



**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE TERMINAL EVALUATION
OF THE WWF GEF PROJECT: GENERATING RESPONSIBLE DEMAND FOR REDUCED
DEFORESTATION COMMODITIES**

Cover Page

POSITION DETAILS	
Location	Flexible – ideal if location enables possibility for in-person interviews or site visits
Reporting to	Amelia Kissick, WWF-US
Starting Date	June or July 2021
Completion Date	October 2021
PROJECT DATA	
Project/Program Title	Generating Responsible Demand for Reduced Deforestation Commodities
GEF Project ID	9182 (Child Project ID); 9072 (Program ID)
WWF (Agency) Project ID	G0008
Implementing Agency(s)	WWF GEF Project Agency
Executing Agency	WWF Markets
Executing Partner(s)	TRASE, Proforest, WWF-Indonesia, WWF-Singapore, WWF-Brazil
Countries	Brazil, Sierra Leone, Indonesia, Paraguay
Focal Area(s)	BD, LD, SFM
GEF Operational Program	GEF-6
Total GEF Approved Budget	\$8,098,060
Total Co-financing Approved	\$42,334,902
RELEVANT DATES	
CEO Endorsement/Approval	1/27/2017
Agency Approval Date	3/27/2017
Implementation Start	4/1/2017
Midterm Evaluation	11/2019
Project Completion Date (proposed or actual)	09/2021

INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

World Wildlife Fund, Inc. (WWF) policies and procedures require all GEF financed projects to complete a terminal evaluation (TE) at the end of project implementation. The following terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for the TE of the project “Generating Responsible Demand for Reduced Deforestation Commodities,” hereafter referred to as the “Project.” The consultant selected to conduct this evaluation will be referred to as “evaluator(s)” throughout this TOR.

The Project seeks to strengthen the enabling environment and public and private sector commitment to and demand for reduced deforestation commodities in priority markets. The Project is organized into the following components:

- Component 1: Mainstreaming demand for reduced deforestation commodities with major buyers and traders
- Component 2: Strengthening the enabling environment for reduced deforestation commodities in demand markets
- Component 3: Promoting reduced deforestation commodities in major markets
- Component 4: Advancing supply chain transparency, traceability, and decision support tools
- Component 5: Monitoring and evaluation

SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE EVALUATION

The scope of the TE covers the GEF financed components of the Project but may additionally examine its coordination with the Good Growth Partnership.

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

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

The evaluation will comply with the guidance, rules and procedures established by WWF¹ and as laid out in the GEF Terminal Evaluation² and Ethical Guidelines.³ The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is independent, transparent, and ethical. The evaluator(s) must be unbiased and free of any conflicts of interest with the Project. The evaluator(s) is expected to reflect all stakeholder views and follow a participatory and consultative approach. There should be close engagement with the Executing Agency Project Management Unit (PMU), partners and key stakeholders. Contact information will be provided.

The Evaluation process will include the following, with deliverables marked by “*”:

A. Desk review consisting of, but not limited to:

- Project Document and CEO Endorsement Letter;
- Midterm Review;
- Relevant safeguards documents;

¹ For additional information on evaluation methods adopted by WWF, see the [WWF Evaluation Guidelines](#), published on our [WWF Program Standards](#) public website.

² For additional information on the GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines, see the [GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines](#), published on the [GEF Evaluation Office](#) website.

³ Please see the GEF [Ethical Guidelines](#) as published on GEF website.

- Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP&B) documents;
 - Project Progress Reports (PPRs), including Results Framework and AWP Tracking;
 - Project Closure Report (PCR) (if available, GEF Agency reports, including Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) and Supervision Mission Reports;
 - Relevant financial documents, including financial progress reports and co-financing documentation;
 - Project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting minutes; and
 - Other relevant documents and deliverables provided by the Executing Agency and partners.
- B. Inception report* that details evaluation methodology, including how evaluation/ratings will be assessed (indicators to be used, key questions, etc.);
- C. Site visits, if feasible given COVID-19 travel restrictions and safety measures, in Indonesia, Brazil and/or Paraguay in descending priority;
- D. Virtual interviews, discussions and consultations with executing partners, Project Steering Committee (PSC) members, WWF GEF Agency, and beneficiaries;
- E. Post-field visit debrief and presentation* of initial findings;
- F. Draft report* (30 page max. excluding annexes) shared with relevant parties for review and feedback. A sample outline will be provided; and
- G. Final TE report* that has incorporated feedback and comments (same page limits as draft).

The evaluator is expected to evaluate the project based on seven (7) core criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, results/impact, sustainability and adaptive capacity. Particular emphasis is desired on results, impact, effectiveness and sustainability. A definition for each core criterion is included in Annex A.

EXPECTED CONTENT OF EVALUATION REPORT

The Terminal Evaluation report should include:⁴

- Information on the evaluation process, including when the evaluation took place, sites visited (if applicable), participants, summary of methodology and rating rubric, and feedback log showing how major comments on draft were incorporated;
- Assessment and rating of project objectives and outcomes
- Assessment of risks to the sustainability of project outcomes;
- Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation systems;
- Assessment of knowledge activities and products;
- Assessment of replication and catalytic effects of the project and with WWF and GEF priorities;
- Assessment of relevance/coherence with WWF, GEF, GGP and country priorities;
- Assessment of stakeholder engagement and gender-responsive measures;
- Assessment of any environmental and social impacts and safeguards used for the project;
- Financial assessment of the project;
- Assessment of implementation and execution by WWF GEF Agency, PMU and project partners;
- Summary of key findings by core criteria⁵ and ratings by GEF rating categories⁶, including justification and/or indicators for their determination;

⁴ See Annex B for a sample report outline.

⁵ See Annex A

⁶ See Annexes C and D

- Lessons learned (e.g. project design (theory of change), objectives, and technical approach; administration and governance arrangements; relevance; implementation of the work plan; achievement of impact; environmental and social safeguards, etc.); and
- Recommendations that would be useful for project close and sustainability, and for other similar projects in order to improve on identified issues, replicate best practices or achieve better results.

EVALUATION TEAM QUALIFICATIONS

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

Required Qualifications and Experience

- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; and
- Excellent written and oral communication in English.

Preferred Qualifications and Experience

- Recent experience conducting Evaluations for GEF projects;
- Experience with both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods;
- Technical knowledge in GEF Biodiversity, Land Degradation, and Sustainable Forest Management Focal Areas;
- Experience with agriculture and food production or commodity markets;
- Demonstrated experience or knowledge of technical area and Good Growth Partnership;
- Knowledge of GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- Experience with WWF Project and Program Management Standards or Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation (www.cmp-openstandards.org);
- Knowledge and experience in implementing or reviewing application of social and environmental safeguards policies in GEF (or similar) projects;
- Experience with social assessments, participatory techniques and gender mainstreaming;
- Regional experience and/or language abilities (Spanish, Portuguese, Indonesian Bahasa); and
- Ability to conduct in-person evaluation site visits in Indonesia, Brazil, and/or Paraguay (if feasible, given COVID-19 travel restrictions and safety measures).

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Payment, expense reimbursement (if necessary), and other contractual terms and conditions will be outlined in the consultant agreement made between WWF and the evaluator(s). Payments will be made according to deliverables submitted. Twenty-five percent of payment will correspond with completion and approval of Inception Report. Fifty percent of payment will correspond with completion and approval of debrief presentation and submission and approval of the Draft Report. The final twenty-five percent will be delivered with the submission and approval of the Final Report.

APPLICATION PROCESS

Interested consultants are invited to submit a technical proposal and financial proposal with their *curriculum vitae*. The financial proposal should include fee and reimbursable expenses, such as travel costs, if applicable. The budget shall not exceed \$35,000. Technical and financial proposals will both be scored. Individual or team applications are welcome. Applicants are requested to email applications to amelia.kissick@wwfus.org by May 7, 2021.

The selection of candidates and contractual agreements will be in compliance with WWF procurement policies and subject to GEF requirements.⁷ WWF applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

⁷ WWF [Procurement Policy](#)

ANNEX A: EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria for Overall Evaluation of Project

The evaluation should assess the project against the following criteria:

1. **Relevance** – the extent to which the project design, outcomes, indicators and targets remain valid and consistent with local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including the context of the changing circumstances of the country (e.g. political context);
2. **Coherence** - the compatibility of a project intervention with other interventions (particularly policies) in a country, sector or institution. This can include internal coherence and external coherence. Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the project interventions and those carried about by the same sector or institution in country. External coherence measures consistency and compatibility of the interventions among different sectors, but in the same context.
3. **Effectiveness** - the extent to which the outputs, outcomes and project objective have been or are likely to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Identify the major factors which have facilitated or impeded this achievement. Review the management structure of the project and determine whether the organizational structure of the project, the resources, the distribution of responsibilities and coordination mechanisms are appropriate for achieving progress towards project outcomes;
4. **Efficiency** - the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. This includes efficiency of: funding availability, project management and human resources, coordination and information flow among the project partners;
5. **Results/Impact** – the extent of intended or unforeseen effects that project interventions or strategies will have on the project objective, conservation targets and GEF global environmental benefits, whether positive or negative. Assess the project’s logic or theory of change and the potential to scale up or replicate the project outcomes and impact.
6. **Sustainability** - the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits, progress and impact after external support has ended. Determine the degree of support and buy-in given to the project at the national and local level;
7. **Adaptive capacity** –the extent to which the use of M&E, lessons learned and adaptive management are used to meet indicator targets and mitigate project issues (such as design flaws or any adverse impacts of the project).

ANNEX B: SAMPLE EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁸

- i.** Opening page:
 - Title of WWF supported GEF financed project
 - Evaluation team member(s) and affiliations
 - Locator Map(s)
 - Acknowledgements
 - ii.** Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Overview of Evaluation Ratings
 - Summary of findings and recommendations, organized by core criteria, as feasible
 - iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 1.** Introduction to Evaluation
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Statement of independence, lack of conflict of interest
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Composition of evaluation team, including specific roles, if applicable
 - Limitations of the evaluation
 - Structure of the evaluation report
 - 2.** Project description and development context
 - Summary of project theory of change and evolution
 - Main stakeholders and beneficiaries
 - Discussion of baseline (of indicators) and expected results
 - 3.** Findings (All criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁹)
 - 3.1** Project Design / Formulation
 - Assessment of Results Framework and theory of change (Project logic /strategies/indicators) in conjunction with assumptions and risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design
 - Additionality
 - Replication approach
 - WWF comparative advantage (if applicable)
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Governance and management arrangements
 - Country ownership
 - M&E design*
 - 3.2** Project Implementation and Execution
 - Assessment of project results*, effectiveness and (potential) impact
 - M&E implementation,* adaptive management and capacity

⁸The Report length should not exceed 30 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁹ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see Annex B for summary format sample.

- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- WWF and Implementing Partner implementation* / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
- Alignment with WWF, GGP and Country priorities / Relevance and Coherence
- Sustainability*

3.4 Gender Equality and Mainstreaming

- Assess implementation of the gender analysis and gender mainstreaming strategy
- Assess gender inclusion as per WWF and GEF gender policies.

3.5 Stakeholder Engagement

- Evaluate stakeholder engagement

3.6 Safeguards Review

- Provide updates on any changes to project risk category classification;
- Elaborate on additional risks and potential impacts identified and addressed during implementation;
- Describe risk management measures taken;
- Submit any new assessments, monitoring/management plans or reports;
- Share lessons learned.

3.7 Finance and Co-finance review

- Extent of co-finance realized to date. Take into account: sources of co-financing, name of co-financer, type of co-financing, amount confirmed at CEO endorsement, approval, actual amount materialized at midterm and actual amount materialized at closing;
- Financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions/ efficiency*; and
- Utilization of grant funds distributed to project partners
- If any shortfalls in co-financing or materialization affected project results.

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Lessons learned organized by core criteria, if applicable
- Actions to build sustainability or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Best and worst practices for other similar projects to replicate or avoid
- Evaluation summary tables

ANNEX C: SAMPLE SUMMARY TABLE OF FINDINGS AND EVALUATION RATINGS

The evaluator should be objective and provide sufficient justification with empirical evidence to support the findings or ratings given. Ratings classifications are provided in Annex D.

1. Summary of Key Findings Against WWF Evaluation Criteria (Annex A)

Relevance
Coherence
Effectiveness
Efficiency
Results/ Impact
Sustainability
Adaptive capacity

2. Assessment and Ratings Per GEF Evaluation Category

A. Assessment of Project Objectives & Outcomes	Remarks
Were project outcomes Relevant when compared to focal area strategies, national, regional and WWF priorities?	
Were project interventions and achieved outcomes Coherent with other interventions in the relevant sectors and countries?	
What is your assessment of the Effectiveness of project outcomes? Were the actual outcomes achieved commensurate with the expected outcomes? <i>If assessment of outcome achievements is not feasible, output achievement can be used as a proxy.</i>	
Were the desired Results/Impact achieved by the project? Was the original and/or adapted theory of change validated by results of the project? Has this project set up the desired enabling conditions and achieved the desired results necessary to contribute to longer-term impacts identified in the project theory of change?	
Was the project cost Efficient ? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project use the least cost options? If not, did they choose the most efficient cost options available? 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did any delays in implementation affect cost effectiveness? • Evaluators should compare costs incurred and the time taken to achieve the outcomes with other similar projects. 		
Overall Rating of Project Objectives & Outcomes	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Justification</i>
Using above criteria, please provide an overall rating for the achievement of the Project Objective and Outcomes. This assessment should analyze both the achievement and shortcomings of these results as stated in the project document. ¹⁰		

B. Assessment of Risks¹¹ to Sustainability¹² of Project Outcomes		
<i>Please describe these risks below, taking into account likelihood and magnitude:</i>		
Financial Risks		
Sociopolitical Risks		
Institutional Framework and Governance Risks		
Environmental Risks		
Overall Rating of Sustainability of Project Outcomes	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Justification</i>
Using above information as a reference, please provide an overall rating for the risks to sustainability of project outcomes.		

C. Assessment of M&E Systems	<i>Remarks</i>
M&E Design – Was the M&E plan at the CEO endorsement practical and sufficient? Did the M&E plan include baseline data? ¹³ Did it: specify clear targets and appropriate SMART indicators to track environmental, gender, and socioeconomic results; a proper methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of M&E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection; and budget adequate funds for M&E activities? Please provide indicative rating for M&E Design.	

¹⁰ If any changes were made to these results, please indicate when they were made and whether those changes were approved.

¹¹ Risks are internal or external factors that are likely to affect the achievement of project outcomes. In this context, please consider how these risks could affect the sustainability or *persistence* of project outcomes. Please feel free to list individual risks for each category (financial, sociopolitical, etc) and provide a corresponding assessment on likelihood and magnitude for each of these. This will help you in forming your overall rating of sustainability of project outcomes according to the ratings definitions provided.

¹² Sustainability is defined by 2010 GEF M&E Policy as: the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion; projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

¹³ If there is not a project baseline, the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline conditions so achievements and results can be properly determined.

<p>M&E implementation – Did the M&E system operate as per the M&E plan? Where necessary, was the M&E plan revised in a timely manner? Was information on specified indicators and relevant GEF focal area indicators gathered in a systematic manner? Were appropriate methodological approaches used to analyze data? Were resources for M&E sufficient? How was the information from the M&E system used during project implementation? Did it facilitate transparency, sharing and adaptive management? Please provide indicative rating for M&E implementation.</p>		
<p>Overall Rating of M&E During Implementation</p>	<p><i>Rating</i></p>	<p><i>Justification</i></p>
<p>Using above information as guidance, please provide an overall rating for M&E during project implementation.</p>		

<p>D. Implementation and Execution Rating</p>	<p><i>Rating</i></p>	<p><i>Justification</i></p>
<p>Please rate the WWF GEF Agency on the project implementation.</p>		
<p>Please rate the Executing Agency on project execution.</p>		

ANNEX D: RATINGS CLASSIFICATIONS

Outcomes Rating Classifications:

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

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

Sustainability/ Risk Rating Classifications:

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

M&E Rating Classifications:

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

Implementation and Execution Rating Classifications:

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

Additional guidance regarding the evaluation classifications and ratings for each dimension can be found in the [GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines](#).