

ANNEX 2 – Guidelines and content for the evaluation¹.

1. Terminal Evaluation Report Content

This chapter provides further details on the key issues to be addressed in the TE report. This information is provided as a tool for evaluators, as well as a guide for Commissioning Units to assess the quality and completeness of TE reports. All TE reports must cover the same required content, must be written in a concise and focused manner, and should be no longer than 30 pages (without annexes).

1.1 Executive Summary

A concise Executive Summary (maximum 4 pages) should precede the Introduction section of the TE report and must include:

- a Project Information Table (Table 7);
- a brief description of the project;
- a completed Evaluation Ratings Table (Table 8) using the specified rating scales (Table 9);
- a concise summary of findings and conclusions
- synthesis of the key lessons learned (bullet points; one-page maximum);
- a Recommendations Summary Table. (Table 10).

Table 7. Project Information Table

The Commissioning Unit must complete this table and share it with the TE team

Project Details		Project Milestones	
Project Title		PIF Approval Date:	
CAF Project ID (PIMS #):		CEO Endorsement Date (FSP) / Approval date (MSP):	
GEF Project ID:		ProDoc Signature Date:	
CAF Atlas Business Unit, Award ID, Project ID:		Date Project Manager hired:	
Country/Countries:		Inception Workshop Date:	
Region:		Mid-Term Review Completion Date:	<i>[if applicable]</i>
Focal Area:		Terminal Evaluation Completion date:	
GEF Operational Programme or Strategic Priorities/Objectives:		Planned Operational Closure Date:	
Trust Fund:	<i>[indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]</i>		
Implementing Partner (GEF Executing Entity):			
NGOs/CBOs involvement:	<i>[Indicate as: Lead executing agency; one of the beneficiaries; through consultation]</i>		

¹ Final content to be defined with the TE consultant and project agencies based on the info available.

Private sector involvement:	<i>[Indicate as: Lead executing agency; one of the beneficiaries; through consultations]</i>
Geospatial coordinates of project sites:	<i>[Coordinates are available in the annual PIRs]</i>

Financial Information		
PDF/PPG	at approval (US\$M)	at PDF/PPG completion (US\$M)
GEF PDF/PPG grants for project preparation		
Co-financing for project preparation		
Project	at CEO Endorsement (US\$M)	at TE (US\$M)
[1] CAF contribution:		
[2] Government:		
[3] Other multi-/bi-laterals:		
[4] Private Sector:		
[5] NGOs:		
[6] Total co-financing [1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5]:		
[7] Total GEF funding:		
[8] Total Project Funding [6 + 7]		

Table 8. Evaluation Ratings Table

1. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
2. Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation & Executing Agency (EA) Execution	Rating
Quality of CAF Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
4. Sustainability	Rating
Financial sustainability	
Socio-political sustainability	
Institutional framework and governance sustainability	
Environmental sustainability	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

The Evaluation Ratings Table consolidates individual ratings undertaken in a number of areas within the main TE report, as detailed in the TE report's 'Section 4. Findings'. The rating scales used in a TE report are described in Table 9.

Table 9. TE Rating Scales

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance	Sustainability ratings:
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

Table 10. Recommendations Table

Rec #	TE Recommendation	Entity Responsible	Time frame
A	Category 1:		
A.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i>		
A.2			
A.3			
B	Category 2:		
B.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i>		
B.2			
B.3			
C	Category 3:		
C.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i>		
C.2			
C.3			
D	Category 4:		
D.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i>		
D.2			
D.3			
E	Category 5:		
E.1	<i>Key recommendation:</i>		
E.2			

1.2 Introduction

The introductory section of the TE report outlines the TE's purpose and objectives, the scope of the TE, and the TE process. It explains the approach and methodology – including data collection methods – making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. Some of this information will have been provided in the TE Inception Report. The Introduction identifies the primary audience and users of the evaluation and how they are expected to use the evaluation results. This section should cover 2-3 pages (maximum) and include the following sections.

A) Evaluation Purpose

The start of the TE report must explain the purpose of the evaluation and why it is being carried out at this point in time.

B) Scope of the Evaluation

The TE report must define the parameters and focus of the evaluation, including the time period being evaluated, segments of the target beneficiaries included, geographic area included, and which components were assessed.

C) Methodology

The TE report will describe the selected methodological approaches; the rationale for their selection; and how, within the constraints of time and money, the approaches and methods employed yielded data that helped answer the evaluation questions and achieved the evaluation purposes. The description should help the report users judge the merits of the methods used in the evaluation and the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

D) Data Collection and Analysis

The TE report must include a section that articulates how data has been collected and analysed. This includes the sources of information (documents, stakeholders, beneficiaries, etc.), the rationale for their selection and how the information obtained addressed the questions in the Evaluation Criteria Matrix (Table 3). Lists of documents reviewed and persons interviewed should be annexed to the report.

For a summary of common data collection methods and sources, please see Annex 2 of the CAF Evaluation Guidelines.

In order to ensure maximum validity and reliability of data, the TE team must ensure triangulation of the various data sources and describe in the TE report the methods used for triangulation.

The Evaluation Criteria Matrix which is provided with the TE Inception Report and final TE report, clarifies how the TE team planned to collect the data. The matrix details the evaluation questions that need to be answered in order to determine project results and identifies where the information is expected to come from, (i.e. documents, questionnaires, interviews, and site visits).

E) Limitations

The TE report must describe any limitations encountered by the TE team during the evaluation process, including limitations of the methodology, data collection methods, and any potential influence of limitation on how findings may be interpreted, and conclusions drawn. Limitations include, among others: language barriers, inaccessible project sites, issues with access to data or verification of data sources, issues with availability of interviewees, methodological limitations to collecting more extensive or more representative qualitative or quantitative evaluation data, deviations from planned data collection and analysis set out in the ToR and Inception Report, etc. Efforts made to mitigate the limitations must also be included in the TE report.

1.3 Project Description

This section must provide background information on the project being evaluated. It should be focused and concise (3-6 pages maximum), highlighting only those issues most pertinent to the evaluation. Much of the information for this section can be accessed from the Project Identification Form (PIF) that was developed to secure GEF Council approval, the CEO Endorsement Request, and the project document. Attention should be paid to 'Part II: Project Justification' in the PIF and CEO Endorsement Request, which describes the project's expected global environmental benefits, consistency with national priorities, contributions to gender equality and women's empowerment, coordination with other initiatives, risks to successful project completion, barriers to be addressed, stakeholder involvement, potential for scaling up, among other aspects.³⁰

Additional background and context information to include:

- **Project start and duration**, including project cycle milestones.
- **Development context**: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope: Significant socio-economic and environmental changes since the beginning of project implementation and any other major external contributing factors.
- **Problems that the project sought to address**: How the project objectives fit into the partner government's strategies and priorities; GEF and CAF priorities and programming; and how they are linked to relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) targets/indicators
- **Immediate and development objectives** of the project
- **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. Where appropriate, after consultations with project stakeholders, the TE team may refine the theory of change.
 - Where an explicit theory of change is not provided for the project, the TE team should develop one based on information provided in the project documentation and through consultations with stakeholders.
- **Expected results**
- **Total resources** that have been identified for the project, including approved grant financing from the GEF Trust Fund (GEF TF), Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) or Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) and expected co-financing from other sources
- Summary of **main stakeholders** involved in implementation and their roles
- **Key partners involved in the project**, including CAF, other joint implementing partners, executing

agencies, country counterparts – including the GEF Operational Focal Point – and other key stakeholders

- How this evaluation fits within the **context of other ongoing and previous evaluations**, for example if a Mid-Term Review was also carried out for the project, or if another implementing partner has evaluated this or a closely linked project

In instances where geo-referenced maps were included in a project's proposal and annexes, and where feasible and appropriate, the TE report should include geo-referenced maps and/or coordinates that demarcate the planned and actual area covered by the project. Also, where feasible, the TE report should include geo-referenced photos of the sites where GEF-supported interventions were undertaken.

1.4 Findings

The findings of the TE report are to be presented as statements of fact based on analysis of the evidence and data. They should be structured around the evaluation criteria so that report users can readily make the connection between what was asked and what was found. Variances between planned and actual results must be explained, as well as factors affecting the achievement of intended results. Evidence must be provided to support all findings in the TE report.

With respect to the findings discussion, it is suggested that the TE report elaborate on the following general areas: project design/formulation, project implementation, and project results and progress to impacts.

Guiding questions to be addressed are shown in shaded boxes in this section. These questions serve as examples and suggestions and should be adjusted by the Commissioning Units and TE teams, as needed, for each evaluation.

Several elements of this section will require a rating using the rating systems that are described. The TE ratings must be summarized in an Evaluation Ratings Table (see Table 8) in the TE report's Executive Summary. Those elements requiring a rating in addition to a descriptive analysis are marked with an asterisk (*) below.

A) Project Design/Formulation

The TE team must undertake an assessment of the project design, as outlined in the Project Document in order to identify whether the design was effective in helping the project reach expected results, especially if an MTR was not required. Questions on elements of the project design that should be addressed include, but are not limited to, the following:

Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators

- How were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame? Was the project designed to address country priorities and be country-driven?
- How were outcomes and outputs consistent with the Theory of Change?
 - Was there a clearly defined and robust Theory of Change? Did the Theory of Change include: a clear definition of the problem to be addressed and its root causes, desired outcomes, an analysis of barriers to and enablers for achieving outcomes, consideration of how to address barriers, a plan for a phased withdrawal of the project, and responses for the project to focus on? (As stated earlier in this guidance, where an explicit theory of

change is not provided for the project, the TE team should develop one based on information provided in the project documentation and through consultations with stakeholders.)

- How was the Results Framework defined? (If the Results Framework was revised – for example, during the project’s Inception Workshop or as a result of MTR recommendations – the TE report should assess the approved version but also whether the revisions to the results framework were sound and made sense given the context of the project.)
- How did the project aim to capture broader development impacts (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance, livelihood benefits, etc.) by using socioeconomic co-benefits and sex-disaggregated/gender-responsive indicators and targets, where relevant?
- How were the indicators in the Results Framework SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Relevant, Time-bound/Timely/Trackable/Targeted)?

Assumptions and Risks

- How were the assumptions and risks well-articulated in the PIF and project document?
- How were the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust, and did they help to determine activities and planned outputs?
- How were any externalities (i.e. effects of climate change, global economic crisis, etc.) relevant to the findings?

Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design

- How were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?

Planned stakeholder participation

- How were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- What were the planned stakeholder interactions, as set out in the project document Stakeholder Engagement Plan?
- How were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?

Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

- Were linkages established with other complementary interventions? Was there planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and/or other initiatives?

Gender responsiveness of project design

The TE report must assess the gender responsiveness of project design and development. If no gender analysis was completed for a project, the TE team is still responsible for integrating a gender analysis and lens throughout the evaluation process and in interpretation of results and recommendations.

Gender issues should have been integrated into the PIF and project document, as appropriate, including the strategy and rationale behind the project, the theory of change, the stakeholder engagement plan and the results framework.

- How were gender considerations integrated in the project's design, including through a gender analysis with the specific context of the project for advancing gender equality and women's empowerment and a gender action plan with a specific implementation plan for the delivery of gender activities, with indicators, targets, budget, timeframe and responsible party?
- How was the project aligned with national policies and strategies on gender equality?
- How were gender issues integrated in the project's strategy, rationale and theory of change, including how advancing gender equality and women's empowerment will advance the project's environmental outcomes? Identify any gaps in integrating or addressing gender issues in these areas.
- What gender expertise was used in the design and development of the project? Was it adequate? This could be in the form of external consultant and/or internal CAF capacity. Identify any gaps in gender expertise.
- How was the CAF Gender Marker rating assigned to the project document realistic and backed by the findings of the gender analysis?

Social and Environmental Safeguards

- Assess any environmental and social risks as identified through the SESP in line with CAF Social and Environmental Standards³¹ and the management measures outlined in the Project Document SESP and any management plans.

B) Project Implementation

The TE team will assess project implementation and will also critically review adaptive management, project finance and co-finance, monitoring & evaluation, and implementation & execution.

Adaptive Management

The TE team should take note whether there were changes made to the project design during implementation, why these changes were made and what the approval process was. Questions to address include:

- What significant changes did the project undergo as a result of recommendations from the Mid-Term Review, or as a result of other review procedures? Explain the process and implications. (Consider presenting the MTR recommendations, management responses to the recommendations, and TE team comments in a table format.)

³¹ Access at: <https://www.CAF.org/content/CAF/en/home/librarypage/operations1/CAF-social-and-environmental-standards.html>

- If the changes were extensive, how did they materially change the expected project outcomes?
- Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the Project Board?

Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements

Analysis of the project's stakeholder engagement should have a strong cross-cutting presence throughout the TE report. The TE report should also cover stakeholder engagement with regards to the following:

- Project management:
 - How did the project develop and leverage the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes:
 - How did local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? How did they have an active role in project decision-making that supported efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness:
 - How did stakeholder involvement and public awareness contribute to the progress towards achievement of project objectives? Were there any limitations to stakeholder awareness of project outcomes or to stakeholder participation in project activities? Was there invested interest of stakeholders in the project's long-term success and sustainability?
- Extent of stakeholder interaction:
 - How did actual stakeholder interaction compare to what was planned in the project document and Stakeholder Engagement Plan? Include challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement, as evolved from the time of the MTR.
- Gender:
 - How appropriate and adaptive was the gender action plan in facilitating gender mainstreaming objectives.
 - How were women's groups, NGOs, civil society orgs and women's ministries adequately consulted and involved in project design? If not, should they have been?
 - How were stakeholder engagement exercises gender responsive?
 - For any stakeholder workshops, were women-only sessions held, if appropriate, and/or were other considerations made to ensure women's meaningful participation?
 - During implementation what systematic and appropriate efforts were made to include diverse groups of stakeholders (e.g. women's groups)?

Project Finance and Co-finance

When considering the effectiveness of financial planning, the TE team should consider the following for assessing project finance:

- Variances between planned and actual expenditures, and the reasons for those variances
- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing;

Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (), implementation (*), overall assessment of M&E (*)*

The TE report must include an M&E assessment and associated ratings. Suggested areas to assess include the following:

- M&E design at entry:
 - Was the M&E plan well-conceived, practical and sufficient at the point of CEO Endorsement? Was it articulated sufficiently to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives?
 - Did the M&E plan include a baseline, SMART³⁴ indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results?

- Were baseline conditions, methodology, logistics, time frames, and roles and responsibilities well-articulated?
- Was the M&E budget in the project document sufficient?
- Did the M&E plan specify how the project will keep the GEF OFP informed and, where applicable and feasible, involved, while respecting the independent nature of the TE process?
- M&E implementation:
 - Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?
 - Was data on specified indicators, relevant GEF/LDCF/SCCF Tracking Tools/Core Indicators gathered in a systematic manner?
 - Extent of compliance with progress and financial reporting requirements, including quality and timeliness of reports;
 - Value and effectiveness of the monitoring reports and evidence that these were discussed with stakeholders and project staff;
 - Extent to which the GEF OFP was kept informed of M&E activities; and extent to which the Project Team used inclusive, innovative, and participatory monitoring systems³⁵;
 - Extent to which information provided by the M&E system was used to improve and adapt project performance;
 - Whether the M&E system included proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure
 - How were perspectives of women and men involved and affected by the project monitored and assessed? How were relevant groups' (including women, indigenous peoples, children, elderly, disabled, and poor) involvement with the project and the impact on them monitored?
 - Was there adequate monitoring of environmental and social risks as identified through the CAF SESP and in line with any safeguards management plan's M&E section?
 - Whether the projects' Theory of Change was reviewed and refined during implementation
 - Whether PIR self-evaluation ratings were consistent with MTR and TE findings. If not, were these discrepancies identified by the Project Board and addressed?
 - TEs for FSPs should also consider whether changes were made to project implementation as a result of the MTR recommendations.
 - Extent of the Project Board's role in M&E activities

M&E Design, M&E Implementation and the overall quality of M&E will be assessed separately on a six-point scale, as described in Table 13.

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)

Rating

M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	

Table 13. Monitoring & Evaluation Ratings Scale

Rating	Description
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no short comings; quality of M&E design/implementation exceeded expectations
5 = Satisfactory (S)	There were minor shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation met expectations
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were moderate shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation more or less met expectations
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There were significant shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation was somewhat lower than expected
2 = Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation was substantially lower than expected
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	There were severe shortcomings in M&E design/implementation
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design/implementation.

CAF implementation/oversight (), Implementing Partner execution (*) and overall assessment of implementation/oversight and execution (*)*

The TE team must assess and rate the quality of CAF implementation/oversight of the project. The assessment should be established through consideration of the following issues:

- Extent to which CAF delivered effectively on activities related to project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation of detailed proposal, approval and start-up, oversight, supervision, completion and evaluation. This includes but is not limited to:
 - Adequacy, quality and timeliness of CAF support to the Implementing Partner and Project Team
 - Candor and realism in annual reporting
 - Quality of risk management
 - Responsiveness to significant implementation problems (if any)
 - Adequate oversight of the management of environmental and social risks as identified through the CAF SESP.

The TE team must also assess and rate the quality of execution by the Implementing Partner by considering the following issues:

- Extent to which the Implementing Partner effectively managed and administered the project’s day-to-day activities under the overall oversight and supervision of CAF. This includes but is not limited to the following:
 - Whether there was an appropriate focus on results and timeliness
 - Appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services
 - Quality of risk management
 - Candor and realism in annual reporting
 - Adequate management of environmental and social risks as identified through the CAF SESP and implementation of associated safeguards requirements (assessments, management plans; if any).

CAF implementation/oversight and Implementing Partner execution and an overall rating for both will each be rated separately and assessed on a six-point scale, as described in Table 14.

CAF Implementation/Oversight & Execution	Implementing Partner Execution	Rating
Quality of CAF Implementation/Oversight		
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution		
Overall quality of Implementation/Oversight and Execution		

Table 14. Implementation/Oversight and Execution Ratings Scale

Rating	Description
6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution exceeded expectations
5 = Satisfactory (S)	There were no or minor shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution met expectations.
4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were some shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution more or less met expectations.
3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There were significant shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution was somewhat lower than expected
2 = Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution was substantially lower than expected
1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	There were severe shortcomings in quality of implementation/execution
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation and execution

Risk Management

The TE report must include an assessment of the extent to which risks, in terms of both threats and opportunities, were properly identified during project implementation and what systems, plans and actions were used to manage them.

The TE report must discuss any social, environmental, financial, operational, organizational, political, regulatory, strategic, safety and security and other risks that emerged or evolved during project implementation.

- Were new risks or changes to existing risks reported on in the annual PIRs and/or MTR (if applicable)?
 - How did those risks affect project implementation?
 - What systems and tools were used to identify, prioritize, monitor and manage those risks? Were action plans developed and followed? Was escalation necessary?
- Were any risks overlooked and what were the consequences of that?
- Was the project's risk register properly maintained during implementation?
- Did the Project Team keep the Project Board informed of new risks, changes to existing risks and the escalation of risks?

The roles of the CAF CO, Project Board, Project Team and all other project partners/stakeholders should be considered and discussed, as appropriate, in this analysis. Lessons learned from the project's management of risks are also important to document in the TE report (in the appropriate chapter).

Please refer to the CAF Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Policy³⁶ for further details on CAF's approach to risk management.