

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**

Cover Page



POSITION DETAILS	
Location	Flexible
Reporting to	Amelia Kissick, WWF-US
Preferred timeframe	Two phased approach is proposed (see Scope section for details): - Phase 1: Inception period, desktop review, and initial recommendations. To begin as early as late October 2026 and end by late January 2027. - Phase 2: Continued data collection, site visits and delivery of remaining deliverables commence June 2027 and end July/August 2027.¹
Potential sites to visit	Seaweed farms in the Philippines and Viet Nam
PROJECT DATA	
Project/Program Title	Blue Horizon: Ocean Relief through Seaweed Aquaculture
GEF Project ID	10573
Implementing Agency(s)	WWF US
Executing Agency	- SEAFDEC Secretariat - BFAR – Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources the Philippines - DFiS – Department of Fisheries and Surveillance Viet Nam
Executing Partner(s)	
Countries	Philippines, Viet Nam
Focal Area(s)	International Waters
GEF Operational Program	GEF-7
Total GEF Approved Budget	6,000,000
Total Co-financing Approved	9,306,269
RELEVANT DATES	
CEO Endorsement/Approval	July 12, 2022
Agency Approval Date	SEAFDEC (5/1/24), BFAR (4/17/25), DFiS (5/27/26)
Implementation Start	Grant Agreement Signature: 4/26/24 (SEAFDEC Secretariat) Work Plan Start date: 6/30/24 (SEAFDEC Secretariat)
Project Completion Date (proposed or actual)	June 2030
Period to Be Evaluated	CEO endorsement to time of evaluation

¹ The proposal is based on the current understanding of work progress in Viet Nam and Philippines. If Component 2 and 3 timelines are pushed further out, there is a possibility of delaying phase 2 of the evaluation in order for more demonstrable work to be assessed in Viet Nam and the Philippines. This will be mutually discussed and agreed upon by evaluators and project parties as the evaluation is underway.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT



INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

World Wildlife Fund, Inc. (WWF) policies and procedures for all GEF financed full-sized projects require a midterm evaluation (MTE). The following terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for the MTE for the project: **Blue Horizon: Ocean Relief through Seaweed Aquaculture** hereafter referred to as the “project.” The technical consultant selected to conduct this evaluation will hereafter be referred to as “evaluator.”

The project is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and implemented through WWF-US as the GEF Agency. The project is executed by three partners, namely: 1) SEAFDEC Project Management Unit (PMU); 2) Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR) of the Philippines; and 3) Department of Fisheries and Surveillance (DFiS) of Viet Nam. The project aims to enhance environmental, social, and economic benefits by developing sustainable seaweed value chains. Seaweed captures carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus, which helps mitigate ocean eutrophication and acidification, as well as improves habitat for marine life.

This project is delivered through four key components. Under Component 1: Regional Approach and Capacity for Seaweed Value Chains in Southeast Asia, the project is developing plans, tools, and training to build capacity and support a regional enabling environment for seaweed aquaculture. Component 2 supports the enabling environment for seaweed aquaculture at the national level in the Philippines and Viet Nam. This includes mapping to ensure proper siting of sustainable seaweed farms, national-level planning, and regulatory frameworks. Component 3 targets barriers faced in seaweed value chains, including production, processing, and marketing. The project will work with farmers and cooperatives to pilot seaweed farms in novel and innovative areas, including offshore seaweed farms, which will serve as proof of concept for seaweed production. The project will integrate standards for safe seaweed production into these seaweed farms. The project will also support new processing initiatives to increase the value of raw seaweed for local farmers. Finally, under Component 4: Knowledge Management, Monitoring and Evaluation, and IW:LEARN, the project is undertaking knowledge sharing, communications, and monitoring and evaluation. As an International Waters project, project activities are monitored and communicated through multiple channels, including IW:LEARN. Regional activities (under Components 1 and 4) commenced on June 30, 2024 by SEAFDEC, while Components 2 and 3 have not yet started. In the Philippines, start-up activities commenced with BFAR, whereas in Viet Nam, a grant agreement with DFiS has not yet been signed. The project was initially intended to be a four-year initiative from 2024 to 2028. However, the implementation timelines for Components 2 and 3 are based on national approval processes and are commencing later than originally anticipated. As a result, additional time is required to ensure the full delivery of project outputs and outcomes, and the project is now expected to conclude in 2030.

For more information on the project, please visit: <https://www.worldwildlife.org/our-work/funds/wwf-gef/projects/blue-horizon-ocean-relief-through-seaweed-aquaculture/>

SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

WWF is seeking an independent consultant to undertake a Midterm Evaluation (MTE) of the Project. The scope of the MTE will cover the WWF GEF financed components.

The primary objective of this evaluation is to assess the project’s progress midway through implementation to determine whether it is on track to achieve its intended end-of-project results. The

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT

MTE report should contain findings related to the criteria and cross-cutting areas described in Annex A and should result in lessons learned and actionable recommendations that can be applied during the remaining project period.

Given the different stages of implementation across the project components, with national-level work under Components 2 and 3 commencing later than the regional and coordination work under Components 1 and 4, the Midterm Evaluation (MTE) will be undertaken in two phases.

Phase 1 should provide recommendations focused on Components 1 and 4, as well as strengthening alignment of implementation timelines (at national PMUs), milestones, and reporting processes across the project, while identifying measures to support effective delivery of planned results.

Phase 2 will complete the full MTE once Components 2 and 3 have sufficient implementation experience to assess. This phased approach seeks to balance the need for Components 1 and 4 to benefit from timely evaluative feedback with the need for Components 2 and 3 to reach a sufficient level of implementation maturity to generate meaningful evidence and lessons.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODS

The evaluation will adhere to the relevant guidance, rules and procedures established by WWF² and align with guidance from the GEF Terminal Evaluation³ and Ethical Guidelines.⁴ The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is independent, participatory, transparent, and ethical. The evaluator must be unbiased and free of any conflicts of interest with the project. The evaluator is expected to reflect all stakeholder views and follow a participatory and consultative approach. There should be close engagement with government counterparts, the GEF operational focal points in each country, the Executing Agency project management unit (PMU), partners and key stakeholders. Contact information will be provided.

The evaluation will use a mixed methods approach, drawing on both qualitative and quantitative evidence from secondary and primary sources. At a minimum, methods should include a desk review of project documents and available monitoring data, together with primary data collection in-country through key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and surveys. Please disclose any planned use of AI in the evaluation methodology and note that AI-generated report content is not permitted.

The evaluator will refine the methodological design during the inception phase and present a clear evaluation matrix linking evaluation questions, indicators of inquiry, data sources, and data collection methods. The final methodology should ensure appropriate coverage of all major stakeholder groups, including the PMU, Executing Agency, executing partners, government counterparts, GEF Operational Focal Points, and relevant stakeholders across the project geographies. The sampling approach should be gender responsive, socially inclusive, and suited to the project's multi country and multi-level nature. A full list of stakeholders with contact details will be provided at inception.

The evaluation must triangulate findings across multiple methods and data sources. It should make systematic use of existing project documentation and monitoring information, while also assessing the quality and adequacy of that evidence. The evaluator should clearly identify and explain any methodological limitations, data gaps, or constraints affecting the analysis.

² For additional information on evaluation methods adopted by WWF, see the [WWF Evaluation Guidelines](#), published on our [WWF Program Standards](#) public website.

³ See [GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines](#) for additional information.

⁴ Please see the GEF [Ethical Guidelines](#) as published on GEF website.



TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT

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

Phase 1. Formative Review

Timeline: October 2026 to January 2027.

Purpose: Review progress and provide recommendations focused on Components 1 and 4, as well as on strengthening alignment of implementation timelines, milestones, and reporting processes across the project.

- A. Kickoff meeting;
- B. Desk review consisting of, but not limited to:
 - Project Document and CEO Endorsement Letter;
 - M&E Plan
 - Knowledge Management and Communication Strategy
 - Relevant safeguards documents, including the Safeguards Screen and Categorization memo, and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan;
 - Annual Work Plans (AWP) and Budgets;
 - Project Progress Reports (PPR) including Results Framework and AWP Tracking;
 - Gender Action Plan
 - GEF Agency reports, including Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) and Supervision Mission Reports (PrISM or BTORs);
 - Relevant technical deliverables
 - Relevant financial documents, including financial progress reports; co-financing monitoring tables and co-financing letters;
 - Meeting minutes (Project Steering Committee (PSC) and relevant virtual meetings with the WWF- GEF Agency and support team; and
 - Project Activities Reports (SEAFDEC PMU)
 - Other relevant documents provided by the Executing Agency and partners.
- Inception Workshop to agree on approach and methods used;
- Inception report (draft and final version) that outlines evaluation methodology*, which shall include data sources and data collection procedure, initial list of partners and stakeholders to be contacted for visits and interviews, revised timeline, survey tools or questionnaires to be utilized, Evaluation Matrix with guiding questions, etc.;
- Interviews and discussions with Project Steering Committee (PSC) Members, Seaweed Technical Working Group (STWG), PMU and AMU; and
- Delivery of Initial Recommendations report* with emphasis on Components 1 and 4 and aspects pertaining to alignment of timelines/reporting across all components of the project and aligning implementation timelines. Reviewed by PMU and WWF-US/ GEF Agency Discussion and action plan to follow during PSC meeting in February.

Phase II. Full Midterm Evaluation

Phase 2 will commence once Components 2 and 3 have achieved sufficient implementation maturity to allow assessment of progress toward outcomes. The anticipated timing is June through July/August 2027, subject to confirmation by WWF GEF Agency⁵.

⁵ Timeline to be revisited during evaluation based on progress in Philippines and Viet Nam.



TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT

- Kickoff, review and methodological update of Inception Report.
- Desktop Review of new and updated documents, especially those related to Components 2 and 3.
- Site visits in Philippines (Palawan and Zamboanga) and Viet Nam (Khanh Hoa and area to be determined) to meet with project parties and observe progress;
- Interviews, discussions and consultations (virtual and/or in-person, as preferred) with WWF GEF Agency, PMU and executing partners, GEF Operational Focal Points (OFP), Project Steering Committee (PSC) members, beneficiaries, ASEAN Seaweed Technical Working Group (STWG), SEAFDEC/AQD, Global Seaweed Coalition, IW/LEARN, and others to be specified.
- Presentation* of initial findings to WWF-US (GEF), PMU and others as specified;
- Draft report* not to exceed 50 pages (excluding annexes) shared with GEF AMU, PMU, PSC, BFAR, DFIS National Focal Points, and OFPs for review and feedback. **Note: The evaluator is expected to author the report; the use of artificial intelligence to generate report content is not permitted.** Feedback log required for subsequent revisions. A sample outline will be provided; and
- Final MTE report* that has incorporated comments, feedback log and data collected from the evaluation.

EXPECTED CONTENT OF EVALUATION REPORT

The Midterm Evaluation report will include:

- Information on the evaluation process, including when the evaluation took place, sites visited, participants, key questions, summary of methodology and rating rubric, and feedback log showing how comments on draft were incorporated;
- Assessment of Relevance, including project design and theory of change;
- Assessment of Coherence;
- Assessment of Effectiveness, including validation of midterm indicator measurements, progress toward outcomes, likelihood of achieving end-of-project results, and potential for results and impact;
- Rating of individual outcomes and overall rating based on relevance, coherence, effectiveness, progress toward outcomes, and likelihood of achievement by project completion;
- Assessment and rating of risks to the Sustainability of project outcomes;
- Assessment and rating of Monitoring and Evaluation design and implementation, including the adequacy of adaptive management and use of evidence for course correction;
- Assessment of knowledge management approach, including activities and products;
- Assessment of replication and catalytic effects of the project;
- Assessment of stakeholder engagement and gender-responsive measures;
- Assessment of any environmental and social impacts and safeguards used for the project. A review of risk category classification and mitigation measures;
- Assessment of Efficiency, financial management and summary of co-financing delivered;
- Assessment of Implementation and Execution;
- Summary rating tables, including justification and/or indicators for their determination;
- Key lessons tied to identified strengths or issues;
- Recommendations that include practical and short-term corrective actions by evaluation criteria to address issues and findings; and best practices towards achieving project outcomes, and



TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT

knowledge sharing / replication for other projects of similar scope. See under Scope and Process headings for the phasing of these recommendations.

QUALIFICATIONS OF EVALUATOR(S)

Required Qualifications and Experience

- Minimum eight years of relevant professional experience related to project monitoring, evaluation and learning.
- Previous experience with evaluation methodologies
- Excellent written and oral communication in English.

Preferred Qualifications and Experience

- Recent experience conducting evaluations (for large/multilateral donors is an advantage);
- Technical knowledge coastal/marine management, blue economy, fisheries or aquaculture value chains (especially seaweed value chains), or related field a plus;
- Familiarity with GEF and related M&E policies. GEF project evaluation experience is an advantage over general GEF project development or implementation experience;
- Experience with gender and social inclusion, participatory techniques, and review of gender policies;
- Knowledge and experience in implementing or reviewing application of social and environmental safeguards policies in GEF (or similar) projects;
- Regional experience an asset;
- Experience with WWF/Conservation Standards, or theory of change approaches; and
- Fluent Filipino/Tagalog and/or Vietnamese, OR translation services hired for interviews an advantage.

PAYMENT MODALITIES

Payment, expense reimbursement, and other contractual terms and conditions will be outlined in the consultant agreement made between WWF and the evaluator. Contracts may be made with an individual or organization. Payments will be made following submitted and approved deliverables and once invoices are sent. Fifteen percent of the fee will be paid after submission and approval of the Inception Report and fifteen percent will be delivered upon completion and approval of the Initial Recommendations Report. Forty-five percent of the fee will be paid following submission and approval of the Presentation of Initial Findings and Draft Report. The final twenty-five percent will be paid following the submission and approval of the Final Report and related documents. Reimbursement for expenses, if separated from fee, will be paid separately. Evaluators should submit receipts for expenses over \$50 when expenses are not integrated into fee.

PROPOSAL PROCESS

Interested consultants are invited to submit a technical and financial proposal in English (maximum 20 pages). The package should also include a *curriculum vitae* for each team member, where applicable, and a relevant writing sample, such as an evaluation report. Three people and their contact information should serve as professional references for the lead evaluator and/or report author; these references will only be contacted during the shortlisting phase of recruitment. Only complete proposals will be accepted. The



**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**

financial proposal should be all-inclusive, including taxes, fees, and reimbursable expenses, if applicable. The total budget shall not exceed USD \$45,000. Individual, team, or consulting firm proposals are welcome. Women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Interested consultants are requested to send their proposals to EvaluationsWWFGEF@wwfus.org by October 12, 2026. All questions about the requirements or process should be submitted to this email address by October 1, 2026. Responses to frequently asked and submitted questions will be available to all interested consultants at [link](#) (Annex G) until the application deadline.

The technical proposal and qualifications/experience of the individual or team will account for 90% of the weighted score of the proposal. The technical score will be based on how the proposal reflects an understanding of the work and adherence to the TOR and quality of the proposal (readability, depth/breadth and suitability of the methodology), as well as the degree to which the candidate meets desired and required qualifications/experience mentioned in the terms of reference above. The financial elements of the proposal will account for 10% of the weighted score of the application.

Once all proposals have been scored by the review committee, a shortlist of proposals will be determined, and the candidates notified. Please contact above email address if you have not received notification within two weeks of the deadline. In addition to having their referees contacted, shortlisted candidates will have their proposal reviewed by project stakeholders and will participate in an interview.

The selection process will be in compliance with WWF and GEF requirements. Any questions or concerns about non-compliance or irregularities in the process can be raised through WWF's mechanism for reporting concerns available here: <https://wwfus.ethicspoint.com>.



**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**



ANNEX A: EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation should assess the project against the following GEF and WWF criteria. Emphasized criteria in bold:

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 changing country circumstances. This includes the extent to which project objectives and design remain responsive to the needs and priorities of intended beneficiaries and to the mandates of the GEF Agency and GEF partners.
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 examines the extent to which the theory of change, project components, activities, and M&E system are aligned with the project objectives and consider good practices and previous GEF/Non-GEF interventions. External coherence measures consistency and compatibility of the project interventions among other activities and strategies implemented in the project country, plus compatibility with targeted sectors, institutions and other organizations to review the synergies and trade-offs involved in the project;
3. **Effectiveness** – the extent to which outputs, outcomes, and the project objective have been achieved to date or are likely to be achieved by project completion, taking into account their relative importance. The assessment should identify factors that have facilitated or impeded progress, assess whether the management structure, resources, distribution of responsibilities, and coordination mechanisms are appropriate, and determine the likelihood of achieving transformational changes at scale.
4. **Efficiency** - the extent to which inputs are converted into results in an economic and timely way. This includes efficiency of: funding availability, project management and human resources, coordination and information flow among the project partners;
5. **Impact** – The extent to which the project is achieving, or is on track to achieve, its intended global environmental benefits and other co-benefits envisioned in the project's theory of change. This includes addressing key threats and barriers, evidence of behavioral, institutional, policy, or management changes, and the likelihood that project achievements will generate sustained benefits, replication, scaling, and broader transformational change beyond the project lifetime.
6. **Sustainability** – the likely ability of the intervention to continue delivering benefits, progress, and impact after external support has ended, as well as the resilience of project benefits. At midterm, this should focus on risks to future delivery and the likelihood that project benefits will continue if current implementation trends persist. Risks should be assessed by probability and magnitude, including institutional capacity, support, and buy-in at national and local levels.
7. **Monitoring and Evaluation** – The extent to which the project's monitoring and evaluation system is appropriately designed, implemented, and utilized to support project management, accountability, learning, adaptive management, and reporting. This includes the quality of the results framework, indicators, baselines, targets, and supporting evidence; progress in tracking and reporting project results; and the extent to which monitoring information, lessons learned are used to inform decision-making, stakeholder learning, and long-term sustainability.
8. **Stakeholder Engagement** - The extent to which stakeholders have been appropriately identified and meaningfully engaged throughout project design and implementation, including participation

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**

in decision-making processes, access to information, consultation processes, responsiveness to stakeholder feedback, and effectiveness of grievance and accountability mechanisms.

9. **Gender and Social Inclusion** - The extent to which the project has effectively integrated gender equality and social inclusion considerations into its design, implementation, monitoring, and decision-making processes, including implementation of gender-responsive measures, equitable participation and benefit-sharing, use of sex-disaggregated data, and inclusion of Indigenous Peoples, local communities, women, youth, and other potentially marginalized or vulnerable groups.
10. **Environmental and Social Safeguards** - The extent to which environmental and social risks have been appropriately identified, managed, monitored, and addressed throughout project implementation, including implementation of safeguard measures and action plans, stakeholder engagement requirements, grievance mechanisms, Indigenous Peoples requirements, and effectiveness of measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or manage adverse environmental and social impacts.
11. **Knowledge Management** – The extent to which the project has established effective systems and processes to capture, document, synthesize and share lessons learned, good practices and evidence generated during implementation. The evaluator should review, if available, the knowledge management plan or strategy, as well as the knowledge products for quality and utility. Do this reach and engage intended audiences; do they contribute to stakeholder learning, informed decision-making, adaptive management, replication, scaling and uptake?



**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**



ANNEX B: SUMMARY TABLE OF EVALUATION RATINGS

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

Because this is a midterm evaluation, ratings should assess progress to date and the likelihood of achieving intended outcomes by project completion, rather than treating outcomes as final. Rating justifications should explicitly address progress toward outcomes, likelihood of achievement, adequacy of adaptive management, and risks to future delivery.

1. Progress Towards Results⁶ and Individual Outcome Ratings

Project Strategy	Indicator (if applicable)	Baseline level	Midterm Target	End of Project Target	Current level of achievement	Outcome Rating	Justification	Other Notes
Objective								
Outcome 1								
Outcome 2								
Outcome 3								
Outcome 4								

2. Overall Assessment of Project Outcomes	Rating	Justification
Were project outcomes Relevant when compared to focal area/operational program strategies, country priorities, beneficiary needs, mandates of WWF GEF and partners, and WWF priorities?		
Is the project Coherent or compatible with / supported by other relevant projects and programs in the recipient country or countries? Does the project have alignment among the theory of change, governance structure, activities and M&E system? Is there alignment with GEF policies, guidelines and is there integration of lessons from similar projects?		
What is the Effectiveness of project outcomes (e.g. were ex-ante targets met)? Did the project make the expected contributions to global environmental benefits? Were there unintended consequences of the project that added to or negated project benefits?		
What is the Cost-efficiency of project outcomes? How does the project cost/time versus output/outcomes equation compare to that of a similar project?		
Overall Rating of Project Outcomes	Rating	Justification
Using above criteria, please provide an overall rating for the achievement of the Project outcomes. This assessment should analyze both the achievement and shortcomings of these results as stated in the project document.		

⁶ If any changes were made to these results, please indicate when they were made and whether those changes were approved.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**



3. Assessment of Risks⁷ to Sustainability⁸ of Project Outcomes		
<i>Please describe these risks below, taking into account probability and magnitude of their effect/severity:</i>		
Financial Risks		
Sociopolitical Risks		
Institutional Framework and Governance Risks		
Environmental Risks		
Other risks		
Overall Rating of Sustainability of Project Outcomes	Rating	Justification
Using above information, please provide an overall rating for the risks to sustainability of project outcomes.		

4. Assessment of M&E Systems	Rating	Remarks
M&E Design – Was the M&E plan at the CEO endorsement practical and thoughtful? Does the plan align with the project theory of change and GEF M&E requirements? Did the M&E plan include baseline data? ⁹ 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?		
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 gathered systematically and as scheduled? Were relevant GEF core indicators/corporate results indicators and/or tracking tools analyzed and reported as expected? 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?		

⁷ 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.

⁸ Sustainability refers to the likelihood of continuation of project benefits after project completion according to the [2019 Monitoring Policy](#).

⁹ If there is not a project baseline, the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline conditions so achievements and results can be properly determined.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**



Overall Rating of M&E	Rating	Justification
Using above information as guidance, please provide an overall rating for M&E during project design /implementation.		

5. Key Risks to Project Implementation	Rating	Explanation of risks and mitigation measures
Climate - This is the project or program's residual risk stemming from the potential for adverse consequences of a climate-related hazard, or of adaptation or mitigation responses to such a hazard, on lives, livelihoods, health and well-being, ecosystems and species, economic, social and cultural assets, services (including ecosystem services), and infrastructure. Risk results from the interaction of vulnerability (of the affected system), its exposure over time (to the hazard), as well as the (climate-related) hazard, and the likelihood of its occurrence. Addressing these risks requires identifying the hazards; assessing vulnerability and exposure; identifying measures to manage the risk; and finally rating the residual risk.	Choose an item.	
Environmental & Social - This category captures the risk that environmental and social changes pose to the viability of an intervention or its achievement of targeted outcomes. This includes environmental factors such as toxic pollution, biodiversity loss, soil degradation or water scarcity (including those linked to climate factors above), as well as social factors such as demographic change, labor dynamics, or patterns of social exclusion. The Environmental and Social Safeguard exercise in projects and programs, as required by Agency and GEF policy and guidelines (SD/PL/03; SD/GN/03) includes analysis of these factors and how to mitigate negative project-related effects on people. This includes special attention to gender equality, youth, indigenous peoples, and activity and engagement in fragile and conflict-affected situations. The rating reported by project under this category is identical to the Overall Safeguards Risk rating provided at PIF, CEO Endorsement, MTR and TE stage.	Choose an item.	
Political & Governance - Political and Governance risks describe situations that may interfere with preparation, implementation and the achievement of the project or program outcomes in areas such as the political context of a country (or region in the case of transboundary projects), governance situation and security. This could include considerations of change in political developments (elections, change in government), governance challenges (transparency, accountability), or security context (terrorism, armed conflict, violence). It may also include the likely consequences of such changes or economic developments on co-financing.	Choose an item.	
Institutional & Policy - This category covers risk related to innovative approaches adopted by a project or program to address institutional and policy challenges and create an enabling environment for success. This may include new laws, regulations, market mechanisms or standards that support investment objectives, when there is some degree of uncertainty as to whether these will be adopted or achieve their intended outcomes. It also captures the uncertainty of success of activities aimed at reforming informal institutions and behaviors (values, beliefs, customs, traditions, and consumer preferences). It may also include targeted change in organizations and the relationships among them—such as novel efforts to	Choose an item.	

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**



devolve authority from national to local agencies; to empower farmers' organizations or religious, cultural, and civil society advocacy networks; or to tap the influence of industry and trade organizations or other business associations.		
Technological - This category relates to the uncertainty of success from the development or application of technological innovations applied in projects and programs to support environmental objectives and enable transformation. Examples include harnessing "big data," remote sensing, or artificial intelligence to improve the targeting of interventions or improve service delivery; testing new crop management, transportation solutions or waste cleanup practices; or piloting novel nature based solutions to replace more carbon- and resource-intensive infrastructure. It reflects the risk that such technological innovation may not achieve intended environmental outcomes (or not at the pace or scale intended), which may increase for experimental technologies with limited track record, or technical solutions that are untested in the particular context in which they will be applied.	Choose an item.	
Financial & Business Model - This category captures risk carried by any financing mechanism that helps mobilize financing by tapping new funding sources or by engaging new financing partners to support solutions promoted by the project or program. This includes financial mechanisms that: enhance the 'efficiency' of financial flows by reducing delivery time and/or cost; expand the reach of an intervention far beyond the scale of the initial investment; or deepen its impact and durability. This category also covers risks related to the uncertainty of success from new business models intended to deliver environmental benefits, for example by restoring ecosystems, reducing waste, or shifting consumer behaviors.	Choose an item.	
Capacity - This category addresses risk stemming from the capacity of the Executing Entity and other key actors to execute the project or program activities in a way that supports the achievement of expected environmental outcomes. Assessing this risk requires considering capacity elements required for successful design, adaptive management during implementation, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements through to project or program completion. Capacity elements may cover the availability of adequate organizational processes, staff with adequate skills and knowledge, extent of reliance on third-party providers, coordination and convening power, as well as the quality of monitoring and evaluation resources and information systems.	Choose an item.	
Fiduciary - This category captures risk related to financial management and procurement arrangements of a project or program, including the successful implementation of measures to ensure full compliance with relevant policies. Agencies assess fiduciary risks and develop and implement mitigation measures under their own internal controls, processes, policies and practices in adherence with GEF minimum standards. This includes reviewing that sufficient skilled staff are available to support the project, with clear lines of accountability and separation of functions in procurement and financial management, clear performance targets in contracts and manageable delays in undertaking procurement, as well as clear mechanisms to identify and report wrongdoing.	Choose an item.	

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**



Stakeholder - This category relates to the risk associated with inadequate participation, engagement and inclusion of stakeholders in projects and programs, and how this may impact results. Such risk may affect country ownership and partnerships, including with civil society, Indigenous Peoples, communities and the private sector. It may also affect the ability of the project or program to harness the knowledge, experience and capabilities of affected and interested individuals and groups. Mitigation measures include: consultations or co-design processes undertaken to ensure that design reflects concerns and priorities expressed by diverse stakeholders; project or program management arrangements that incorporate key stakeholder groups in decision-making; and multi-stakeholder dialogue processes to support the achievement and durability of outcomes.	Choose an item.	
Other - Additional risks may arise beyond those covered in the nine categories above. The “other” category is optional and may be used to describe one or more important risks that may affect achievement of outcomes from a project or program and are not already covered. Examples may include mobility restrictions related to a pandemic or other health emergency, natural disasters, or rapid shifts in global market conditions.	Choose an item.	
Overall Risk Rating	Rating	Justification
Using above information as guidance, please provide an overall rating for Risk during project implementation.	Choose an item.	

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**



ANNEX C: RATING SCALES

Outcomes Rating Scale:¹⁰

- **Highly satisfactory (HS)** – Progress to date exceeds what would be expected at midterm; outcomes are highly relevant and coherent; adaptive management is strong; and the project is highly likely to achieve or exceed intended end-of-project results.
- **Satisfactory (S)** – Progress to date is broadly on track for midterm expectations; outcomes remain relevant and coherent; adaptive management is adequate; and the project is likely to achieve intended end-of-project results.
- **Moderately satisfactory (MS)** – The level of outcomes achieved was generally close to the targets. The majority of the targets were met or almost met, but some were not. The outcomes are generally relevant, coherent, and cost-effective.
- **Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)** – Progress to date is below what would be expected at midterm, although some outputs or outcomes show meaningful progress. Adaptive management is insufficient or delayed, and achievement of intended results is uncertain without corrective action.
- **Unsatisfactory (U)** – Progress to date is substantially below midterm expectations, key outputs or outcomes are not advancing as planned, adaptive management is weak, and the project is unlikely to achieve intended results without major changes.
- **Highly unsatisfactory (HU)** – There is negligible progress toward outcomes, major implementation failures or negative consequences are evident, adaptive management is absent or ineffective, and the project is highly unlikely to achieve intended results.
- **Unable to assess (UA)** – The available information does not allow a credible assessment of progress to date or likelihood of achieving intended outcomes.

Sustainability/ Risk Rating Scale:

- **Highly Likely (HL)** – There is negligible risk to continuation of benefits and based on the progress made so far it is expected that the long-term objectives of the project will be achieved.
- **Likely (L)** - Either there is negligible risk to continuation of benefits or there are some risks, but the magnitude of their effect is too small and/or the probability that they will materialize is too small. Overall, it is likely that the net benefits of the project will continue.
- **Moderately likely (ML)** - There are some risks to sustainability, and they may have some effect on continuation of benefits if they materialize. However, probability of materialization of these risks is low. Net benefits are more likely to continue than abate.
- **Moderately unlikely (MU)** - There are significant risks to sustainability. The effect on continuation of benefits would be substantial if these risks materialize and the probability of materialization of these risks is significant. Overall, net benefits of the project are likely to abate.
- **Unlikely (U)** – Because of the high risks it is unlikely that net benefits of the project will continue to accrue, and the progress made so far is likely to be lost. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its long-term objectives.

¹⁰ **GEF guidelines on Outcome rating:** The project outcome rating will be based on the extent to which the expected outcomes were achieved (effectiveness), and the extent to which the project was relevant, coherent, and efficient. Although the evaluators will consider performance on these four criteria, the overall rating need not be a simple average of the criteria because a criterion may be more or less important depending on the type of project and its operational context. A six-point rating scale is used to assess outcome. For more details see GEF IEO TE Guidelines.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**

- **Highly Unlikely (HU)** – It is expected that the project will not achieve its long-term objectives. Major risks have either already materialized and halted accrual of net benefits or have high probability of materializing soon and will halt accrual of net benefits when they materialize.
- **Unable to assess (UA)** – Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability.

M&E Rating Scale:

Rating	M&E Design	M&E Implementation
Highly Satisfactory	The M&E plan is a good practice and does not have any weaknesses. Its alignment with the project theory of change is robust. Complete baseline data have been provided. The specified indicators are appropriate, and arrangements for plan implementation are adequate. Overall, the M&E plan exceeds expectations and is exemplary	M&E plan implementation was excellent. Weaknesses in the M&E plan, if present, were addressed promptly. M&E activities were conducted in a timely manner, and data from M&E were used to improve project implementation. Overall, M&E implementation exceeds expectations and was exemplary
Satisfactory	The M&E plan is robust and has no or only minor weaknesses. Its alignment with the project theory of change is robust. Baseline data are provided or their collection is planned at project start. The specified indicators are appropriate, and arrangements for M&E plan implementation are adequate. The plan meets expectations.	M&E plan implementation was generally robust. Weaknesses in M&E were addressed in a timely manner. M&E activities were conducted in a timely manner, and data from M&E were used in improving project implementation. Overall, M&E implementation meets expectations
Moderately Satisfactory	The M&E plan is solid overall. Its alignment with the project theory of change is solid. The specified indicators are generally appropriate, and arrangements for M&E plan implementation are adequate. There are areas where the M&E plan could be strengthened but, overall, it is adequate.	M&E plan implementation was generally robust, with some weaknesses. Weaknesses in M&E were generally addressed although some remained. Some M&E activities were delayed. M&E data were used for reporting but had little use in improving project implementation. Overall, M&E implementation meets expectations with some areas of low performance.
Moderately unsatisfactory	The M&E plan is weak overall, although it has strengths in some areas. Its alignment with the project theory of change is somewhat weak. The specified indicators are generally appropriate but additional indicators are required to adequately capture project results, and/or arrangements to gather data on indicators are not adequate. The plan needs several improvements to meet expectations.	M&E plan implementation was weak and/or did not address weaknesses in the original plan. Most M&E activities were completed, with some either dropped or delayed. M&E data were not reported in a timely manner, and there is little evidence to suggest that the data were used to improve project implementation. Overall, M&E implementation does not meet expectations, although there are some areas of adequate performance.
Unsatisfactory	The M&E plan has severe shortcomings. Its alignment with the project theory of change is weak. No baseline data are provided nor is there any indication that these would be collected at project start. Indicators do not adequately address project outcomes and other results; relevant indicators have not been specified for several results. There are gaps in arrangements for	M&E plan implementation was flawed and/or did not address severe weaknesses in the original plan. Several M&E activities were either dropped or were incomplete. The data collection methodology was not sound. M&E data were not reported in a timely manner, and there is little evidence to suggest that the data were used to improve project implementation.



**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**

	M&E plan implementation. Either no budget or an inadequate budget has been provided for M&E.	M&E implementation does not meet expectation.
Highly Unsatisfactory	No M&E plan was prepared.	No, or negligible, M&E activity was implemented other than conduct of the project evaluation.
Unable to Assess	Unable to assess because the project documents are not available.	Unable to assess because the evaluation does not cover M&E implementation adequately.

Additional guidance regarding the evaluation criteria and ratings for each dimension can be found in the [GEF Terminal Evaluation Guidelines](#). Where those guidelines refer to terminal evaluations, the evaluator should adapt the guidance to the midterm context by focusing on progress to date, likelihood of achievement, adaptive management, and risks to future delivery.



**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**



ANNEX D: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE¹¹

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of WWF supported GEF financed project
 - WWF and GEF project summary table (page 1 TOR)
 - Evaluation team members and affiliations
 - Locator map (if appropriate)
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary (~2 – 4 pages)
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Principle findings and recommendations, organized by core criteria
 - Overview of Evaluation Ratings
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Introduction to Evaluation
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Limitations of the evaluation
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Concise summary of project evolution, underlying rationale and strategies to achieve conservation results
 - Main stakeholders and beneficiaries
 - Discussion of baseline (of indicators) and Expected Results
3. Findings (All criteria marked with (*) must be rated¹²)
(will include rationale, tables, graphics, and other figures to convey key findings)
 - 3.1 Project Design
 - Assessment of Relevance and theory of change (project logic /strategies) together with assumptions and risks
 - Use of lessons from other similar projects
 - WWF and EA comparative advantage
 - Coherence /Linkages between project and other interventions, sectors, priorities, GEF policies, etc.
 - Governance and management arrangements
 - Country ownership
 - Analysis of M&E design*
 - 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Assessment of Project Performance and Effectiveness, achievement of outputs and outcomes, Outcome ratings* validation of midterm indicator measurements, and potential for impact);
 - M&E in implementation*, adaptive management and capacity*
 - Assessment of risks to the project achievement (See Key Risks Table in Annex B);
 - Governance and management arrangements in implementation plus coordination, integration and operational management including assessment of WWF GEF and EA and partner execution roles

¹¹The Report length should not exceed 50 pages in total (not including annexes).

Deleted: ¶

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**

- Transformational change, catalytic effects and additionality
- Unintended effects
- Sustainability* / project exit

3.3 Gender Equality and Mainstreaming

- Assess design and implementation of the gender analysis and gender mainstreaming strategy, including indicators and intermediate results.
- Assess gender responsive measures, as per WWF and GEF gender policies.

3.4 Stakeholder Engagement

- Evaluate stakeholder engagement and assess the implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

3.5 Safeguards Review

- Assess if safeguards were adequately considered in design, and whether measures to address the identified safeguards needs are being effectively implemented;
- Evaluate the environmental and social risk category of the project (which is different from the Annual Rating) and compare it with the classification assigned by WWF.
- Identify environmental and social risks and describe risk management measures;
- Assess implementation of the beneficiary criteria developed during project preparation;
- Assess project activities for any additional adverse or unforeseen environmental or social impacts and include potential measures to address these;
- Review supplied and gather additional safeguards documents (e.g. new assessments, monitoring/management plans, reports or other supporting documents);
- Share lessons learned.

3.6 Finance and Co-finance review

- Extent of co-finance materialized to date and timeliness. Report on: sources of co-financing, name of co-financer, type of co-financing (cash or in-kind, grant, loan or equity), investment mobilized or reoccurring expenditures), amount confirmed at CEO endorsement, actual amount materialized at midterm and actual amount materialized at time of MTE; plus activities supported by the co-financing;
- Degree to which co-financing was taken into account by project;
- Assessment of 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 influenced project results and why.

3.7 Assessment of Knowledge Management

- Assessment of knowledge management approach (design and implementation);
- Assessment of knowledge activities and products (please list/link priority ones).

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons



**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**

- Lessons learned organized by the core evaluation criteria, if applicable
- Specific and actionable recommendations to address issues and findings; leverage best practices, or knowledge sharing / replication for other projects of similar scope.
- Evaluation rating tables.

5.

Annexes

- TOR of MTR,
- Workplan and schedule
- Geo-referenced maps and photos of project sites
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Questions/ Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Rating Summary Table
- Traceability of Evaluation Requirements to the Report



**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**



ANNEX E: INCEPTION REPORT OUTLINE

- I. Project/program description,
- II. Purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation, describing the two phased approach and including a brief description of the requirements of the TOR and evaluation audience.
- III. Evaluability considerations
- IV. Evaluation approach, including overall design, data collection methods and analytical procedures
- V. Evaluation questions
- VI. Ethical considerations
- VII. Gender responsive stakeholder engagement and dissemination plan
- VIII. Quality assurance, risk management plan
- IX. Roles and responsibilities
- X. Detailed evaluation work plan indicating the activities at each phase, timing of delivery, key deliverables, and milestones

Annexes:

Terms of Reference

Analysis of gaps (project documents provided, contacts, etc)

Evaluation matrix

Draft data collection tools (e.g. surveys, interview tools)

Agenda for any site visits

Rating summary tables and scales

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**



ANNEX F: PHASE 1 RECOMMENDATIONS REPORT OUTLINE

- I. Executive summary
- II. Acronyms
- III. Intro to the evaluation with descriptive summary of Phase 1 and 2.
- IV. Description of the project
- V. Findings
 - a. Review of Effectiveness, Efficiency, Relevancy and Coherence for Components 1 & 4
 - b. Review of Cross-cutting assessment areas: MEL and Coordination, Stakeholder Engagement, Gender
- VI. Recommendations
 - a. Focus on strengthening alignment of implementation timelines, milestones and reporting processes across the project.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MIDTERM EVALUATIONS
OF WWF-US GEF FUNDED PROJECT**

ANNEX G: ANSWERS TO FREQUENT QUESTIONS

1. Can proposals be submitted by an individual, a team, or a company?

Response: Yes, proposals can be submitted by an individual, a group of individuals, or a consulting firm.

2. Will candidates be notified if they are not selected?

Response: WWF will acknowledge receipt of all submitted proposals and either confirm they are complete and be reviewed or notify you if additional information is needed. If you do not get confirmation, please call +1 (202) 495-4457. If a proposal is not selected to move forward, candidates will also be notified.

3. Where can I report any irregularities or concerns about the selection process?

Response: Any questions or concerns about non-compliance or irregularities in the process can be raised through WWF's mechanism for reporting concerns available here:
<https://wwfus.ethicspoint.com>.

4. In terms of the MTE timeline, is there any flexibility?

Response: Yes, there is flexibility and we defer to the evaluators as well as the project team's availability. Note that the project team will weigh in on the shortlisted proposals received, including methodological aspects and timeline. The inception period is where the timeline will be further discussed. The work in Philippines in Viet Nam still has not begun, therefore it is possible that the June reinitiation of the MTR may be delayed depending on what the group has decided would be best for the evaluation.

