REQUEST FOR EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST

Consultancy Services – Selection of Organizations and Firms

**Project:** CI-GEF Project Agency

**Assignment Title:** Midterm Review and Terminal Evaluation of CI-GEF funded projects

**Possible Countries:** Guyana, Mexico, Ecuador, Madagascar, Kenya, Uganda, Timor Leste, Liberia, Panama, and Indonesia

**Background:**
As a Project Agency of the GEF, Conservation International brings over 25 years of innovative research and solutions to transform the conservation agenda. With our partners, we have worked to provide the right knowledge, to the right people, at the right scales, so they can build sustainable societies and improve lives while sustaining natural capital. Conservation International serves as a trusted advisor to global decision-makers, providing the data, tools, counsel, and access to funding needed to first identify and then to protect or restore essential ecosystems. Our partnerships, expertise, and experience provide a foundation from which we hope to solve today’s greatest environmental challenges, and successfully contribute to the mission of the GEF.

In particular, Conservation International’s structure and experience complement the GEF in the following ways:

- Conservation International Global Reach
- Science and Innovation
- Private Sector Partnerships
- Operational Capacity and Approach
- Conservation International Funds and Funding Instruments

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) requires 1) Mid-term review, and 2) 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 the 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.

MTRs are used as an adaptive management tool by GEF Agencies and as a portfolio monitoring tool by the GEF Secretariat. MTRs are primarily a monitoring tool to identify challenges and outline corrective actions to ensure that a project is on track to achieve maximum results by its completion.

The assignment is expected to be conducted within a timeframe of two years. The terms of reference for these Services can be found at: [https://www.conservation.org/about/procurement-opportunities](https://www.conservation.org/about/procurement-opportunities).

Conservation International now invites eligible firms, including regional and international non-governmental organizations and for-profit firms (“Consultants”) to indicate their interest in providing the Services. Interested organizations or firms should provide information demonstrating that they have the required qualifications and relevant experience to perform the Services.
The short-listing criteria are: (1) experience conducting assignments of similar size, scope, and complexity as that required here; (2) availability of appropriately skilled permanent and temporary personnel; (3) evidence of the operational capacity of the firm.

Expressions of interest will consist of written materials both expressly prepared for this request as well as previously prepared statements and demonstrations of corporate qualifications. Expressions of interest must be delivered electronically by 10 March 2020, 4:00 PM EST to ciprocurement@conservation.org.

Please make the Subject line of your e-mail, “EOI: CI GEF Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation.”
Midterm Review of GEF funded Projects through the CI-GEF Project Agency

Possible Countries: Guyana, Mexico, Ecuador, Madagascar, Kenya, Uganda, Timor Leste, Liberia, Panama, and Indonesia

Midterm Review Background:
The Global Environment Facility (GEF) requires mid-term reviews (MTRs) for full-sized projects and encourages MTRs for medium-sized projects. MTRs are conducted by independent consultants and are used as an adaptive management tool by GEF Agencies and as a portfolio monitoring tool by the GEF Secretariat. MTRs are primarily a monitoring tool to identify challenges and outline corrective actions to ensure that a project is on track to achieve maximum results by its completion.

Scope of Work:
1. Based on an approved work plan, the consultant will conduct first a desk review of project documents (i.e. PIF, CI-GEF Project Document, plans related to the Environmental and Social Safeguards, Gender, Stakeholder Engagement policies, Project Inception Report, Quarterly Reports, Project Implementation Reports, Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools or Core Indicators, policies and guidelines used by the Executing Agency, CI-GEF Evaluation Policy, GEF Monitoring Policy, GEF Evaluation Policy, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.)
2. The consultant will host a MTR workshop (in person/virtual) with the Executing Agencies to clarify understanding of the objectives and methods of the MTR. The conclusion of the workshop will be summarized in an Inception Workshop Report with the following information:
   (a) Identification of the subject of the review, and relevant context
   (b) Purpose of the MTR: why is the MTR being conducted at this time, who needs the information and why?
   (c) Objectives of the MTR: What the MTR 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 MTR
   (e) Identification and description of the criteria (including relevance, effectiveness, results, efficiency, and sustainability)
   (f) Key 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 MTR
3. The consultant will then undertake the mid-term review of the project, including any interviews and site visits. The consultant should work with the Executing Agency(ies) to identify the list of stakeholders to be consulted as part of the MTR; it is expected that the Operational Focal Point
and government counterparts engaging on the project should be in the list of stakeholders included in the MTR.

4. The consultant will produce a draft and final Mid-term review report. The draft and final reports should at the minimum contain the information below:

Executive summary including a table of recommendations

Project Strategy (Results Framework):
- Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s results framework, indicators and targets, assess how 'SMART' the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary;
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyze beneficial development effects that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.

Project Justification (design of the GEF project):
- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions.
- Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document;
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results;
- Review how the project addresses country priorities;
- Review decision-making processes, project governance, implementing and executing arrangements.

Progress Towards Results:
- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; color code progress in a 'traffic light system' based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as 'not on target to be achieved' (red);
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool or Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review;
- Identify remaining barriers and bottlenecks to achieving the project objective and project results;
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

Safeguards:
- Review safeguard plans and any safeguard related documentation, including monitoring reports, assessments, PIRs etc
• Analyze whether management measures related to safeguards, including the grievance mechanism, are being effectively implemented
• Analyze whether there is any change to the risks identified in the safeguard screening form and safeguard plans at the time of CEO endorsement
• Analyze whether additional safeguards have been triggered as a result of project implementation.
• Specifically for the implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, determine the percentage of stakeholders who rate as satisfactory the level at which their views and concerns are taken into account by the project

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Assess the following categories of project progress:
• Quality of supervision by the CI-GEF Agency
• Execution Arrangements;
• Work Planning;
• Finance and Co-financing;
• Project-level monitoring systems;
• Stakeholder Engagement;
• Gender Mainstreaming
• Reporting;

Sustainability: Assess overall risks to sustainability factors of the project in terms of the following four categories:
• Financial risks to sustainability;
• Socio-economic risks to sustainability;
• Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability;
• Environmental risks to sustainability;
• Any additional external risks that could affect project outcomes.

Recommendations: Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. Recommendations should be linked to the findings in the above categories. 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.

Expected Outputs and Deliverables:
• MTR Desk Review
• MTR Inception Workshop and Inception Workshop Report
• Presentation of initial findings to the Executing Agency, CI GCO and CI-GEF Agency at the end of MTR mission
• Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes to be shared with CI GCO, CI-GEF Agency, Executing Agencies
Final Report: Revised report incorporating comments including annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report.
Terminal Evaluation of GEF funded Projects through the CI-GEF Project Agency

Possible Locations: Guyana, Mexico, Ecuador, Madagascar, Kenya, Uganda, Timor Leste, Liberia, Panama, and Indonesia

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.

Scope of Work:
2) 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.).
3) 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.
4) 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
5) The evaluator will undertake the evaluation of the project, including any interviews and in- country site visits.
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.

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 Schedule:
1) Establish Work Plan
2) Desk review of all relevant project documents
3) Host Evaluation Inception workshop with Executing Agencies (virtual/in person)
4) Evaluation of the project via interviews and site visits
5) Review draft evaluation report
6) Incorporate comments into evaluation report

General Requirements:
- 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.

Annex 1: Outline for Draft and Terminal Evaluation Reports

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

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
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 geo-referenced 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/core indicators to which the project contributes and will also incorporate data from the focal area tracking tool and/or core indicator worksheet.

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 key risks, including 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
It is often too early to assess the long-term impacts of the project at the point of project completion. This said, some evidence on progress towards long-term impacts, and the extent to which the key assumptions of the project’s theory of change hold, may be available and it may be feasible to assess and report on the progress. 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 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 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/ risk categorization of the project along with the implementation of the safeguard plans that were approved by the GEF Agency. There should be an analysis of the implementation of management measures, as outlined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including findings on the effectiveness of management measures and lessons learned.

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

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