progress towards project outcomes;
4. **Efficiency** - the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. This includes efficiency of: funding availability, project management and human resources, coordination and information flow among the project partners;
5. **Results/Impact** – the extent of intended or unforeseen effects that project interventions or strategies will have on the project objective, conservation targets and GEF global environmental benefits, whether positive or negative. Whereas effectiveness focuses on intended outcomes, impact is a measure of the broader consequences of the intervention at different levels. Assess the project’s logic or theory of change and the potential to scale up or replicate the project outcomes and impact.
6. **Sustainability** - the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits, progress and impact after external support has ended. Determine the degree of support and buy-in given to the project at the national and local level;
7. **Adaptive capacity** –the extent to which the use of M&E, lessons learned and adaptive management are used to meet indicator targets and mitigate project issues (such as design flaws or any adverse impacts of the project).

# Annex B: Summary Table of Evaluation Ratings

The evaluator should be objective and provide sufficient justification with empirical evidence to support the findings or ratings given. Rating scales are provided in Annex C.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Progress Towards Results**[[5]](#footnote-5) **and Individual Outcome Ratings** | | | | | | | | |
| Project Strategy | Indicator (if applicable) | Baseline level | Midterm Target | End of Project Target | Current level of achievement | *Outcome Rating* | *Justification* | Other Notes |
| Objective |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Overall Assessment of Project Outcomes** | ***Rating*** | ***Justification*** |
| Were project outcomes ***Relevant*** when compared to focal area/operational program strategies, country priorities, beneficiary needs, mandates of WWF GEF and partners, and WWF priorities? |  |  |
| Is the project C***oheren***t or compatible with / supported by other relevant projects and programs in the recipient country or countries? Does the project have alignment among the theory of change, governance structure, activities and M&E system? Is there alignment with GEF policies, guidelines and is there integration of lessons from similar projects? |  |  |
| *What is the* ***Effectiveness*** *of project outcomes (e.g. were ex-ante targets met)? Did the project make the expected contributions to global environmental benefits? Were there unintended consequences of the project that added to or negated project benefits?* |  |  |
| *What is the* ***Cost-efficiency*** *of project outcomes?*  How does the project cost/time versus output/outcomes equation compare to that of a similar project? |  |  |
| **Overall Rating** **of Project Outcomes** | ***Rating*** | ***Justification*** |
| Using above criteria, please provide an **overall rating** for the achievement of the Project outcomes. This assessment should analyze both the achievement and shortcomings of these results as stated in the project document. |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Assessment of Risks[[6]](#footnote-6) to Sustainability[[7]](#footnote-7) of Project Outcomes**  *Please describe these risks below, taking into account probability and magnitude of their effect/severity:* | | |
| **Financial Risks** | | |
|  | | |
| **Sociopolitical Risks** | | |
|  | | |
| **Institutional Framework and Governance Risks** | | |
|  | | |
| **Environmental Risks** | | |
|  | | |
| **Other risks** | | |
|  | | |
| **Overall Rating** **of Sustainability of Project Outcomes** | ***Rating*** | ***Justification*** |
| Using above information, please provide an **overall rating** for the risks to sustainability of project outcomes. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Assessment of M&E Systems** | ***Rating*** | ***Remarks*** | |
| **M&E Design** – Was the M&E plan at the CEO endorsement practical and thoughtful? Does the plan align with the project theory of change and GEF M&E requirements? Did the M&E plan include baseline data?[[8]](#footnote-8) Did it: specify clear targets and appropriate SMART indicators to track environmental, gender, and socioeconomic results; a proper methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of M&E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection; and budget adequate funds for M&E activities? |  |  | |
| **M&E implementation** – Did the M&E system operate as per the M&E plan? Where necessary, was the M&E plan revised in a timely manner? Was information on specified indicators gathered systematically and as scheduled? Were relevant GEF core indicators/corporate results indicators and/or tracking tools analyzed and reported as expected? Were appropriate methodological approaches used to analyze data? Were resources for M&E sufficient? How was the information from the M&E system used during project implementation? Did it facilitate transparency, sharing and adaptive management? |  |  | |
| **Overall Rating** **of M&E** | ***Rating*** | | ***Justification*** |
| Using above information as guidance, please provide an overall rating for M&E during project design /implementation. |  | |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5. Implementation and Execution Rating Against Responsibilities** | ***Rating*** | ***Justification*** |
| **WWF GEF Agency implementation** (e.g. project identification, concept and detailed proposal preparation, approval and start-up, oversight and supervision, completion and evaluation, etc). |  |  |
| **Executing Agency execution** (e.g. Management and administration of project’s daily activities, including appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services in line with GEF Agency rules regulations) |  |  |

# ANNEX C: RATING SCALES

**Outcomes Rating Scale:[[9]](#footnote-9)**

* **Highly satisfactory (HS)** – The outcomes exceed targets and are highly relevant, coherent, and cost-effective.
* **Satisfactory (S)** – The level of outcomes achieved meets targets. The outcomes are relevant, coherent, and cost-effective.
* **Moderately satisfactory (MS**) – The level of outcomes achieved was generally close to the targets. The majority of the targets were met or almost met, but some were not. The outcomes are generally relevant, coherent, and cost-effective.
* **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU**) – Overall, the level of outcomes achieved is lower than the targets, although some outcomes were substantially achieved. The outcomes are generally relevant but not sufficient given the costs or, alternatively, are generally cost-effective but not adequately relevant and coherent.
* **Unsatisfactory (U)** – The expected outcomes were not achieved, or achievement was substantially lower than expected, and/or the achieved outcomes are not relevant or coherent. Alternatively, the outcome was cost-ineffective compared to alternatives..
* **Highly unsatisfactory (HU**) – A negligible level of outcomes was achieved and/or the project had substantial negative consequences that outweigh its benefits.
* **Unable to assess (UA) –** The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievement.

**Sustainability/ Risk Rating Scale:**

* **Highly Likely (HL)** – There is negligible risk to continuation of benefits and based on the progress made so far it is expected that the long-term objectives of the project will be achieved.
* **Likely (L) -** Either there is negligible risk to continuation of benefits or there are some risks, but the magnitude of their effect is too small and/or the probability that they will materialize is too small. Overall, it is likely that the net benefits of the project will continue.
* **Moderately likely (ML)** - There are some risks to sustainability, and they may have some effect on continuation of benefits if they materialize. However, probability of materialization of these risks is low. Net benefits are more likely to continue than abate.
* **Moderately unlikely (MU) -** There are significant risks to sustainability. The effect

on continuation of benefits would be substantial if these risks materialize and the probability of materialization of these risks is significant. Overall, net benefits of the project are likely to abate.

* **Unlikely (U)** – Because of the high risks it is unlikely that net benefits of the project will continue to accrue, and the progress made so far is likely to be lost. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its long-term objectives.
* **Highly Unlikely (HU)** – It is expected that the project will not achieve its long-term objectives. Major risks have either already materialized and halted accrual of net benefits or have high probability of materializing soon and will halt accrual of net benefits when they materialize.
* **Unable to assess (UA)** – Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability.

**M&E Rating Scale:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **M&E Design** | **M&E Implementation** |
| **Highly Satisfactory** | **The M&E plan is a good practice and does not have any weaknesses.** Its alignment with the project theory of change is robust. Complete baseline data have been provided. The specified indicators are appropriate, and arrangements for plan implementation are adequate. Overall, the M&E plan exceeds expectations and is exemplary | **M&E plan implementation was excellent.**  Weaknesses in the M&E plan, if present, were  addressed promptly. M&E activities were  conducted in a timely manner, and data from M&E were used to improve project implementation. Overall, M&E mplementation exceeds expectations and was exemplary |
| **Satisfactory** | **The M&E plan is robust and has no or only minor weaknesses.** Its alignment with the project theory of change is robust. Baseline data are provided or their collection is planned at project start. The specified indicators are appropriate, and arrangements for M&E plan implementation are adequate. The plan meets expectations. | **M&E plan implementation was generally robust.** Weaknesses in M&E were addressed in a timely manner. M&E activities were conducted in a timely manner, and data from M&E were used in improving project implementation. Overall, M&E implementation meets expectations |
| **Moderately Satisfactory** | **The M&E plan is solid overall.** Its alignment with the project theory of change is solid. The specified indicators are generally appropriate, and arrangements for M&E plan implementation are adequate. There are areas where the M&E plan could be strengthened but, overall, it is adequate. | **M&E plan implementation was generally robust, with some weaknesses.** Weaknesses in M&E were generally addressed although some remained. Some M&E activities were delayed. M&E data were used for reporting but had little use in improving project implementation. Overall, M&E implementation meets expectations with  some areas of low performance. |
| **Moderately unsatisfactory** | **The M&E plan is weak overall, although it has strengths in some areas.** Its alignment with the project theory of change is somewhat weak. The specified indicators are generally appropriate but additional indicators are required to adequately  capture project results, and/or arrangements to gather data on indicators are not adequate. The plan needs several improvements to meet expectations. | **M&E plan implementation was weak and/or did not address weaknesses in the original plan.** Most M&E activities were completed, with some either dropped or delayed. M&E data were not reported in a timely manner, and there is little evidence to suggest that the data were used to improve project implementation. Overall, M&E implementation does not meet expectations, although there are some areas of adequate performance. |
| **Unsatisfactory** | **The M&E plan has severe shortcomings.** Its alignment with the project theory of change is weak. No baseline data are provided nor is there any indication that these would be collected at project start. Indicators do not adequately address  project outcomes and other results; relevant indicators have not been specified for several results. There are gaps in arrangements for M&E plan implementation. Either no budget or an inadequate budget has been provided for M&E. | **M&E plan implementation was flawed and/**  **or did not address severe weaknesses in the**  **original plan.** Several M&E activities were either dropped or were incomplete. The data collection methodology was not sound. M&E data were not reported in a timely manner, and there is little evidence to suggest that the data were used to improve project implementation. M&E implementation does not meet expectation. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory** | No M&E plan was prepared. | No, or negligible, M&E activity was implemented other than conduct of the project evaluation. |
| **Unable to Assess** | Unable to assess because the project documents are not available. | Unable to assess because the terminal evaluation does not cover M&E implementation adequately. |

**Implementation and Execution Rating Scales:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Implementation (GEF Agency)** | **Execution (Executing Entity)[[10]](#footnote-10)** |
| **Highly Satisfactory** | Performance of the GEF Agency was exemplary. Project preparation and implementation were robust. The Agency ensured that relevant GEF policies were applied in project preparation and  implementation. Project supervision was strong— the Agency identified and addressed emerging concerns in a timely manner. The Agency ensured that project implementation stayed on track and project activities were completed on time | Performance of the executing entity was  exemplary. Execution of project activities was  timely and of high quality. Relevant GEF policies and requirements were adhered to. Guidance from the GEF Agency was followed, and any corrective actions required were taken promptly. Measures were undertaken to mitigate risks to sustainability, and steps were taken to support follow-up to the project. Project activities were completed on time |
| **Satisfactory** | **Performance met expectations and did not have any salient weaknesses.** Project preparation and implementation were robust, and relevant GEF policies were applied. The GEF Agency supervised the project well—it identified and addressed emerging concerns in a timely manner. The Agency ensured that project implementation was on track | **Performance met expectations and did not have any salient weaknesses.** Execution of project activities was timely and of good quality. Relevant GEF policies and requirements were adhered to. Guidance from the GEF Agency was followed.  Measures were undertaken to mitigate risks to sustainability of project outcomes. |
| **Moderately Satisfactory** | **Performance had some weaknesses but met**  **expectations overall.** Project preparation and implementation were adequate and relevant GEF policies were applied, although there are some weak areas. Project supervision was adequate—the GEF Agency identified and addressed emerging concerns, although some  may have been inadequately addressed. Project implementation had minor delays, and a few activities may have been dropped. | **Performance had some weaknesses but met expectations overall.** Execution of project  activities were generally timely but with some  instances of delay. Relevant GEF policies and  requirements were adhered to, although some  minor slip-ups may have been observed.  Guidance from the GEF Agency was followed, and problems were fixed. There were some areas for improvement in execution |
| **Moderately unsatisfactory** | **Performance did not meet expectations, although there were some areas of solid performance.** Project preparation and implementation had weaknesses, although these were not too severe. Project supervision was somewhat weak—although the GEF Agency identified most emerging concerns,  many remained unaddressed or inadequately.  addressed. Project implementation was delayed, and a few activities were dropped or reduced in scale because of issues that were largely under Agency control. | **Performance did not meet expectations, although there were some areas of solid performance.** Execution of project activities was delayed, and executing entity capabilities observably limited project execution. Several slip-ups in adherence to GEF policies and requirements were observed. Guidance from the GEF Agency was generally followed and problems were fixed, but such actions usually were not timely. There were several areas for improvement in execution. |
| **Unsatisfactory** | **Performance did not meet expectations.**  Project preparation and implementation were weak. Project supervision was weak—emerging concerns were not identified in time and remained unaddressed or inadequately addressed. Activities were not implemented in time or were not undertaken. Project implementation was delayed, and several activities were dropped or reduced in scale. | **Performance did not meet expectations.**  The execution of project activities was delayed, and at least some activities were dropped due to factors largely under the control of the executing entity. Many slip-ups were observed in adherence to GEF policies and requirements. Guidance from the GEF  Agency was not put into practice, or was applied with considerable delay. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory** | **Performance had severe shortcomings.** The GEF Agency mismanaged project implementation, and its supervision was poor. Emerging concerns were not identified in time, including those that should have been obvious. Although instances of mismanagement were discovered, corrective  actions were not undertaken. Project activities were poorly implemented, and several had to be dropped. | **Performance had severe shortcomings.** There were several instances of mismanagement by the executing entity. Emerging concerns were not addressed in time, including those that should have been obvious. Most activities were very poorly executed and/or experienced delays, and  some activities were dropped. GEF policies and requirements were not applied. |
| **Unable to Assess** | The available information is not sufficient to allow rating of performance. | The available information is not sufficient to allow rating of performance. |

Additional guidance regarding the evaluation criteria and ratings for each dimension can be found in in the [GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines.](https://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/terminal-evaluations-2023.pdf)

# ANNEX D: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE[[11]](#footnote-11)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of WWF supported GEF financed project * WWF and GEF project summary table (page 1 TOR) * Evaluation team members and affiliations * Locator map (if appropriate) * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary (~2 – 4 pages)   * Project Description (brief) * Principle findings and recommendations, organized by core criteria * Overview of Evaluation Ratings |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations |
| **1.** | Introduction to Evaluation   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Limitations of the evaluation |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Concise summary of project evolution, underlying rationale and strategies to achieve conservation results * Main stakeholders and beneficiaries * Discussion of baseline (of indicators) and Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings (All criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[12]](#footnote-12))  (will include rationale, tables, graphics, and other figures to convey key findings) |
| **3.1** | Project Design   * Assessment of Relevance and theory of change (project logic /strategies) together with assumptions and risks * Use of lessons from other similar projects * WWF and EA comparative advantage * Coherence /Linkages between project and other interventions, sectors, priorities, GEF policies, etc. * Governance and management arrangements * Country ownership * Analysis of M&E design\* |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Assessment of Project Performance: Outcomes\* and outputs, effectiveness, \* and potential for impact) * M&E implementation\* / adaptive management and capacity\* * Governance and management arrangements in implementation plus coordination, integration and operational management * WWF GEF implementation\* / EA and partner execution (\*) * Alignment with WWF and Country priorities * Transformational change, catalytic effects and additionality * Unintended effects   Sustainability\* / project exit |
| **3.3** | Gender Equality and Mainstreaming   * Assess design and implementation of the gender analysis and gender mainstreaming strategy, including indicators and intermediate results. * Assess gender responsive measures, as per WWF and GEF gender policies. |
| **3.4** | Stakeholder Engagement   * Evaluate stakeholder engagement and assess the implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. |  |
| **3.5** | Safeguards Review   * Assess if safeguards were adequately considered in design, and whether measures to address the identified safeguards needs are being effectively implemented; * Evaluate the environmental and social risk category of the project (which is different from the Annual Rating) and compare it with the classification assigned by WWF. * Identify environmental and social risks and describe risk management measures; * Assess implementation of the beneficiary criteria developed during project preparation; * Assess project activities for any additional adverse or unforeseen environmental or social impacts and include potential measures to address these; * Review supplied and gather additional safeguards documents (e.g. new assessments, monitoring/management plans, reports or other supporting documents); * Share lessons learned. |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Lessons learned organized by the core evaluation criteria, if applicable * Specific and actionable recommendations to address issues and findings; leverage best practices, or knowledge sharing / replication for other projects of similar scope. * Evaluation rating tables. |
| **5.** | Annexes   * TOR of MTR, * Workplan and schedule * Geo-referenced maps and photos of project sites * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Questions/ Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Rating Summary Table * Traceability of Evaluation Requirements to the Report |

# ANNEX E: INCEPTION REPORT OUTLINE

1. Project/program description,
2. Purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation, including a brief description of the requirements of the TOR and evaluation audience
3. Evaluability considerations
4. Evaluation approach, including overall design, data collection methods and analytical procedures
5. Evaluation questions
6. Ethical considerations
7. Gender responsive stakeholder engagement and dissemination plan
8. Quality assurance, risk management plan
9. Roles and responsibilities
10. Detailed evaluation work plan indicating the activities at each phase, timing of delivery, key  
    deliverables, and milestones

ANNEXES:

Terms of Reference

Analysis of gaps (project documents provided, contacts, etc.)

Evaluation matrix

Draft data collection tools (e.g. surveys, interview tools)

Agenda for any site visits

Rating summary tables and scales

1. For additional information on evaluation methods adopted by WWF, see the [WWF Evaluation Guidelines](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1oj1hb2IIi6ScGSkOUN-rZu-teuteRJTn/view) , published on our [WWF Program Standards](http://wwf.panda.org/what_we_do/how_we_work/programme_standards/) public website. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For additional information on the GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines, see the [GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines](https://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/terminal-evaluations-2023.pdf) , published on the [GEF Independent Evaluation Office](http://www.thegef.org/gef/PoliciesGuidelines) website. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Please see the GEF [Ethical Guidelines](http://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/gef-eo-ethical-guidelines-2007.pdf) as published on GEF website. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See annex A [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. If any changes were made to these results, please indicate when they were made and whether those changes were approved. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Risks are internal or external factors that are likely to affect the achievement of project outcomes. In this context, please consider how these risks could affect the sustainability or *persistence* of project outcomes. Please feel free to list individual risks for each category (financial, sociopolitical, etc) and provide a corresponding assessment on likelihood and magnitude for each of these. This will help you in forming your overall rating of sustainability of project outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Sustainability refers to the likelihood of continuation of project benefits after project completion according to the [2019 Monitoring Policy](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/gef_monitoring_policy_2019.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. If there is not a project baseline, the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline conditions so achievements and results can be properly determined. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. **GEF guidelines on Outcome rating:** The project outcome rating will be based on the extent to which the expected outcomes were achieved (effectiveness), and the extent to which the project was relevant, coherent, and efficient. Although the evaluators will consider performance on these four criteria, the overall rating need not be a simple average of the criteria because a criterion may be more or less important depending on the type of project and its operational context. A six-point rating scale is used to assess outcome. For more details see GEF IEO TE Guidelines. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. When multiple entities are involved in project execution, the rating should be based on their collective performance. The

    rating needs to take into account the performance of the individual executing agencies, their level of responsibilities, and

    their performance as a collaborative and coordinated arrangement. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The Report length should not exceed 6*0* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory [↑](#footnote-ref-12)