# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TERMINAL EVALUATION OF WWF-US GEF PROJECT

## Cover Page

| CONSULTANCY DETAILS | |
|---|---|
| Location of Consultant(s) | Flexible |
| Reporting To | Amelia Kissick |
| Preferred Timeframe of Consultancy | October 2026 - mid-January 2027 |
| Period To Be Evaluated | CEO Endorsement through end of project |
| Potential Sites to Visit | Menarbu in Roon Island, Watkidat in Kei Besar Island and Kilitay in East Seram Island |
| Maximum Budget Available | $25,000 |
| Project/Program Title | Eco-system Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) in Eastern Indonesia (FMA 715, 717 & 718) |
| GEF Project ID | 9129 (project), 9060 (program) |
| WWF (Agency) Project ID | G0009 |
| Implementing Agency(ies) | World Wildlife Fund (WWF) GEF, Conservation International (CI) GEF |
| Executing Agency | Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries |
| Executing Partner(s) | Yayasan Keanekaragaman Hayati Indonesia (KEHATI) - Blue Abadi Fund |
| Countries | Indonesia |
| Focal Area(s) | Biodiversity and International Waters |
| GEF Operational Program | GEF-6 |
| Total GEF Approved Budget | $10,183,486 |
| Total Co-financing Committed | $52,071,783 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | 5/9/2017 |
| Agency Approval Date | WWF: 12/20/2019 CI: 05/09/2017 |
| Implementation Start | WWF: 05/04/2021 CI: 03/15/2018 |
| Project Completion Date | WWF: 12/31/2026 CI: 05/20/22 |
| Date of Midterm Review | 11/15/2024 |


## SUMMARY

WWF-US is seeking an independent evaluator or evaluation team to conduct the Terminal Evaluation of the GEF-financed Eco-system Approach to Fisheries Management project in Eastern Indonesia. The evaluation will assess project performance, outcomes, sustainability, implementation and execution, M&E, safeguards, gender and social inclusion, stakeholder engagement, knowledge management, efficiency, and co-financing materialization. The assignment is expected to take place from October 2026 to mid-January 2027, with a maximum all-inclusive budget of USD 25,000. Proposals must be submitted by August 31, 2026, and questions must be submitted by August 24, 2026.

## INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

World Wildlife Fund, Inc. (WWF) policies and procedures for all GEF financed full-sized projects require a Terminal Evaluation (TE). The following terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for the TE for the project: Eco-system Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) in Eastern Indonesia, hereafter referred to as the "Project." The technical consultant selected to conduct this evaluation will hereafter be referred to as "evaluator."

The Project Objective is to contribute to coastal fisheries in Indonesian FMAs 715, 717 and 718 by delivering sustainable environmental, social and economic benefits and demonstrating effective, integrated, sustainable and replicable models of coastal fisheries management characterized by good governance and effective incentives. The Project was organized into four components, with Component C implemented by CI-GEF and executed by KEHATI, and Components A, B and D implemented by WWF-GEF and executed by MMAF:

- Component A: Implementing Enabling Conditions for EAFM in FMA 715, 717 & 718.
- Component B: Implementing EAFM Tools to support EAFM in FMA 715, 717 and 718.
- Component C: Sustainably Financing the Protection of Coastal Ecosystems and EAFM Activities in FMA 715 and 717. (Implemented by CI-GEF)
- Component D: Implementing Knowledge Management, Monitoring and Evaluation for Sustainable Coastal Fisheries in FMA 715, 717 and 718.

**Note:** The CI-implemented component followed a different implementation timeline than the WWF-implemented components of the Project. As a result, the CI portion of the Project has already closed.

For additional project details and documents, bidders should consult the WWF-GEF project page[1], the GEF project page for Project 9129,[2] and the project website for CFI Indonesia.[3]

## SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE EVALUATION

WWF-US is seeking an independent consultant to undertake a Terminal Evaluation of the GEF-financed Project.

The evaluation will assess the WWF/GEF-financed project activities, results, and ratings. Co-financing activities and associated results will not be rated against the evaluation criteria. However, the evaluator must assess the extent to which committed co-financing materialized, how co-financing was considered in project design and implementation, and whether any shortfalls, delays, or changes in co-financing affected delivery of GEF-financed results.

The objectives of this evaluation are to examine the extent, magnitude and sustainability of any project impacts to date; identify concerns as well as best practices; assess progress towards project outcomes and outputs; and draw lessons learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the enhancement of future related projects. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the seven core criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, results/impact, sustainability and adaptive capacity. Particular emphasis will be placed on effectiveness, efficiency, results/impact and sustainability.

## EVALUATION APPROACH

The evaluation will adhere to the guidance, rules and procedures established by applicable WWF and GEF standards. This includes the WWF Project and Programme Standards, the GEF IEO Guidelines for Conducting

[1] WWF-GEF project page: https://www.worldwildlife.org/our-work/funds/wwf-gef/projects/eco-system-approach-to-fisheries-management-in-eastern-indonesia-fisheries-management-area-fma-715-717-718/

[2] GEF project page for Project 9129: https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/9129

[3] Project website: https://cfi-indonesia.id/

Terminal Evaluations of Full-Size Projects, the GEF Evaluation Policy, and applicable GEF policies and guidelines on monitoring, stakeholder engagement, gender equality, environmental and social safeguards, fiduciary standards, and ethics.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is independent, participatory, transparent, and ethical. The evaluator should use a theory-based and mixed-methods approach, grounded in the Project's theory of change, results framework, and GEF results requirements. The methodology should triangulate evidence across document review, monitoring data, key informant interviews, focus group discussions or other participatory methods, field/site observations where feasible, and relevant quantitative data. The evaluator should assess the quality and sufficiency of available evidence, identify data gaps and limitations, and explain how limitations affect findings, ratings, and conclusions.

The evaluation must integrate cross-cutting analysis of environmental and social safeguards, gender equality and social inclusion, stakeholder engagement, knowledge management, adaptive management, and sustainability throughout the findings, conclusions, recommendations, and ratings where applicable.

#### Ethics and principles

The evaluator must maintain independence and disclose any actual or perceived conflict of interest. The evaluator must obtain informed consent for interviews, focus groups, surveys, or other direct engagement; protect confidential and sensitive information; avoid attribution of individual comments unless explicit permission is granted; and store and transfer evaluation data securely. Any use of AI-assisted tools must be disclosed in the inception report and evaluation report, and all AI-assisted outputs must be reviewed, verified, and remain the responsibility of the evaluator.

## EVALUATION PROCESS AND DELIVERABLES

| Deliverable | Minimum content | Format | Reviewers | Payment |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kickoff meeting | Confirm scope, timeline, document availability, focal points, stakeholder access, and field-visit schedule. | Meeting | WWF-GEF, PMU, evaluator | N/A |
| Draft and final inception report | Methodology, evaluation matrix, sampling approach, stakeholder list, workplan, data tools, ethics, limitations, quality assurance, data management, confidentiality approach, and AI-use disclosure if applicable. | Word document | WWF-GEF, PMU, selected stakeholders | 25% after final approval |
| Initial findings debrief and slide deck | Preliminary findings, evidence gaps, emerging conclusions, validation questions, and feedback log template. | PowerPoint | WWF-GEF, PMU, PSC/partners as agreed | Part of 50% milestone |
| Draft TE report | Full draft following Annex D, including rating tables, evidence, annexes, traceability table, and feedback log template. Note that subsequent revision(s) | Word, clean version | WWF-GEF, PMU, PSC, CI, KEHATI, GEF Operational Focal Point, others as agreed | Part of 50% milestone. Paid after approval of both deliverables |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | may be necessary to arrive at final report. | | | |
| Final TE package | Final clean and tracked-change report, completed feedback log, final rating tables, all data collection tools, and primary/anonymized data collected as appropriate. | Word/Excel/PowerPoint | Same as above. WWF-US approval | 25% after final approval |

## EXPECTED CONTENT OF EVALUATION REPORT

- 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 (project design, theory of change) and Coherence;
- Assessment of Effectiveness, including review of project Results Framework and rating of project objective and outcomes (individual and overall);
- Validation of Core indicator measurements at project end;
- Assessment and ratings for Implementation and Execution;
- Assessment and rating of Risks to the Sustainability of project outcomes;
- Assessment and ratings for Monitoring and Evaluation Design and Implementation;
- Assessment of knowledge management approach, including activities and products;
- Assessment of replication, additionality and catalytic effects of the project;
- Assessment of stakeholder engagement;
- Assessment of gender-responsive measures;
- Assessment of any environmental and social impacts generated by the project's activities as well as its safeguards stipulations, which includes (a) a review of the assigned environmental and social risk category classification; and (b) a review of the progress made in the implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the project's relevant documents or otherwise utilized to manage risks.
- Assessment of Efficiency, financial management and summary of co-financing materialized;
- Summary ratings table, including justification and/or indicators for their determination;
- Key lessons tied to identified strengths, best practices or issues;
- Conclusions and recommendations that would be useful for project close and sustainability, and for other similar projects in order to improve on identified issues, replicate best practices or achieve better results.

## QUALIFICATIONS OF EVALUATOR(S)

**Required Qualifications and Experience**

- Master's degree or equivalent in Environmental or Social Sciences or related field
- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience (e.g. monitoring and evaluation)
- Noted experience with evaluation methodologies
- Excellent written and oral communication in English

**Preferred Qualifications and Experience**

- Recent experience conducting evaluations (experience with GEF-financed projects is an advantage);
- Technical knowledge relating to project (e.g. marine fisheries management, conservation finance and/or governance, etc.);

- Knowledge of GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies;
- Experience with WWF Project and Program Management Standards or Conservation Standards;
- Experience with social assessments, participatory techniques, and gender mainstreaming;
- Knowledge and experience in implementing or reviewing application of social and environmental safeguards policies in GEF (or similar) projects;
- Fluency in Bahasa for local consultations and interviews;
- Understanding of local context in Indonesia including familiarity with project area and experience working with relevant stakeholders and institutions; and
- Understanding of the scheme and mechanism of Trust Funds.

## PAYMENT MODALITIES

Payment, expense reimbursement, and other contractual terms and conditions will be outlined in the consultant agreement made between WWF and the evaluator. Payments will be made following submitted and approved deliverables and once invoices are sent. Twenty-five percent of the fee will be paid after submission and approval of the Inception Report. Fifty percent of the fee will be paid following submission and approval of the debrief presentation, Draft Report and related documents. 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. Evaluator should submit receipts for expenses over $50.

## PROPOSAL PROCESS

Proposal package checklist: Proposals must be submitted in English and include (1) a technical proposal, including proposed methodology, evaluation approach, workplan, team composition, approach to stakeholder engagement, and quality assurance plan; (2) a financial proposal, all-inclusive of fees, reimbursable expenses, travel, taxes, translation/interpretation, and administrative costs, with a total not exceeding USD 25,000; (3) curriculum vitae for the lead evaluator and any proposed team members; (4) one relevant writing sample, preferably an evaluation report authored by the proposed lead evaluator; and (5) three professional references for the lead evaluator. Only complete proposals will be accepted.

Interested consultants are requested to send their proposals to EvaluationsWWFGEF@wwfus.org by August 31, 2026. All questions about the requirements or process should be submitted to this email address by August 24, 2026. Responses to frequent and submitted questions will be available until the deadline to all interested consultants at Annex F.

The selection process will be conducted 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: https://wwfus.ethicspoint.com.

## ANNEX A: EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation should assess the project against the following GEF and WWF criteria. Prioritized 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 the context of the changing circumstances of the country (e.g. political context); Also, the extent to which the project objectives and design are responsive to the needs and priorities of the intended beneficiaries, and the extent that the project responds to the mandates of the GEF Agency and GEF partners. Finally, the extent that project objectives and results remain relevant at project completion;

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 the outputs, outcomes and project objective have been or are likely to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Identify the major factors which have facilitated or impeded this achievement. Review the management structure of the project and determine whether the organizational structure of the project, the resources, the distribution of responsibilities and coordination mechanisms are appropriate for achieving progress towards project outcomes. Determine the potential for 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. It may also include unforeseen effects that the project has, whether positive or negative. Whereas effectiveness focuses on intended outcomes, impact is a measure of the broader consequences of the intervention at different levels.

6. **Sustainability -** the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits, progress and impact after external support has ended; plus resiliency of project benefits. Risks will be weighed by their probability and magnitude for influencing continuation of the net benefits of the project. Determine the degree of institutional capacity, support and buy-in given to the project at the national and local level;

7. M&E / Adaptive capacity 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, and knowledge products are used to inform decision-making, stakeholder learning, replication, scaling, 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 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

## ANNEX B: RATINGS TABLES

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.

| 1. Progress Towards Results[4] 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 C***oheren***t 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. | | |

| 3. Assessment of Risks to Sustainability[5] of Project Outcomes<br>*Please describe these risks below, taking into account probability and magnitude of their effect/severity:* |
|---|
| **Financial Risks** |
| |
| **Sociopolitical Risks** |
| |

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

[5] Sustainability refers to the likelihood of continuation of project benefits after project completion according to the 2019 Monitoring Policy.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| **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. Key Risks[6] 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, | Choose an item. | |

[6] 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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| armed conflict, violence). It may also include the likely consequences of such changes or economic developments on co-financing. | | |
| **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, consumer preferences). It may also include targeted change in organizations and the relationships among them—such as novel efforts to 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. | Choose an item. | |
| **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 risk 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 | Choose an item. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 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. | | |
| **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. | |

| 5. 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?[7] 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? | | |
| **Overall Rating of M&E** | ***Rating*** | ***Justification*** |
| Using above information as guidance, please provide an overall rating for M&E during project design /implementation. | | |

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

| 6. Implementation and Execution Rating Against Responsibilities | *Rating* | *Justification* |
|---|---|---|
| **WWF GEF Agency implementation** (e.g. project identification, concept and detailed proposal preparation, approval and start-up, oversight and supervision, completion and evaluation, etc). | | |
| **Executing Agency execution** (e.g.. Management and administration of project's daily activities, including appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services in line with GEF Agency rules regulations) | | |

## ANNEX C: RATING SCALES

**Outcomes Rating Scale:**[8]

- **Highly satisfactory (HS)** – The outcomes exceed targets and are highly relevant, coherent, and cost-effective.
- **Satisfactory (S)** – The level of outcomes achieved meets targets. The outcomes are relevant, coherent, and cost-effective.
- **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**) – Overall, the level of outcomes achieved is lower than the targets, although some outcomes were substantially achieved. The outcomes are generally relevant but not sufficient given the costs or, alternatively, are generally cost-effective but not adequately relevant and coherent.
- **Unsatisfactory (U)** – The expected outcomes were not achieved, or achievement was substantially lower than expected, and/or the achieved outcomes are not relevant or coherent. Alternatively, the outcome was cost-ineffective compared to alternatives.
- **Highly unsatisfactory (HU**) – A negligible level of outcomes was achieved and/or the project had substantial negative consequences that outweigh its benefits.
- **Unable to assess (UA) –** The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievement.

**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.
- **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.

[8] **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.

**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 | **M&E plan implementation was flawed and/** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 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. Either no budget or an inadequate budget has been provided for M&E. | **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. 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 terminal evaluation does not cover M&E implementation adequately. |

**Implementation and Execution Rating Scale:**

| **Rating** | **Implementation (GEF Agency)** | **Execution (Executing Entity)**[9] |
|---|---|---|
| **Highly Satisfactory** | Performance of the GEF Agency was exemplary. Project preparation and implementation were robust. The Agency ensured that relevant GEF policies were applied in project preparation and implementation. Project supervision was strong— the Agency identified and addressed emerging concerns in a timely manner. The Agency ensured that project implementation stayed on track and project activities were completed on time | Performance of the executing entity was exemplary. Execution of project activities was timely and of high quality. Relevant GEF policies and requirements were adhered to. Guidance from the GEF Agency was followed, and any corrective actions required were taken promptly. Measures were undertaken to mitigate risks to sustainability, and steps were taken to support follow-up to the project. Project activities were completed on time |
| **Satisfactory** | **Performance met expectations and did not have any salient weaknesses.** Project preparation and implementation were robust, and relevant GEF policies were applied. The GEF Agency supervised the project well—it identified and addressed emerging concerns in a timely manner. The Agency ensured that project implementation was on track | **Performance met expectations and did not have any salient weaknesses.** Execution of project activities was timely and of good quality. Relevant GEF policies and requirements were adhered to. Guidance from the GEF Agency was followed. Measures were undertaken to mitigate risks to sustainability of project outcomes. |

[9] When multiple entities are involved in project execution, the rating should be based on their collective performance. The rating needs to take into account the performance of the individual executing agencies, their level of responsibilities, and their performance as a collaborative and coordinated arrangement.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Moderately Satisfactory** | **Performance had some weaknesses but met expectations overall.** Project preparation and implementation were adequate and relevant GEF policies were applied, although there are some weak areas. Project supervision was adequate—the GEF Agency identified and addressed emerging concerns, although some may have been inadequately addressed. Project implementation had minor delays, and a few activities may have been dropped. | **Performance had some weaknesses but met expectations overall.** Execution of project activities were generally timely but with some instances of delay. Relevant GEF policies and requirements were adhered to, although some minor slip-ups may have been observed. Guidance from the GEF Agency was followed, and problems were fixed. There were some areas for improvement in execution |
| **Moderately unsatisfactory** | **Performance did not meet expectations, although there were some areas of solid performance.** Project preparation and implementation had weaknesses, although these were not too severe. Project supervision was somewhat weak—although the GEF Agency identified most emerging concerns, many remained unaddressed or inadequately addressed. addressed. Project implementation was delayed, and a few activities were dropped or reduced in scale because of issues that were largely under Agency control. | **Performance did not meet expectations, although there were some areas of solid performance.** Execution of project activities was delayed, and executing entity capabilities observably limited project execution. Several slip-ups in adherence to GEF policies and requirements were observed. Guidance from the GEF Agency was generally followed and problems were fixed, but such actions usually were not timely. There were several areas for improvement in execution. |
| **Unsatisfactory** | **Performance did not meet expectations.** Project preparation and implementation were weak. Project supervision was weak—emerging concerns were not identified in time and remained unaddressed or inadequately addressed. Activities were not implemented in time or were not undertaken. Project implementation was delayed, and several activities were dropped or reduced in scale. | **Performance did not meet expectations.** The execution of project activities was delayed, and at least some activities were dropped due to factors largely under the control of the executing entity. Many slip-ups were observed in adherence to GEF policies and requirements. Guidance from the GEF Agency was not put into practice, or was applied with considerable delay. |
| **Highly Unsatisfactory** | **Performance had severe shortcomings.** The GEF Agency mismanaged project implementation, and its supervision was poor. Emerging concerns were not identified in time, including those that should have been obvious. Although | **Performance had severe shortcomings.** There were several instances of mismanagement by the executing entity. Emerging concerns were not addressed in time, including those that should have been |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | instances of mismanagement were discovered, corrective actions were not undertaken. Project activities were poorly implemented, and several had to be dropped. | obvious. Most activities were very poorly executed and/or experienced delays, and some activities were dropped. GEF policies and requirements were not applied. |
| **Unable to Assess** | The available information is not sufficient to allow rating of performance. | The available information is not sufficient to allow rating of performance. |

Rating scales should be reviewed against the current GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Guidelines and GEF Evaluation Policy before posting. Any deviations from the standard guidance should be explained in the TOR and applied consistently across Annex B, Annex C, and Annex D.

## ANNEX D: REPORT OUTLINE (TO REFINE IN INCEPTION)

| Section | Required content |
|---|---|
| i. | Opening page: project title, WWF and GEF project summary table, evaluation team members and affiliations, statement of independence/conflict of interest, acknowledgements. |
| ii. | Executive Summary: project description, summary of findings by core criteria, overview of ratings, recommendations. |
| iii. | Acronyms and Abbreviations. |
| 1. | Introduction to Evaluation: purpose, scope and methodology, limitations. |
| 2. | Project description and development context: theory of change, map/geographic coordinates if available, problems addressed, stakeholders and beneficiaries, baseline and expected results. |
| 3. | Findings: all required ratings and narrative assessments. |
| 3.1 | Project Design / Formulation: relevance, theory of change; assumptions and risks; lessons from similar projects; WWF comparative advantage; coherence; governance and management arrangements; country ownership; and M&E design rating. |
| 3.2 | Project Implementation and Performance: effectiveness (achievement of outcomes and outputs); impact and unintended effects; M&E implementation/ adaptive management; governance and coordination; WWF-GEF implementation, EA and partner execution; transformational change, catalytic effects, and additionality. |
| 3.3 | Sustainability and Exit Strategy: risks to sustainability, exit strategy, institutional capacity, financing, ownership, and likelihood that benefits will continue. |
| 3.4 | Gender Equality and Social Inclusion: design and implementation of gender analysis and gender mainstreaming strategy, indicators, intermediate results, and gender-responsive measures. |
| 3.5 | Stakeholder Engagement: implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and quality of participation. |
| 3.6 | Safeguards Review: safeguards documents, risk category, mitigation measures, unforeseen environmental or social impacts, beneficiary criteria, risk management measures, and lessons learned. |
| 3.7 | Finance and Co-finance Review: co-financing materialization, use of grant funds, financial management, cost-effectiveness/efficiency, and effects of any shortfalls. |
| 3.8 | Knowledge Management: design and implementation of the knowledge management approach and list/link priority knowledge products. |
| 4. | Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons: concise rationale, lessons and best practices, specific recommendations for sustainability, closeout, portfolio learning, and future project design, plus evaluation rating tables. |
| 5. | Annexes: TOR of TE, evaluation team composition, itinerary, geo-referenced maps/photos, list of persons interviewed, list of documents reviewed, evaluation matrix/questions, questionnaires and summary results, rating summary tables, feedback log, data collection tools, traceability table[10]. |

[10] The final report must include a traceability table showing where each TOR requirement, evaluation criterion, required rating, cross-cutting assessment area, and deliverable requirement is addressed in the report. The table should include at minimum: TOR requirement, corresponding report section/page, evidence source, rating provided if applicable, and any limitations or gaps.

## ANNEX E: INCEPTION REPORT OUTLINE

- Project/program description.
- Purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation, including evaluation audience and requirements of the TOR.
- Evaluability considerations, evidence gaps, methodological limitations, and mitigation measures.
- Evaluation approach, overall design, data collection methods, analytical procedures, triangulation approach, and rating methodology.
- Evaluation questions and evaluation matrix.
- Ethical considerations, independence, conflict of interest, confidentiality, and informed consent approach.
- Gender-responsive and socially inclusive stakeholder engagement and dissemination plan.
- Data management and confidentiality plan, including interview notes, recordings, survey data, personal data, translation/interpretation, storage, transfer, and retention/disposal.
- AI-use disclosure, if applicable, including tools used, purposes, verification process, and evaluator accountability.
- Quality assurance and risk management plan.
- Roles and responsibilities.
- Detailed evaluation work plan indicating activities, timing of delivery, key deliverables, and milestones.
- Annexes: Terms of Reference, analysis of gaps, evaluation matrix, draft data collection tools, agenda for any site visits, rating summary tables and scales.

## ANNEX F: ANSWERS TO FREQUENT AND SUBMITTED QUESTIONS

Questions and responses to submitted questions:

1. **Qualifications.** The Required Qualifications specify a minimum of ten years of relevant professional experience and noted experience with evaluation methodologies. Do these apply to each named team member, or to the lead evaluator only, with team members assessed against the Preferred criteria?

   Because proposals may be submitted by either individuals or teams, the qualifications may be met by the individual consultant or collectively by the proposed team. WWF generally expects the lead evaluator and/or lead author to have at least 10 years of relevant experience, although exceptions may be considered. Preferred qualifications may be met by the lead evaluator or by other team members. If an individual consultant submits a proposal, all required qualifications apply to that person.

2**. Conflict of interest.** Where a proposal names a consultant who has previously held a contract with an executing partner on a separate and unrelated project, how does WWF assess that against the independence requirement? Is there a defined look-back period, and would a signed declaration submitted with the proposal be sufficient to manage it?

The conflict of interest is largely for situations where someone has been involved in design or implementation of the project, or someone who stands to gain from the project. If an individual has a previous relationship with an executing partner, it is recommended to disclose this and discuss any potential mitigation factors to reduce bias, but this does not prevent this individual from participating in the evaluation.

3. **Baseline and tracking tools.** Footnote 7 of Annex B anticipates that a baseline may not exist. Please confirm whether a baseline was established at CEO endorsement, whether a midterm review was conducted, and whether GEF core indicator tracking tools were completed at baseline, midterm and project end.

Thank you. That footnote is standard guidance issued by GEF SEC. There are baseline figures (however, there may be some uncompleted), a midterm was conducted and monitoring is being completed by the project.

4. **Co-financing.** Total committed co-financing substantially exceeds the GEF grant. Will WWF provide a consolidated co-financing table with supporting confirmations from executing partners, or is the evaluator expected to reconstruct materialisation from partner records?

It is standard practice for co-financiers to send co-finance letters confirming the materialization of the co-finance commitments and the evaluator should validate these figures when providing their findings.

5. **Executing partners.** Please confirm which entities are treated as executing agencies for the Implementation and Execution ratings, and whether the evaluator will have direct access to records and personnel across all executing partners.

Implementing agencies included WWF-GEF and CI-GEF. The executing agency is Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, however Yayasan Keanekaragaman Hayati Indonesia (KEHATI) - Blue Abadi Fund  Kehati did execute a portion of the project as well and should also receive a rating.

6**. Trust fund.** The Preferred Qualifications refer to understanding of the scheme and mechanism of Trust Funds. Please confirm whether the Blue Abadi Fund falls within the scope of this evaluation as a project outcome or component, and what documentation will be available.

Yes, BAF falls within the scope as they executed a component of the project. Available project documents will be sent to the evaluator.

7. **Documentation language.** Please confirm what proportion of key project documentation is in Bahasa Indonesia, given that translation costs sit within the stated ceiling.

All key documents, such as meeting reports, will be in English. Some knowledge or communication materials may be in Indonesian and some outputs that did not require supervision review may be in Indonesian. Please note however that field-level interviews will require translation services.

8. **Safeguards and gender data.** Are sex-disaggregated data and safeguards documentation, including the assigned risk category, mitigation plans and grievance mechanism records, included in the documentation package?

Sex-disaggregated data and safeguards documentation will be made available to the evaluator(s).

9. **Project status.** Please confirm the operational status of the project between October 2026 and mid-January 2027, specifically whether field activities are ongoing and whether project and partner personnel will remain in post and available for interview.

Project activities will be ongoing and staff will remain to participate in interviews and report reviews.

10. **Schedule.** Please confirm indicative dates for the inception report, debrief, draft report and final package, the number of review rounds anticipated, and whether the debrief and validation are expected in person or remotely.

These are only indicative timeframes and may be influenced by the evaluation team and the project team in inception period. Inception period is first month, data collection is second month, presentation and delivery of reports in third (and fourth month as applicable).

11. **Taxes.** Please confirm whether Indonesian withholding tax and any US tax obligations fall within the stated all-inclusive ceiling or are handled separately.

All taxes should be included in the budget.

12. **Proposal format.** Is there a page limit or required format for the technical proposal, and are professional references contacted at proposal stage or only for the preferred bidder? Would signed reference letters from previous assignments suffice?

We suggest proposals are limited to 20 pages. Template is not provided. References are contacted in shortlisting phase, therefore signed letters do not suffice.

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

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

- The request for proposals instructions say to submit proposals to EvaluationsWWFGEF@wwfus.org, but some posting websites may request uploads.

Response: Only complete proposals submitted to the e-mail address listed will be reviewed.

- Should indicated budget ($25,000) include expenses and taxes?

Response: The indicated budget is the maximum budget available for fee, expenses and taxes. It is all inclusive.