



GUIDELINE: GEF/GN/thematic code/number

Date

---

# Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-sized Projects

**Summary:**

The *GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy* (2010) specifies that each GEF full-sized project will be evaluated at the end of implementation. The purpose of *Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full Sized Projects* is to support GEF Agencies in conducting terminal evaluations in a consistent manner.

**Applicability:**

Terminal evaluation reports are required, in English, at project completion for all full-size projects (including child projects and enabling activities that were processed as full-size projects) funded by GEF through the GEF Trust Fund, the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), and, where applicable, other GEF administered trust funds.<sup>1</sup> Terminal evaluation reports are also required for full-sized projects that have been cancelled if at least US \$ 1 million (or more than US \$ 2 million for the projects approved on or after January 1<sup>st</sup> 2013) of the GEF grant had been spent at the point of cancellation.

These guidelines take precedence over any other guidance on terminal evaluations for full-sized projects issued by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO) in past and complement the relevant guidance issued by the GEF Agencies. Although these guidelines do not cover terminal evaluations for GEF programs or medium-sized projects, the Agencies are encouraged to use these guidelines as a reference to develop their approach to conduct terminal evaluations for these activities as well.

**Key Words:**

Co-financing; Full-sized Project; Impact; Learning; Lessons; Monitoring and Evaluation; Outcomes; Project Cycle; Results; Sustainability; Terminal Evaluation.

---

<sup>1</sup> In August 2006 the Council decided that all GEF operational policies, procedures, and governance structure are applied to these funds unless the LDCF/SCCF Council decides otherwise (GEF/C.29/5, *Governance of the Climate Change Funds*, Joint Summaries of the Chairs, 29<sup>th</sup> GEF Council Meeting, Decision on Agenda Item 6). Accordingly, the LDCF/SCCF currently applies the GEF M&E policy.

## I. Introduction

The terminal evaluations, i.e. evaluations that are conducted at the end of project implementation, are expected to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its design, implementation, and achievement of objectives. They are expected to: promote accountability and transparency; facilitate synthesis of lessons; provide feedback to allow the GEF IEO to identify issues that are recurrent across the GEF portfolio; and, contribute to GEF IEO databases for aggregation and analysis.

## II. Guidelines for Conduct of Terminal Evaluations

### A. Roles and Responsibilities

#### *GEF Agencies<sup>2</sup>*

##### 1. The GEF Agencies will:

- a. Conduct terminal evaluations within six months before or after completion of a full-sized project.
- b. Develop specific terms of reference for each terminal evaluation. Provide guidance, documentation, and support to the evaluation team.
- c. Archive information gathered during project implementation and conduct of terminal evaluation and, at the request of the GEF IEO, make it available for follow-up studies and evaluations.
- d. Ensure that the evaluation team is composed of evaluators with relevant expertise, including social safeguards and gender.
- e. Ensure that project evaluation team members are independent, unbiased, and free of conflicts of interest. The GEF Agency should ensure an independent quality control review of the terminal evaluation.
- f. Facilitate the engagement of the GEF operational focal points in conduct of terminal evaluations, without compromising the independence of the evaluation. The GEF Agencies will share the terms of reference for the evaluation with the relevant operational focal points. The Agencies will also share the draft reports of the evaluation with them for comment, and transmit the final report to them.
- g. Actively seek and address feedback of relevant stakeholders to prepare terminal evaluation's terms of reference and its final report.

---

<sup>2</sup> This includes the 10 GEF Agencies and 8 GEF Agencies accredited through the Pilot Program on Accrediting GEF Agencies.

- h. Submit the terminal evaluation to the GEF IEO within 12 months of project completion.
    - i. Share the terminal evaluation reports publicly, with the relevant operational focal points, and with the relevant national and regional counterparts.
- 2. For full-sized projects that are **jointly implemented** by two or more GEF Agencies, one terminal evaluation report should be prepared. The terminal evaluation report should be:
  - a. **Unified.** The terminal evaluation report will include the overall assessment of project performance and cover all project components.
  - b. **Jointly owned.** Unless otherwise agreed, the lead Agency implementing the project will lead the process for conducting the terminal evaluation. It should be undertaken with active participation and/or support from other GEF Agencies.

*Independent Evaluation Units of the GEF Agencies*

- 3. The GEF IEO encourages the independent evaluation units of the GEF Agencies to review and validate terminal evaluation reports to ensure compliance with GEF evaluation requirements. Where the ratings and assessments provided by the independent evaluation units of the GEF Agencies have a track record of being consistent with those given by the GEF IEO, the GEF IEO will adopt them for reporting to the GEF Council.

*GEF Operational Focal Points*

- 4. Minimum requirement 4 of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (2010) requires that the GEF Agencies involve the relevant operational focal points in the terminal evaluation process. The OFPs will receive the draft terminal evaluation report for comments, and will receive the final evaluation report within 12 months of project or program completion. The operational focal points are encouraged to provide inputs while respecting the independent nature of the evaluation.

*Evaluators*

- 5. The following guidelines shall be observed by the evaluators in conducting terminal evaluations:
  - a. As per the minimum requirement 3 of the GEF M&E Policy (2010), evaluators will be independent. This implies independence from project design, approval, implementation and execution.
  - b. Evaluators will familiarize themselves with the GEF programs and strategies, and with relevant GEF policies such as those on project cycle, M&E, co-

financing, fiduciary standards, gender, and environmental and social safeguards.

- c. Evaluators will take perspectives of all relevant stakeholders into account. They will gather information on project performance and results from multiple sources including the project M&E system, tracking tools, field visit, stakeholder interviews, project documents, and other independent sources, to facilitate triangulation. They will seek the necessary contextual information to assess the significance and relevance of observed performance and results.
- d. Evaluators will be impartial and will present a balanced account consistent with evidence.
- e. Evaluators will apply the rating scales provided in these guidelines.
- f. Evaluators will abide by the *GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines*.<sup>3</sup>

## B. Content of the Terminal Evaluation Report

### *Scope of Terminal Evaluation*

6. The scope of a terminal evaluation will depend upon the project's theory of change, its objectives, supported activities, M&E design and implementation, and the context in which the project was designed and implemented. The terminal evaluation report will clarify the key questions that the evaluation seeks to answer, the interventions assessed, the geographical and demographic coverage, the methods used, and the time period under review.
7. In most cases, terminal evaluations will include field visits, and interviews with key stakeholders; review of project documents, project M&E data, audit reports, and mid-term reviews; and information from independent sources.

### *General Information*

8. The terminal evaluation report will provide general information on the project and conduct of the terminal evaluation. This includes information such as GEF Project ID, project name, GEF financing, promised and materialized co-financing, key objectives, GEF Agency, project countries, key dates, name of the project executing entity, whether the project is linked to a GEF program, the evaluation team, etc. The terminal evaluation report will also provide information on when the evaluation took place, places visited, who was involved, the methodology, and the limitations of the evaluation. The report will also include, as annexes

---

<sup>3</sup> *GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines*, Evaluation Document No. 2 (GEF Independent Evaluation Office, 2007) is available at <http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/gef-ee-ethical-guidelines-2007.pdf>

to the main report, the evaluation team's terms of reference, its composition and expertise.

9. Where feasible and appropriate, the terminal evaluation reports should include geo-referenced maps and/or coordinates that demarcate the planned and actual area covered by the project.<sup>4</sup> To facilitate tracking and verification, where feasible, the terminal evaluations should include geo-referenced pictures of the sites where GEF supported interventions were undertaken.

### *Project Theory of Change*

10. A project's theory of change provides a basis for evaluation of the theory and results. The terminal evaluation report will include a description of the project's theory of change including description of: the outputs, outcomes, intermediate states, and intended long-term environmental impacts of the project; the causal pathways for the long-term impacts; and, implicit and explicit assumptions. The project's objective(s) should also be included within the theory of change.
11. Some of the projects may already have an explicit theory of change. Where appropriate, after consultations with the project stakeholders, the evaluators may refine this theory of change. Where an explicit theory of change is not provided in the project documents, the evaluators should develop it based on information provided in the project documents and through consultations with the project stakeholders.

### *Assessment of Project Results<sup>5</sup>*

12. Minimum Requirement 3 of the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (2010) specifies that terminal evaluations will, at the minimum, assess achievement of outputs and outcomes, and report on these. While assessing a project's results, evaluators will determine the extent to which the project objectives – as stated in the documents submitted at the CEO Endorsement stage – have been achieved. The evaluators should also indicate if there were any changes in project design and/or expected results after start of implementation. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), where feasible, the evaluator should estimate the baseline conditions so that results can be determined. Where applicable, the terminal evaluation report will include an assessment of the level of achievement of the

---

<sup>4</sup> This applies in instances where geo-referenced maps were included in a given project's proposal and annexes.

<sup>5</sup> In GEF terms, "results" include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and progress toward longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects (page 27, *The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2010* <http://www.gefio.org/evaluations/gef-monitoring-and-evaluation-me-policy-2010> ).

GEF corporate results targets to which the project contributes and will also incorporate data from the focal area tracking tool.

## Outputs

13. Outputs are tangible direct results of a project, and to a large extent its production is within direct control of the project management. The evaluators should assess the extent to which the key expected outputs were actually delivered. They should also identify and assess the factors that affected delivery of outputs.

## Outcomes<sup>6</sup>

14. In the causal pathways of a project, its outputs are expected to lead to its intended outcomes. Although achievement of outcomes is not certain, most GEF projects may be expected to achieve the targeted outcomes at implementation completion. The evaluators should, therefore, assess the extent to which the expected outcomes were achieved and the extent to which its achievement was dependent on delivery of project outputs. They should also assess the factors that affected outcome achievement, e.g. project design, project's linkages with other activities, extent and materialization of co-financing, stakeholder involvement, etc. Where the project was developed within the framework of a program, the assessment should also report on the extent the project contributed to the program outcomes.

## Criteria for Outcome Ratings

15. Outcome ratings will take into account the outcome achievements of the projects against its expected targets.<sup>7</sup> Project outcomes will be rated on three dimensions:
  - a. **Relevance:** Were the project outcomes congruent with the GEF focal areas/operational program strategies, country priorities, and mandates of the Agencies? Was the project design appropriate for delivering the expected outcomes?
  - b. **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the project's actual outcomes commensurate with the expected outcomes?
  - c. **Efficiency:** Was the project cost-effective? How does the project cost/time versus output/outcomes equation compare to that of similar projects?

---

<sup>6</sup> Outcomes are "the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Outputs are the products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes." *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management. OECD, Development Assistance Committee.*

<sup>7</sup> Where measurement of outcome achievements is not realistic at the point of project completion, quality and level of outputs delivered may be used as a proxy to indicate outcome achievement.

16. **Rating Scale for Outcomes:** An overall outcome rating will be provided on a six-point scale (highly satisfactory to highly unsatisfactory) after taking into account outcome relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency (See Annex 2).

## Sustainability

17. The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (2010), minimum requirement 3, specifies that a terminal evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability<sup>8</sup> of outcomes at project termination and provide a rating. The assessment of sustainability will weigh risks to continuation of benefits from the project. The assessment should identify key risks and explain how these risks may affect continuation of benefits after the GEF project ends. The analysis should cover financial, socio-political, institutional, and environmental risks.
18. The overall sustainability of project outcomes will be rated on a four-point scale (Likely to Unlikely) based on an assessment of the likely incidence and magnitude of the risks to sustainability. Higher levels of risks and magnitudes of effect, imply lower likelihood of sustainability. Annex 2 describes the rating scale for sustainability.

## Progress to Impact

19. It is often too early to assess the long-term impacts of the project at the point of project completion. This said, some evidence on progress towards long-term impacts, and the extent to which the key assumptions of the project's theory of change hold, may be available and it may be feasible to assess and report on the progress. The evaluators should also assess the extent to which the progress towards long-term impact may be attributed to the project.
20. The evaluators should report the available qualitative and quantitative evidence on environmental stress reduction (e.g. GHG emission reduction, reduction of waste discharge, etc.) and environmental status change (e.g. change in population of endangered species, forest stock, water retention in degraded lands, etc.). When reporting such evidence, the evaluator should note the information source and clarify the scale/s at which the described environmental stress reduction is being achieved.
21. The evaluators should cover project's contributions to changes in policy/ legal/regulatory framework. This would include observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, monitoring systems, etc.) and governance architecture, including access to and use of information (laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict

---

<sup>8</sup> The GEF M&E Policy 2010 adopts the following definition of sustainability: the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion; projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.



resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc.). Contribution to change in socioeconomic status (income, health, well-being, etc.) should also be documented.

22. Where the environmental and social changes are being achieved at scales beyond the immediate area of intervention, the evaluators should provide an account of the processes such as sustaining, mainstreaming, replication, scaling up and market change, through which these changes have taken place. The evaluators should discuss whether there are arrangements in the project design to facilitate follow-up actions, and should document instances where the GEF promoted approaches, technologies, financing instruments, legal frameworks, information systems, etc., were adopted/implemented without direct support from, or involvement of, the project. Evidence on incidence of these processes should be discussed to assess progress towards impact.
23. When assessing contributions of GEF project to the observed change, the evaluators should also assess the contributions of other actors and factors. The evaluators should assess merits of rival explanations for the observed impact and give reasons for accepting or rejecting them. Where applicable, the evaluators are encouraged to identify and describe the barriers and other risks that may prevent further progress towards long-term impacts.
24. The evaluators should document the unintended impacts – both positive and negative impacts – of the project and assess the overall scope and implications of these impacts. Where these impacts are undesirable from environmental and socio-economic perspectives, the evaluation should suggest corrective actions.

### *Assessment of Monitoring & Evaluation Systems*

25. The GEF M&E minimum requirement 1 calls for fully developed and budgeted project M&E plan at CEO Endorsement, and the minimum requirement 2 calls for implementation of these plans. The evaluators will include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the project M&E plan and its implementation.
26. **M&E Design.** To assess the quality of the M&E plan, the evaluators will assess: Was the M&E plan at the point of CEO Endorsement practical and sufficient? Did it include baseline data? Did it: specify clear targets and appropriate (SMART<sup>9</sup>) indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio economic results; a proper methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of the M&E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection; and, budget adequate funds for M&E activities?

---

<sup>9</sup> SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable/Attributable, Relevant/Realistic, and Time-bound, Timely, Trackable and Targeted.

27. **M&E Implementation.** The evaluators should assess: Whether the M&E system operated as per the M&E plan? Where necessary, whether the M&E plan was revised in a timely manner? Was information on specified indicators and relevant GEF focal area tracking tools gathered in a systematic manner? Whether appropriate methodological approaches have been used to analyze data? Were resources for M&E sufficient? How was the information from M&E system used during the project implementation?
28. Project M&E systems will be rated on the quality of M&E design and quality of M&E implementation using a six-point scale (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory). Annex 2 provides more details on the scale.

### *Assessment of Implementation and Execution*

29. The assessment of the implementation and execution of GEF full size projects will take into account the performance of the GEF Agencies and project executing entities (EAs) in discharging their expected roles and responsibilities. The performance of these agencies will be rated using a six-point scale (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory). See Annex 2 for more information on the scale.
30. **Quality of Implementation:** Within the GEF partnership, GEF Agencies are involved in activities related to a project's identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation of detailed proposal, approval and start-up, oversight, supervision, completion, and evaluation.<sup>10</sup> To assess performance of the GEF Agencies, the evaluators will assess the extent to which the agency delivered effectively on these counts, with focus on elements that were controllable from the given GEF Agency's perspective. The evaluator will assess how well risks were identified and managed by the GEF Agency.
31. **Quality of Execution:** Within the GEF partnership, the EAs are involved in the management and administration of the project's day-to-day activities under the overall oversight and supervision of the GEF Agencies.<sup>11</sup> The EAs are responsible for the appropriate use of funds, and procurement and contracting of goods and services to the GEF Agency.<sup>12</sup> To assess EA performance, the evaluators will assess the extent to which it effectively discharged its role and responsibilities.

---

<sup>10</sup> See GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01 and GEF/C.39/9

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

## *Other Assessments*

32. The terminal evaluations should assess the following topics, for which ratings are not required:

- a. **Need for follow-up:** Where applicable, the evaluators will indicate if there is any need to follow up on the evaluation findings, e.g. instances financial mismanagement, unintended negative impacts or risks, etc.
- b. **Materialization of co-financing:** the evaluators will provide information on the extent to which expected co-financing materialized, whether co-financing is cash or in-kind, whether it is in form of grant or loan or equity, whether co-financing was administered by the project management or by some other organization, how short fall in co-financing or materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results, etc.
- c. **Environmental and Social Safeguards<sup>13</sup>:** The evaluator will assess whether appropriate environmental and social safeguards, including those on mainstreaming of gender concerns<sup>14</sup>, were addressed in the project's design and implementation. It is expected that a GEF project will not cause any harm to environment or to any stakeholder and, where applicable, it will take measures to prevent and/or mitigate adverse effects.
- d. **Gender Concerns<sup>15</sup>:** The evaluator will determine the extent to which the gender considerations were taken into account in designing and implementing the project. The evaluator should report whether a gender analysis was conducted, the extent to which the project was implemented in a manner that ensures gender equitable participation and benefits, and whether gender disaggregated data was gathered and reported on beneficiaries. In case the given GEF project disadvantages or may disadvantage women, then this should be documented and reported. The evaluator should also determine the extent to which relevant gender related concerns were tracked through project M&E.

---

<sup>13</sup> Refer to GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1 available at: [http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.41.10.Rev.1.Policy\\_on\\_Environmental\\_and\\_Social\\_Safeguards.Final%20of%20Nov%2018.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.41.10.Rev.1.Policy_on_Environmental_and_Social_Safeguards.Final%20of%20Nov%2018.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> GEF/C.40/10/Rev.1 available at: [http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.40.10\\_GEF\\_Policies\\_on\\_Safeguards\\_and\\_Gender.April\\_26\\_2011\\_1.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.40.10_GEF_Policies_on_Safeguards_and_Gender.April_26_2011_1.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> POLICY: SD/PL/02 Policy on Gender Mainstreaming available at: [http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Gender\\_Mainstreaming\\_Policy-2012\\_0.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Gender_Mainstreaming_Policy-2012_0.pdf), and GEF/C.47/09.Rev.01, Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) available at: [http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/25\\_EN\\_GEF.C.47.09.Rev.01\\_Gender\\_Equality\\_Action\\_Plan\\_1.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/25_EN_GEF.C.47.09.Rev.01_Gender_Equality_Action_Plan_1.pdf)

- e. **Stakeholder Engagement:** The evaluator should, where applicable, assess aspects such as involvement of civil society, indigenous population, private sector, etc.

### *Lessons and Recommendations*

- 33. Evaluators should provide a few well-formulated lessons that are based on the project experience and applicable to the type of project at hand, to the GEF's overall portfolio, and/or to GEF systems and processes. Wherever possible, terminal evaluation reports should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation that have led to effective stakeholder engagement, successful broader adoption of GEF initiatives by stakeholders, and large-scale environmental impacts. The evaluators should describe aspects of the project performance that worked well along with reasons for it. They should discuss where these good practices may or may not be replicated.
- 34. Recommendations should be well formulated and targeted. The recommendations should discuss the need for action, the recommended action along with its likely consequences vis-à-vis status quo and other courses of action, the specific actor/actors that need to take the action, and time frame for it.

### **C. Submission of Terminal Evaluation**

- 35. The GEF Agencies will submit the final terminal evaluation reports to the GEF IEO, no later than one year after project completion. The GEF Agency may submit these reports either on a rolling basis or on an annual basis on or before September 30<sup>th</sup>. Along with the terminal evaluation, where applicable, the GEF Agencies should also send the independent assessment of the terminal evaluation report. The GEF IEO will track, and report on, submission of completed terminal evaluations.

### **D. Use of Terminal Evaluation**

- 36. The information provided by the terminal evaluations and the independent assessment of the terminal evaluation reports, is used by the GEF IEO to report annually to the Council on portfolio performance and trends. The evidence presented in the terminal evaluations and its independent reviews may also be an input to other evaluations that the GEF IEO undertakes. The GEF IEO shares the terminal evaluation reports and terminal evaluation reviews publicly through the GEF project database webpage.

### III. Related Documents and References

- *Clarifying the Responsibilities of the GEF's Key Actors with respect to the Use of GEF Resources*, GEF/C.42/04, June 2012
- GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines, Evaluation Document No. 2. GEF IEO, 2007.
- *GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards: Separation of Implementation and Execution Functions in GEF Partner Agencies*, GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01, November 2011
- GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards, GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1, GEF, November 2011.
- *GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy*, GEF/C.50/08/Rev.01, June 2016.
- Gender Equality Action Plan, GEF/C.47/09.Rev.01, GEF, October 2014.
- *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Development Assistance Committee. Working Party on Aid Evaluation. 2002.
- *Governance of the Climate Change Funds*, GEF/C.29/5, GEF, August 2006.
- *Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations*, Evaluation Document No. 3. GEF IEO, 2008.
- *Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility*. GEF, March 2015.
- Joint Summaries of the Chairs: 29<sup>th</sup> GEF Council Meeting, August 2006.
- Joint Summary of the Chairs: 43<sup>rd</sup> GEF Council Meeting. GEF, November 2012.
- Policy on Gender Mainstreaming, SD/PL/02, GEF Secretariat, May 2012.
- Rules and Guidelines for Agency Fees and Project Management Costs, GEF/C.39/09, GEF, October 2010.
- *Streamlining of Project Cycle*, GEF/C.43/06. GEF, October 2012.
- *The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*, Evaluation Document No. 1. GEF IEO, 2006.
- *The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*, Evaluation Document No. 4. GEF IEO, 2010.

## IV. Annexes

### 1. Impact Assessment Related Definitions

**Impact in general:** Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended (OECD/DAC 2002). This definition is used by the Development Assistance Committee Evaluation Network of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) of the International Financial Institutions, and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

The goal of the GEF is to achieve **environmental impact**, which is defined as changes in biophysical parameters that could take the following forms:

- **Stress reduction:** biophysical changes that reflect reduction of threats emanating from actions of humans (local communities, societies, economies)
- **Environmental status:** changes in the status of the environment

Over time, stress reduction leads to improvements in environmental status. Impact measurement thus has a **time dimension**, significantly longer than project duration, as many biophysical processes that the GEF aims to influence take a long time to mature—from 20 to 30 years before an ecosystem is brought back to a healthy status to 50 years before the ozone layer is restored. This time dimension is identified in terms of the following:

- **Direct impact:** changes attributable to an intervention; i.e. habitat restoration for a specific species, which can show quick impact (within a few years)
- **Long-term impact:** changes emerging over time in long-duration biophysical processes

Furthermore, impact has a **spatial dimension**; it can be measured at different geographical, socio-ecological, or administrative impact scales such as demonstration sites, landscapes or seascapes, markets, in local or national administrations, in regions, or world-wide.

**System-level impact**, occurring at landscape, seascape, market-wide, and higher administrative scales and worldwide is measured through both biophysical and socioeconomic parameters that identify the dynamics of the system. System-level changes are difficult to attribute as too many actors and processes of interaction occur, but may have identification of contribution.

Impacts may have local and global significance. **Globally significant impacts** have local impact as well, but not all **local impacts** have global significance. **Social and economic impacts** are studied to determine whether behavior changes reduce or enhance threats and whether they lead to sustainable development.

Broader adoption of GEF promoted approach and or technologies typically take place through mainstreaming, replication, scaling-up and market-change.

**Mainstreaming:** Information, lessons, or specific results of GEF are incorporated into broader stakeholder mandates and initiatives such as laws, policies, regulations, and programs. This may occur through governments and/or through development organizations and other sectors.

**Replication:** GEF-supported initiatives are reproduced or adopted at a comparable administrative or ecological scale, often in another geographical area or region.

**Scaling-up:** GEF-supported initiatives are implemented at larger geographical scale, often expanded to include new aspects or concerns that may be political, administrative or ecological in nature.

**Market change:** GEF-supported initiatives help catalyze market transformation by influencing the supply of and/or demand for goods and services that contribute to global environmental benefits. This may encompass technological changes, policy and regulatory reforms, and financial instruments.

## 2. Rating Scales

The main dimensions of project performance on which ratings are first provided in terminal evaluation are: outcomes, sustainability, quality of monitoring and evaluation, quality of implementation, and quality of execution.

### Outcome Ratings

The overall ratings on the outcomes of the project will be based on performance on the following criteria:

- a) Relevance
- b) Effectiveness
- c) Efficiency

Project outcomes are rated based on the extent to which project objectives were achieved. A six-point rating scale is used to assess overall outcomes:

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

The calculation of the overall outcomes rating of projects will consider all the three criteria, of which relevance and effectiveness are critical. The rating on relevance will determine whether the overall outcome rating will be in the unsatisfactory range (MU to HU = unsatisfactory range). If the relevance rating is in the unsatisfactory range then the overall outcome will be in the unsatisfactory range as well. However, where the relevance rating is in the satisfactory range (HS to MS), the overall outcome rating could, depending on its effectiveness and efficiency rating, be either in the satisfactory range or in the unsatisfactory range.



The second constraint applied is that the overall outcome achievement rating may not be higher than the effectiveness rating.

During project implementation, the results framework of some projects may have been modified. In cases where modifications in the project impact, outcomes and outputs have not scaled down their overall scope, the evaluator should assess outcome achievements based on the revised results framework. In instances where the scope of the project objectives and outcomes has been scaled down, the magnitude of and necessity for downscaling is taken into account and despite achievement of results as per the revised results framework, where appropriate, a lower outcome effectiveness rating may be given.

### **Sustainability Ratings**

The sustainability will be assessed taking into account the risks related to financial, sociopolitical, institutional, and environmental sustainability of project outcomes. The evaluator may also take other risks into account that may affect sustainability. The overall sustainability will be assessed using a four-point scale.

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

### **Project M&E Ratings**

Quality of project M&E will be assessed in terms of:

- Design
- Implementation

Quality of M&E on these two dimensions will be assessed on a six point scale:

- Highly satisfactory (HS): There were no short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation exceeded expectations.
- Satisfactory (S): There were no or minor short comings and quality of M&E design / implementation meets expectations.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were some short comings and quality of M&E design/implementation more or less meets expectations.

- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings and quality of M&E design / implementation somewhat lower than expected.
- Unsatisfactory (U): There were major short comings and quality of M&E design/implementation substantially lower than expected.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): There were severe short comings in M&E design/ implementation.
- Unable to Assess (UA): The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design / implementation.

### **Implementation and Execution Rating**

Quality of implementation and of execution will be rated separately. Quality of implementation pertains to the role and responsibilities discharged by the GEF Agencies that have direct access to GEF resources. Quality of Execution pertains to the roles and responsibilities discharged by the country or regional counterparts that received GEF funds from the GEF Agencies and executed the funded activities on ground. The performance will be rated on a six-point scale.

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

## Annex 3 – Required Project Identification and Financial Data

### Project and Terminal Evaluation Data

GEF Project ID	
IA Project ID	
Project Name	
Country	
Implementing Agency / Agencies	
Executing Agency / Agencies	
Focal Area	
GEF Strategy / Operational Program	
Date of work program approval	
Date of CEO endorsement	
Date of project start / effectiveness	
Date of project completion (completion of project activities; indicate expected or actual)	
Name of Evaluators	
Date of Terminal Evaluation Completion	

### Financial data

#### *Project Preparation through PDF/PPG grants (in US \$)*

Particulars	At approval	At PDF/PPG completion
GEF PDF/PPG grants for project preparation		
Co-financing for project preparation		

#### *GEF's Project Funding*

Particulars	At CEO Endorsement	At project completion
GEF project grant		
Co-financing		
<b>Total</b>		

#### *Project Co-financing Break up*

Name of the Co-financer	Co-financer type <sup>16</sup>	Type of co-financing <sup>17</sup>	Co-financing at project start			Actual Co-financing at project end		
			In-kind	Cash	Total	In-kind	Cash	Total
<b>Grand Total</b>								

<sup>16</sup> Examples of categories include: local, provincial or national government; semi-government autonomous institutions; educational and research institutions; private sector; multilateral or bilateral organizations; Non-profit organizations; and, others.

<sup>17</sup> Grant; loan; or equity participation by beneficiaries (individuals) in form of cash, in-kind or material contributions.