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INTRODUCTION and Project overview

World Wildlife Fund, Inc. (WWF) policies and procedures for all GEF financed full and medium-sized projects require a terminal evaluation (TE) upon completion of project implementation. The following terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for the TE for the project “[insert project title]”, hereafter referred to as the “Project”. The technical consultant selected to conduct this evaluation will be referred to as “evaluator(s)” throughout this TOR.

The Project seeks to [insert Project Objective and summary]. The Project was organized into the following components: [insert bullet points describing each Project Component]

SCOPE AND Objectives for the evaluation

WWF is seeking an independent consultant to undertake a Terminal Evaluation of the Project. The TE will cover the GEF financed components and review the project co-financing delivered.

The objective of this evaluation is to examine the extent, magnitude and sustainability of any project impacts to date; identify any project design problems; assess progress towards project outcomes and outputs; and draw lessons learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the enhancement of future related projects.

Evaluation approach and method

The evaluation will comply with the guidance, rules and procedures established by WWF[[1]](#footnote-1) and the GEF Terminal Evaluation[[2]](#footnote-2) and Ethical Guidelines.[[3]](#footnote-3) The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is useful, independent, participatory, respectful, credible, transparent, and ethical. The evaluator(s) must be unbiased and free of any conflicts of interest with the project. The evaluator(s) 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 point, the Executing Agency project management unit (PMU), partners and key stakeholders. Contact information has been provided on the cover page.

The consultant will liaise with the WWF GEF Agency Project Manager as well as the PMU Project Manager for any logistical and/or methodological needs for the review. A draft report will be prepared and circulated to WWF GEF Agency and the executing office to solicit comments and suggestions.

The review process will include:

1. Desk review consisting of, but not limited to:
   * Project Document and CEO Endorsement Letter;
   * Midterm Review if applicable;
   * Support Mission Reports;
   * Relevant safeguards documents, including safeguards Categorization Memo, Social Assessment, Beneficiaries Selection Criteria Document, etc;
   * Annual Work Plans (AWP) and Budgets;
   * Project Progress Reports (PPR) including Results Framework and AWP Tracking;
   * GEF Agency reports, including Annual Monitoring Reviews (AMR) and Project Implementation Reports (PIRs);
   * GEF Tracking Tools (if applicable);
   * Relevant financial documents, including financial progress reports; co-financing monitoring tables and co-financing letters from government;
   * Meeting minutes (Project Steering Committee (PSC)) and relevant virtual meetings with the WWF- GEF AMU and support team; and
   * Other relevant documents provided by the Executing Agency and partners.
2. Field visits with PMU and project field sites;
3. 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;
4. Post-field visit debrief;
5. Draft report not to exceed <insert page requirement> pages (excluding annexes) shared with GEF AMU and PMU for review and feedback. A sample outline will be provided; and
6. Final TE report that has incorporated feedback and comments.

The WWF methodology for conducting project evaluations is a key element of our adaptive management approach. The evaluator(s) is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the six (6) core criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results/impact, sustainability and adaptive capacity. Definitions of each of these criteria are available in Annex A. A sample of questions covering each of these criteria has been provided (Annex B). The evaluator(s) will provide a rating on relevance, effectiveness and efficiency to assess the level of achievement of project objectives and outcomes. A completed ratings table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. A performance Evaluation Ratings Summary template has been provided (Annex B) with the GEF required rating scales. A sample outline is also provided (Annex C).

Expected Outputs of Evaluation

The Terminal Evaluation report will include:

* + Information on the evaluation, including when the evaluation took place, sites visited, participants, key questions, and methodology;
  + Key findings by core criteria[[4]](#footnote-4); plus rationale for each criteria rating provided. Should include identification of key strengths, challenges and shortcomings;
  + Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes;
  + Review of Monitoring and Evaluation systems;
  + Replication and catalytic effects of the project;
  + Assessment of alignment with WWF priorities;
  + Assessment of any environmental and social impacts;
  + Assessment of WWF GEF Agency, PMU and project partners;
  + Lessons learned regarding: project design (theory of change), objectives, and technical approach; use of adaptive management; administration and governance arrangements; relevance; implementation of the work plan; achievement of impact; etc;
  + Conclusions, and recommendations that include: practical and short-term corrective actions per evaluation criteria to address issues and findings; recommendations on best practices towards achieving project outcomes and replication for other projects of similar scope.

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. The evaluator(s) will assess the appropriateness of and compliance with financial controls. Financial planning and reports should have supported timely decision making for effective project management. Cash flows should have been timely and sufficient to support on-going project activities. Co-financing actuals should be reviewed against commitments. Evidence and verification of due diligence and complaint management of funds, including any financial audits should also be assessed.

Project cost and financial source data will be required, including annual expenditure reports. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained in the evaluation report. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the executing office to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which must be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CO-FINANCING DATA[[5]](#footnote-5)** | | | | | | | |
| **Co-Financing Source** | **Type** | **Project Preparation** | | **Project Implementation** | | **Total** | |
| **Expected** | **Actual** | Expected | **Actual** | **Expected** | **Actual** |
| GEF Agency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Host Government |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Donors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Internal Funds |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total co-financing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Project Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the WWF’s Conservation Strategies & Measures (CSM) team in coordination with the WWF GEF Project Manager. The CSM will select evaluator(s) and ensure the timely reimbursement, approve travel arrangements, and respond to questions concerning the scope and requirements for the evaluation. The PMU will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator(s) to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government partners, etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be [XX] days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *XX* days *(recommended: 2-4)* | *date* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *XX* days (*~5-15)* | *date* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *XX* days (*~5-10*) | *date* |
| **Final Report** | *XX* days *(~1-2*) | *date* |

Evaluation deliverables

In addition to the deliverables outlined below, the evaluator(s) is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how feedback and comments have been addressed in the final evaluation report. Please note that the evaluation team may be contacted by the GEF Partnership for up to three years after completion of the terminal evaluation for information requests.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator(s) provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator(s) submits to WWF CSM |
| **Presentation for verbal feedback** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | Evaluator (s) provides to PMU, EA, WWF, <insert others> |
| **Draft Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Evaluator submits to CSM, reviewed by PMU, EA, WWF office, WWF GEF Project, and GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving WWF’s comments on draft | Evaluator submits to CSM |

Evaluation Team Qualifications

The consultant(s) shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. The evaluator(s) selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have a conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum *XX* years of relevant professional experience;
* Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage;
* Technical knowledge in the targeted GEF Operational Focal Area(s)
* Knowledge of GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy is an asset;
* Recent experience conducting Evaluations or Mid-term Reviews for GEF projects is an asset;
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Experience with WWF Project and Program Management Standards or Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation (www.cmp-openstandards.org) is preferred;
* Experience with social assessments, participatory project design and management, and community-based resource management preferred;
* Knowledge and experience in implementing or reviewing application of social and environmental safeguards policies in GEF (or similar) projects preferred;
* Regional experience an asset; and
* (*additional skills based on project particulars*)

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards. Evaluations are conducted in accordance with WWF principles[[6]](#footnote-6) and the terms and conditions of the consulting agreement.

Payment modalities and specifications

Payment, expense reimbursement, and other contractual terms and conditions are outlined in the consultant agreement made between WWF and the evaluator(s). Payments are according to deliverables submitted.

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (insert site link) by (date). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. Applications should contain a current and complete C.V. in English, and (insert other language requirements) with contact information. The selection of candidates and contractual agreements will be in compliance with WWF procurement policies[[7]](#footnote-7) and subject to GEF requirements.

WWF applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex A: Evaluation Criteria

**Criteria for Overall Evaluation of Project**

The evaluation should assess the project against the following GEF and WWF Project and Program Management Standards (Open Standards) 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. **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;
3. **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;
4. **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. Assess the project’s logic or theory of change and the potential to scale up or replicate the project outcomes and impact.
5. **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;
6. **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: Evaluation Ratings Sample Summary Table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Assessment of Project Objectives & Outcomes** | ***Remarks*** | |
| Were project outcomes ***Relevant*** when compared to focal area strategies, country priorities, and WWF strategies? |  | |
| How do you assess the ***Effectiveness*** of project outcomes? Were the actual outcomes commensurate with the expected outcomes?  *If assessment of outcome achievements is not realistic, output achievement can be used as a proxy.* |  | |
| How do you assess the achievement of anticipated long-term impacts of the project?  *If it is not possible to identify the impacts just yet, please provide notes on past or future steps to assess these impacts and how these findings will be reported to GEF in the future.* |  | |
| How do you assess project cost **Efficiency?**   * Did the project use the least cost options? If not, did they chose the most efficient cost options available? * Did any delays in implementation affect cost effectiveness? * Evaluators should compare costs incurred and the time taken to achieve the outcomes with other similar projects. |  | |
| **Overall Rating** **of Project Objectives & Outcomes\*[[8]](#footnote-8)** | ***Rating*** | ***Justification[[9]](#footnote-9)*** |
| Using above criteria, please provide an **overall rating[[10]](#footnote-10)** for the achievement of the Project Objective and outcomes. This assessment should analyze both the achievement and shortcomings of these results as stated in the project document.[[11]](#footnote-11) |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Assessment of Risks[[12]](#footnote-12) to Sustainability[[13]](#footnote-13) of Project Outcomes**  *Please describe these risks below, taking into account likelihood and magnitude:* | ***Rating per Risk Category[[14]](#footnote-14)*** | |
| **Financial Risks** |  | |
|  |
| **Sociopolitical Risks** |  | |
|  |
| **Institutional Framework and Governance Risks** |  | |
|  |
| **Environmental Risks** |  | |
|  |
| **Overall Rating** **of Sustainability of Project Outcomes** | ***Rating[[15]](#footnote-15)*** | ***Justification*** |
| Using above criteria, please provide an **overall rating** for the risks to sustainability of project outcomes. |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Assessment of M&E Systems** | ***Remarks*** | |
| M&E Design – Was the M&E plan at the CEO endorsement practical and sufficient? Did the M&E plan include baseline considerations,[[16]](#footnote-16) data sources, collection methodologies, assumptions, appropriate and SMART indicators and targets, and a system for storing, analyzing and sharing data? |  | |
| Budgeting and Funding for M&E Activities – Was the budget for M&E adequate at the planning stage? Was the budget utilized in a timely and efficient manner for monitoring during implementation? |  | |
| Monitoring of long term changes - Did this project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?  What were the accomplishments and shortcomings in establishment of this system?  Is the system sustainable – that is, is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and does it have financing?  Is the information generated by this system being used as originally intended? |  | |
| M&E Plan Implementation – Was an M&E system and process in place to track project progress towards outcomes? Did it facilitate transparency, sharing and adaptive management? Assess the quality of implementation and the role monitoring played in the adaptation and implementation of project activities. Did project management ensure appropriate institutional and financial arrangements to ensure data on long-term impacts will continue after project closure? |  | |
| **Overall Rating** **of M&E During Implementation[[17]](#footnote-17)** | ***Rating*** | ***Justification*** |
| Using above information as guidance, please provide an overall rating for M&E during project implementation. |  |  |

**Achievement Rating Criteria:**

* **Highly satisfactory (HS)** - The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
* **Satisfactory (S)** - The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
* **Moderately satisfactory (MS**) - The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
* **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU**) - The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
* **Unsatisfactory (U)** - The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.
* **Highly unsatisfactory (HU**) - The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

**Sustainability/ Risk Rating Criteria:**

* **Likely (L) -** There are no or negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
* **Moderately likely (ML)** - There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
* **Moderately unlikely (MU) -** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
* **Unlikely (U)** - There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

**M&E Rating criteria:**

* **Highly satisfactory (HS).** There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
* **Satisfactory (S).** There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
* **Moderately satisfactory (MS).** There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
* **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU).** There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
* **Unsatisfactory (U).** There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
* **Highly unsatisfactory (HU).** The project had no M&E system.

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/ieo/evaluations/te-guidelines-2008.pdf)
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Annex C: Evaluation Report Outline[[18]](#footnote-18)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | Opening page:   * Title of WWF supported GEF financed project * WWF and GEF project summary table (page 1 TOR) * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | Executive Summary   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | Acronyms and Abbreviations |
| **1.** | Introduction to Evaluation   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Limitations of the evaluation * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | Project description and development context   * Project start and duration * Main stakeholders * Problems that the project sought to address * Outcomes and Project Objective of the project * Discussion of baseline (of indicators) * Expected Results |
| **3.** | Findings (All criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[19]](#footnote-19)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of Results Framework and theory of change (Project logic /strategies/indicators) * Assumptions and risks * Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design * Replication approach * WWF comparative advantage (if applicable) * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Governance and management arrangements * Country ownership |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * WWF and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues * Alignment with WWF and Country priorities |
| **3.3** | Project Assessment   * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness * Efficiency (\*) * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) / Impact * Sustainability (\*) * Adaptive capacity   3.4 |
| **3.4** | Gender Equality and Mainstreaming   * Assess implementation of the gender analysis and gender mainstreaming strategy * Assess gender inclusion as per WWF and GEF gender policies. |
| **3.5** | Stakeholder Engagement   * Evaluate stakeholder engagement and (if GEF-7) assess the implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. |
| **3.6** | Safeguards Review   * Assess project activities for any adverse or unforeseen environmental impacts <with particular attention to…>; * Assess implementation of the beneficiary criteria developed during project preparation for site selection and community grants; * Assess any indirect or direct project impacts related to access restriction to natural resources; and |
| **3.7** | Finance and Co-finance review   * Extent of co-financerealized to date. Take into account: sources of co-financing, name of co-financer, type of co-financing, amount confirmed at CEO endorsement, approval, actual amount materialized at midterm and actual amount materialized at closing; * Financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions; and * Utilization of grant funds distributed to project partners, including [insert partners]. |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Proposed corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success. |
| **5.** | Annexes   * TOR of TE, including evaluator composition and expertise * Itinerary of TE (PMU and field visits) * Geo-referenced maps and photos of project sites * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Response from PMU and/or OFP regarding TE findings * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Evaluation Report ACCEPTANCE Form

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Accepted by:

WWF US (GEF Project Agency)

Name: John Morrison, Director for Conservation Strategies & Measures

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on evaluation methods adopted by WWF, see the [WWF Evaluation Guidelines](http://assets.panda.org/downloads/evaluation_terms_of_reference.doc) , 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](http://www.gefieo.org/evaluations/guidelines-gef-agencies-conducting-terminal-evaluations-2008) , published on the [GEF 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. An acceptable tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROTI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office. A link is provided here for reference  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Expected amounts are those submitted by the GEF Agencies in the original project appraisal document. Cofinancing types are grant, soft loan, hard loan, guarantee, in kind, or cash. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. WWF maintains principles for ethical conduct and conflicts of interest that have been articulated into policies for employees. These principles for conduct and professionalism are applied to external consultants conducting evaluations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. WWF [Procurement Policy](http://assets.worldwildlife.org/publications/454/files/original/WWF-US_Recipient_Procurement_Guidelines.pdf?1347549122) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Asterix (\*) denotes GEF requirement. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The evaluator should be objective and provide sufficient justification with empirical evidence to support the rating given. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Please use the rating criteria provided on the following page. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. If any changes were made to these results, please indicate when they were made and whether those changes were approved. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. 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-12)
13. Sustainability is defined by 2010 GEF M&E Policy as: the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion; projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the lowest rated dimension. For example, if a project has an “unlikely” rating in any dimension, its overall rating cannot be higher than “unlikely.” For further guidance, see the [GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines](http://www.gefieo.org/evaluations/guidelines-gef-agencies-conducting-terminal-evaluations-2008) [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Using the ratings for each risk category, please use the Sustainability Rating Criteria to provide an overall Sustainability of Project Outcomes rating. The evaluator should be objective and provide sufficient justification with empirical evidence to support the rating given. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. According to [GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines](http://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/te-guidelines-2008.pdf), 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-16)
17. The overall rating of M&E during project implementation will be based solely on the quality of M&E plan implementation. The ratings on quality at entry of M&E

    design and sufficiency of funding during planning and implementation will be used as explanatory variables. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. The Report length should not exceed *50* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)