

Date: January 28, 2019

Request for Proposals Terminal Evaluation of Global Environmental Facility Funded Projects

Dear Sir or Madam,

Conservation International Foundation (hereinafter referred to as “Conservation International”), is issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Evaluations of Global Environmental Facility (GEF) Funded Projects. The attached RFP contains all the necessary information for interested Offerors.

General Background:

Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded projects are required to complete a Terminal Evaluation. The Terminal Evaluation (TE) is designed to provide 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 the synthesis of lessons learned. 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.

Consulting firms (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 4:00PM Eastern Standard Time on Monday March 4, 2019. Interested Offerors can submit their questions to CIProcurement@conservation.org.

Table of Contents:

Section 1.	Instructions and General Guidance
1.1	Introduction
1.2	Offer deadline
1.3	Instruction for offerors
1.4	Chronological List of Events
1.5	Evaluation and basis for Selection
Section 2.	Scope of Work, Deliverables, and Deliverables Schedule
2.1	Scope of Work
2.2	Deliverables and Deliverables Schedule
2.3	CI's Service Agreement Template

Section 1. Instructions and General Guidance

1.1 Introduction

CI, the Buyer, is soliciting offers from consulting firms to submit proposals to carry out The Evaluation of GEF Funded Projects

General Guidelines:

- 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.
- 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.
- Evaluators will be impartial and will present a balanced account consistent with evidence.
- Evaluators will apply the rating scales provided in these guidelines in Annex 2.
- Evaluators will abide by the GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines.

The evaluator will review the documents and deliver a terminal evaluation reports on the following project:

Project Title: Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable management in priority Socio- ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)

Project Objective: To mainstream conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human well-being in priority Socio-Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)

The project includes the following components:

Component 1: Enhanced conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services in priority SEPLS

Component 1 will focus on field-level demonstration activities to be implemented at SEPLS. On-the-ground activities at ten or more selected sites will aim to improve the status of the targeted SEPLS. Lessons from these activities will also be captured and incorporated into a developing knowledge base for improved management of SEPLS (see Component 2). The critical roles of indigenous peoples, women and other vulnerable groups in SEPLS will gain further recognition and respect through the activities of these demonstrations.

Component 2: Improvement of knowledge generation and management to increase understanding, raise awareness and promote sustainable management of SEPLS

Component 2 will generate and synthesize knowledge related to SEPLS management. It will help to document and disseminate good practices, including traditional knowledge and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities, for management of SEPLS, before they are lost. This knowledge will be brought together with modern management techniques to create best practice guidelines and tools for mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into the management of SEPLS. Site-level knowledge will be generated from three main sources: (i) pilot demonstration sites (see Component 1); (ii) IPSI member case studies, and (iii) global priority SEPLS (see Output 2.1). In addition to being made available online and other innovative tools, knowledge products will be disseminated and used as the basis for capacity building under Component 3.

Component 3: Improved inter-sectoral collaboration and capacities for maintaining, restoring and revitalizing social and ecological values in priority SEPLS

The final component is designed to raise awareness and build capacities of key national and international level decision makers, practitioners and other stakeholders regarding the importance of SEPLS, as a key step in encouraging national-level action for sustainable use of biodiversity and mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes. Through a series of thematic regional and global workshops, stakeholders will share experiences and lessons learned, while exchanging and building knowledge on key mainstreaming themes

More information on the project can be found here:

<https://www.conservation.org/gef/projects/pages/satoyama.aspx>

1.2 Offer Deadline

Offerors shall submit their offers electronically at the following email address, CIProcurement@conservation.org.

Offers must be received no later than 4:00 PM EST Monday, March 4, 2019. Offerors are responsible for ensuring that their offers are received in accordance with the instructions stated herein. Late offers may not be considered. CI cannot guarantee that late offers will be considered.

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.

1.3 Instruction for Offerors

All proposals must be submitted in one volume, consisting of:

- Technical proposal
- Cost proposal

Technical Proposal: Technical Approach, Methodology, and Detailed Work Plan

The Technical Proposal should describe in detail how the offeror intends to carry out the requirement described in Section 2, Scope of Work (SOW). The technical proposal should demonstrate a clear understanding of the work to be undertaken and the responsibilities of all parties involved. The consultant should hold a Master's Degree in natural science, or other closely related field and should have the following experience at the minimum:

- a. Experience in relevant technical areas
- b. Experience with program's terminal evaluation
- c. Knowledge of programs and strategies such as project life cycle, M&E, fiduciary standards, environmental and social safeguards
- d. Experience with results-based management and evaluation methodologies, and applying smart targets

The offeror must include the corporate capabilities, past performance, and provide contact information of the two recent references to the technical volume.

Cost 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. The cost shall include a budget narrative that explains the basis for the estimation of expenses. If required, supporting information must be provided in sufficient detail to allow for a complete analysis of the cost.

1.4. Chronological List of Proposal Events

The following calendar summarizes important dates in the solicitation process. Offerors must strictly follow these deadlines.

RFP published	Friday, March 8, 2019
Deadline for written questions	Friday, March 22, 2019
Proposal due date	Monday, March 4, 2019

The dates above may be modified at the sole discretion of CI. Any changes will be published/advertised in an amendment to this RFP.

1.5. Evaluation and Basis for Award

An award will be made to the offeror whose proposal is determined to be responsive to this solicitation document, meets the eligibility criteria stated in this RFP, meets the technical capability requirements, and is determined to represent the most advantageous to CI.

Evaluation Criteria	Weighted Points
Technical know-how: Does the proposal clearly explain, understand, and respond to the objectives of the project as stated in the Scope of Work?	20
Approach and Methodology: Does the proposed program approach and detailed activities and timeline fulfill the requirements of executing the Scope of Work effectively and efficiently?	20
Personnel Qualifications: Do the proposed consultants have the necessary experience and capabilities to carry out the Scope of Work?	20

Company Background and Experience: Does the company have experience and capabilities to carry out the Scope of Work	10
Cost: Includes Travel, Fee, Reimbursable, any other expenses	30

Section 2. Scope of Work, Deliverables, and Deliverables Schedule

2.1. Scope of Work – 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.). Since the GEF-Satoyama project is global in nature, the consultant will need to propose specific countries within the hotspots for site visits.
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.

Annex 1: Outline for Draft and Terminal Evaluation Reports

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.

Project Theory of Change:

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.

Assessment of Project Results:

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.

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 (See Annex 2).

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. Annex 2 describes the rating scale for sustainability.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

THE EVALUATOR SHOULD ALSO REVIEW AND ASSESS ANY OTHER SAFEGUARD PLANS THAT WERE TRIGGERED.
extent to which it effectively discharged its role and responsibilities.

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 (See Annex 2 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Annex 2: 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.

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.

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.

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.

Implementation and Execution Rating:

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 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

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 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.

2.2. Deliverables and Deliverables Schedule:

The successful offeror shall deliver to CI the final Terminal Evaluation Report, in accordance with the outline in Annex 1.

Number	Activity	Responsible	Deliverable	Due Date
1	Establish work plan	Consultant	Approved work plan	04/10/2019
2	Desk review of all relevant project documents	Consultant	Consultants understands project and can deliver a 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	To be determined
4	Evaluation of the project via interviews and site visits	Consultant	Draft evaluation report based on outline in Annex 1	To be determined
5	Review draft evaluation report	Executing agencies and CI-GEF Agency	Provide comments or questions	To be determined
6	Incorporate comments into evaluation report	Consultant	Final Terminal Evaluation Report (word and PDF), including document showing how comments/questions were incorporated	To be determined

2.3 Attachment: CI's Service Agreement Template

**SERVICE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION
AND
[ENTER SERVICE PROVIDER NAME]**

Service Agreement Number: **[ENTER BUSINESS WORLD CMF NUMBER]**

Project Title: **[ENTER PROJECT TITLE]**

This Services Agreement (the 'Agreement') is made and entered into as of **[insert date]** (the 'Effective Date') by and between Conservation International Foundation ('CI'), a nonprofit public benefit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California and **[NAME]**, a **[type legal entity e.g. sole proprietor, partnership, corporation etc.]** ('Service Provider').

1. Services; Project Description. CI hereby engages Service Provider as an independent contractor, on a non-exclusive basis, to perform the activities and provide the deliverables set forth below (the 'Services'), as may be modified from time to time:

[INCLUDE OVERALL DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT, SPECIFY EXPECTED OUTCOMES; AND

COMPLETE THE TABLE BELOW

#	[OPTION 1] Allotted [days/ hours] [OR OPTION 2 Delete column if not applicable]	Activity	Due date	Deliverable
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

#	[OPTION 1] Allotted [days/ hours] [OR OPTION 2 Delete column if not applicable]	Activity	Due date	Deliverable
6				
7				
8				
9				

During the Period of Performance (as defined in Section 2) of this Agreement, CI shall have the right to request reasonable changes to the scope of the Services. All changes shall be in writing and signed by authorized representatives of the parties. Service Provider shall receive technical direction from [CI REPRESENTATIVE’S NAME AND TITLE] or his/her designee, as authorized in writing.

2. Period of Performance. The Performance Start Date is [DATE]. The Performance End Date is [DATE] unless otherwise modified, or the Agreement is terminated in accordance with Section 5. Any extension of the Period of Performance requires a written amendment of this Agreement signed by authorized representatives of both Parties.

3. Compensation.

a. Fee for Services. In consideration of Service Provider’s performance of the Services during the Period of Performance, CI shall pay Service Provider an amount [choose among the following options, depending on payment terms – if these options do not apply to the contractual arrangement, write it up as best you can]

[OPTION 1 not to exceed amount, based on labor rate] not to exceed US\$ [] which is based on a rate of US\$ [] per [hour/day/week] for such times as the Service Provider actually performs Services under this Agreement.

[OR OPTION 2, fixed price contract] equal to US\$ [click and type amount].

b. Expenses. [OPTION 1] The Fee For Services set forth above is inclusive of all expenses.

[OPTION 2] CI agrees to reimburse Service Provider for reasonable, documented out of pocket expenses as indicated below or authorized by CI in writing prior to incurrence: **[include expense budget and budget cap]**

Service Provider must provide receipts or invoices for all expenses of US\$40.00 or more. Total expenses shall not exceed those set forth in the attached budget without prior written approval of CI.

c. All activities and expenditures must occur during the Period of Performance of this Agreement to be reimbursable.

d. Payment Terms. **[PLEASE CHOSE APPROPRIATE OPTION]**

e. **[EXAMPLE 1]** Payment shall be made against invoice(s). Consultant shall invoice CI on a monthly basis. Consultant shall provide invoices to CI containing name and address, place of performance, days/period and hours worked according to activities and deliverables (as defined in Section 1), and payment instructions. Invoices for reimbursable expenses shall be accompanied by an itemized account of such expenses, together with original receipts for expenses over \$40.00. All amounts will be paid within thirty (30) days after receipt and approval of Consultant's invoice.

[EXAMPLE 2] Payment shall be made in accordance with the following payment milestones:

- (1) \$ ___ upon completion and CI's acceptance of deliverable No. 1,
- (2) \$ ___ upon completion and CI's acceptance deliverable No. 2,
- (3) \$ ___ upon completion and CI's acceptance of final deliverable.

Service Provider shall provide invoices to CI containing name and address, place of performance, activities and deliverables (as defined in Section 1) completed and accepted, and payment instructions. Invoices for reimbursable expenses, if any, shall be accompanied by an itemized account of such expenses, together with original receipts for expenses over \$40.00. All amounts will be paid within thirty (30) days after receipt and approval of Consultant's invoice.

f. Service Provider shall provide an IRS W-9 form for US entities, or an IRS W-8 form for non-US entities.

4. Acceptance of Deliverables; Time is of the Essence.

a. Acceptance Criteria. Service Provider is expected to perform the Services and Deliverables in accordance with the following acceptance criteria, which may be revised and supplemented from time to time during the Period of Performance of this Agreement to accommodate for successful performance of the Services.

i. **[INCLUDE ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA AGAINST WHICH THE ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURE DESCRIBED IN 4 B MAY BE**



CARRIED OUT; PLEASE BE SPECIFIC IN DEFINING THE ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA, AS UNCLEAR EXPECTATIONS CONSTITUTES A MAJOR AREA FOR DISPUTES BETWEEN CI AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.

ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA SHOULD DEFINE THE MINIMUM EXPECTATIONS AND STANDARDS FOR A COMPLETE AND QUALITY DELIVERABLE. THIS IS THE CRITERIA CI WILL USE TO APPROVE THE DELIVERABLE AND ISSUE PAYMENT.

IF THE ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA ARE DETAILED OR COMPLEX YOU MAY INCLUDE THEM IN ATTACHMENT 1 AND MAKE REFERENCE TO ATTACHMENT 1 IN 4(A).

- b. Acceptance. In the event that a Deliverable meets CI's acceptance criteria, CI shall notify the Service Provider via email that such Deliverable has been accepted. In the event that a Deliverable does not meet CI's acceptance criteria, CI shall advise the Service Provider via email as to which aspects of the Deliverable require revision. Service Provider shall implement such revisions in accordance with CI's instructions and deliver the revised Deliverable to CI for review within **[INCLUDE APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF BUSINESS DAYS]** business days following receipt by Service Provider of the revision request. CI may request that this process be repeated for as many times as necessary to meet the acceptance criteria. Time spent on necessary revisions to meet acceptance criteria may not be charged to CI, unless authorized in writing by CI.
- c. Time is of the Essence. Service Provider shall perform the Services in strict compliance with the Delivery Schedule set forth in Appendix 1. Time is of the essence with respect to all aspects of this Agreement and the subject matter hereof.
5. Termination. Either party may terminate this Agreement at any time upon ten (10) days prior written notice. In such event, Service Provider shall provide to CI all deliverables (incl. all embodiments thereof) completed or partially completed up to the effective date of termination to CI in a format and medium specified by CI, and CI shall pay a pro-rated fee for all Services provided by the Service Provider in good faith prior to the effective date of termination. Any payment effected by CI in excess of the pro-rated fee due on the effective date of termination shall be returned by the Service Provider immediately upon request by CI. If CI terminates this Agreement due to a material breach by Service Provider or due to the Service Provider's failure to perform any of the Services to CI's satisfaction, CI may withhold payment for any such unsatisfactory Services until such Services are performed to CI's satisfaction.
6. Indemnification. Service Provider hereby covenants and agrees to indemnify CI and to defend and hold CI harmless from and against any and all liabilities, damages, costs and expenses (including reasonable attorney's fees) arising out of or resulting from any claim, action or other proceeding (including any proceeding by any of Service Provider's

employees, agents or contractors) related to or arising out of the performance of the Services under this Agreement.

7. Relationship of CI and Service Provider. **[CHOOSE (A) OR (B) DEPENDING ON WHETHER SERVICE PROVIDER IS A COMPANY OR AN INDIVIDUAL – DELETE THE PARAGRAPH WHICH DOES NOT APPLY]**

a. **[IF A COMPANY]** Service Provider is not an employee, agent or assign of CI for any purposes whatsoever. Accordingly, Service Provider shall be solely responsible for all matters relating to the employment of its personnel including, but not limited to, compliance with all applicable workers' compensation, unemployment compensation and social security laws and with all withholding and all other federal, state and local laws and regulations governing such matters. CI shall not provide Service Provider or its employees with any insurance or other benefits including, but not limited to, unemployment, medical, dental, worker's compensation and/or disability insurance.

b. **[IF AN INDIVIDUAL]** Service Provider is performing the Services as an independent contractor of CI and not as an employee, agent or assign of CI for any purposes whatsoever including, but not limited to, federal, state, or local taxes, payroll tax or workers' compensation coverage. Accordingly, CI shall not withhold or pay federal, state or local income tax, or payroll tax of any kind on behalf of Service Provider, nor shall CI provide Service Provider with any insurance or other benefits including, but not limited to, unemployment, medical, dental, worker's compensation and/or disability insurance. **Service Provider understands that he/she is responsible to pay, according to law, his/her income and all other applicable taxes.**

c. **[APPLICABLE TO BOTH COMPANIES AND INDIVIDUALS]** Service Provider is performing the Services as an independent contractor of CI and not as an officer, employee, partner or agent of CI. Accordingly, Service Provider has no right or authority to assume or create any obligation of any kind or to make any representation or warranty, whether expressed or implied, on behalf of CI or to bind CI in any respect.

8. Government Officials and Employees. Service Provider hereby certifies that no assistance, payments or anything of value (monetary or non-monetary) shall be made, promised, offered to or accepted by any government employee or official (a) in contravention of any U.S. or other applicable law or regulation including, but not limited to, the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act; (b) without the express consent of the government for which the employee or official works; and (c) that is not reasonable, *bona fide*, and directly related to the activities funded under this Agreement. It is Service Provider's responsibility to ensure compliance with this clause, and to maintain and provide at CI's request, documentation demonstrating such compliance. Service Provider hereby certifies that no payments or other form of assistance shall be made to or accepted by any government employee or official (x) to influence any official government act or decision; (y) to induce any government employee or official to do or omit to do any act in violation of his or her lawful duty; or (z) to obtain or retain business for, or direct business

to any individual or entity. If Service Provider is a government employee or official, Service Provider shall recuse him/herself from any governmental act or decision affecting CI, and shall not influence any governmental act or decision affecting CI. Under no circumstances shall any payments or anything of value be given, made, promised or offered to any U.S. Federal, State or local employee or official.

9. Confidential Matters and Proprietary Information. During the course of this Agreement, either party may acquire confidential information or trade secrets of the other (“Confidential Information”). Each party agrees to keep all such Confidential Information in a secure place, and further agrees not to publish, communicate, divulge, use, or disclose, directly or indirectly, for his own benefit or for the benefit of another, either during or after performance of this Agreement, any of the Confidential Information, except as may be required by law or this Agreement. Upon termination or expiration of this Agreement, each party shall deliver all Confidential Information produced or acquired during the performance of this Agreement and all copies thereof to the other. This obligation of confidence shall not apply with respect to information that is (a) available to the receiving party from third parties on an unrestricted basis; (b) independently developed by the receiving party; or (c) disclosed by the other party to others on an unrestricted basis.

10. Intellectual Property

[CHOOSE BETWEEN THE FOLLOWING TWO OPTIONS – NOTE THAT THE FIRST OPTION IS RECOMMENDED]

[CI OWNERSHIP – NO LICENSE TO SERVICE PROVIDER] All work product created, prepared, procured, generated or produced by Service Provider under this Agreement and delivered to CI including, but not limited to, raw or processed data, articles, reports, drawings, computer data bases, and all other memoranda (collectively, “Works”), shall belong solely and exclusively to CI. All Works shall be deemed “works made for hire” within the meaning of U.S. copyright law, and CI shall be deemed the author of the Works. If for any reason, any Work is not deemed a “work made for hire,” or all rights in and to any Work are deemed not to vest in CI, Service Provider hereby irrevocably assigns and transfers any rights it may retain in and to the Works to CI and waives all its rights, title and interest in and to the Works, including moral rights. Upon CI’s request and at its expense, Service Provider agrees to cooperate with and assist CI in perfecting its rights in and to the Works, including executing appropriate documents.

CI will have the sole right to copyright the Works, except that Service Provider grants to CI a nonexclusive, irrevocable royalty-free license to reproduce, translate, publish, use and dispose of, and to authorize others to so do, all copyrighted or copyrightable material not first produced or prepared by Service Provider in the performance of this Agreement, but which is incorporated in the Works, provided that such license shall be only to the extent that the Service Provider now has, or prior to completion of the Agreement may acquire, the right to grant such license without becoming liable to pay compensation to others solely because of such grant. To the extent that the Works contain any material to which Service Provider does not have the right to grant such license, Service Provider will assume responsibility for obtaining all necessary rights for use, reproduction, translation, publication and disposition of

that material by CI.

OR

[CI OWNERSHIP – LICENSE TO SERVICE PROVIDER TO USE] All work product created, prepared, procured, generated or produced by Service Provider under this Agreement and delivered to CI including, but not limited to, raw or processed data, articles, reports, drawings, computer data bases, and all other memoranda (collectively, “Works”), shall belong solely and exclusively to CI. CI hereby grants to Service Provider a nonexclusive, revocable, royalty-free license to reproduce, translate, publish and use, and to authorize others to so do, all copyrightable Works first produced or prepared under this Agreement by Service Provider; provided, however, that Service Provider understands and agrees that this license does not include the right to first publication of any Works, which right shall belong solely to CI.

CI will have the sole right to copyright such Works, except that Service Provider grants to CI a nonexclusive, irrevocable royalty-free license to reproduce, translate, publish, use and dispose of, and to authorize others to so do, all copyrighted or copyrightable material not first produced or prepared by Service Provider in the performance of this Agreement, but which is incorporated in the Works, provided that such license shall be only to the extent that the Service Provider now has, or prior to completion of the Agreement may acquire, the right to grant such license without becoming liable to pay compensation to others solely because of such grant. To the extent that the Works contain any material to which Service Provider does not have the right to grant such license, Service Provider will assume responsibility for obtaining all necessary rights for use, reproduction, translation, publication and disposition of that material by CI.

11. Security and Safety. Service Provider agrees that s/he has read, understands and shall comply with any applicable security regulations provided by CI, and acknowledges that Service Provider shall be solely responsible for Service Provider’s own safety and physical property or equipment during the performance of this Agreement. **[IN THE EVENT OF HIGH RISK ACTIVITIES, PLEASE CONTACT GCO FOR INCORPORATION OF A RELEASE OF LIABILITY]**
12. Travel. Service Provider shall be solely responsible for any travel arrangements, travel insurance, and all arrangements for visas, passports or immunizations.
13. Choice of Law; Arbitration. This Agreement shall be construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of the District of Columbia, USA, applicable to contracts fully executed and performed therein and without giving effect to its conflict of laws principles. Any controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Agreement, or the breach thereof, shall be settled by arbitration before a single arbitrator in Washington, DC, under the rules of the American Arbitration Association in effect at the time of commencement of the arbitration, and the parties agree that judgment upon the award rendered by the arbitrator shall be final, binding and may be entered in any court having jurisdiction thereof.
14. Compliance With Law; CI Code of Ethics. Service Provider will perform the Services in compliance with (i) the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and Office of Foreign Asset Control regulations, as well as (ii) all laws and regulations of the country in which the

Services are performed (including, but not limited to, such relating to bribery, corruption, terrorism financing and equal employment opportunity, as well as all the generally

19. NON-ASSIGNMENT. THIS AGREEMENT SHALL NOT BE TRANSFERRED OR ASSIGNED BY SERVICE PROVIDER WITHOUT PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF CI.

accepted standards applicable to such work), as if such aforementioned laws and regulations directly reached the activities of the Service Provider. Further, Service Provider agrees to perform all Services and to conduct all activities related thereto in accordance with CI's Code of Ethics, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 2 and incorporated by reference.

15. Service Provider's Anti-Terrorism Representation And Warranty. Service Provider is hereby notified that U.S. Executive Orders and U.S. law prohibit transactions with, and the provision of resources and support to, individuals and organizations associated with terrorism. Service Provider, therefore, represents and warrants that Service Provider has not provided, and will take all reasonable steps to ensure that Service Provider does not and will not knowingly provide, material support or resources to any individual or entity that commits, attempts to commit, advocates, facilitates, or participates in terrorist acts, or has committed, attempted to commit, facilitate, or participated in terrorist acts, and is compliant with all other applicable provisions of such U.S. Executive Orders and U.S. law.

16. Counterparts And Facsimile Signatures.

- a. Each party agrees that the other party may rely on a facsimile copy of the signature of a duly authorized signatory and that upon the exchange of such facsimile signatures, electronically or otherwise, this Agreement shall be binding between the parties whether or not hard copies of this Agreement are ever exchanged between them.
- b. This Agreement may be signed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument even though all the parties are not signatories to the original or the same counterpart.

17. Severability. In the event that any one or more of the provisions contained herein shall, for any reason, be held to be invalid, illegal or unenforceable in any respect, such invalidity, illegality or unenforceability shall not affect any other provisions of this Agreement, but this Agreement shall be construed as if such invalid, illegal or unenforceable provisions had never been contained herein, unless the deletion of such provision or provisions would result in such a material change so as to cause completion of the transactions contemplated herein to be unreasonable.

18. No Third-Party Beneficiaries. Except as expressly set forth herein, neither party intends that this Agreement shall benefit or create any right or cause of action in or on behalf of any person or entity other than the Service Provider and CI.

20. Waiver. Either party may specifically waive any rights under this Agreement by the other party, but no such waiver shall be deemed effective unless in writing, signed by the

waiving party, and specifically designating the rights waived. No waiver shall constitute a continuing waiver of similar or other rights.

- 21. Entire Agreement; Amendments. This Agreement supersedes all prior oral or written agreements between the parties and constitutes the entire Agreement between the parties. Unless indicated otherwise herein, this Agreement may not be amended, supplemented, or modified in any respect except by written agreement signed by both parties.
- 22. Notices. Notice under this Agreement shall be deemed to have been sufficiently given either when served personally or when sent by first-class registered mail addressed to the parties at the addresses set forth below. CI shall not be liable for, nor shall Service Provider be liable to perform, services or expenses incurred after the receipt of notice or termination.

If to Service Provider:

[Click and type Contractor name]
[Click and type Contractor Address]
Phone:
[Click and type Contractor phone]
Fax: **[Click and type Contractor fax]**

If to CI:

Attn: **[Click and type contact person]**
Conservation International
Foundation
2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22202
Phone: 703-341.2400
Fax: **"[click and type your fax number]"**

The authorized representatives of the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed as of the date first written above.

[CLICK AND TYPE CONTRACTOR NAME] Conservation International Foundation

[Click here and type Title]

[Name of CI representative]
[Title]
[SVPs/+ or their authorized designees only]

APPENDIX 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE AND DELIVERY SCHEDULE

APPENDIX 2 ETHICS STANDARDS

Conservation International's reputation derives from our commitment to our core 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 violations of the Code of Ethics should be reported to CI via its Ethics Hotline at www.ci.ethicspoint.com.

CI relies on the personal integrity, good judgment and common sense of all third parties acting on behalf, or providing services to the organization, to deal with issues not expressly addressed by the Code or as noted below.

Integrity:

- Act in good faith, responsibly, with due care, competence and diligence and maintain the highest professional standards at all times.
- Comply with all contractual terms as well as all applicable laws, rules and regulations, domestic and international, in every country where Services are carried out.
- Provide true representation of all Services performed.
- Never engage in any of the following acts: falsification of business document or receipts, theft, embezzlement, diversion of funds, bribery, or fraud.

Transparency:

- Avoid conflicts of interest and not allow independent judgment to be compromised.
- Not accept gifts or favors from sub-contractors, suppliers or other 3rd parties that would negatively impact the provision of Services to CI.

Accountability:

- Disclose to CI, at the earliest opportunity, any information you have or become aware of, that may result in a real or perceived conflict of interest or impropriety.
- Implement activities, provide Services, and manage staff and operations in a professionally sound manner, with knowledge and wisdom with the goal of a successful outcome per the terms of this Agreement.

Confidentiality:

- Not disclose confidential or sensitive information obtained during the course of your work with CI.
- Protect confidential relationships between CI and other 3rd parties.

Mutual Respect and Collaboration:

Engage with indigenous peoples and local communities in which CI works in a positive and constructive manner that respects the culture, laws, and practices of those communities, with due regard for the right of free, prior and informed consent.

I hereby acknowledge receipt of CI's Code of Ethics and certify agreement and compliance therewith.

FOR SERVICE PROVIDER:

By: _____

Title: _____