

Request for Proposals (RFP)

Date: August 20, 2019

RFP No. 003 - 2019

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTION FOR OFFERORS

I.1. Introduction

Conservation International - GEF, invites proposals from suitably qualified consultants or firms for evaluation of "Improve sustainability of mangrove forests and coastal mangrove areas in Liberia through protection, planning and livelihood creation- as a building block towards Liberia's marine and coastal protected areas". The award will be in the form of service agreement (hereinafter referred to as "the contract"). The successful offeror(s) shall be required to adhere to the *code of ethics, statement of work, and the terms and conditions of the contract*. This RFP does not obligate CI to execute a contract nor does it commit CI to pay any costs incurred in the preparation and submission of the proposals. Furthermore, CI reserves the right to reject any and all offers, if such action is considered to be in the best interest of CI.

Interested consultants should indicate their interest in submitting a proposal for the anticipated agreement by sending an email indicating their intention to CIProcurement@conservation.org by 4:00 PM on August 25, 2019.

Transparency: Conservation International's reputation derives from our commitment to our values: Integrity, Respect, Courage, Optimism, and Passion and Teamwork. CI's Code of Ethics (the "Code") provides guidance to CI employees, service providers, experts, interns, and volunteers in living CI's core values, and outlines minimum standards for ethical conduct which all parties must adhere to.

Any violation of the Code of Ethics should be reported to CI via its Ethics Hotline at www.ci.ethicspoint.com

Concerns regarding the integrity of the procurement process and documents shall be reported to www.ci.ethicspoint.com under procurement violation section

I.2. General Background:

All Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded projects are required to complete a Terminal Evaluation. The Terminal Evaluation (TE) is designed to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its design, implementation, and achievement of objectives. The evaluation is expected to: promote accountability and transparency; and facilitate synthesis of lessons. Also, the TE will provide feedback to allow the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) to identify recurring issues across the GEF portfolio; and, contribute to GEF IEO databases for aggregation and analysis.

I.3. Proposals Deadline

Proposals shall be submitted electronically at the following email address, CIProcurement@conservation.org

Proposals must be received no later than 4:00 PM EST September 20, 2019. Offerors are responsible for ensuring that their offers are received in accordance with the instructions stated herein. *Late offers may not be considered.*

I.4. Chronological List of Proposal Event

Offerors must strictly follow the calendar of important dates in the solicitation process. The dates can be modified at the sole discretion of CI. Any changes will be communicated in an addendum to this RFP.

RFP Published	August 20, 2019
Deadline for Questions	August 30, 2019
Proposal Due Date	September 20, 2019 - 4:00 PM-EST

I.5. Evaluation and Basis for Award

Award will be made to the offeror whose proposal is determined to be responsive to this solicitation document, meets the technical capability requirements, and is determined to represent the most advantageous to CI.

- Technical approach, methodology, and work plan [0- 45 PTS]
- Personnel Qualifications [0- 45 PTS]
- Cost [0- 10 PTS]

I.6. Instruction for Proposal Submission

Technical and Financial proposals shall be submitted in one volume and in English language to the address identified in **I.3**.

I.6.1 Technical Proposal

The technical proposal should demonstrate a clear understanding of the work to be undertaken. The Technical Proposal should have a detail work plan including a timeline to meet the deadlines identified in Scope of Work. The Technical Proposals should have the following details:

- a. Management, Key Personnel, and Staffing Plan. This section should include CV(s) of consultant(s) that will be assigned to the implementation of the proposed methodology.
- b. A narrative proposal for delivering scope of work, including (1) approach or methodology (2) workplan for completion of each assignments, and (3) Outcome of Scope of Work.
- c. List of not more than three most recent experiences with similar assignment

I.6.2 Financial Proposal

The cost proposal is used to determine which proposals are the most advantageous and serves as a basis of negotiation for award of a contract. Offerors are required to use the budget template Annexed to this RFP.

SECTION II. INFORMATION AND GENERAL GUIDANCE

II.1 Guidelines for the Evaluator(s)

1. Evaluators will be independent from project design, approval, implementation and execution. Evaluators will familiarize themselves with the GEF programs and strategies, and with relevant GEF policies such as those on project cycle, M&E, co-financing, fiduciary standards, gender, and environmental and social safeguards.
2. Evaluators will take perspectives of all relevant stakeholders (including the GEF Operational Focal Point[s]) into account. They will gather information on project performance and results from multiple sources including the project M&E system, tracking tools, field visits, stakeholder interviews, project documents, and other independent sources, to facilitate triangulation. They will seek the necessary contextual information to assess the significance and relevance of observed performance and results.
3. Evaluators will be impartial and will present a balanced account consistent with evidence.
4. Evaluators will apply the rating scales provided in these guidelines in II.3.
5. Evaluators will abide by the GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines found at <https://www.conservation.org/gef/Pages/about.aspx>.

II.2 Outline for Draft and Terminal Evaluation Reports

The draft and final evaluation reports should at a minimum contain the information below:

II.2.1 General Information

The Terminal Evaluation report will provide general information on the project and conduct of the Terminal Evaluation. This includes information such as:

- GEF Project ID
- Project name

- GEF financing
- Planned and materialized co-financing
- Key objectives
- GEF Agency
- Project countries
- Key dates: Date of project start, Date of project completion
- Name of the Project Executing Agency(ies)

The Terminal Evaluation report will also provide information on when the evaluation took place, places visited, who was involved, the methodology, and the limitations of the evaluation. The report will also include, as annexes to the main report, the evaluation team's terms of reference, its composition and expertise.

Where feasible and appropriate, the Terminal Evaluation reports should include georeferenced maps and/or coordinates that demarcate the planned and actual area covered by the project. To facilitate tracking and verification, where feasible, the Terminal Evaluations should include georeferenced pictures of the sites where GEF supported interventions were undertaken.

II.2.2 Project Theory

The Terminal Evaluation report will include a description of the project's theory of change including description of: the outputs, outcomes, intermediate states, and intended long-term environmental impacts of the project; the causal pathways for the long-term impacts; and, implicit and explicit assumptions.

The project's objective(s) should also be included within the theory of change. Some of the projects may already have an explicit theory of change. Where appropriate, after consultations with the project stakeholders, the evaluators may refine this theory of change. Where an explicit theory of change is not provided in the project documents, the evaluators should develop it based on information provided in the project documents and through consultations with the project stakeholders.

II.2.3 Assessment of Project Result

The TE must assess achievement of project outputs and outcomes, and report on these. While assessing a project's results, evaluators will determine and rate the extent to which the project objectives – as stated in the documents submitted at the CEO Endorsement stage – have been achieved. The evaluator(s) should also indicate if there were any changes in project design and/or expected results after start of implementation. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), where feasible, the evaluator should estimate the baseline conditions so that results can be determined. Where applicable, the Terminal Evaluation report will include an assessment of the level of achievement of the GEF corporate results targets to which the project contributes and will also incorporate data from the focal area tracking tool.

- Outputs:** The evaluator should rate the extent to which the expected outputs were actually delivered. An identification and assessment of the factors that affected delivery of outputs should also be included.
- Outcomes:** The evaluator should rate the extent to which the expected outcomes were achieved and the extent to which its achievement was dependent on delivery of project outputs. They should also assess the factors that affected outcome achievement, e.g. project design, project's linkages with other activities, extent and materialization of co-

financing, stakeholder involvement, etc. Where the project was developed within the framework of a program, the assessment should also report on the extent the project contributed to the program outcomes.

- c. Criteria for Outcome Ratings:** Outcome ratings will take into account the outcome achievements of the projects against its expected targets. Project outcomes will be rated on three dimensions: a. Relevance: Were the project outcomes congruent with the GEF focal areas/operational program strategies, country priorities, and mandates of the Agencies? Was the project design appropriate for delivering the expected outcomes? b. Effectiveness: Were the project's actual outcomes commensurate with the expected outcomes? c. Efficiency: Was the project cost-effective? How does the project cost/time versus output/outcomes equation compare to that of similar projects? Rating Scale for Outcomes: An overall outcome rating will be provided on a six-point scale (highly satisfactory to highly unsatisfactory) after taking into account outcome relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency (II.3).

a. Sustainability: The assessment of sustainability will weigh risks to continuation of benefits from the project. The assessment should identify key risks and explain how these risks may affect continuation of benefits after the GEF project ends. The analysis should cover financial, socio-political, institutional, and environmental risks. The overall sustainability of project outcomes will be rated on a four-point scale (Likely to Unlikely) based on an assessment of the likelihood and magnitude of the risks to sustainability. Higher levels of risks and magnitudes of effect imply lower likelihood of sustainability. II.3 describes the rating scale for sustainability.

b. Progress to Impact: The evaluators should also assess the extent to which the progress towards long-term impact may be attributed to the project. The evaluators should report the available qualitative and quantitative evidence on environmental stress reduction (e.g. GHG emission reduction, reduction of waste discharge, etc.) and environmental status change (e.g. change in population of endangered species, forest stock, water retention in degraded lands, etc.). When reporting such evidence, the evaluator should note the information source and clarify the scale/s at which the described environmental stress reduction is being achieved.

The evaluators should cover the project's contributions to changes in policy/legal/regulatory frameworks. This would include observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.) and governance architecture, including access to and use of information (laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc.). Contribution to change in socioeconomic status (income, health, well-being, etc.) should also be documented.

Where the environmental and social changes are being achieved at scales beyond the immediate area of intervention, the evaluators should provide an account of the processes such as sustaining, mainstreaming, replication, scaling up and market change, through which these changes have taken place. The evaluators should discuss whether there are arrangements in the project design to facilitate follow-up actions, and should document instances where the GEF promoted approaches, technologies, financing instruments, legal frameworks, information

systems, etc., were adopted/implemented without direct support from, or involvement of, the project. Evidence on incidence of these processes should be discussed to assess progress towards impact. When assessing contributions of GEF project to the observed change, the evaluators should also assess the contributions of other actors and factors.

The evaluators should assess merits of rival explanations for the observed impact and give reasons for accepting or rejecting them. Where applicable, the evaluators are encouraged to identify and describe the barriers and other risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term impacts.

The evaluators should document the unintended impacts – both positive and negative impacts – of the project and assess the overall scope and implications of these impacts. Where these impacts are undesirable from environmental and socio-economic perspectives, the evaluation should suggest corrective actions.

- c. Assessment of Monitoring & Evaluation Systems:** The evaluators will include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the project M&E plan and its implementation.

M&E Design. To assess the quality of the M&E plan, the evaluators will assess:

- a. Was the M&E plan at the point of CEO Endorsement practical and sufficient?
- b. Did it include baseline data?
- c. Did it: specify clear targets and appropriate (SMART) indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio-economic results; a proper methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of the M&E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection; and, budget adequate funds for M&E activities?

M&E Implementation. The evaluators should assess:

- a. Whether the M&E system operated as per the M&E plan?
- b. Where necessary, whether the M&E plan was revised in a timely manner?
- c. Was information on specified indicators and relevant GEF focal area tracking tools gathered in a systematic manner?
- d. Whether appropriate methodological approaches have been used to analyze data?
- e. Were resources for M&E sufficient? How was the information from the M&E system used during the project implementation?

Project M&E systems will be rated on the quality of M&E design and quality of M&E implementation using a six-point scale (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory). Annex 2 provides more details on the scale.

- d. Assessment of Implementation and Execution:** The assessment of the implementation and execution of GEF full size projects will take into account the performance of the GEF Implementing Agencies and project Executing Agency(ies) (EAs) in discharging their expected roles and responsibilities. The

performance of these agencies will be rated using a six-point scale (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory). See Annex 2 for more information on the scale.

II.2.4 Quality of Implementation

Within the GEF partnership, GEF Implementing Agencies are involved in activities related to a project's identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation of detailed proposal, approval and start-up, oversight, supervision, completion, and evaluation. To assess performance of the GEF Agencies, the evaluators will assess the extent to which the agency delivered effectively on these counts, with focus on elements that were controllable from the given GEF Agency's perspective. The evaluator will assess how well risks were identified and managed by the GEF Agency.

II.2.5 Quality of Execution

Within the GEF partnership, the EAs are involved in the management and administration of the project's day-to-day activities under the overall oversight and supervision of the GEF Agencies. The EAs are responsible for the appropriate use of funds, and procurement and contracting of goods and services to the GEF Agency. To assess EA performance, the evaluators will assess the extent to which it effectively discharged its role and responsibilities.

- a. Assessment of the Environmental and Social Safeguards:** The evaluator will assess whether appropriate environmental and social safeguards were addressed in the project's design and implementation (II.3) for more details on the rating scale). It is expected that a GEF project will not cause any harm to environment or to any stakeholder and, where applicable, it will take measures to prevent and/or mitigate adverse effects. The evaluator should assess the screening/categorization of the project along with the implementation of the safeguard plans that were approved by the GEF Agency.

II.2.6 Gender

The evaluator will determine the extent to which the gender considerations were taken into account in designing and implementing the project. The evaluator should report whether a gender analysis was conducted, the extent to which the project was implemented in a manner that ensures gender equitable participation and benefits, and whether gender disaggregated data was gathered and reported on beneficiaries. In case the given GEF project disadvantages or may disadvantage women or men, then this should be documented and reported. The evaluator should also determine the extent to which relevant gender related concerns were tracked through project M&E, and if possible, addressing whether gender considerations contributed to the success of the project.

II.2.7 Stakeholder Engagement

The evaluator should, where applicable, review and assess the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and project specific aspects such as involvement of civil society, indigenous population, private sector, etc. The evaluator should also indicate the percentage of stakeholders who rate as satisfactory, the level at which their views and concerns are taken into account by the project.

II.2.8 Accountability and Grievance Mechanism

The evaluator should review and assess the project's Grievance Mechanism. The evaluator should analyze and assess whether project stakeholders were aware of the grievance mechanism and whether the mechanism was effective in addressing grievances.

The evaluator should also review and assess any other safeguard plans that were triggered.

II.2.9 Other Assessments

The Terminal Evaluations should assess the following topics, for which ratings are not required:

- a. Need for follow-up: Where applicable, the evaluators will indicate if there is any need to follow up on the evaluation findings, e.g. instances financial mismanagement, unintended negative impacts or risks, etc.
- b. Materialization of co-financing: the evaluators will provide information on the extent to which expected co-financing materialized, whether co-financing is cash or in-kind, whether it is in form of grant or loan or equity, whether co-financing was administered by the project management or by some other organization, how shortfall in co-financing or materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results, etc.
- c. Lessons and Recommendations: Evaluators should provide a few well-formulated lessons that are based on the project experience and applicable to the type of project at hand, to the GEF's overall portfolio, and/or to GEF systems and processes. Wherever possible, Terminal Evaluation reports should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation that have led to effective stakeholder engagement, successful broader adoption of GEF initiatives by stakeholders, and large-scale environmental impacts. The evaluators should describe aspects of the project performance that worked well along with reasons for it. They should discuss where these good practices may or may not be replicated. Recommendations should be well formulated and targeted. The recommendations should discuss the need for action, the recommended action along with its likely consequences vis-à-vis status quo and other courses of action, the specific actor/actors that need to take the action, and time frame for it.

II.3 Rating Scale

The main dimensions of project performance on which ratings are first provided in the terminal evaluation are: outcomes, sustainability, quality of monitoring and evaluation, quality of implementation, and quality of execution. The CI-GEF Agency also includes ratings for environmental and social safeguards.

II.3.1 Outcome Ratings

The overall ratings on the outcomes of the project will be based on performance on the following criteria:

- a. Relevance
- b. Effectiveness
- c. Efficiency

Project outcomes are rated based on the extent to which project objectives were achieved. A six-point rating scale is used to assess overall outcomes:

- Highly satisfactory (HS): Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no short comings.
- Satisfactory (S): Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor short comings.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate short comings.
- 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 short comings.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe short comings.
- Unable to Assess (UA): The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements.

The calculation of the overall outcomes rating of projects will consider all the three criteria, of which relevance and effectiveness are critical. The rating on relevance will determine whether the overall outcome rating will be in the unsatisfactory range (MU to HU = unsatisfactory range). 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.

The second constraint applied is that the overall outcome achievement rating may not be higher than the effectiveness rating. During project implementation, the results framework of some projects may have been modified. In cases where modifications in the project impact, outcomes and outputs have not scaled down their overall scope, the evaluator should assess outcome achievements based on the revised results framework. In instances where the scope of the project objectives and outcomes has been scaled down, the magnitude of and necessity for downscaling is taken into account and despite achievement of results as per the revised results framework, where appropriate, a lower outcome effectiveness rating may be given.

II.3.2 Sustainability Ratings

The sustainability will be assessed taking into account the risks related to financial, sociopolitical, institutional, and environmental sustainability of project outcomes. The evaluator may also take other risks into account that may affect sustainability. The overall sustainability will be assessed using a four-point scale.

- Likely (L): There is little or no risk 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.

II.3.3 Project M&E Ratings

Quality of project M&E will be assessed in terms of:

- Design
- Implementation

Quality of M&E on these two dimensions will be assessed on a six-point scale:

- Highly satisfactory (HS): There were no short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation exceeded expectations.
- Satisfactory (S): There were no or minor short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation meets expectations.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were some short comings 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 short comings and quality of M&E design/implementation substantially lower than expected.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): There were severe short comings 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.

II.3.4 Implementation and Execution Ratings

Quality of implementation and of execution will be rated separately. Quality of implementation pertains to the role and responsibilities discharged by the GEF Agencies that have direct access to GEF resources. Quality of Execution pertains to the roles and responsibilities discharged by the country or regional counterparts that received GEF funds from the GEF Agencies and executed the funded activities on ground. The performance will be rated on a six-point scale.

- Highly satisfactory (HS): There were no short comings and quality of implementation / execution exceeded expectations.
- Satisfactory (S): There were no or minor short comings and quality of implementation / execution meets expectations.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were some short comings 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 short comings and quality of implementation / execution substantially lower than expected.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): There were severe short comings in quality of implementation / execution.
- Unable to Assess (UA): The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation / execution.

II.3.5 Environmental and Social Safeguards

The approved environmental and social safeguard plans will be rated according to the following scale.

- Highly satisfactory (HS): There were no short comings and quality of environmental and social safeguard plans design/implementation exceeded expectations.

- Satisfactory (S): There were no or minor short comings and quality of environmental and social safeguard plans design/execution met expectations.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were some short comings and quality of environmental and social safeguard plans design/implementation more or less met expectations.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings and quality of environmental and social safeguard plans design/implementation somewhat lower than expected.
- Unsatisfactory (U): There were major short comings and quality of environmental and social safeguard plans design/implementation substantially lower than expected.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): There were severe short comings in quality of environmental and social safeguard plans design/implementation
- Unable to Assess (UA): The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of environmental and social safeguard plans design/implementation

SECTION III. SCOPE OF WORK, REQUIREMENTS, AND DELIVERABLES

Improve sustainability of mangrove forests and coastal mangrove areas in Liberia through protection, planning and livelihood creation- as a building block towards Liberia's marine and costal protected areas.

Estimated Start Date: 10/01/2019

Estimated Completion Date: 11/15/2019

Travel Requirement: Multiple locations in Liberia (*Up to the consultant to purpose*)

Project Location: The Liberia Mangroves Project is based in Liberia. The Executing Agency for this project is located in Liberia

Project Objective: To strengthen the conservation and sustainable use of globally important mangrove forests through effective participatory land-use planning and establishment of marine and coastal protected areas in at least 35% of Liberia's mangroves.

The project includes the following components:

Component 1: Enabling conditions for establishment of coastal and marine protected areas in 20% of priority mangrove forests (15% as National Protected Areas and 5% as community Conserved Mangrove Forest)

This component will provide the delineation for the establishment of a mangrove forest protected area in Liberia – protecting 15% of mangrove forests within the Protected Areas Network of Liberia, and 5% of mangrove forests as Community Conserved mangrove forests (output 1.2.1). In addition, this component will help identify the 20% of mangrove forest where project funding will be directed. This will be done through a multi-criteria analysis.

The criteria for selecting sites will be further refined with all stakeholders during the PPG phase, but at a minimum the criteria will include biodiversity, pattern and process (connectivity), mangrove functioning and health, community uses, and ecosystem services, such as flood control. We are estimating that 15% will be government protected areas and 5% will be managed through

community protected areas, but the true breakdown of the 20% will be based on location and community willingness and government capacity to manage the protected areas. Participatory management plans for two proposed national protected areas (output 1.1.2), as well as financial plans (output 1.1.3), will be developed with stakeholders for the government protected areas and the community protected areas. We are well aware that stand-alone “island” protected areas that are not incorporated into the wider landscape, or where no attempt to reduce land-use pressure has been made, will not produce our desired results. Throughout the project we will increase awareness within the appropriate government agencies, ministries and the legislature to garner support and advocacy for the formal declaration of mangrove and coastal protected areas (output 1.1.4).

Component 2: Reducing pressures on an additional 15% of priority mangrove areas through integrated land-use planning, improving local community livelihoods and increasing stakeholders’ capacity and awareness

Component 2 will endeavor to reduce the pressures on the mangrove systems in Liberia by integrating land-use planning and improving adjacent communities’ livelihoods. The project will develop a tool kit for land-use planning for Liberian mangrove systems and develop integrated land-use plans for the mangrove areas as delineated during the PPG phase (output 2.1.1). The project will utilize the tool-kit for land-use planning with the communities in and around the mangroves to find a solution that protects these vital forest systems while also addressing the needs of the communities. The specific decision support tools will be determined during the PPG phase. The toolkit will be designed to meet the needs of key stakeholders including the Environmental Protection Agency and the Forestry Development Authority. This will include issues of land allocation, harmonizing land use needs based on all current uses and conservation needs, among others. More information on the project can be found here:

<https://www.conservation.org/gef/projects/pages/liberia-mangroves.aspx>

Key Tasks:

1. Based on an approved work plan, the evaluator will conduct a desk review of project documents (i.e. PIF, Project Document, plans related to the Environmental and Social Safeguards [including Gender and Stakeholder Engagement], Work plans, Budgets, Project Inception Report, Quarterly Reports, PIRs, documents with project results, Finalized GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools, policies and guidelines used by the Executing Agency, CI-GEF Evaluation Policy, GEF Evaluation Policy, Project Operational Guidelines, Manuals and Systems, etc.).
2. The evaluator will host a workshop (in person/virtual) with the Executing Agencies to clarify understanding of the objectives and methods of the Terminal Evaluation.
3. The conclusion of the workshop will be summarized in a Terminal Evaluation Zero Report with the following information:
 - a. Identification of the subject of the review, and relevant context
 - b. Purpose of the evaluation: why is the evaluation being conducted at this time, who needs the information and why?
 - c. Objectives of the evaluation: What the evaluation aims to achieve (e.g. assessment of the results of the project, etc.)

- d. Scope: What aspects of the project will be covered, and not covered, by the evaluation
 - e. Identification and description of the evaluation criteria (including relevance, effectiveness, results, efficiency, and sustainability)
 - f. Key evaluation questions
 - g. Methodology including approach for data collection and analysis, and stakeholder engagement
 - h. Rationale for selection of the methods, and selection of data sources (i.e. sites to be visited, stakeholders to be interviewed)
 - i. System for data management and maintenance of records
 - j. Intended products and reporting procedures
 - k. Potential limitations of the evaluation
4. The evaluator will undertake the evaluation of the project, including any interviews and in-country site visits.
 5. Based on the document review and the in-country interviews/site visits, the evaluator will prepare a draft evaluation report following the outline in Annex 1. The report will be shared with the Executing Agencies and the CI-GEF Agency. Each party can provide a management response, documenting questions or comments on the draft evaluation report.
 6. The evaluator will incorporate comments and will prepare the final evaluation report. The evaluator will submit a final evaluation report in word and PDF and will include a separate document highlighting where/how comments were incorporated.

Deliverables and Deliverables Schedule:

The successful offeror shall deliver to CI the final Terminal Evaluation Report, in accordance with the outline in II.2. The report is required to be in English Language.

Number	Activity	Responsible	Deliverable	Due Date
1	Establish work plan	Consultant	Approved work plan	TBD
2	Desk review of all relevant project documents	Consultant	Consultants understands project and can deliver an Evaluation Inception Workshop as outlined in Deliverable #3.	To be completed before Evaluation Inception Workshop
3	Host Evaluation Inception workshop with Executing Agencies (virtual/in person)	Consultant	Terminal Evaluation Zero Report	TBD
4	Evaluation of the project via interviews and site visits	Consultant	Draft evaluation report based on outline in Annex 1	TBD
5	Review draft evaluation report	Executing agencies and	Provide comments or questions	TBD

		CI-GEF Agency		
6	Incorporate comments into evaluation report	Consultant	Final Terminal Evaluation Report (word and PDF), including document showing how comments/questions were incorporated	TBD

Annex: Budget template:

No	Activity	Milestones & Payments	Your offered Rate
1	Establish Work Plan		
2	Desk review of all relevant project documents	1	
3	Host Evaluation Inception workshop with Executing Agencies (virtual/in person)	2	
4	Evaluation of the project via interviews and site visits		
5	Final Evaluation Report	3	
6	Trip Expenses (Lodging, Per diem, Airfare, Ground Transportation etc.)	1	
	Total Budget		