

Request for Proposals (RFP)

June 30th, 2022

RFP No: GEF-TE-Paraguay-008

Conservation International Foundation (hereinafter referred to as "CI") under Global Environmental Facility (GEF-Agency), is issuing a Request for Proposal (RFP) for **Terminal Evaluation (TE)** for the *"Innovative Use of a Voluntary Payment for Environmental Services Scheme to Avoid and Reduce GHG Emissions and Enhance Carbon Stocks in the Highly Threatened Dry Chaco Forest Complex in Western Paraguay"* program.

The successful offeror shall have the human resources to perform the evaluation in Paraguay.

The award will be in the form of a Firm Fixed Price Contract (hereinafter referred to as "the contract"). The successful offeror(s) shall be required to adhere to the code of ethics, statement of work, and the terms and conditions of the contract. A Firm-Fixed-Price Contract provides for a price that is not subject to any adjustment on the basis of the contractor's cost experience in performing the contract.

Interested offerors should indicate their interest in submitting a proposal for the anticipated agreement by sending an email to cievaluationprocurement@conservation.org by **5:00 PM (EDT)(UTC-04:00) on July 8th, 2022.**

All Offerors are expected to exercise the highest standards of conduct in preparing, submitting and if selected, eventually carrying out the specified work in accordance with CI's Code of Ethics, Eligibility and Environmental and Social Responsibility.

Any violation of the Code of Ethics, as well as concerns regarding the integrity of the procurement process and documents should be reported to CI via its Ethics Hotline at www.ci.ethicspoint.com.

COVID 19 Guidelines

Service Provider shall adhere to all applicable international, national or local regulations and advisories governing travel, including safety, health and security measures in effect throughout the Period of Performance.

It is expected that CI and the Offeror will take into consideration and plan around the international, national or local regulations and advisories governing travel, including safety, health and security measures in effect in the countries that the consultant is expected to visit. Virtual consultations are possible and expected where in-person field work is not possible.

Table of Contents

Section 1. Proposal Instructions	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Proposals Deadline	1
1.3 Instruction for Offerors.....	1
1.4 Chronological List of Proposal Events.....	3
1.5 Evaluation and Basis for Award.....	4
Section 2. Scope of Work Terminal Evaluation	5
2.1 Terminal Evaluation.....	5
I. Scope of Work:.....	5
II. Guidelines for the Evaluator(s):	6
III. Expected Outputs and Deliverables:	7
Annex 1: Outline for Draft and Terminal Evaluation Report	8
Annex 2: Rating Scale	14
Section 3. Brief Overview of Project Being Evaluated	18
Section 4. CI’s Service Agreement Template & Code of Ethics	19
Section 5. Offeror Representation of Transparency, Integrity, Environmental and Social Responsibility	20

Section 1. Proposal Instructions

1.1 Introduction

CI, the Contracting entity, is soliciting offers from firms to submit their full proposals to carry out Terminal Evaluation of a GEF funded project. When submitting a proposal, please include the RFP number of the evaluation your firm is bidding on, the Budget Template, and your final Bid. **Please note that the firm chosen to carry out this Terminal Evaluation is automatically disqualified if it carried out the Mid-Term Evaluation for this program.** This measure has been adopted to enhance the objectivity of the results of both evaluations.

In order to have a successful bid, the proposed staff must have previous experience with GEF evaluations. **Not having GEF evaluation experience will negatively impact the scoring evaluation section (in section1.5).**

General Background:

All Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded projects are required to complete a Terminal Evaluation (TE). This is designed to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its design, implementation, and achievement of objectives. The evaluation is expected to: promote accountability and transparency; and facilitate synthesis of lessons. Also, the TE will provide feedback to allow the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) to identify recurring issues across the GEF portfolio; and, contribute to GEF IEO databases for aggregation and analysis.

This RFP does not obligate CI to execute a contract(s) nor does it commit CI to pay any costs incurred in the preparation or submission of the proposals. Furthermore, CI reserve the right to reject any and all offers, if such action is considered to be in the best interest of CI.

1.2 Proposals Deadline

Offerors shall submit their offers electronically at the following email address, cievaluationprocurement@conservation.org.

Offers must be received no later than **5:00 PM (EDT)(UTC-04:00) on July 29th, 2022**. Offerors are responsible for ensuring that their offers are received in accordance with the instructions stated herein. Late offers may not be considered.

1.3 Instruction for Offerors

All proposals must be submitted in one volume, consisting of:

- A. Technical proposal
- B. Cost proposal using the provided Budget Template
- C. Offeror Representation of Transparency, Integrity, Environmental and Social Responsibility

A. Technical Proposal

The technical proposal shall be comprised of the following parts:

- Part 1: Technical Approach, Methodology and Detailed Work Plan. This part shall be between 3 and 5 pages long but may not exceed 5 pages.

The Technical Proposal should describe in detail how the Offeror intends to carry out the requirements described in Section 2, Scope of Work (SOW). The technical proposal should demonstrate a clear understanding of the work to be undertaken and the responsibilities of all parties involved. The Offeror should include details on personnel, equipment, and contractors who will be used to carry out the required services.

- Part 2: Management, Key Personnel, and Staffing Plan. This part shall be between 2 and 5 pages long, but may not exceed 5 pages. CVs may be included in an annex to the technical proposal and will not count against the page limit. Proposed staff must have previous experience with GEF evaluations. Due to COVID 19 concerns and to promote local staffing, firms that have an established presence in the country(ies) where the evaluation will take place will be given preference. This will be reflected under Section 2 of the Evaluation Criteria.

One of the key facets of the Evaluation Criteria is the Personnel Qualifications for carrying out the evaluation. In providing CI with the CVs for the key personnel, this provides a baseline for the evaluation. Therefore, changes in key personnel under the contract must be pre-approved by CI in writing, to ensure that the substitute personnel have the similar vigor in terms of qualifications.

If the Offeror issues a Subcontract, Subcontractors meet the technical profile required: language skills, GEF evaluation experience and ability to travel to the designated locations, and must be pre-approved by CI.

For the evaluation team, it is encouraged to have at least four (4) core members: project leader, assistant project leader, data specialist, coordinator/writer. The project leader must have at least 8 years of experience in doing evaluations, and he/she must have led at least three evaluation projects related to the project being evaluated for the bid. For the assistant project leader, he/she must have been involved in at least three project evaluations and with environmental and social safeguards background. For the data specialist, knowledge on data collection techniques, data processing and analysis, statistical methods and software that may be used in the project evaluation. The coordinator/writer must have sufficient experience (i.e., at least two projects involved in the past) in coordinating and writing reports for an evaluation. The technical specifications here are the minimum requirements.

- Part 3: Corporate Capabilities, Experience, Past Performance, and 3 client references. This part shall be between 2 and 4 pages long, but may not exceed 4 pages. Please include descriptions of similar projects or assignments and at least three client references.

B. Cost Proposal

Offerors shall use the cost proposal template provided for this RFP (please use the excel file provided in the posting). The cost proposal is used to determine which proposals are the most advantageous and serves as a basis of negotiation for award of a contract. The cost proposal must be all-inclusive of profit and fees. Additional costs cannot be included after award, and revisions to proposed costs may not be made after submission unless expressly requested by CI should the offerors proposal be accepted.

Nevertheless, for the purpose of the proposal, **Offerors must price out the deliverables listed in Part III of Section 2 (Expected Outputs and Deliverables)** and provide at a minimum their hourly or daily rate, travel, and any other anticipated cost. Please refer to the Budget Template attached for details. CI reserves the right to request additional cost information if the evaluation committee has concerns of the reasonableness or completeness of an Offeror's cost proposal.

If selected, Offeror shall use its best efforts to minimize the financing of any taxes on goods and services, or the importation, manufacture, procurement or supply thereof. If Offeror is eligible to apply for refunds on taxes paid, Offeror shall do so. Any tax savings should be reflected in the total cost.

C. Offeror Representation of Transparency, Integrity, Environmental and Social Responsibility

This document must be signed by the Offerors or (Offerors representative) and submitted with the Offeror's proposal to CI and can be found in Section 5 to the RFP.

1.4 Chronological List of Proposal Events

Offerors must strictly follow the calendar of important dates in the solicitation process. The dates can be modified at the sole discretion of CI. Any changes will be published in an amendment to this RFP.

Event	Due By
RFP Originally Issued	June 30 th , 2022
Notice of Intent to Participate	July 8 th , 2022
RFP Reposted, if applicable	July 8 th , 2022
Questions Due (send to: cievaluationprocurement@conservation.org)	July 15 th , 2022

Answers to Questions Distributed	July 25 th , 2022
Proposal Due Date	July 29 th at 5:00pm EDT (UTC-04:00)
Estimated Award-Interview	August 15 th , 2022

1.5 Evaluation and Basis for Award

Award(s) will be made to the offeror(s) whose proposal is determined to be responsive to this solicitation document, meets the technical capability requirements, and is determined to represent the most advantageous to CI. CI reserves the right to split the award(s) among the highest ranked offerors, if such action is considered to be in the best interest of CI.

	Evaluation Criteria	Total Possible Points
I	Technical Proposal (Part 1): Technical Approach, Methodology, and Detailed Work Plan	
1	Does the proposal clearly explain, understand and respond to the objectives of the project as stated in the Scope of Work?	10
2	Does the organization have an established presence in the country (directly or through a subcontractor) where the evaluation will take?	10
3	Does the proposed program approach and detailed activities and timeline fulfill the requirements of executing the Scope of Work effectively and efficiently?	20
4	Does the proposal demonstrate the Offeror's knowledge related to technical sectors required by the Scope of Work?	10
II	Technical Proposal (Part 2): Management, Key Personnel, and Staffing Plan	
5	Personnel Qualifications – Do the proposed team members have necessary experience and capabilities to carry out the Scope of Work?	15
6	Does the organization have extensive experience conducting GEF evaluations?	15
III	Technical Proposal (Part 3): Corporate Capabilities, Experience, Past Performance, and references	
7	Company Background and Experience – Does the company have experience relevant to the project Scope of Work?	10
IV	Cost Proposal: Cost Includes (Travel, Fee, Charges, any other expenses)	
8	Cost- Lowest Cost	10

Section 2. Scope of Work Terminal Evaluation

2.1 Terminal Evaluation

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) requires Terminal Evaluations (TEs) for full-sized projects and encourages TEs for medium-sized projects. TEs are conducted by independent consultants and are used as an adaptive management tool by GEF Agencies and as a portfolio monitoring tool by the GEF Secretariat. TEs are primarily a monitoring tool to identify challenges and outline corrective actions to ensure that a project is on track to achieve maximum results by its completion. **All reports that are submitted must be in English.**

I. Scope of Work:

1. Kick off meeting to introduce team, and provide project related documents for evaluations, based on the submitted proposal.
2. The evaluator will conduct a desk review of project documents (i.e. PIF, Project Document, plans related to the Environmental and Social Safeguards [including Accountability and Grievance Mechanism, Gender Mainstreaming, and Stakeholder Engagement], Work plans, Budgets, Project Inception Report, Quarterly Reports, PIRs, documents with project results, Finalized GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools, policies and guidelines used by the Executing Agency, CI-GEF Evaluation Policy, GEF Evaluation Policy, Project Operational Guidelines, Manuals and Systems, etc.), and develop draft Key informant Questionnaire and draft terminal evaluation inception report to be reviewed by CI-GEF team. The report will contain the initial information on the following:
 - a. Initial subject of the review, and relevant context
 - b. Purpose of the evaluation: why is the evaluation being conducted at this time, who needs the information and why?
 - c. Objectives of the evaluation: What the evaluation aims to achieve (e.g. assessment of the results of the project, etc.)
 - d. Scope: What aspects of the project will be covered, and not covered, by the evaluation
 - e. Identification and description of the evaluation criteria (including relevance, effectiveness, results, efficiency, and sustainability)
 - f. Key evaluation questions
 - g. Methodology including approach for data collection and analysis, and stakeholder engagement
 - h. Rationale for selection of the methods, and selection of data sources (i.e. sites to be visited, stakeholders to be interviewed)
 - i. Proposal on the system for data management and maintenance of records
 - j. Intended products and reporting procedures
 - k. Potential limitations of the evaluation
3. The evaluator will host a workshop (in person/virtual) with the Executing Agencies to clarify understanding of the objectives and methods of the Terminal Evaluation.

The conclusion of the workshop will be summarized in a Terminal Evaluation Workshop Report with the following information:

- a. Final subject of the review, and relevant context
 - b. Purpose of the evaluation: why is the evaluation being conducted at this time, who needs the information and why?
 - c. Objectives of the evaluation: What the evaluation aims to achieve (e.g. assessment of the results of the project, etc.)
 - d. Scope: What aspects of the project will be covered, and not covered, by the evaluation
 - e. Identification and description of the evaluation criteria (including relevance, effectiveness, results, efficiency, and sustainability)
 - f. Key evaluation questions
 - g. Methodology including approach for data collection and analysis, and stakeholder engagement
 - h. Rationale for selection of the methods, and selection of data sources (i.e. sites to be visited, stakeholders to be interviewed)
 - i. Final system for data management and maintenance of records
 - j. Intended products and reporting procedures
 - k. Potential limitations of the evaluation
4. The evaluator will undertake the evaluation of the project, including any interviews and in- country site visits, based on the Guidelines for the Evaluator/s section II. The evaluator will Present initial findings to the Executing Agency, CI's General Counsel's Office (GCO) and CI-GEF Agency at the end of TE mission.
5. Based on the document review and the in-country interviews/site visits, the evaluator will prepare a draft evaluation report following the outline in Annex 1. The report will be shared with the Executing Agencies and the CI-GEF Agency. Each party can provide a management response, documenting questions or comments on the draft evaluation report.
6. The evaluator will incorporate comments and will prepare the final evaluation report. The evaluator will submit a final evaluation report in word and PDF and will include a separate document highlighting where/how comments were incorporated.

II. Guidelines for the Evaluator(s):

- Evaluators will be independent from project design, approval, implementation and execution. 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.
- Evaluators will take perspectives of all relevant stakeholders (including the GEF Operational Focal Point[s]) into account. They will gather information on project performance and results from multiple sources including the project M&E system, tracking tools, field visits, 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.

- Evaluators will be impartial and will present a balanced account consistent with evidence.
- Evaluators will apply the rating scales provided in these guidelines in Annex 2.
- Evaluators will abide by the GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines.

III. Expected Outputs and Deliverables:

Number	Activity	Deliverable	Proposed Cost \$US
1	Introductory Call	Summary of the introductory call to introduce team members and review evaluation timeline	Insert Cost US\$
2	Desk review of all relevant project documents	Draft Terminal Evaluation Inception Report and Key Informant Questionnaire	Insert Cost US\$
3	Host Evaluation Inception workshop with Executing Agencies (virtual/in person)	Final Terminal Evaluation Inception Workshop Report	Insert Cost US\$
4	Evaluation of the project via interviews and site visits	Presentation of initial findings	Insert Cost US\$
5	Draft Final Report	Terminal Evaluation Final Report (Draft)	Insert Cost US\$
6	Revised report incorporating comments from CI	Final Terminal Evaluation Report (word and PDF), including document showing how comments/questions were incorporated	Insert Cost US\$

Annex 1: Outline for Draft and Terminal Evaluation Report

The draft and final evaluation reports should at the minimum contain the information below:

General Information

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
- Planned and materialized co-financing
- Key objectives
- GEF Agency
- Project countries
- Key dates
- Name of the Project Executing Agency(ies)

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

Where feasible and appropriate, the Terminal Evaluation reports should include georeferenced maps and/or coordinates that demarcate the planned and actual area covered by the project. 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

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.

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. The report should provide an explicit (or implicit) statement on project's theory of change - i.e. how through a causal chain project activities would lead to project outcomes and long term impact. It should describe how causal links among the outputs, outcomes and long term impacts are supposed to work. The report should also include the assumptions made in the project's theory of change.

Assessment of Project Results

The TE must assess achievement of project outputs and outcomes, and report on these. While assessing a project's results, evaluators will determine and rate the extent to which the project objectives – as stated in the documents submitted at the CEO Endorsement stage – have been achieved. The evaluator(s) 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 GEF corporate results targets/core indicators to which the project contributes and will also incorporate data from the focal area tracking tool and/or core indicator worksheet .

Outputs

The evaluator should rate the extent to which the expected outputs were actually delivered. An identification and assessment of the factors that affected delivery of outputs should also be included.

Outcomes

The evaluator should rate 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

Outcome ratings will take into account the outcome achievements of the projects against its expected targets.

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: Were 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?

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

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 key risks, including financial, socio-political, institutional, and environmental risks. The overall sustainability of project outcomes will be rated on a four-point scale (Likely to Unlikely) based on an assessment of the likelihood 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

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.

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.

The evaluators should cover the project's contributions to changes in policy/ legal/regulatory frameworks. 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 resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc.). Contribution to change in socioeconomic status (income, health, well-being, etc.) should also be documented.

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.

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.

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

The evaluators will include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the project M&E plan and its implementation.

M&E Design. To assess the quality of the M&E plan, the evaluators will assess:

- a. Was the M&E plan at the point of CEO Endorsement practical and sufficient?
- b. Did it include baseline data?
- c. Did it: specify clear targets and appropriate (SMART) 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?

M&E Implementation. The evaluators should assess:

- a. Whether the M&E system operated as per the M&E plan?
- b. Where necessary, whether the M&E plan was revised in a timely manner?
- c. Was information on specified indicators and relevant GEF focal area tracking tools gathered in a systematic manner?
- d. Whether appropriate methodological approaches have been used to analyze data?
- e. Were resources for M&E sufficient? How was the information from the M&E system used during the project implementation?

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

The assessment of the implementation and execution of GEF projects will take into account the performance of the GEF Implementing Agencies and project Executing Agency(ies) (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.

Quality of Implementation: Within the GEF partnership, GEF Implementing 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. 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.

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. The EAs are responsible for the appropriate use of funds, and procurement and contracting of goods and services to the GEF Agency. To assess EA performance, the evaluators will assess the extent to which it effectively discharged its role and responsibilities.

Assessment of the Environmental and Social Safeguards

The evaluator will assess whether appropriate environmental and social safeguards were addressed in the project's design and implementation (See Annex 2 for more details on the rating scale). 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. It is also expected that projects actively seek to do good, by identifying opportunities to advance gender equality, social inclusion and meaningful participation of stakeholders in project implementation. The evaluator should assess the screening/ risk categorization of the project along with the implementation of the safeguard plans that were approved by the GEF Agency. There should be an analysis of the implementation of management measures, as outlined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, including findings on the effectiveness of management measures and lessons learned.

In projects that included local communities and/or indigenous people as beneficiaries or key stakeholders, the evaluator should guarantee that their voices are adequately heard and represented in the evaluation, through primary data collection.

Gender: 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 or men, 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, and if possible, addressing whether gender considerations contributed to the success of the project.

At the minimum, the evaluator should assess the progress towards achieving gender sensitive measures and/or targets as documented at CEO endorsement/approval in the Gender Mainstreaming Plan or equivalent. The evaluator should at least attempt to address the following questions:

- a) How effective was the project in reaching women and integrating gender mainstreaming throughout its activities? were all activities planned in the GMP implemented? Yes/No Why?
- b) Did the project face any challenges in implementing the GMP as initially proposed? Which challenges? How were the challenges overcome?
- c) Compared to the original GMP, did the project had to implement any adaptations to promote meaningful participation of women and advance towards other gender sensitive targets?
- d) Did the project team/stakeholders/beneficiaries observed any qualitative outcomes (either positive or negative) related to gender equality, that are difficult to capture in a quantitative project target?

- e) Considering all the above, what are the recommendations for future similar projects to effectively advance towards gender sensitive targets or seize opportunities to promote gender transformational change?
- d) Were there any key lessons learned and/or good practices identified in the project's efforts to implement gender sensitive measures?

In projects that included local communities and/or indigenous people as beneficiaries or key stakeholders, the evaluator should also explore:

- To what extent did the project enhanced women's leadership and meaningful participation in decision-making spaces and processes?
- To what extent did the project facilitated and enhanced the capacity of women and men to change negative gender norms, that could potentially prevent women from fully benefiting from project's Outputs and Outcomes?
- Are there any indications of the project influencing or enabling women's agency, access and control over assets, access to new economic opportunities or productive or conservation opportunities or roles?
- Were there any unintended outcomes (positive or negative) related to gender equality at the community level?

Stakeholder Engagement: The evaluator should, where applicable, review and assess the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and project specific aspects such as involvement of civil society, indigenous population, private sector, etc. The evaluator should also indicate the percentage of stakeholders who rate as satisfactory, the level at which their views and concerns are taken into account by the project.

At the minimum, the evaluator should explore the progress, challenges, the strategies advanced to overcome them, and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

In projects that included local communities and/or indigenous people as beneficiaries or key stakeholders, the evaluator should also give an account on the efforts made by the project to enhance their meaningful participation in project implementation. It should also explore if there were any additional efforts implemented to promote the participation of vulnerable or marginalized groups present in the prioritized communities.

Accountability and Grievance Mechanism: The evaluator should review and assess the project's Grievance Mechanism. The evaluator should analyze and assess whether project stakeholders were aware of the grievance mechanism and whether the mechanism was effective in addressing grievances.

In projects that include local communities and/or indigenous people as beneficiaries or key stakeholders, the evaluator should review and assess if established channels and procedures, were accessible and responded to their specific context and needs.

The evaluator should also review and assess any other safeguard plans that were triggered.

Overall, the evaluator should identify key lessons learned in the implementation of the ESMF (ESS, gender, stakeholder engagement and grievance mechanism), including what worked well and what needs to be improved. The evaluator should also provide recommendations to guide upcoming future GEF projects.

Other Assessments

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 shortfall in co-financing or materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results, etc.
- c. Knowledge Management: the evaluators should provide an assessment of whether the Knowledge Management Plan as included in the Project Document was implemented. If possible, the evaluators should also include the list of knowledge products developed throughout project implementation, including internet references if available.
- d. Lessons and Recommendations: 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. 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.

Annex 2: Rating Scale

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. The CI-GEF Agency also includes ratings for environmental and social safeguards.

Outcome Ratings:

The overall ratings on the outcomes of the project will be based on performance on the 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 risk to sustainability.
- Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks to sustainability.
- Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks to sustainability.
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks to sustainability.

- Unable to Assess (UA): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability.

Project M&E Ratings:

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

- Design
- Implementation

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

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

Implementation and Execution Rating:

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

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

Environmental and Social Safeguards:

The approved environmental and social safeguard plans will be rated according to the following scale.

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

Section 3. Brief Overview of Project Being Evaluated

Innovative Use of a Voluntary Payment for Environmental Services Scheme to Avoid and Reduce GHG Emissions and Enhance Carbon Stocks in the Highly Threatened Dry Chaco Forest Complex in Western Paraguay

Fiscal Year: 2022
Location(s): Paraguay

RFP Number: GEF-TE-Paraguay-008

Awarding Agency: Global Environmental Facility (GEF-Agency)
Type of Contract: Firm Fixed Price

Planned Terminal Evaluation: September 1st, 2022

Total Estimated Cost/Amount Range Budget: \$25,000 - \$30,000

Scope of Work/ Deliverables: Section 2.1 of RFP

Link to Project Being Evaluated: <https://www.conservation.org/gef/projects-list/innovative-use-of-a-voluntary-payment-for-environmental-services-scheme-to-avoid-and-reduce-ghg-emissions-and-enhance-carbon-stocks-in-the-highly-threatened-dry-chaco-forest-complex-in-western-paraguay>

(Note – Updated Results Framework can be found [here](#))

Section 4. CI's Service Agreement Template & Code of Ethics

Any resulting agreement will be subject to the terms and conditions of CI's Services Agreement. A model form of agreement can be provided upon request.

Section 5. Offeror Representation of Transparency, Integrity, Environmental and Social Responsibility

This form to be signed by the Offerors or (Offerors representative) and must be submitted with the proposal to CI. No revisions may be made.

Solicitation Number: GEF-TE-Paraguay-008

All Offerors are expected to exercise the highest standards of conduct in preparing, submitting and if selected, eventually carrying out the specified work in accordance with CI's Code of Ethics. CI's Code of Ethics provides guidance to CI employees, service providers, experts, interns, and volunteers in living CI's core values, and outlines minimum standards for ethical conduct which all parties must adhere to. Any violations of the Code of Ethics should be reported to CI via its Ethics Hotline at www.ci.ethicspoint.com.

CI relies on the personal integrity, good judgment and common sense of all third parties acting on behalf, or providing services to the organization, to deal with issues not expressly addressed by the Code or as noted below.

With respect to CI's Code of Ethics, we certify:

We understand and accept that CI, its contractual partners, grantees and other parties with whom we work are expected to commit to the highest standards of Transparency, Fairness, and Integrity in procurement.

With respect to social and environmental standards, we certify:

We are committed to high standards of ethics and integrity and compliance with all applicable laws across our operations, including prohibition of actions that facilitate trafficking in persons, child labor, forced labor, sexual abuse, exploitation or harassment. We respect internationally proclaimed human rights and take no action that contributes to the infringement of human rights. We protect those who are most vulnerable to infringements of their rights and the ecosystems that sustain them.

We fully respect and enforce the environmental and social standards recognized by the international community, including the fundamental conventions of International Labour Organization (ILO) and international conventions for the protection of the environment, in line with the laws and regulations applicable to the country where the contract is to be performed.

With respect to our eligibility and professional conduct, we certify:

We are not and none of our affiliates [members, employees, contractors, subcontractors, and consultants] are in a state of bankruptcy, liquidation, legal settlement, termination of activity, or guilty of grave professional misconduct as determined by a regulatory body responsible for licensing and/or regulating the offeror's business

We have not and will not engage in criminal or fraudulent acts. By a final judgment, we were not convicted in the last five years for offenses such as fraud or corruption, money laundering or professional misconduct.

We are/were not involved in writing or recommending the scope of work for this solicitation document.

We have not engaged in any collusion or price fixing with other offerors.

We have not made promises, offers, or grants, directly or indirectly to any CI employees involved in this procurement, or to any government official in relation to the contract to be performed, with the intention of unduly influencing a decision or receiving an improper advantage.

We have taken no action nor will we take any action to limit or restrict access of other companies, organizations or individuals to participate in the competitive bidding process launched by CI.

We have fulfilled our obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions or taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country where the contract is to be performed.

We have not provided, and will take all reasonable steps to ensure that we do not and will not knowingly provide, material support or resources to any individual or entity that commits, attempts to commit, advocates, facilitates, or participates in terrorist acts, or has committed, attempted to commit, facilitate, or participated in terrorist acts, and we are compliant with all applicable Counter-Terrorist Financing and Anti-Money Laundering laws (including USA Patriot Act and U.S. Executive Order 13224).

We certify that neither we nor our directors, officers, key employees or beneficial owners are included in any list of financial or economic sanctions, debarment or suspension adopted by the United States, United Nations, the European Union, the World Bank, or General Services Administration's List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement or Non-procurement programs in accordance with E.O.s 12549 and 12689, "Debarment and Suspension".

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____