

## UNDP-GEF Project Midterm Review

## Terms of Reference

**International consultant to conduct Mid-Term Evaluation of** **UNDP-supported GEF-financed “Elimination of obsolete pesticide stockpiles and addressing POPs contaminated sites within a Sound Chemicals Management Framework in Armenia” full-sized project**

**BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location:** Republic of Armenia

**Application Deadline:** 20 November, 2017

**Category:** Energy and Environment

**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract

**Assignment Type:** International Consultant

**Languages Required:** English

**Starting Date:** 5 February, 2018

**Duration of Initial** 5 February – 15 June, 2018

**Contract:**

**Expected Duration** Estimated 22 effective person-days (17 effective person-days home based and

**of Assignment:** 5 effective person-days on field mission to Yerevan, Armenia)

**BACKGROUND**

##### **A. Project Title**

UNDP-supported GEF-financed full-sized project “Elimination of obsolete pesticide stockpiles and addressing POPs contaminated sites within a Sound Chemicals Management Framework in Armenia”.

##### **B. Project Description**

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled “Elimination of obsolete pesticide stockpiles and addressing POPs contaminated sites within a Sound Chemicals Management Framework in Armenia” (PIMS#4905) implemented by UNDP jointly with the Ministry of Nature Protection and the Ministry of Emergency Situations in partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Armenia and with the Yerevan Municipality. The project started on May 26, 2015 and entered to the third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the third Project Implementation Report (PIR). The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document [*Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf)*.*

The objective of the project is to protect human health and the environment globally as well as locally through elimination of POPs and obsolete pesticide stockpiles, and addressing associated contaminated sites within a sound chemicals management framework. It will meet this objective by eliminating a large POPs pesticide burial site representing the major POPs stockpile and waste legacy for the country as well as residual obsolete pesticide stores at 24 locations. In total, approximately 7,100 t of POPs waste in the form of heavily contaminated soil, 1,050 t of POPs pesticides and other obsolete pesticides will be recovered, secured and ultimately treated and destroyed in an environmentally sound fashion. A further 12,700 t of less severely POPs contaminated soil will be securely contained. Additionally the project will provide critically needed hazardous waste infrastructure and national technical capability for the ongoing management of POPs and other chemical hazardous wastes as well as supporting the strengthening of institutional and regulatory capacity within an overall chemicals management framework.

The project objective will be achieved through the four main components:

**Component 1:** Capture and Containment of Obsolete Pesticide Stockpiles and Wastes

**Component 2:** Obsolete Pesticide and POPs Waste Elimination

**Component 3:** Institutional and Regulatory Capacity Strengthening for Sound Chemicals management and Contaminated Sites

**Component 4:** Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Activities of the project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: “**Armenia is better able to address key environmental challenges including climate change and natural resource management**”, and to the Applicable Outcome and Output (from UNDP’s 2014-17 Strategic Plan): Outcome 1: “**Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded**”, Output 1.3. “**Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste**”.

The planned end date of the project is 29 April, 2019.

The project runs on allocations of 4,700,000 USD from GEF and additional input of 200,000 USD from UNDP and planned co-financing of 16,020,000 USD as in-kind and cash financing contributions from the Government of the Republic of Armenia.

The Project Management Board is responsible for making consensus based decisions, in particular when guidance is required by the Project Coordinator (PC). The Board will play a critical role in project monitoring and evaluations by assuring the quality of these processes and associated products, and by using evaluations for improving performance, accountability and learning. The Project Management Board includes key national government agencies as followings: Republic of Armenia Government Staff, Ministry of Nature Protection, Ministry of Emergency Situations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Yerevan City Municipality, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Agriculture and UNDP Country Office. Project Management Board contains of three distinct roles: Executive, Senior Supplier, Senior Beneficiary roles. The project is implemented by the Ministry of Nature Protection (MNP) following UNDP’s National Implementation Modality (NIM).

**MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

##### **C. Scope of Work and Key Tasks**

The MTR team will consist of one independent consultant who will conduct the MTR and be supported with an Interpreter (Armenian-English-Armenian).

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR consultant will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review [APR], project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR consultant will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR[[2]](#footnote-2). Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local governments, NGOs and CBOs, etc.

The MTR consultant will first conduct a desk review of the project documents (i.e. PIF, Project Document, AWPs, Project Inception Report, Project Implementation Reports [PIRs], Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools, Project Board meetings’ minutes, Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team, project operational guidelines, manuals and systems, etc.) provided by the Project Team and Commissioning Unit. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex A of this Terms of Reference. Then they will participate in an MTR inception workshop to clarify their understanding of the objectives and methods of the MTR, producing the MTR inception report thereafter. The MTR mission will consist of several interviews with local stakeholders and site visits to Nubarashen OPs burial site as well as the site selected for the temporary storage of excavated POPs.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

The MTR consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress and produce a draft and final MTR report. See the [*Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf) for requirements on ratings. No overall rating is required.

1. **Project Strategy**

*Project Design:*

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
* Review how the project addresses country priorities.
* Review decision-making processes.
* Review decision-making processes: 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.
* Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.

*Results Framework/Log-frame:*

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log-frame indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

1. **Progress Towards Results**

* Review the log-frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “not on target to be achieved” (red).
* Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

1. **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Using the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; assess the following categories of project progress:

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated, if applicable?)
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

* Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
* For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

1. **Sustainability**

Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, APR/ and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Assess overall risks to sustainability factors of the project in terms of the following four categories:

Financial risks to sustainability:

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

* Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

The MTR consultant will include a section in the MTR report setting out the MTR’s evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. The MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

##### **D. Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

The MTR consultant shall prepare and submit:

1. MTR Inception Report: MTR consultant clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 1 week before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: **26 February, 2018**
2. Presentation: Initial Findings presented to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR field mission. Approximate due date: **March 16/19, 2018**
3. Draft Final Report: Full report with annexes within 2 weeks of the MTR mission. Approximate due date: **April 9, 2018**
4. Final Report\*: Revised report with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: **April 30, 2018**

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

##### **E. Institutional Arrangement**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is the UNDP Country Office in the Republic of Armenia.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultant, and ensure the timely provision of due payments and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

The Certifying Officer of this assignment is Sustainable Development Dimension Chief.

##### **F. Timeframe**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately *22* effective person-days over a period of *20 weeks* starting *5 February, 2018*. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

* *3 days:* Desk review and preparing MTR Inception Report;
* *2 days:* Finalization andValidation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission;
* *5 days:* MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits (including Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission);
* *8 days:* Preparing draft report;
* *2 days:* Incorporating audit trail on draft report;
* *2 days:* Finalization of MTR report/Expected full MTR completion.

The start date of the contract is planned for February 5, 2018.

##### **G. Duty Station**

**Travel:**

* International travel for 5 effective person-days of field mission to Yerevan, Armenia will be required during the MTR mission;
* The Basic Security in the Field II and Advanced Security in the Field courses must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
* Statement of Medical Fitness for Work:

Individual Consultants/Contractors whose assignments require travel and who are over 62 years of age are required, at their own cost, to undergo a full medical examination including x-rays and obtaining medical clearance from an UN - approved doctor prior to taking up their assignment. Where there is no UN office nor a UN Medical Doctor present in the location of the Individual Contractor prior to commencing the travel, either for repatriation or duty travel, the Individual Contractor may choose his/her own preferred physician to obtain the required medical clearance.

* Inoculations/Vaccinations:

Individual Consultants/Contractors are required to have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. The cost of required vaccinations/inoculations, when foreseeable, must be included in the financial proposal. Any unforeseeable vaccination/inoculation cost will be reimbursed by UNDP;

* Consultant is required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/> ;
* The Individual Consultant must obtain security clearance before travelling to the duty station;
* All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to duty station. UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket and daily allowance exceeding UNDP rates. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

**REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

**H. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Qualifications** | **Evaluation weight for each qualification** |
| Master’s degree or higher in natural or chemical sciences or other closely related field | 20 points |
| At least 10 years of work experience in relevant technical areas and project evaluation | 20 points |
| Experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies and/or experience applying SMART targets and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios | 15 points |
| Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system | 15 points |
| Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations | 10 points |
| Knowledge of priorities and basic principles of POPs management and relevant international best-practices would be an asset | 5 points |
| Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and the Chemicals Focal Area, and/or experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis would be an asset | 5 points |
| Excellent English communication skills (written and oral), knowledge of Russian would be an asset | 5 points |
| Experience working in CIS countries and in the Caucasus countries; | 5 points |

***Consultant Independence:***

The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

**I. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

***Financial Proposal:***

* Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, per diem costs, etc.);
* Individual on this contract is not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the requirements of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.
* The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

**SCHEDULE OF PAYMENT**

The service provider will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows: lump sum payable in 2 installments, upon satisfactory completion and approval by UNDP of all deliverables, including the Final MTR Report.

**40% of the lump sum payment for Deliverables 1, 2, 3** - upon submission of the draft MTR Report;

**60% of the lump sum payment for Deliverable 4** - upon finalization of the MTR Report.

Or, as otherwise agreed between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR consultant.

**J. Recommended Presentation of Offer**

1. Completed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx) provided by UNDP;
2. **Personal CV or a** [**P11 Personal History form**](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc), indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate;
3. **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
4. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP. See Letter of Confirmation of Interest template for financial proposal template.

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70%and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract

Documents with a subject “International Consultant for Mid-Term Evaluation” should be submitted no later than 15:00 (local time), November 20, 2017 to email: [procurement@undp.am](mailto:procurement@undp.am) or by post to the address below: United Nations Development Programme, 14 Petros Adamyan, Yerevan 0010, Armenia

**K. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**

The award of the contract will be made to the Individual Consultant who has obtained the highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions. Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. The offers will be evaluated using the “Combined Scoring method” where:

1. The educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted a max. of 70%;
2. The price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring.

**Annex A: List of documents for review by the MTR Consultant**

1. PIF
2. UNDP Project Document
3. Project Inception Report
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
6. Annual Project Review (APR)
7. Semi-annual reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (fill in specific TTs for this project’s focal area)
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project

**The following documents will also be available:**

11. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems

12. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)

13. Minutes of the Project Management Board meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

14. Project site location maps

**ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **i.** | Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID# * MTR time frame and date of MTR report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program * Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners * MTR team members * Acknowledgements | | |
| **ii.** | Table of Contents | | |
| iii. | Acronyms and Abbreviations | | |
| **1.** | Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*   * Project Information Table * Project Description (brief) * Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words) * MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table * Concise summary of conclusions * Recommendation Summary Table | | |
| **2.** | Introduction *(2-3 pages)*   * Purpose of the MTR and objectives * Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR * Structure of the MTR report | | |
| **3.** | Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*   * Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope * Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted * Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) * Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. * Project timing and milestones * Main stakeholders: summary list | | |
| **4.** | Findings *(12-14 pages)* | | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | |
| **4.2** | Progress Towards Results   * Progress towards outcomes analysis * Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective | |
| **4.3** | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management   * Management Arrangements * Work planning * Finance and co-finance * Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems * Stakeholder engagement * Reporting * Communications | |
| **4.4** | Sustainability   * Financial risks to sustainability * Socio-economic to sustainability * Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability * Environmental risks to sustainability | |
| **5.** | Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)* | | |
|  | **5.1** | | Conclusions   * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project |
| **5.2** | | Recommendations   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives |
| **6.** | Annexes   * MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes) * MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) * Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection * Ratings Scales * MTR mission itinerary * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report) * Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form * Signed MTR final report clearance form * *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report * *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.)* | | |

**ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?** | | | |
| How well does the project align with evolving GEF CCCD focal area priorities through GEF 5 and GEF 6? | Extent to which CCCD and related GEF priorities and areas of work incorporated | Project documents  National policies and strategies  Project partners  Project beneficiaries |  |
| Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? | Degree to which the project supports objectives of Government. |  |
| Have implementation strategies been appropriate (is the logframe logical and complete)? | Adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities |  |
| Did the project address the needs of target beneficiaries and other stakeholders? Are beneficiaries and other stakeholders effectively engaged in implementation? | Degree to which the project meets stakeholder expectations |  |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** | | | |
| How well has the project performed against its expected objectives and outcomes, and its indicators and targets? | Extent to which milestones and targets are achieved at mid-term, as laid out in the logframe and monitoring plan | Project reports  Minutes of Project Board and Advisory Committee Meetings  Local partners Capacity Development Scorecards |  |
| Which have been key factors contributing to project success/underachievement? | Evidence of adaptive management and/or early application of lessons learned | Project work plans and reports  Interviews with local partners  Tracking tools |  |
| How has the project contributed to raising capacity of local stakeholders to address aims of the project or of Government? | Extent of support from local stakeholders |  |
| What are the views of stakeholders on the implementation and activities of the project? | Extent to which stakeholders are actively participating in the  implementation and monitoring of the project |  |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?** | | | |
| Implementation efficiency (including monitoring):   * Was the project management effective? * Were there any particular challenges with the management process? * Has project implementation been responsive to issues arising (e.g. from monitoring or from interactions with stakeholders)? * Were progress reports produced accurately and timely, and did they respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? * Did the Project Management Board provide the anticipated input and support to project management? * Has internal and external communication been effective and efficient? * How efficiently have resources and back-up been provided by donors, including quality assurance by UNDP? | Extent to which project activities were conducted on time  Extent to which project delivery matched the expectation of the ProDoc and the expectations of partners  Level of satisfaction expressed by partners in the responsiveness (adaptive management) of the project | Project work plans and reports  Local partners  Tracking tools |  |
| Financial efficiency:   * Are the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? * Have funds been available and transferred efficiently (from donor to project to contractors) to address the project purpose, outputs and planned activities? * Are funds being used correctly? * Are financial resources being utilized efficiently (converted into outcomes)? Could financial resources be used more efficiently? * Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) | Extent to which funds have been converted into outcomes as per the expectations of the ProDoc  Level of transparency in the use of funds  Level of satisfaction of partners and beneficiaries in the use of funds  Timely delivery of funds, mitigation of bottlenecks | Project financial records  Project audit reports  Project work plans and reports |  |
| Efficiency of partnership arrangements for the project   * To what extent were partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations realized as planned? * Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?   What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? | * Extent to which project partners committed time and resources to the project * Extent of commitment of partners to take over project activities | Project work plans and reports  Interviews with local partners |  |
| Is the project responsive to threats and opportunities emerging during the course of the project? | Level of adaptive management related to emerging trends | Project work plans and reports |  |
| How well were risks, assumptions and impact drivers managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related to long-term sustainability of the project? | Extent to which project has responded to identified and emerging risks  Level of attention paid to up-dating risks log | Risks log |  |
| Is a communications strategy in place? How well is it implemented and how successful has it been in reaching intended audiences? | Extent to which project information has been disseminated  Level of awareness of beneficiaries and the general public | Communications documents  Press articles |  |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | |
| Is the social, legal and political environment conducive to sustainability? | Extent of supportive policies | Policy documents  Project board and Advisory Committee minutes  Local partners and beneficiaries |  |
| Are there early signs of activities being taken up by project partners, and plans being developed to sustain them? | Extent to which partners are considering post-project actions |  |  |
| Have partners and stakeholders successfully enhanced their capacities and do they have the required resources to make use of these capacities? | Extent to which partners and stakeholders are applying new ideas outside of the immediate project context |  |  |

**ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants**[[4]](#footnote-4)

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place)* on *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ANNEX E: MTR Ratings**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results:** (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

**ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP-GEF RTA and included in the final document)*

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ANNEX G: Project Results Framework**

**Annex A. Project Results Framework**

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** Armenia is better able to address key environmental challenges including climate change and natural resource management |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:** *Ind: Environmental Performance Index (EPI)* |
| **Applicable Outcome and Output (from UNDP’s 2014-17 Strategic Plan):**  Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded Output 1.3. Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:**  GEF-5Chemicals Strategy: Objective CHEM-1: Phase out POPs and Reduce POPs Releases |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:**  Outcome 1: POPs waste prevented, managed and disposed of, and contaminated sites managed in an environmentally sound manner.  Outcome 1.5: Country capacity built to effectively phase out and reduce releases of POPs. |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:**  Indicator 1.4.2 Amount of obsolete pesticides, including POPs, disposed of in an environmentally sound manner; measured in tons.  Indicator 1.5.1 Progress in developing and implementing a legislative and regulatory framework for environmentally sound management of POPs, and for the sound management of chemicals in general, as recorded in the POPs tracking tool. |

|  | | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | | **Targets** | | | | **Sources of verification** | **Risks and assumptions** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid-term** | | **End of project** | |
| **Objective:**  Protection of health and environment through elimination of obsolete pesticide stockpiles and addressing contaminated sites within a sound chemicals management strategy | | Obsolete Pesticide stockpiles including POPs Pesticides and wastes are securely packaged, contained and stored pending elimination | * The major current obsolete pesticide stockpile site and major remaining location of POPs pesticides is at the Nubarashen burial site in a state that creates a risk to health and the environment. And has expanded to create a significant contaminated site. * Lesser stockpiles and associated site contamination exist unaddressed at 24 OP storehouses. * Contaminated soils classified sufficiently to constitute a potent risk remain uncontained at some of these storehouse sites. | | * The major stockpiles of pure pesticides 605 t including 284 t of pure POPs pesticides along with 295 t of highly contaminated POPs waste excavated, packaged and removed from the Nubarashen burial site. * 150 t of obsolete pesticide stockpiles packaged for removal from 24 storehouses. * National HW facility site operational and 1,050 t of consolidated priority obsolete pesticides and POPs waste securely stored pending environmental sound destruction. * 7000 t of highly contaminated POPs waste (soil) and 12,500 t of POPs contaminated soil contained at the Nubarashen site | | * Removal and export of Pure obsolete pesticides and highly contaminated POPs waste for environmentally sound destruction * 12,700 of POPs contaminated soil securely from the Nubarashen site and OP storage sites permanently contained and monitored at the restored and stabilized Nubarashen site. * 7,100 of treated Category 2 POPs waste contained at the Nubarashen site. | | * Inventory control documentation of excavated, packaged and transported material * Supervisory consultant reports. * Regulatory inspection reports * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * Substantive cash direct government co-financing is available for the civil works required at the Nubarashen and the physical infrastructure improvements required at the Kotayk site. * Public acceptance and regulatory approvals are in place for the Kotayk storage facility in a timely manner. * Timely implementation of the EU funded activities at the OP storehouses through MoA. | |
| Major stockpiles of Obsolete Pesticides and POPs pesticide wastes have been destroyed in an environmental sound manner | * No elimination of national stockpiles of obsolete has been attempted | | * Commercial arrangements made for the export of 1,050 t of pure obsolete pesticides and highly contaminated POPs waste. * Technology selection and demonstration along with commercial arrangements made for the treatment/remediation of 7,100 t of POPs waste in the form of heavily contaminated soil | | * 1,050 t of pure obsolete pesticides and highly contaminated POPs waste exported and destroyed. * 7,100 t of POPs waste in the form of heavily contaminated soil treated/remediated | | * Inventory control, shipping manifest, tracking and destruction certificate documentation of material shipped, received and destroyed * Operational management and project supervision reports. * Independent due diligence peer review reports * Regulatory inspection reports | * No major barriers prevent the export of pure obsolete pesticides and highly contaminated POPs waste for environmentally sound destruction. * Appropriate cost effective commercial contaminated soil treatment/ remediation technology is available either for application in Armenia or at facilities outside the country. | |
| National legal instruments and regulatory framework for hazardous waste and contaminated sites update with gaps filled, conflicts resolved and consistent with relevant international requirements. | * Current legal and regulatory framework for hazardous waste and contaminated site management has significant gaps and conflicting provisions | | * Complete definition of current gaps and requirements for legal and regulatory changes documented and actions agreed   (To be completed when Component 3 inputs received) | | * Fully updated regulatory framework for hazardous and chemicals waste management implemented | | * Operational management and project supervision reports. | * Full commitment of MNP and government generally to improvement of the waste management legal and regulatory framework. * Failure to fully engage the necessary institutional stakeholders | |
| Core national technical capacity in place relative to hazardous waste management, risk assessment and contaminated site management | * Limited technical capacity in key areas of expertise and support infrastructure | | * Identification and documentation key methodologies and scope for the required risk assessment and initial application on a pilot | | * Environmental and health risk assessment methodologies documented, disseminated and implemented as part of the national regulatory assessment process for contaminated sites. * Professional in regulatory agencies, academia, NGOs and environmental service providers trained on their application | | * Operational management and project supervision reports * Independent peer review of results | * Active cooperation of all beneficiaries in the development and implementation of the risk assessment initiative * Failure to fully engage the necessary institutional stakeholders | |
| **Component 1: Capture and Containment of Obsolete Pesticide Stockpiles and Wastes** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 1.1:** Removal of priority POPs pesticide waste from the Nubarashen burial site, secure containment of residual contamination on-site, site stabilization and restoration, with the site secured under appropriate institutional arrangements providing effective access limitations, monitoring and future land use control, all endorsed by an informed public. | | Detailed site assessment, design documentation, tender specification, implementation procedures including EHS procedures, EIA and required approvals in place to initiate Nubarashen burial site works | * Preliminary site assessment completed during PPG * Conceptual excavation, containment, site stabilization sign completed during the PPG. * No formal EIA or site approvals initiated. * No national standards and procedures in place | | * Detailed design in place with supporting tender documents and construction specifications. * Contracting complete * EIA and formal approvals in place * Operational procedures including EHS procedures in place and utilized. | | * Implementation of design, operational procedures and conformance with approval conditions verified | | * Peer review of technical documentation. * Supervisory consultant reports. * Regulatory submission/ approval documents * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * Preliminary site assessment and conceptual design does not fully define scope/ * More complex EIA an approval processes than foreseen are applied. * Public acceptance of activities proposed will be obtained | |
| Removal of pure pesticides/.high concentration POPs wastes (Category 1) and soil highly contaminated with POPs pesticides (Category 2) from the Nubarashen burial site to secure storage | * An estimated 7,900 t of pure pesticides, high concentration POPs waste and soil highly contaminated with POPs have been identified is found in and around the Nubarashen burial site. * Risk assessments identify the need to ensure removal of high risk POPs waste | | * Excavation, packaging and removal to secure storage of 900 t of pure pesticides and high concentration POPs wastes (Category 1) from the Nubarashen burial site to secure storage | | * Removal to secure storage of 7,000 t of POPs pesticide waste in the form of highly contaminated soil (Category 2) from the Nubarashen burial site. | | * On-site visual and analytical screening records differentiating between Category 1, 2 and 3 POPs wastes * Inventory control documentation of excavated, packaged and transported material. * Supervisory consultant reports. * Regulatory inspection reports * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * Actual estimated quantities are reasonable accurate. * Effective affordable on-site analytical screening is available * Effective trained labour and on-site supervision is used | |
|  | | Onsite secure containment of 12,000 t of low and moderately contaminated soil (Category 3) in an engineered landfill within the Nubarashen site in place | * Containment of pure pesticide burial cells compromised. * Contamination has spread to soil across and around the Nubarashen site | | * Onsite secure temporary containment of 7,000 t of POPs pesticide waste in the form of highly contaminated soil and 12,000 t of low and moderately contaminated soil in an engineered landfill within the Nubarashen site in place | | * Onsite secure permanent containment of 12,000 t of low and moderately contaminated soil in an engineered landfill within the Nubarashen site in place | | * On-site visual and analytical screening records differentiating between Category 1, 2 and 3 POPs wastes * Inventory control documentation of excavated, packaged and transported material * Supervisory consultant reports. * Regulatory inspection reports * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * Actual estimated quantities are reasonable accurate. * Effective affordable on-site analytical screening is available * Effective trained labour and on-site supervision is used | |
|  | | Restoration, monitoring and access control provisions for the Nubarashen burial site are in place and civil works to stabilize the surrounding land and drainage are completed. | * Only temporary containment works in place involving basic drainage, and cover of the burial site itself. * Site is generally intact but poorly maintained and sparsely vegetated, subject to erosion, drainage blockage and surrounding geotechnical and hydrogeological instability. * Basic ground water monitoring capability in place * Site security and access control as part of a an emergency measures order but general public access to area permitted | | * Upgraded and enforced public access controls in place for works activities. * Upgraded access roads, security controls and site protection measures suitable for the active excavation and restoration works are in place. * Temporary repairs and modification to on-site as well and upstream and downstream drainage to assure minimum water ingress during active site excavation and remediation civil works | | * Site fully restored with sustainable phytoremediation vegetation, appropriately fenced and gated with signage including a 100m buffer zone around the former burial site. * The site drainage system upgraded and functional inclusive of a monitored phytoremediation reed bed downstream pond. * Permanent measures to maintain land stability upstream and downstream of site including removal of perched water table and upstream ponds. * Long term monitoring program in place and funded by national budgets. * Institutional arrangements respecting long tern land use of the site and surrounding territory involving its administration as part of the adjoining ecological reserve. | | * Supervisory consultant reports. * Regulatory inspection reports * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring * Site monitoring data | * Public and City of Yerevan acceptance of land use restrictions and protected area designation. * MNP capability to establish and maintain appropriate protected area land use arrangements. * National budget commitments made for site maintenance and monitoring. | |
|  | | Availability of trained capability in the practical management of hazardous chemicals wastes and contaminated site clean up | * Limited national capability in the practical management of hazardous chemicals wastes and contaminated site clean up | | * Training delivered to 20 national technical and regulatory staff in support of Nubarashen burial site POPs wastes excavation, packaging, transportation and site containment/ restoration operations | | * Sustainable operational capability in the public and private sector for hazardous chemical waste management and contaminated site clean-up in place | | * Supervisory consultant reports. * Reports on training delivered * Information on availability of services in other applications | * Availability of suitable candidates and operating entities for training. | |
|  | | High level of public awareness, engagement and support for the clean- up activities and ongoing custody and monitoring arrangements for the Nubarashen burial site supported by appropriate awareness products, | * Limited awareness of the site, its risks and activities being undertaken with respect to its clean up. | | * 3 public consultation events held and 50 public documents/web/media products produced | | * 2 additional public consultation events held and 5 public documents/web/media products produced. * Survey indicating the views of affected public stakeholders upon completion | | * Feedback from public events. * Independent media reports. * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * Immediately affected public will recognize the benefit of dealing with the Nubarashen site. * Responsive and proactive approach by institutional stakeholders to public concerns and input | |
| **Outcome 1.2:** Development of the Kotayk national hazardous waste management site at equipped with secure storage and basic infrastructure to allow introduction of HW treatment soil remediation technologies constructed and operated for the secure storage of POPs pesticide waste and OP stockpiles, and the treatment of POPs pesticide contaminated soil | | Detailed design documentation, tender specification, implementation procedures including EHS procedures, EIA and required approvals in place to initiate development of the Kotayk HW facility site | * MTAES site in Kotayk Marz assessed as suitable for development. * Preliminary conceptual design survey and cost estimate complete. * Initial public consultation with authorities and local public undertaken. | | * Detailed design in place with supporting tender documents and construction specifications. * Contracting complete * EIA and formal approvals in place * Operational procedures including EHS procedures in place and utilized. | | * Implementation of design, operational procedures and conformance with approval conditions verified | | * Peer review of technical documentation. * Supervisory consultant reports. * Regulatory submission and approval documents * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * No unforeseen institutional or legal barriers exist to accessing the site. * Preliminary site assessment and conceptual design sufficiently defines scope. * More complex EIA an approval processes than foreseen are applied. * Public acceptance of activities proposed will be obtained | |
| Kotayk national HW management site developed to and operated to international standards | * No suitable HW storage or management facilities available in Armenia. | | * Upgrading works on the Kotayk national HW management site completed to national and international standards * Kotayk national HW management site operational and being used for the project. | | * Kotayk national HW management site utilized for general HW management activities on a sustainable basis. | | * Supervisory consultant reports. * Regulatory inspection reports * Site environmental monitoring reports. * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring * Future business and operational plans for the facility and site. | * Site proves suitable for project and ongoing operations * National commitment remains to sustain its operation. | |
|  | | Successful operation of the facility for the storage of Category 1 POPs pesticide waste and OP stockpiles pending export for environmentally sound destruction. | No suitable HW storage capacity currently exists in Armenia that would meet project requirements. | | * Secure receiving and storage of 1,050 t of Category 1 pesticide waste and OP stockpiles * Handling and export shipment of of 1,050 t of Category 1 pesticide waste and OP stockpiles for environmentally sound destruction. | | * Secure receiving and storage of any contingency volumes of Category 1 pesticide waste and OP stockpiles from Nubarashen and OP stockpile site remediation operations. * Handling and export shipment of any contingency volumes of Category 1 pesticide waste and OP stockpiles from Nubarashen and OP stockpile site remediation operations for environmentally sound destruction. | | * Inventory control and shipping manifest documentation of material received and placed in storage. * Operational management and project supervision reports. * Regulatory inspection reports * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * Amount received is as estimated * Facility operates as designed and expected. * Survey indicating the views of affected public stakeholders. * Responsive and proactive approach by institutional stakeholders to public concerns and input | |
|  | | Successful operation of the facility to host treatment/remediation technology treating for soil highly contaminated with POPs pesticide in an environmentally sound manner. | No HW qualified site for the operation of HW treatment and soil remediation technology currently exist in Armenia that would meet project requirements. | | * Secure receiving and secure storage of 7,000 t of Category 2 material (soil highly contaminated with POPs pesticide) from Nubarashen. | | * Secure receiving and secure storage of approximately 100 t amount of additional soil highly contaminated with POPs pesticide) from OP storehouse cleanup activities. * Treatment and remediation of at least 7,100 t of Category 2 material from Nubarashen and OP storage site clean-ups or alternatively export of this material to suitable treatment and remediation facilities elsewhere. | | * Inventory control and shipping manifest documentation of material received and placed in storage. * Operational management and project supervision reports. * Regulatory inspection reports * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * Competitive treatment and remediation technology can be attracted through an international tendering process for establishment on the Kotayk site. * Infrastructure developed and provided by the facility is suitable. | |
|  | | Availability of trained and equipped staff for the practical operation of the Kotayk HW management facility including safeguards and EHS practices | • Limited national capability in the practical management of hazardous chemicals wastes and particularly the operation of HW storage and treatment facilities | | * Training delivered to 20 national technical and regulatory staff in support of Kotayk HW facility operations. | | * Sustainable operational capability for hazardous chemical waste management facility in place | | * Supervisory consultant reports. * Reports on training delivered   Information on availability of services in other applications | * Availability of suitable candidates and operating entities for training. | |
|  | | High level of public awareness, engagement and support for the Kotayk HW facility site activities and ongoing operations supported by the delivery of appropriate awareness products and activities delivered. | * Initial public consultations with local authorities and affected public stakeholders undertaken. | | * 3 public consultation events held and 5 public documents/web/media products delivered | | * 2 public consultation events held and 5 public documents/web/media products delivered | | * Feedback from public events. * Independent media reports. * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * Sustained acceptance by immediately affected public for the operation of the facility. | |
| **Outcome 1.3:** Remaining significant historical OP storehouses have OP stocks packaged and removed and residual site contamination cleaned up. | | Screening assessments completed/documented on identified historical OP storehouse stockpile sites and OP stockpiles and clean up residuals packaged and removed to the Kotayk HW facility. | * Fragmented historical assessment and inventory work consolidated for project preparation * 24 OP stockpile sites identified and up to 6 sites considered priorities for substantive clean up. * Preliminary commitment for EU funding of initial work pending | | * EU/MoA/FAO administered site assessment, packaging and surficial clean up undertaken to a make available 150 t of OPs and residuals for storage at the Kotayk facility. * Environmentally sound disposal of 150 t of OPs arranged by FAO * Public consultation conducted at all OP storehouse sites | | * Under MoA supervision all former OP stores are maintained in other productive uses. | | * Inventory control and shipping manifest documentation of material received and placed in storage. * Operational management and project supervision reports. * Regulatory inspection reports * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * The EU funding will be confirmed and acted upon over the next two years. * The preliminary estimates of quantities and site conditions are generally accurate. * Acceptance of access and involvement of private sector owners and/or appropriate regulatory action. * Institutional and legal issues related to local jurisdiction and licensing requirements resolved | |
| Detailed contaminated site and risk assessments and remediation/clean up designs on identified priority sites completed/documented | * Limited site assessment work done by local and international NGOs | | * Preliminary site assessment reports received from, MoA and assessed. * Priority sites for substantive clean up agreed with MoA and MNP | | * Detailed contaminated site and risk assessments and remediation/clean up designs on identified on up to 6 priority sites completed/documented | | * Peer review of technical documentation. * Supervisory consultant reports. * Regulatory submission/ approval documents * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * The preliminary identification of priority sites through EU/MoA/FAO work generally accurate. * Acceptance of access and involvement of private sector owners and/or appropriate regulatory action. | |
| Excavation/removal, remediation and/or containment on identified priority sites completed. | * No clean up activity undertaken at any OP stores. | | * No action | | * Excavation/removal, remediation and/or containment of 200 t of contaminated soil from up to 6 identified priority sites completed | | * Inventory control and shipping manifest documentation of material received and placed in storage. * Operational management and project supervision reports. * Regulatory inspection reports * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * No unforeseen institutional, legal jurisdictional barriers exist to accessing the site. * Preliminary site assessment and conceptual design sufficiently defines scope. * Regulatory approvals are available * Public acceptance of activities proposed will be obtained | |
| Public consultation events held at 6 priority sites and public acceptance of actions are obtained | * No dedicated public consultation activities on priority sites to date. | | * No Action | | * 6 public consultation events held at 6 priority sites | | * Feedback from public events. * Independent media reports. * Citizen/NGO independent monitoring | * Immediately affected public will recognize the benefit of dealing with the site issues. * Responsive and proactive approach by institutional stakeholders to public concerns and input | |
| **Component 2: Obsolete Pesticide Stockpile and Waste Elimination** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 2.1:** Removal from Armenia of all substantially all high priority POPs pesticides, associate very high concentration wastes and OP stockpiles. | Destruction of Category 1 POPs pesticide wastes from Nubarashen and OP stockpiles in an environmentally sound destruction in accordance with the SC Article 6, Basel Convention and GEF guidance performance requirements. | | | * No destruction of POPs pesticides, POPs wastes or OPs yet undertaken | * International pre-qualification, tender and contract documents prepared and implemented * Shipment and environmental sound destruction of 900t Category 1 POPs pesticide wastes and 150 t of OP stockpiles at a qualified competitive export destruction facility. supported | * Shipment and environmental sound destruction of any contingency volumes of Category 1 pesticide waste and OP stockpiles from Nubarashen and OP stockpile site remediation operations at qualified competitive export destruction facility. | | * Inventory control, shipping manifest, tracking and destruction certificate documentation of material shipped, received and destroyed * Operational management and project supervision reports. * Independent due diligence peer review reports * Regulatory inspection reports | | | * Qualified and competitive export facilities and supporting logistics service providers are available. * Timely export, transit country and destination import approvals are available. |
| **Outcome 2.2:** Environmentally sound remediation of heavily POPs pesticide contaminated soil inclusive of destruction of extracted POPs pesticides demonstrated**.** | | Treatment/remediation of Category 2 heavily contaminated POPs contaminated soil (POPs pesticide waste) remediated to levels below the low POPs content and demonstration of its commercially viability in Armenia for remediation of POPs contaminated soil | | * No highly contaminated soil treatment/remediation facilities available in the country | * International pre-qualification, tender and contract documents prepared and implemented * Trial treatment testing on candidate shortlisted technologies completed. * Site preparation arrangements for hosting the required technology as may be required completed. | * Shipment and environmental sound destruction of 7,100 t of Category 1heavily contaminated POPs contaminated soil (POPs pesticide waste) remediated to levels below the low POPs content at the Kotayk site and returned/contained on the Nubarashen site, or exported to a qualified facility. | | * Inventory control, shipping manifest, tracking and destruction certificate documentation of material shipped, received and treated/remediated * Operational management and project supervision reports including analysis of treated soil. * Independent due diligence peer review reports * Regulatory inspection reports | | * Qualified and competitive export facilities and supporting logistics service providers are available. * Feasibility of primary option of treatment and remediation in Armenia. * Timely export, transit country and destination import approvals are available as a contingency. | |
| Operational training of national technical personal and service providers on a modern contaminated soil treatment/remediation technology | | * No currently qualified technical personal or service providers in Armenia for treatment/remediation of POPs contaminated soil. | * 20 national technical personal trained on a modern contaminated soil treatment/remediation technology | * 20 national technical personal operationally qualified and experienced on a modern contaminated soil treatment/remediation technology. * Commercial service provider capability available for other contaminated soil treatment/remediation projects in Armenia. | | * Supervisory consultant reports. * Reports on training delivered * Information on availability of services in other applications | | * Availability of suitable candidates and operating entities for training. | |
| **Component 3: Institutional and Regulatory Capacity Strengthening for Sound Chemicals Management and Contaminated Sites** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3.1:** Legal/regulatory and technical guidance tools for management of chemical wastes, including POPs, and, contaminated sites management within a national sound chemicals management framework strengthened | | Policies, legislation and regulatory measures respecting hazardous chemical wastes and contaminated sites management reviewed, updated and appropraite revisions implemented | * Basic framework legislation in place but has gaps, inconsistencies and conflicts with international standards and MEA obligations | | * Systematic review and clarification of HW management and contaminated sites existing legislation and regulation completed. * Action plan for streamlining and filling gaps in existing legislation consistent with international practice adopted and implemented, | | (List of specific legislative and regulatory measures to be provided by MNP/UNDP CO) | | * Project supervision reports. * Peer reviews of documents produced | * Broad institutional support for the development process across government stakeholders. * Sustained high level government commitment to the adoption of required legislation and regulations. | |
| Adopted technical guidelines on operational and EHS procedures for hazardous chemicals waste handling, transport, storage and disposal, developed in accordance with international practice and relevant national personal trained | * While requirements exist in legislation requiring technical guidelines on operational safety procedures for hazardous chemicals waste handling, transport, storage and disposal to be in place these have not been developed and adopted. * Limited national experise exist in implementation of operational procedures for HW management. | | * Draft guidance materials on operational and EHS procedures for hazardous chemicals waste handling, transport, storage and disposal consistent with international practice prepared and under public review. * Training program hazardous chemicals waste handling, transport, storage and disposal developed with a designated accedited national institution. | | * Adopted guidance materials operational and EHS procedures for hazardous chemicals waste handling, transport, storage and disposal consistent with international practice implemented. * National training program delivered to at least 50 relevant technical personnel in regulatory and private sector service provider positions who would attain relevant certification. | | * Project supervision reports. * Peer reviews of documents produced | * Qualified personnel are available and interested in the field. * Private sector service provider interest. * Availability of a qualified training institution | |
| Guidance documentation on environmental and health risk assessment methodologies and practices applicable to hazardous waste stockpiles and contaminated sites developed in accoradnce with international practice introduced and adopted, and rel;evant national professional trained. | * No nationally adopted guidance materials exist for environmental and health risk assessment. | | * Draft guidance materials on environmental and health risk assessment methodologies and practices applicable to hazardous waste stockpiles and contaminated sites developed in accoradnce with international practice prepared and under public review. * Training session s involving at laest 10 train the trainers is undertaken | | * Adopted guidance materials on on environmental and health risk assessment methodologies and practices applicable to hazardous waste stockpiles and contaminated sites developed in accoradnce with international practice implemented. * Training of at least 50 professionals from regulatory authorities, academia, NGOs and environmental service providers | | * Project supervision reports. * Peer reviews of documents produced | * Qualified personnel are available and interested in the field. * Private sector service provider interest. * Availability of a qualified training institution | |
| **Outcome 3.2:** | | The EcoProject incineration facility is fully qualified based on international standards for management of HW and chemical wastes. | * .Facility has been constructed and is operational for biomedical and other industrial waste destruction with its operator expressing interest in expanding its range of wastes to various HW up to and including POPs wastes | | * Test burn program designed, baseline studies undertaken and wastes identified for testing assembled. | | * Full test burn program completed and licensing decisions made on an expanded menu of HW made. * A technical assessment and upgrading investment plan is completed for purposes of improving facility efficiency and environmental performance including potential application to chlorinated waste streams. | | * Project supervision reports. * Test burn results and technical assessment study documents * Peer reviews of documents produced | * Continued enterprise financial commitment to further investment as a HW service provider. * Maintenance of public acceptance of the facility and its location in Yerevan. * An efficient and technical sound regulatory licensing regime exists and is applied. | |
| **Outcome 3.3:** Basic national capacity for effective hazardous chemicals sampling and analysis for multi-environmental media and contaminated sites in place, operational and certified to international standards | | Adopted national strategy for rationalization and upgrading national laboratory capability to serve a sound chemoicals management framework including hazardous waste and contaminated sites management. | * Highly fragmented under equipped and resourced laboratory infrastructure distributed across the regulatory, academic and private sector. * Lack of fully creditable capability to service the needs of regulators and the industrial/private sector | | * National laboratory strategy developed, endorsed by major institutional and public stakeholders and endorsed for implementation by the government. | | * National strategy implemented as reflected by availability of effective support capability for sound chemicals management particular hazardous waste management and contaminated sites. | | * Project supervision reports. * Peer reviews of documents produced | * Consensus on a strategy is achieved * Government commitment and political will is sustained to make necessary decisions on rationalization of existing infrastructure and effective allocation of resources to focus capability in sufficient quantity. | |
| Designated national laboratories, including one each in the regulatory, academic and private sector upgraded with suitable capability for hazardous chemical waste and contaminated site sampling and analysis | * Reasonably good but somewhat dated capability in MNR regulatory laboratory and one modern academic laboratory. * Growing private sector laboratories. | | * Selection of three designated laboratories, one in each of regulatory, academic and private sector for capital and infrastructure upgrading. * Approved specifications and plans for upgrading endorsed by the government | | * Three designated laboratories upgraded and operational. * Long term national budget commitments and/or business plans in place ensuring sustainable operation | | * Project supervision reports. * Peer reviews of documents produced | * Consensus on a selection of designated laboratories. * Sustained government commitment and funding available. | |
| Training program for laboratory and associated personal delivered. | * Variable levels of training and qualifications in existing laboratory personnel | | * 15 key laboratory personal from designated laboratories trained | | * 15 additional key laboratory personal from designated laboratories trained | | * Project supervision reports. * Peer reviews of documents produced | * Consensus on a selection of designated laboratories. * Sustained government commitment and funding available. | |
| Designated national laboratories with international certification and international methods and practice in place | * Only one laboratory with partial international certification | | * 3 designated laboratories initiated formal international certification | | * 3 designated laboratories achieved full international certification | | * Project supervision reports. * Peer reviews of documents produced * Certification documentation | * Consensus on a selection of designated laboratories. * Sustained government commitment and funding available. | |
| **Component 4: Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 4:**  Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation. | | M&E and adaptive management applied to project in response to needs, mid-term evaluation findings with lessons learned extracted. | * No Monitoring and Evaluation system * No evaluation of project output and outcomes | | * Monitoring and Evaluation system developed. * Mid-term-evaluation of project output and outcomes conducted with lessons learnt at 30 months of implementation. | | * Final evaluation report ready in the end of project | | * Project document inception workshop report. * Independent mid-term evaluation report. | * Availability of reference material and progress reports * Cooperation of stakeholder agencies and other organizations. | |

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
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