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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 independent, participatory, 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 will be provided.

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 independent and qualified evaluator(s) and ensure 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.

The review process will include:

1. Desk review consisting of, but not limited to:
   * Project Document and CEO Endorsement Letter;
   * Midterm Review if applicable;
   * Relevant safeguards documents, including safeguards Categorization Memo, Social Assessment, Beneficiaries Selection Criteria Document, etc;
   * Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP&B) documents;
   * Project Progress Reports (PPR) including Results Framework and AWP Tracking;
   * Project Closure Report (PCR) (if available);
   * GEF Agency reports, including Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) and Supervision Mission Reports;
   * 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. Inception report that outlines evaluation methodology;
3. Field visits with PMU and project partners to field sites, as necessary and feasible;
4. 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;
5. Post-field visit debrief and presentation of initial findings to PMU;
6. 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
7. 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 is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the seven (7) core criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, results/impact, sustainability and adaptive capacity. Definitions of each of these criteria will be provided as well as summary table templates and a report outline (See annexes A - C).

Evaluation timeframe[[4]](#footnote-4)

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator(s) provides clarifications on timing and methods | 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 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** | Final report incorporating feedback | Within 2 weeks of receiving comments on draft | Evaluator submits to CSM |

Expected Content of Evaluation Report

The Terminal Evaluation report should include:

* + Information on the evaluation, including when the evaluation took place, sites visited, participants, key questions, methodology, and feedback log showing how comments on draft were incorporated;
  + Key findings by core criteria[[5]](#footnote-5); plus, rationale for each criterion 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 and GEF priorities;
  + Assessment of stakeholder engagement and gender-responsive measures;
  + Assessment of any environmental and social impacts, revision of risk category classification, if applicable, information on mitigation measures taken; and new assessments /monitoring/ management plans or reports relating to environmental and social safeguards.
  + Assessment of WWF GEF Agency, PMU and project partners;
  + Knowledge activities and products;
  + Lessons learned regarding: project design, objectives, and technical approach; use of adaptive management; administration and governance arrangements; relevance; implementation of the work plan; achievement of impact; environmental and social safeguards, 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.

The report should include:

* + Information on the evaluation, including when the evaluation took place, sites visited, participants, key questions, methodology, and feedback log showing how major comments on draft were incorporated;
  + Key findings by core criteria[[6]](#footnote-6); plus, rationale for each criterion 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 and GEF priorities;
  + Assessment of stakeholder engagement and gender-responsive measures;
  + Assessment of any environmental and social impacts, including potential updates to project risk category classification, description of risk management measures implemented; and any related assessments/monitoring/management plans or reports;
  + Assessment of WWF GEF Agency, PMU and project partners;
  + Assessment of planned and realized co-financing, and review of financial controls and audits;
  + Knowledge activities and products
  + 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; environmental and social safeguards; etc.;
  + Conclusions, and recommendations that include: potential corrective actions for key stakeholders that will continue initiatives after project close; recommendations on best practices towards achieving project outcomes and replication /knowledge sharing for other projects of similar scope.

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 is an asset;
* 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;
* Strong English writing required and fluent [insert relevant language] preferred;
* Regional experience an asset; and
* [Insert additional skills based on project particulars].

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. Twenty-five percent of payment will correspond with completion of Inception Report and debrief presentation. Fifty percent of payment will correspond with submission and approval of the Draft Report. The final twenty-five percent will be delivered with the submission and approval of the Final Report.

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online [insert site link] by [date]. Consultants are invited to submit a technical proposal and financial proposal with their *curriculum vitae.* The financial proposal should include daily fee, per diem and travel costs.

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:* | | |
| **Financial Risks** | | |
|  | | |
| **Sociopolitical Risks** | | |
|  | | |
| **Institutional Framework and Governance Risks** | | |
|  | | |
| **Environmental Risks** | | |
|  | | |
| **Overall Rating** **of Sustainability of Project Outcomes** | ***Rating*** | ***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 data?[[14]](#footnote-14) 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 and relevant GEF focal area indicators gathered in a systematic manner? 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 During Implementation[[15]](#footnote-15)** | ***Rating*** | ***Justification*** |
| Using above information as guidance, please provide an overall rating for M&E during project implementation. |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Implementation and Execution Rating** | ***Rating*** | ***Justification*** |
| Please rate the WWF GEF Agency on the project implementation. |  |  |
| Please rate the Executing Agency on project execution. |  |  |

**ANNEX C: Ratings Criteria**

**Outcomes Rating Criteria:**

* **Highly satisfactory (HS)** – Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were not shortcomings.
* **Satisfactory (S)** – Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor shortcomings.
* **Moderately satisfactory (MS**) – Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate shortcomings.
* **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU**) – Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings.
* **Unsatisfactory (U)** – Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major shortcomings.
* **Highly unsatisfactory (HU**) – Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe shortcomings.
* **Unable to assess (UA) –** The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements.

The calculation of overall outcomes rating of projects will consider all three criteria, of which relevance and effectiveness are critical. The rating on relevance will determine whether the overall rating will be in the unsatisfactory range (MU to HU). If the relevance rating is in the unsatisfactory range then the overall outcome will be in the unsatisfactory range as well. However, where the relevance rating is in the satisfactory range (HS to MS), the overall outcome rating could, depending on its effectiveness and efficiency rating, be either in the satisfactory range or in the unsatisfactory range. Overall Outcome achievement rating may not be higher than the effectiveness rating. For more details see GEF IEO TE Guidelines.

**Sustainability/ Risk Rating Criteria:**

* **Likely (L) -** There are little or no risks to sustainability.
* **Moderately likely (ML)** - There are moderate risks to sustainability.
* **Moderately unlikely (MU) -** There are significant risks to sustainability.
* **Unlikely (U)** - There are severe risks to sustainability.
* **Unable to assess (UA)** – Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability.

**M&E Rating criteria:**

* **Highly satisfactory (HS) --** There were no shortcomings and quality of M&E design / implementation exceeded expectations.
* **Satisfactory (S) --** There were no or minor shortcomings and quality of M&E design / implementation meets expectations.
* **Moderately satisfactory (MS) --** There were some shortcomings and quality of M&E design / implementation more or less meets expectations.
* **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU) --** There were significant shortcomings and quality of M&E design/ implementation somewhat lower than expected.
* **Unsatisfactory (U) --**There were major shortcomings and quality of M&E design/ implementation substantially lower than expected.
* **Highly unsatisfactory (HU) --** There were severe shortcomings in M&E design / implementation.
* **Unable to assess (UA) –** The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design /implementation.

**Implementation and Execution Rating Criteria:**

* **Highly satisfactory (HS) --** There were no shortcomings and quality implementation / execution exceeded expectations.
* **Satisfactory (S) --** There were no or minor shortcomings and quality implementation /execution meets expectations.
* **Moderately satisfactory (MS) --** There were some shortcomings and quality of implementation /execution more or less meets expectations.
* **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU) --** There were significant shortcomings and quality of implementation /execution somewhat lower than expected.
* **Unsatisfactory (U) --**There were major shortcomings and quality of implementation /execution substantially lower than expected.
* **Highly unsatisfactory (HU) --** There were severe shortcomings in quality of implementation/ execution.
* **Unable to assess (UA) –** The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation / execution.

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/files/gef-guidelines-te-fsp-2017.pdf%20p%208%20and%2018)
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Annex C: Evaluation Report Outline[[16]](#footnote-16)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[17]](#footnote-17)) |
| **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   * Provide updates on any changes to project risk category classification; * Elaborate on additional risks and potential impacts identified and addressed during implementation; * Describe risk management measures taken; * Submit any new assessments, monitoring/management plans or reports; * Share lessons learned. |
| **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. If given timeframe is desired, you may pose here. However, it is also possible to request a proposed timeline as part of the technical proposal. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See annex A [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See annex A [↑](#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. 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-14)
15. 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-15)
16. The Report length should not exceed *50* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. 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-17)