Terms of reference for the independent final evaluation **of "Knowledge 4 Nature: Provisioning the biodiversity data behind global goals for nature" (K4N)**

Evaluation Terms of Reference
18 July 2025

1. Evaluation context

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for an International Firm/Consultant to conduct the terminal evaluation (TE) of the project titled "**Knowledge 4 Nature: Provisioning the biodiversity data behind global goals for nature**" (GEF ID 10897), which is both implemented and executed by IUCN, in addition to executing partners, BirdLife International, Sapienza University, Re:wild, Old Dominion University, Simon Fraser University, and Arizona State University. The project commenced on November 1, 2022 and will end on December 31, 2025, after a one-year extension of the planned two-year project. This ToR sets out the expectations for the TE.

"Knowledge 4 Nature: Provisioning the biodiversity data behind global goals for nature" (K4N) will strengthen delivery of global biodiversity species data through the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species in the most comprehensive, sustainable, convenient and interoperable way for the many existing and planned platforms and users. This work will be accomplished through 1) providing state-of-the-art data services, 2) addressing urgent knowledge needs, and 3) strengthening sustainability, including through taking advantage of new technologies and innovative applications. Approximately 4,000,000 Red List users will benefit from the activities over the course of the project, including 50% each women and men.

Through these three areas of work, decision-makers will be provided with sustainable, robust and accessible biodiversity data. This would be underpinned by clear processes and services to apply that data in policy and economic decisions for nature conservation, restoration and sustainable development. The proposed work would provide countries with credible information to promote environmental outcomes and sustainability for the wellbeing of its people, and of global biodiversity and the natural resource base, as a global environmental benefit. In line with IUCN's and the GEF's mandate, and with the scope of the IUCN Nature 2030 programme (People, Land, Water, Oceans, Climate) endorsed in February 2021 by IUCN's State, government and non-state members, ensuring data availability and quality for all sectors concerned with nature conservation and sustainable development. The three areas of work will focus on delivering the following outcomes:

Outcome 1.1: Data availability is strengthened for decision-making in conservation and sustainable development, facilitating the establishment, tracking and verification of NBSAPs and science-based targets for biodiversity.

Outcome 1.2: Science-based targets for species biodiversity are extended to marine environments.

Outcome 1.3: Biodiversity data is tailored for and served to the Task Force on Nature-Related Financial Disclosure (TNFD), building on IUCN engagement with TNFD.

Outcome 2.1: Critical biodiversity datasets are expanded for accelerated action on issues of highest conservation concern.

Outcome 3.1: The production of high-quality biodiversity data is broadened by exploiting new technologies and methods.

Outcome 3.2: Development and implementation of a sustainability plan for Red List.

2. Rationale and Purpose for the Evaluations

This final evaluation fulfils the GEF and IUCN's requirements to conduct an independent terminal evaluation for the purpose of assessing the results of the intervention. It is expected that the findings and recommendations of the final evaluations will help to inform future decisions such as whether to pursue additional interventions, to scale up existing interventions, or to replicate this programme elsewhere. The external evaluations should also help IUCN, BirdLife International, Sapienza University, Re:wild, Old Dominion University, Simon Fraser University, and Arizona State University identify key lessons learned that could be used for the development of future GEF project proposals and improve the implementation of future biodiversity data-related interventions.

3. Audience, key stakeholders and use of the evaluations

The primary intended users of K4N Project final evaluation are:

- IUCN, Multilateral Finance Unit
- K4N executing partners
- The GEF secretariat
- The evaluation will also be publicly shared on the IUCN evaluation data base

4. Objectives and evaluation questions

It is expected that this final evaluation will provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the project performance by assessing its design, implementation, and observed results at project completion. The final evaluation will be carried out in conformity with the GEF Evaluation policy and guidance and IUCN Evaluation Policy (2023)[1] and use the widely accepted OECD DAC Evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability along other GEF specific criteria.

The final evaluation should explore K4N Programme's work and the role played by the Implementing and executing agencies with the aim of assessing the results of the project intervention and its sustainability. Through the assessment of the performance, the final evaluation will also contribute to learning, accountability, transparency, decision-making and knowledge sharing.

In particular, this terminal evaluation will assess the performance of the project against the following performance criteria:

- **Relevance:** The report will discuss the project's relevance by explaining the extent to which its objectives and design are responsive to the environmental and development priorities of the participating countries and are congruent with IUCN and the GEF's strategic priorities and objectives, and the mandates its executing partners. It will also assess the extent to which the project objectives and design are responsive to the needs and priorities of the intended beneficiaries. The report will discuss whether the project objectives and results remain relevant at project completion.

- **Coherence**: The report will discuss the external and internal coherence of the project design. It will assess external coherence by analysing the project's compatibility with other activities and strategies being implemented by development partners and other organizations where the K4N project was implemented. It will discuss the socioeconomic synergies and trade-offs involved in the project. The report will also assess whether the project was well targeted in terms of countries, regions, and/or communities covered to generate global environmental benefits.
  The report will discuss the internal coherence of the project by examining whether the project design provides a practical approach for addressing the targeted environmental concern. It will also discuss the extent to which the theory of change, project components, activities, and M&E system are aligned with the project objectives.

- **Effectiveness:** The report will assess the extent to which the project objectives have

[1] https://www.iucn.org/sites/default/files/2023-07/iucn_evaluation_policy_june-2023.pdf

been achieved. It will note changes in the project's design and/or expected results after the start of implementation. It will provide clear insights about what has and has not worked and why. It should also highlight how external factors, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, has affected the project and how the project adapted to this situation. It should also assess whether the project had unintended effect.

- **Efficiency:** The report will discuss the extent to which the project was efficient in achieving its results. It will assess the extent to which the inputs (human, financial, etc) were converted into results in an economic and timely way.

- **Sustainability**: The report will weigh risks to continuation of the benefits of the project, including achievement of long-term impacts, considering the probability and magnitude of relevant risks. The report will discuss key risks and explain how these are likely to affect achievement of the project's long-term objectives. It should cover the measures that were undertaken and/or may be needed to mitigate risks.

- **Implementation and Execution:** The report will assess the performance of the Implementing and executing agencies

- **Project Monitoring and Evaluation**: The report will assess the strengths and weaknesses of the project M&E plan and its implementation.

Although they will not be rated, the report will also assess the performance of the project against the following additional criteria:

- **Additionality:** The report will discuss the additionality of the K4N project.by comparing the benefits of GEF support to a scenario without GEF support.

- **Cofinancing:** The report will assess the extent to which cofinancing materialized by the closure of the project

- **Application of GEF policies and Guidelines:** The project will assess the extent to which Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards was applied during the project preparation and implementation.
  It will also provide information on the extent to which the project was implemented in a manner that ensures gender-equitable participation and benefits and discuss the engagement of the various stakeholders in the project activities. Finally, it will discuss how knowledge was managed and lessons learned used to inform the design and implementation of the project

Finally, the report will identify **lessons learned** and provide set of **actionable recommendations** that can inform future decision-making on whether to improve, pursue or replicate similar programme/project arrangements.

An initial set of questions that the evaluator(s) can use to develop their evaluation matrix is provided in Annex 1.

5. Methods and source

This evaluation will adhere to the GEF Evaluation policy and will be carried out in conformity with the IUCN Evaluation Policy (2023)[2], which sets out IUCN's institutional commitment to evaluation, and the criteria and standards for the evaluation and evaluation of its projects, programmes and organizational units.

[2]https://www.iucn.org/sites/default/files/2023-07/iucn_evaluation_policy_june-2023.pdf

I. Scoping Phase - Framing the boundaries of the evaluation

The Evaluator(s) will review key programme and project documents and engage with IUCN, BirdLife International, Sapienza University, Re:wild, Old Dominion University, Simon Fraser University, and Arizona State University to finalise the evaluation objectives, questions, criteria and methodology. Against the above, the Evaluator(s) will identify additional evidence that needs to be gathered and synthesized to fully inform the evaluation process – as well as sources of information including key individuals to be interviewed. The output if this phase will be an ***evaluation inception report*** which will include a ***methodological note*** and **an *evaluation matrix*** presenting how each evaluation questions will be addressed, data sources and data collection methods that will be used to gather additional information needed and a set of criteria to rate the strength of the evidence collected. The evaluation matrix will be reviewed and should be approved by IUCN. Adequately addressing the key evaluation questions will be the basis for IUCN to sign off on the completeness of the inception report.

II. Further data collection and analysis; development of draft evaluation report

In this phase, the Evaluator(s) will work with IUCN, BirdLife International, Sapienza University, Re:wild, Old Dominion University, Simon Fraser University, and Arizona State University to gather and consolidate the necessary information to address the evaluation questions. The evaluator(s) will present their preliminary findings during a short webinar to collect feedback from key target audience. The link between the evaluation questions, data collection, analysis, findings and conclusions must be clearly made and set out in a transparent manner during the presentation. Following the webinar, the Evaluator(s) will submit a ***draft evaluation report*** for the K4N Project for further review by the target audience.

III. Finalising the evaluation report and presenting findings to key stakeholders

Once the draft report has been circulated, IUCN, BirdLife International, Sapienza University, Re:wild, Old Dominion University, Simon Fraser University, and Arizona State University will undertake a final review of the report and provide their comment in written to the Evaluator(s). The comments will be integrated by the Evaluator(s) in the **final version of the report** and serve to finalise recommendations and to develop lessons learned for the K4N Project. The Evaluator(s) will also present in a separate document how each of the comments were addressed. The conclusion and recommendations presented in the final report should be underpinned by a strong set of evidence and will be further explained during the final webinar. Finally, evaluator(s) will produce short but concise summaries that can be disseminated to the wider public for general information on the K4N Project's results and performance.

A. Methods, sources and analysis

The evaluator(s) is expected to use mixed methods to allow a degree of triangulation and synthesis, including:

- Desk review of relevant documentation from the project;
- Interviews (individual or in Focus group) of key stakeholders;
- Survey of additional stakeholders;
- Other methods may be proposed as needed and as project resources allow.

B. Stakeholder to be consulted

The evaluation will adopt a consultative approach, seeking and sharing opinions with stakeholders at different stages throughout the evaluation process. Stakeholder categories include, but are not limited to: The implementing agency, project executing partners, and external stakeholders involved in the delivery of the project activities. External stakeholders may include national and local government representatives, consultants, private sector representatives and community members, including youth and women.

The list of stakeholders that will be consulted will be presented and validated through the inception report. The total number of stakeholders to be consulted is however estimated to approximately 37 individuals. IUCN will provide a suggested list of stakeholders in different categories during inception. The evaluation team may propose changes or additions.

C. Sampling requirements

The evaluator(s) should ensure that the sample of project stakeholders consulted equitably represent the various possible perspectives, including in terms of gender balance.

6. Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator(s) will be accountable for producing the following final evaluation products:

- ✓ **Draft inception report** and **Inception report** on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the report including a detailed evaluation matrix;
- ✓ **Preliminary findings presentation** to be presented at a debriefing meeting with Implementing and Executing agency.
- ✓ **A draft evaluation report**, including key findings, a set of limited and strategic recommendations (not to exceed 10 recommendations total), and response addressing issues raised during presentation of draft.
- ✓ **A final evaluation report**, including key findings, a set of limited and strategic recommendations (not to exceed 10 recommendations total), and response addressing issues raised during presentation of draft, plus annex;
- ✓ **One final webinar** targeted to key audience in which the key findings and recommendations from the final evaluations will be presented.
- ✓ **Two two-page executive summaries** of key findings, lessons learned and recommendations from the final evaluation.

The Inception Report is expected to follow the format below:

A. Identification of the subject of the review, and relevant context
B. Purpose and scope of the evaluation: Why is the evaluation being conducted at this time, who needs the information and why? What aspects of the project will be covered, and not covered, by the evaluation?
C. Theory of change and results. A one-page diagram and explain it with a narrative, including a discussion of assumptions and drivers. This section should also confirm the formulation of planned results so that the evaluand can be assessed against its intended results.
D. An evaluation matrix presenting how each evaluation criteria and questions will be addressed, the indicators, the data sources and the data collection methods and tools that will be used to gather the information needed for the final evaluation and a set of criteria to rate the strength of the evidence collected.
E. Methodology including approach for data collection and analysis, and stakeholder engagement, a rationale for selection of the methods, and selection of data sources.
F. The evaluation workplan and schedule, as well as a description of roles and responsibilities for the management of the evaluation
G. Potential limitations of the evaluation

The final report is expected to follow the format below:

A. Title page including project identification details
B. Executive Summary (including at a minimum the methodology, findings and recommendations)

C. Table of Contents
D. List of Abbreviations and Acronyms
E. A short introduction to project/programme – context and description
F. Theory of change
G. Scope and Purpose of the Evaluation
H. Methodology (including approach to data analysis)
I. Project Performance - Findings - organized as follows:
    a. Additionality
    b. Relevance
    c. Coherence
    d. Effectiveness
    e. Efficiency
    f. Sustainability
    g. Implementation and execution
    h. Project monitoring and evaluation
    i. Cofinancing
    j. Application of GEF policies and guidelines
J. Conclusions and lessons learned
K. Recommendations – actionable recommendations clearly linked to findings and lessons
L. Annexes, including Performance criteria and rating

7. Travel requirements

It is expected Travel is not envisaged for these final evaluations although permitted if evaluator(s) deem it as necessary. In this case, a detailed budget for travel will have to be presented in the financial proposal submitted by the evaluator(s).

8. Schedule

It is expected that evaluator(s) will submit their deliverables according to the following schedule. The starting date for the Final evaluation is 1 September 2025. Expected end date is 31 December 2025.

Milestone/Deliverable	Indicative Completion Date	Responsibilities
Estimated contract award date	TBD	IUCN
Inception meeting and start of the evaluation	Within 1 week of signing the service agreement	Evaluator(s), IUCN
Inception report with methodological note and review maK4Nx	Within 2 weeks of the introductory call	Evaluator(s)
Comments on inception report	Within 1 week after the submission of the inception report	IUCN
Final inception report and approval	Within 1 week after the submission of comments	Evaluator(s) and IUCN
Data collection and analysis phase completed	Within 6 weeks after the approval of the inception report	Evaluator(s)
Preliminary findings presentation	Within 1 week after the completion of the data collection	Evaluator(s)

Draft report delivery	Within 2 weeks after the presentation of preliminary findings	Evaluator(s)
Comment on draft report	Within 2 weeks after the submission of the draft final report	IUCN, BirdLife International, Sapienza University, Re:wild, Old Dominion University, Simon Fraser University, and Arizona State University
Final report delivery and approval	Within 2 weeks after the submission of comments	Evaluator(s) and IUCN
Final webinar and two-page executive summary	Within 1 week after the approval of the final report	Evaluator(s)

9. Roles and responsibilities

This final evaluation is commissioned by IUCN. Day-to-day management and coordination will be done by IUCN. This evaluation will be undertaken by an independent evaluation team, selected through IUCN's procurement process.

10. Qualifications of the Evaluator(s)

IUCN requires a person or a team of evaluators with experience in assessing change in complex systems and with extensive expertise and knowledge in at least one of the following fields: biodiversity assessments and data, Red List Index (RLI), Species Threat Abatement and Restoration (STAR) metric, Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT), Task Force of Nature-Related Financial Disclosure (TNFD) science-based targets, national policy making, technology and innovation, or a combination thereof, applied to policy instruments and practice. Expertise and previous experience in countries of K4N intervention and their contexts is also expected.

In addition, the Lead team member will meet the following technical requirements:

- Advanced university degree in data science, biodiversity conservation, natural resource management, or similar;
- At least ten years of relevant experience in supporting, designing, planning and/or conducting development evaluations; with demonstrated quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis skills, with proven record of conducting formative, process and impact evaluation;
- Experience in leading final evaluation and/or final evaluations of GEF projects and in particular of GEF programmatic approach;
- English language fluency in both speaking and writing. French or Spanish is a plus.
- Women are strongly encouraged to apply. The successful candidate will be selected based on merit.
- The review team members should be completely independent from any organisation that have been involved in designing, implementing, executing or advising any aspect of K4N.

11. Cost

The maximum available budget for this review, including travel, is **USD 29,500**. The evaluator(s) shall be paid upon completion of the following milestones:

- ✓ 30% upon signing of the contract
- ✓ 30% after presentation of the draft report (noting that acceptance of the inception report is a required milestone)
- ✓ 40% after the approval of the final report

12. Appendices

- Evaluation Matrix

Annex 1: Evaluation questions:

Relevance

- To what extent are the project's objectives and design responsive to the environmental and development priorities of the participating stakeholders?
- How well do the project's objectives and design align with the GEF's strategic priorities and objectives?
- To what extent are the project's objectives and design congruent with the mandates of the IUCN and its executing partners?
- To what extent are the project's objectives and design responsive to the needs and priorities of the intended beneficiaries?
- Do the project's objectives and intended results remain relevant at the time of project completion?

Coherence

- To what extent is the project design compatible with other activities and strategies implemented by participating stakeholders, relevant sectors, and institutions?
- How well does the project align with the work of development partners and other organizations in the same context?
- What socioeconomic synergies and trade-offs are associated with the project design?
- Is the project well targeted—in terms of countries, regions, and/or communities—to generate global environmental benefits?
- Does the project design provide a practical and logical approach for addressing the targeted environmental concern?
- To what extent are the theory of change, project components, activities, and monitoring and evaluation system aligned with the project's objectives?
- How and to what extent has the project design incorporated lessons from past interventions and build on recognized good practices?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the project achieved its planned outputs and outcomes?
- How effective were the approaches and strategies implemented by the project?
- Did the project contribute to transformational change at scale? If so, how?
- What were the causal factors and mechanisms driving transformational change?
- What factors affected the delivery of outputs, outcomes, and progress toward impact? And how did the project deal with these constraints?
- Were there any unintended consequences, both positive and negative resulting from the actions of the Project?

Efficiency

- To what extent is the Project governance system conducive to results achievement?
- Has the management approach promoted by the Project led to the most effective use of the resources, costs savings and to efficiencies of scale in the provision of coordination and technical support? More especially:
    - Are accounting and financial systems adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?
    - Have progress reports been produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements?

    - In terms of periodic update meetings, what worked and what didn't in ensuring effective communication and project alignment between Implementing and Executing agencies and other partners?
- To what extent has the Project been able to adapt to any changing conditions to improve the efficiency of project implementation?

Sustainability

- What is the likelihood that results will be useful or persist after the end of the K4N project?
- What are the chances to see initiatives developed under the K4N project replicated elsewhere or scaled up?
- Are there any financial, institutional, environmental, social or political risks that could jeopardize the permanence of the program results?
- What efforts were made by the K4N project to mitigate these risks and ensure sustainability of the results in the long term?

Implementation and execution

- How well did the implementing agency discharge its responsibilities throughout project implementation?
- What challenges emerged during different stages of implementation, and how were they addressed by implementing agency?
- What circumstances facilitated or hindered implementation progress?
- To what extent was information from project monitoring used by implementing agency for decision-making, adaptive management, and learning?
- To what extent did the executing entity effectively discharge its roles and responsibilities in managing and administering day-to-day project activities?
- How well did the executing entity perform in delivering the project under the oversight of the GEF Agency?
- To what extent is the executing entity likely to facilitate or support follow-up activities after project completion?

Monitoring and Evaluation

Design

- To what extent was the project’s M&E framework practical and well thought out?
- How well did the M&E framework address the project’s theory of change and meet GEF M&E requirements?
- Did the M&E framework incorporate applicable core indicators or corporate results indicators and provide baseline information?
- Did the M&E plan clearly specify planned activities, responsibilities, and timelines?

Implementation

- To what extent are the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) strategy and tools adequate and effective in view of:
    - Tracking progress against expected results
    - Enabling adaptation in the strategy according to current success and failures, changes of stakeholders’ priorities or conditions on the context;
    - Improving reporting, transparency and accountability to the GEF, and other key stakeholders.
    - Providing lessons from activities and results that contribute to the enrichment and continuous improvement of the project;
- To what extent the resources allocated for M&E were sufficient and used adequately?

Additionality:
- To what extent has the project demonstrated additionality as a result of GEF support?
- In which specific areas has GEF support contributed to additional results beyond what would have occurred otherwise?
- What quantitative and qualitative evidence supports the assessment of additionality

Program Co-financing
- What type of co-financing was mobilized by the K4N Project?
- To what extent did the expected co-financing materialize and how timely was it delivered?

Environmental and Social Safeguards
- To what extent were environmental and social safeguards applied and the extent to which they were appropriate?
- To what extent did the project affected marginalized communities, including indigenous people

Gender
- To what extent was the project implemented in a manner that ensured gender-equitable participation and benefits?
- Was gender-disaggregated data on beneficiaries collected, tracked through the project's M&E system and used effectively?
- Are any project activities or outcomes that disadvantaged women or exacerbate gender inequalities?

Stakeholder engagement
- To what extent did the program engage with the relevant stakeholders, including the private sector, civil society organizations, government agencies, and program beneficiaries?
- To what extent did stakeholder engagement contribute to building partnerships, leveraging expertise and capacities, and fostering project ownership and follow-up?
- How did stakeholder engagement influence project implementation, achievement of results, and risks to sustainability?

Knowledge management and learning
- To what extent did the project design incorporate existing lessons and good practices?
- What arrangements were made to capture, manage, use, and share knowledge and lessons generated during project implementation?
- Were knowledge management activities supported with an adequate budget?
- What knowledge products were planned and delivered, and how have they contributed or are expected to contribute to learning and knowledge sharing?

Annex 2: Evaluation rating
The main dimensions of project performance on which ratings are first provided in Mid-Term Review 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 Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability.

In terms of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of an outcome, 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.

In terms of sustainability of an outcome, project outcomes are rated based on risks related to financial, sociopolitical, institutional, and environmental sustainability. 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 Rating:
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

Evaluation Matrix

1. **Relevance:**				
Key evaluation questions	*Sub-questions*	*Indicators*	*Source of Information*	*Data Collection Tools*
[These are the overall general questions that will facilitate analysis of the evaluation issues (as identified in part 5 of the ToR).	*[List the specific questions that are needed to answer the key questions. s as required]*	*[An indicator is a measuring device that clarifies and measures a concept: in this case, the sub-questions. Indicators make these sub-questions more tangible and give something concrete to measure. They may be qualitative or quantitative signals that help to decide whether something has changed. There can be multiple indicators for one sub-question.]*	*[In this column, identify possible sources of data needed to answer the sub-questions. These sources may include people, different kinds of documents such as situation analyses, trends analyses, other research, observation, or other types of information. Be as specific as possible when citing these.]*	*[What data collection tools will be used?]*
[Add rows as required]				
2. **Coherence**				
Key evaluation questions	*Sub-questions*	*Indicators*	*Source of Information*	*Data Collection Tools*
[Add rows as required]				
3. Effectiveness:				
Key evaluation questions	*Sub-questions*	*Indicators*	*Source of Information*	*Data Collection Tools*
[Add rows as required]				
4. **Efficiency:**				
Key evaluation questions	*Sub-questions*	*Indicators*	*Source of Information*	*Data Collection Tools*
[Add rows as required]				

5. Impact:				
Key evaluation questions	*Sub-questions*	*Indicators*	*Source of Information*	*Data Collection Tools*
[Add rows as required]				
6. **Sustainability:**				
Key evaluation questions	*Sub-questions*	*Indicators*	*Source of Information*	*Data Collection Tools*
[Add rows as required]				
7. **Other**:				
[Add rows as required]				