

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS & TERMS OF REFERENCE
TERMINAL EVALUATION OF WWF-US GEF PROJECT**



Cover Page

POSITION DETAILS	
Location of Consultant(s)	Flexible
Reporting To	Amelia Kissick, Technical Director for agreement with WWF-US
Preferred Timeframe of Consultancy	Mid-September – Mid-November
Period To Be Evaluated	June 3, 2021 until time of evaluation
Potential Sites To Visit	Two sites in Uganda to visit Mountain Harvest and Faima Posho Millers
Maximum Budget Available	\$35,000
PROJECT DATA	
Project/Program Title	Investment Readiness for the Landscape Resilience Fund
GEF Project ID	10436
WWF (Agency) Project ID	G0029
Implementing Agency(s)	WWF GEF Project Agency
Executing Agency	Southpole Carbon Asset Management Company Ltd.
Executing Partner(s)	
Countries	Viet Nam, Tanzania, Brazil, Uganda, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya
Focal Area(s)	Climate Change Adaptation
GEF Operational Program	GEF Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation
Total GEF Approved Budget	LDCF – \$571,331 SCCF – \$571,330 Total - \$1,142,661
Total Co-financing Committed	\$12,821,806
RELEVANT DATES	
CEO Endorsement/Approval	June 3, 2021
Agency Approval Date	September 3, 2021
Implementation Start	August 31, 2021
Midterm Evaluation Completion Date	n/a not required for MSP
Project Completion Date (proposed or actual)	December 31, 2025

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

World Wildlife Fund, Inc. (WWF) and GEF require a terminal evaluation (TE) for all full and medium-sized projects. The following terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for the TE for the project “Investment Readiness for the Landscape Resilience Fund,” hereafter referred to as the “Project”. The technical consultant(s) selected to conduct this evaluation will be referred to as “evaluator” throughout this TOR.

The Project seeks to unlock private sector investments in SMEs developing climate-resilient practices. The Project was organized into the following components and outcomes:

- **Component 1: Establishing systems to support climate resilience-focused SMEs’ access to private investments for climate resilience-focused initiatives**
 - **Outcome 1.1. Sustainable processes for provision of pre-investment services to SMEs to make their climate-resilient practices investment-ready**
- **Component 2: Pre-investment services to make climate resilience-focused SMEs investment ready**
 - **Outcome 2.1. SMEs have increased technical, operational and financial capacity to structure their climate-resilient practices and make them investment-ready**
- **Component 3: establishing match-making support for climate resilience-focused SMEs to match with potential private investors**
 - **Outcome 3.1. Increased capacity of selected SMEs to match with private investors**
- **Component 4: Knowledge management and effective project monitoring and evaluation**
 - **Outcome 4.1. M&E to inform adaptive management of project**
 - **Outcome 4.2. Knowledge management increases awareness of SMEs with climate-resilient practices and private investors on successful approaches on preparing, implementing and financing climate-resilient practices**

See the WWF GEF project website for additional details and project documents:

<https://www.worldwildlife.org/projects/investment-readiness-for-the-landscape-resilience-fund>

SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

WWF is seeking an independent consultant to undertake a Terminal Evaluation of the GEF-financed Project. Only the materialization of the co-financing will be assessed – not the co-financing activities or associated results.

The objectives of this evaluation are to examine the extent, magnitude and sustainability of any project impacts to date; identify concerns as well as best practices; assess progress towards project outcomes and outputs; and draw lessons learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits and scalability from this project and aid in the enhancement of future related projects. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the seven (7) core criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, results/impact, sustainability and adaptive capacity. Particular emphasis will be placed on effectiveness, efficiency, results/impact and sustainability. Definitions of each of these criterion will be provided as well as summary table templates, additional assessment areas, and a sample report outline (See annexes A - E).

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

The evaluation will adhere to the guidance, rules and procedures established by WWF¹ and the GEF Terminal Evaluation² and Ethical Guidelines.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 WWF GEF Implementing Agency (IA), the Executing Agency/ project management unit (PMU), / government counterparts, the GEF operational focal point, partners and key stakeholders. Contact information will be provided.

The Evaluation process will include the following, with deliverables marked by “*”⁴:

- A. Kickoff for introductions to project and teams;
- B. Desk review including, but not limited to:
 - Project Document and CEO Endorsement Letter;
 - Project governance documents;
 - Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP&B) documents;
 - Project Progress Reports (PPR) including Results Framework and AWP Tracking tool;
 - Project Closure Report (PCR) (if available);
 - GEF Agency reports, including Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), Back to the Office Reports (BTORs) and Support Mission Reports;
 - Relevant financial documents, including financial progress reports; co-financing monitoring tables and letters, and audits;
 - Relevant safeguards documents, including WWF GEF Agency Categorization and Compliance memo, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, sub-project safeguards screens, if applicable;
 - Gender Action Plan and/or other gender-related documents;
 - Meeting minutes from Project Steering Committee (PSC), WWF- GEF AMU and support team; and others;
 - Other relevant documents provided by the Executing Agency and partners.
- C. Inception meeting to gather input from select project stakeholders on evaluation approach, to agree on methodology, and to inform the draft inception report;
- D. Inception report (Draft and Final) * that outlines evaluation methodology, including how ratings/findings will be assessed (indicators to be used, key questions), sample questionnaires, stakeholders, workplan, etc.;
- E. Site visits with suggested project partners;
- F. Interviews, discussions and consultations with executing partners, Project Steering Committee (PSC) members, beneficiaries, WWF-GEF Agency and extended team; Project Management Unit, and others;

¹ For additional information on evaluation methods adopted by WWF, see the [WWF Evaluation Guidelines](#) , published on our [WWF Program Standards](#) public website.

² For additional information on the GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines, see the [GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines](#) , published on the [GEF Evaluation Office](#) website.

³ Please see the GEF [Ethical Guidelines](#) as published on GEF website.

⁴ All deliverables and subsequent revisions should be sent directly to the Technical Director of the agreement who will determine whether the deliverable is satisfactory and ready for circulation.

- G. Debrief and presentation* of initial findings to Executing partners and WWF-GEF extended team for feedback and final data collection. Feedback log requested to record responses to comments received;
- H. Draft report* (50-page suggested limit excluding annexes) in English shared with WWF-GEF, PMU, PSC and others indicated for review and approval. Subsequent draft reports shall include both a tracked changes and clean version of the report. A sample outline will be provided; and
- I. Final TE report* (50-page suggested limit excluding annexes) that has addressed any inaccuracies, responded to requests for additional means of verification and taken into consideration any feedback. Report should be in English. Final deliverable package shall include a tracked changes and clean version of the report, should annex a feedback log showing actions taken/responses to all reviewer comments, and include all data collected from the evaluation.

EXPECTED CONTENT OF REPORT

The Terminal Evaluation report should 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) and Coherence;
- Assessment of Effectiveness, including review of project Results Framework and rating of project objective and outcomes (individual and overall);
- Validation of Core indicator measurements at project end;
- Assessment and ratings for Implementation and Execution;
- Assessment and rating of Risks to the Sustainability of project results and financial sustainability and scale-up after the life of the projects;
- Assessment and ratings for Monitoring and Evaluation Design and Implementation;
- Assessment of knowledge management approach, including activities and products;
- Assessment of replication, additionality and catalytic effects of the project;
- Assessment of stakeholder engagement;
- Assessment of gender-responsive measures;
- Assessment of any environmental and social impacts generated by the project's activities as well as its safeguards stipulations, which includes (a) a review of the assigned environmental and social risk category classification; and (b) a review of the progress made in the implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the project's relevant documents or otherwise utilized to manage risks.
- Assessment of Efficiency, financial management and summary of co-financing materialized;
- Summary table of key findings by core criteria and GEF ratings, including justification and/or indicators for their determination;
- Key lessons tied to identified strengths, best practices or issues;
- Conclusions and recommendations that would be useful for project close and sustainability, and for other similar projects in order to improve on identified issues, replicate best practices or achieve better results.

QUALIFICATIONS

Required Qualifications and Experience

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience (e.g. leading evaluations)

- Noted experience with evaluation methodologies
- Excellent written and oral communication in English

Preferred Qualifications and Experience

- Experience with GEF financed projects and knowledge of GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies;
- Experience with participatory evaluation, social assessments, and both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods;
- Experience with project countries or familiarity with local context (Uganda in particular);
- Technical knowledge related to the project, climate change adaptation, technical assistance for impact investing in SMEs, agricultural value chains, sustainable agriculture and agroforestry, risk management, Environmental, Social, Governance (ESG) Investing, etc.;
- Experience with gender mainstreaming and inclusion;
- Familiarity with Conservation Standards or WWF Project and Programme Management Standards, including emphasis on theory of change; and
- Knowledge and experience implementing or reviewing application of social and environmental safeguards policies in GEF (or similar) projects.

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. Please limit technical proposal to 30 pages please. Documents should be in English. 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 July 4, 2025. All questions about the requirements or process should be submitted to this e-mail address by June 27, 2025. Responses to frequent and submitted questions will be available until the proposal deadline in Annex F of the Terms of Reference.

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); Also, the extent to which the project objectives and design are responsive to the needs and priorities of the intended beneficiaries, and the extent that the project responds to the mandates of the GEF Agency and GEF partners. Finally, the extent that project objectives and results remain relevant at project completion;
2. **Coherence** - the compatibility of a project intervention with other interventions (e.g. policies) in a country, sector or institution. This can include internal coherence and external coherence. Internal coherence examines the extent to which the theory of change, project components, activities, and M&E system are aligned with the project objectives and consider good practices and previous GEF/Non-GEF interventions. External coherence measures consistency and compatibility of the project interventions among other activities and strategies implemented in the project country, plus compatibility with targeted sectors, institutions and other organizations to review the synergies and trade-offs involved in 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. Determine the potential for achieving transformational changes at scale;
4. **Efficiency** - the extent to which inputs are converted into results in an economic and timely way. 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; plus resiliency of project benefits. Risks will be weighed by their probability and magnitude for influencing continuation of the net benefits of the project.

Determine the degree of institutional capacity, 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 EVALUATION RATINGS TABLES

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 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 Coherent 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 Risks⁶ to Sustainability⁷ of Project Outcomes

Please describe these risks below, taking into account probability and magnitude of their effect/severity:

⁵ If any changes were made to these results, please indicate when they were made and whether those changes were approved.

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.

⁷ Sustainability refers to the likelihood of continuation of project benefits after project completion according to the [2019 Monitoring Policy](#).

Financial Risks		
Sociopolitical Risks		
Institutional Framework and Governance Risks		
Environmental Risks		
Other risks		
Overall Rating of Sustainability of Project Outcomes	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Justification</i>
Using above information, please provide an overall rating for the risks to sustainability of project outcomes.		

4. Assessment of M&E Systems	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
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 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	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Justification</i>
Using above information as guidance, please provide an overall rating for M&E during project design /implementation.		

5. Implementation and Execution Rating Against Responsibilities	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Justification</i>
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)		

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.

ANNEX C: RATING SCALES

Outcomes Rating Scale:⁹

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.

- **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 Scale:

Rating	Implementation (GEF Agency)	Execution (Executing Entity)¹⁰
Highly Satisfactory	Performance of the GEF Agency was exemplary. Project preparation and implementation were robust. The Agency	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.

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.

	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	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	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.

	been obvious. Although instances of mismanagement were discovered, corrective actions were not undertaken. Project activities were poorly implemented, and several had to be dropped.	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](#).

ANNEX D: SAMPLE EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE¹¹

-
- i.** Opening page:
 - Title of WWF supported GEF financed project
 - WWF and GEF project summary table (page 1 TOR)
 - Evaluation team members and affiliations
 - Statement of independence / conflict of interest
 - Acknowledgements
 - ii.** Executive Summary
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Summary of Findings by core criteria, as applicable
 - Overview of Evaluation Ratings
 - Recommendations
 - iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations
 - 1.** Introduction to Evaluation

¹¹The Report length should not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Purpose of the evaluation
 - Statement of independence / conflict of interest
 - Composition of evaluation team, including roles
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Limitations of the evaluation
 - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
- Summary of project theory of change and evolution
 - Locator map and geographic coordinates of project, if available
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Main stakeholders and beneficiaries
 - Discussion of baseline and expected results
3. Findings (All criteria marked with (*) must be rated¹²)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
- Assessment of Relevance and theory of change (project logic /strategies) together with assumptions and risks
 - Use of lessons from other similar projects
 - Replication approach, catalytic effects and additionality
 - WWF and Southpole comparative advantage
 - Coherence /Linkages between project and other interventions
 - Governance and management arrangements
 - Country ownership
 - Analysis of M&E design*
- 3.2 Project Implementation & Execution
- Assessment of Effectiveness*, Review of Results Framework including ratings of Project Outcomes*, and assess potential for impact
 - Execution* and Implementation*, including coordination and management arrangements in implementation, operational issues
 - Assessment of M&E during implementation* / adaptive management and capacity
 - Partnership arrangements
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
 - Alignment with WWF and Country priorities /
 - Sustainability* / project exit
- 3.4 Gender Equality and Mainstreaming
- Assess implementation of the gender analysis and gender mainstreaming strategy / Gender Action Plan
 - Assess gender inclusion as per WWF and GEF gender policies.
- 3.5 Stakeholder Engagement

¹² Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see Annex B for summary format sample.

- Evaluate stakeholder engagement and assess the implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

3.6 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.

3.7 Finance and Co-finance review

- Extent of co-finance realized to date. Report on: sources of co-financing, name of co-financer, type of co-financing (grant or in-kind, investment mobilized or reoccurring expenditures), amount confirmed at CEO endorsement, actual amount materialized at midterm and actual amount materialized at time of TE;
- Degree to which co-financing was taken into account by project;
- Assessment of financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions / efficiency*; and
- Utilization of grant funds distributed to project partners;
- If any shortfalls in co-financing or materialization influenced project results.

3.8 Assessment of Knowledge Management

- Assessment of knowledge management approach (design and implementation);
- Assessment of knowledge activities and products (please list/link priority ones).

4. Conclusions, Lessons and Recommendations

- Summary of findings including sufficient but concise rationale
- Key lessons or best practices to share and replicate
- Specific recommendations to build sustainability or reinforce benefits and impacts from the project
- Summary of ratings (or evaluation rating tables)

5. Annexes

- TOR of TE
- Composition of the evaluation team and roles

- Itinerary of TE (PMU and field visits)
- Geo-referenced maps and photos of project sites from visits
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Framework (Key questions)
- Interview protocol and Guided Questions
- Summary of results from interviews, focus groups, as applicable
- 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

ANNEX E: ANSWERS TO FREQUENT AND SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

1. Can proposals be submitted by an individual, a team or a company?

Response: Yes, proposals can be submitted from an individual, a group of individuals or a consulting firm.

2. The request for proposals instructions say to submit proposals to EvaluationsWWFGEF@wwfus.org, but the website where the call for proposals is posted appears to request applications in another way (e.g., upload a *curriculum vitae* or cover letter to the site). Which is correct?

Response: Due to the nature of some of the websites where the call for proposals is posted, it may appear that candidates could upload their curriculum vitae or a cover letter as an alternative means to apply, but please be aware that only complete proposals submitted to the e-mail address

listed will be reviewed. To be complete, proposals must include technical and financial proposals plus a curriculum vitae, writing sample, and three references.

3. Will candidates be notified if they are not selected?

Response: WWF will acknowledge receipt of all submitted proposals and either confirm they are complete and be reviewed or notify you if additional information is needed. If you do not get confirmation, please call +1 (202) 495-4457. If a proposal is not selected to move forward, candidates will also be notified.

4. Where can I report any irregularities or concerns about the selection process?

Response: 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>.