ANNEX-1
Terms of Reference
Terminal Evaluation for POPs Legacy Elimination and Release Reduction

1. BACKGROUND

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the *full-sized* project titled *POPs Legacy Elimination and Release Reduction (PIMS 4833 & UNIDO SAP# 140288)* implemented through the *Ministry of Environment and Urbanization.* The project started on the *21 May 2015 and* is in its *5th* year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects' (insert hyperlink).

UNDP in collaboration with UNIDO and Ministry of Environment and Urbanization implements the project which objective is to protect human health and the environment globally as well as locally through addressing POPs legacies including elimination of POPs Pesticide and PCB stockpiles, and initiating clean-up of associated POPs and chemical pollutant contaminated sites, as well as dealing with longer term PCB phase out consistent with the country's Stockholm Convention obligations, reducing U-POPs release in major industrial sectors , and providing targeted institutional, regulatory and technical capacity strengthening, all within a sound chemicals management framework. The project is directed by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization. It will meet this objective by eliminating a large POPs pesticide stockpile consisting of pure HCH and associated high concentration POPs waste and PCB stockpiles as well as supporting assessment, cleanup and monitoring of priority POPs contaminated sites involving representative range of site contamination situations, remediation approaches and clean-up financing modalities. The project will also demonstrate the sustainable treatment of cross contaminated PCB transformer units by means of de-halogenation technologies, will provide technical assistance for setting up a national plan for treatment of PCB contaminated transformers, and will provide technical assistance for the establishment of BAT/BEPs among priority U-POPs emitting sectors Additionally the project will support the qualification of 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.

Considering the targets and the progress in implementation, Project evaluated to contribute to below SDGs:

SDG 3, SDG 6, SDG 11 and SDG 12 by elimination of the hazardous waste as an important threat to public health and water resources, and contributing the establishment of healthy conditions in urban areas,

SDG 12 and SDG 13, by providing BAT/BEP methodologies in production, that support sustainability and liveable environments in urban areas, also considering climate change.

2. OBJECTIVE & SCOPE

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The TE must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The TE expert 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/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the expert considers useful for this evidence-based review). The TE expert 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 TE expert is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[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, *UNIDO* Country Office and other key stakeholders.

3. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT (IC)

The generic duties and responsibilities of the IC are as follows:

- Preparing detailed methodology, work plan and outline;
- Preparing Terminal Evaluation Report with findings;
- Submitting lessons learned and recommendations for improvement, including recommendations for the revision of project strategy, approach, outputs and activities, if necessary;
- Providing recommendations for a strategy for future replication of the project approach for other types of the climate change and sustainable energy financing projects, for other countries in the region;
- Preparing description of best practices, and an "action list" in a certain area of particular importance for the project;
- Reviewing the documents listed in Annex 2b.

If required by the UNDP Project Team, the IC could provide additional consultancy services on topics related to her/his expertise area for other activities within the scope of this Terms of Reference.

[1] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.

4. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

UNDP will provide to IC all relevant background documents. UNDP is not required to provide any physical facility for the work of the IC. However, depending on the availability of physical facilities (e.g. working space, computer, printer, telephone lines, internet connection etc.) and at the discretion of the UNDP and relevant stakeholders, such facilities may be provided at the disposal of the IC.

The IC shall report to Climate Change and Environment Portfolio Manager of UNDP Turkey. The IC shall conduct the Terminal Evaluation in collaboration with Monitoring & Evaluation Advisor of CCE Portfolio at UNDP CO. The IC 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.

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP Country Office in Turkey. UNDP will assign a facilitator to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, coordinate with the GDF and provide translation (when necessary).

In preparation for the evaluation mission, Chemicals and Waste Cluster Lead, with assistance of UNDP CO, will arrange completion of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). Results of METT should be used by an international project evaluation consultant, who will provide his/her comments and track the progress in management effectiveness of project sites. Upon incorporation of the evaluator's comments the METT will be finalized and the results should be attached as a mandatory Annex to the Terminal Evaluation report. **This Terms of Reference follow the UNDP-GEF policies and procedures.**

5. DELIVERABLES

The core product of the Terminal Evaluation will be the Terminal Evaluation Report and Rating Tables given in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference. IC shall be responsible to submit the following deliverables.

Activity	Milestone/Deliverables	Estimated Deadline	Estimated Number of Days to be invested*
Preparation	**Inception Report:** Desk review, development of methodology, updating timetable, drafting mission programme. Incorporating comments received from UNDP Country Office (if necessary).	**14 December 2020**	5
Evaluation Mission	In-country field visits, interviews, preliminary mission findings briefing(s), debriefings with project partners and providing aide memoire. Delivering a presentation on aide memoire (finding(s) and	**15 December - 10 January 2021**	15

	recommendation(s)) to Project Partners.		
Draft Evaluation Report	Submission of **Draft Terminal Evaluation report**	**15 January 2021**	5
Final Evaluation Report	**Final Terminal Evaluation Report** in line with the comments received from the relevant stakeholders regarding the Draft TE Report and completed Audit Trail with responses to all comments received	**25 January 2021**	5
		Total Number of days	30

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.[2]

Each and every activity to be conducted by the IC is subject to UNDP approval. Each step shall be conducted upon approval of the previous step by UNDP.

When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail' (audit trail document will be provided), detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

*Number of days to be invested for each deliverable may change but the **total number of days worked by the individual contractor cannot exceed 30 days for this assignment** (i.e. for submission of the deliverables) as defined in the ToR.

Reporting Line

The IC shall be responsible to the Climate Change and Environment Portfolio Manager of UNDP Turkey for the completion of the tasks and duties assigned in Section 5. Deliverables of this ToR. All of the reports are subject to approval from Climate Change and Environment Portfolio Manager of UNDP Turkey in order to realize the payments to the IC.

Reporting Language

The reporting language shall be in English.

Title Rights

The title rights, copyrights and all other rights whatsoever nature in any material produced under the provisions of this TORs will be vested exclusively in UNDP.

[2] Access at: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml

6. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The TE expert will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the expert considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE expert will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE expert is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Merkim A.Ş., İZAYDAŞ, Erdemir, İSDEMİR, Brissa, EUAŞ, KARDEMİR, Akademi Çevre A.Ş. BEDAŞ, SEDAŞ, TURK TELEKOM, MOFAL, MOEU; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE expert is expected to conduct field missions to Ankara, Kocaeli, Zonguldak, Hatay, Karabuk, , Istanbul, including the following project sites Merkim Site, İZAYDAŞ HTI Facility, PCB Stockpile Owners in Kocaeli, KARDEMİR Factory, ISDEMİR Factory and site of Akademi Çevre..

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE expert and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE expert must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE expert.

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

7. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects *(insert hyperlink). (The scope*

of the TE should detail and include aspects of the project to be covered by the TE, such as the time frame, and the primary issues of concern to users that the TE needs to address.)

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk "(*)" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*) , socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE expert will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE expert should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for POPs Legacy Elimination and Release Reduction

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating[3]
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	

[3] Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

8. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *(30 working days)* over a time period of (*12 weeks)* starting on *(02 November 2020) and be completed by 31 January 2021*.

The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
25 November 2020	Application closes
30 November 2020	Selection of TE expert
05 December 2020	Preparation period for TE expert (handover of documentation)
(15 December 2020) 4 days	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
(16 December 2020) 1 day	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
(10 December – 10 January 2021) 15 days	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
15 January 2021	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
(15 January 2020) 5 days	Preparation of draft TE report
16 January 2021	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
(20 January 2021) 5 days	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
25 January 2021	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
30 January 2021	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)
15 February 2021	Expected date of full TE completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

9. THE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is *UNDP Country Office, Turkey*.

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

10. MINIMUM QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

An *independent evaluator* will conduct the TE

The evaluator cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The expected qualifications of the expert are as follows:

	Minimum Requirements	Assets
General Qualifications	• Bachelor's Degree in environmental studies/Chemistry/Engineering/ natural resources/. (5 Points) • Fluency in English. (5 Points) • Full computer literacy. (4 Points)	• **Asset:** Masters or Higher Degree in natural resources/chemistry/ climate change/ environmental economics/ engineering/ business administration/ economics. (5 Points)
General Professional Experience	• Minimum ten (10) years of relevant professional experience. (15 Points)	• **Asset:** More than fifteen (15) years of relevant professional experience (5 Points)
Specific Experience	• 5 years of specific professional experience in environmental projects /chemicals and waste projects/ monitoring and evaluation of projects. (20 Points)	• **Asset:** Monitoring and evaluation experience with the United Nations system. (3Points) • **Asset:** Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (2 Points) • **Asset:** Competence in adaptive management, as applied to chemicals and waste management (3 Points) • **Asset:** Experience in evaluating projects (3 Points)
Notes: • Internships (paid/unpaid) are not considered professional experience. • Obligatory military service is not considered professional experience. • Professional experience gained in an international setting is considered international experience. • Female candidates are encouraged to apply.		

UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, indigenous identity, disability and culture. Individuals from all genders, minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

11. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE expert will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information

knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

12. PAYMENTS

Payments will be made within 30 days upon acceptance and approval of the corresponding deliverable by UNDP on the basis of actual number of days invested in that respective deliverable and the pertaining Certification of Payment document signed by the IC and approved by the responsible Cluster Lead. Final payment is due upon satisfactory delivery and approval of the Final TE report and completed Audit Trail, the Final TE report must be approved by both the Commissioning Unit and the RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance form.)

The total amount of payment to be affected to the IC within the scope of this contract **cannot exceed 30 working days**. The IC shall be paid in USD if he/she resides in a country different than Turkey. If he/she resides in Turkey, the payment shall be realized in TL through conversion of the USD amount by the official UN exchange rate valid on the date of money transfer.

If the deliverables are not produced and delivered by the IC to the satisfaction of UNDP as approved by the responsible Cluster Lead, no payment will be made even if the IC has invested working days to produce and deliver such deliverables.

Expected delivery dates of the reports will be finalized by UNDP during the Briefing Meeting that will be conducted upon contract signature.

The amount paid to the IC shall be gross and inclusive of all associated costs such as social security, pension and income tax etc.

Tax Obligations: The IC is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the IC.

13. PLACE OF WORK

Place of work (duty station) for the assignment is home-based.
There are *missions to Ankara and selected project sites*. The mission shall be a minimum of 15 working days in Turkey, although this may be conducted as two shorter missions with the mutual agreement of the IC and UNDP Turkey, provided that the total number of days spent in Turkey is not less than 15 working days. The mission to Turkey will cover days spent in Ankara, as well as days spent to visit project sites and also possibly a day or days in Istanbul for relevant meetings. All travel related costs (cost items indicated below) of these missions out of the duty station (economy class flight ticket and accommodation in 3 or 4-star hotel) will be borne by UNDP. Approval of UNDP is needed prior to the missions is needed. The costs of these missions may either be;

- Arranged and covered by UNDP CO from the respective project budget without making any reimbursements to the consultant or

- Reimbursed to the consultant upon the submission of the receipts/invoices of the expenses by the consultant and approval of the UNDP. The reimbursement of each cost item subject to following constraints/conditions provided in below table;
- covered by the combination of both options

Cost item	Constraints	Conditions of Reimbursement
Travel (intercity transportation)	full-fare economy class tickets	1- Approval by UNDP of the cost items before the initiation of travel 2- Submission of the invoices/receipts, etc. by the consultant with the UNDP's F-10 Form 3- Acceptance and Approval by UNDP of the invoices and F-10 Form.
Accommodation	Up to 50% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Breakfast	Up to 6% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Lunch	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Dinner	Up to 12% of the effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	
Other Expenses (intra city transportations, transfer cost from /to terminals, etc.)	Up to 20% of effective DSA rate of UNDP for the respective location	

As per UNDSS rules, the IC is responsible for completing necessary online security trainings and submitting certificates and travel clearance prior to assignment-related travels.

14. TOR ANNEXES

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE expert
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

(Insert the project's results framework)

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: Outcome 2: Democratic and Environmental Governance
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Securing the Merkim 2,500 m2 storage site to prevent further HCH release, packaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of up to 3,000 t of HCH from the Merkim site (Y2018). Packaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of at least 200 t of high concentration PCBs and PCB containing equipment (Y2018)
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): OUTPUT 3.3.8: Protection of health and environment through elimination of current POPs legacies, ensure longer term capacity to manage POPs into the future consistent with international practice and standards, and integrate POPs activities with national sound chemicals management initiatives.
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: GEF-5 Chemicals Strategy: Objective CHEM-1: Phase out POPs and Reduce POPs Releases
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outtcome 1.3: POPs releases to the environment reduced. Outcome 1.4: 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 1.3.1 Amount of un-intentionally produced POPs releases avoided or reduced from industrial and non-industrial sectors; measured in grams TEQ against baseline as recorded through the POPs tracking tool. Indicator 1.4.1 Amount of PCBs and PCB-related wastes disposed of, or decontaminated; measured in tons as recorded in the POPs tracking tool. 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 current POPs legacies, ensure longer term capacity to manage POPs into the	Major legacy POPs stockpiles (POPs pesticides and current/pending PCB based equipment) eliminated in an environmentally sound	• Globally significant large POPs pesticide stockpile remains without action beyond securing it and no more than token amounts being destroyed in the medium future.	• Removal and environmentally sound destruction of 2,800 t of POPs pesticides. • Removal and environmentally sound destruction of at least an	• Restoration of former storage site for productive use • Qualification of a second HTI facility for the environmentally sound destruction of POPs and	• Task specific reports and technical documentation. • Peer review of technical documentation.	• 500 t of PCB based equipment planned to be eliminated under the UNEP/MAP project in 2014, noting risks on this not occurring

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
future consistent with international practice and standards, and integrate POPs activities with national sound chemicals management initiatives.	manner	• 500 t of existing PCB based equipment scheduled for export and elimination in 2014 • Approximately 650t of additional PCB equipment identified as requiring phase out and elimination. • No fully qualified national capability for destruction of POPs stockpiles in place.	additional 200 t of PCB based equipment. • Qualification of one HTI facility for the environmentally sound destruction of POPs and POPs waste operating in Turkey	POPs waste operating in Turkey	• Supervisory consultant reports. • Regulatory submission/ approval documents	due to timing constraints and export/import approval timelines/ • No constraints exist with respect to co-financing availability from POPs stockpiles holders. • Cost estimates for elimination are conservatively high and sufficient to cover requirements.
	A long term PCB phase out plan assuring compliance with SC requirements is in place and capacity is in place to eliminate PCB cross contamination in electrical equipment and plans are in place for phase out and elimination of remaining PCBs based electrical equipment.	• National inventory of PCB based equipment still being developed. • Existence of PCB cross contaminated transformers identified but no systematic inventory identifying extent of the issue exists. • No clear PCB phase out plan operational with respect to addressing remain PCB issues in accordance with the SC. • No national capability available to treat cross contamination and retain such equipment in service.	• Comprehensive inventories exist for remaining PCB based equipment and PCB cross contaminated transformers as a result of full implementation of the 2005 PCB regulations. • A draft national PCB phase out plan is developed and under consultation for implementation • Technology and business arrangements identified for the establishment of national commercial capability to treat cross contaminated transformers	• A comprehensive PCB phase out Plan is in place and being implemented and time lines consistent with SC deadlines for phase out and elimination. • Commercial capability in place and operational for treatment of cross contaminated transformers.	• Task specific reports and technical documentation. • Supervisory consultant reports. • Regulatory submission/ approval documents • MoEU PCB inventory data base	• The 2005 regulations are effectively implemented and enforced to obtain appropriate inventories, without avoidance or illegal sub-standard disposal. • Cost effective business arrangements for required decontamination technology is available.
	Implemented regulatory framework for addressing contaminated sites and action initiated on POPs contaminated sites	• Framework legislation covering contaminated sites in place but not yet implemented. • No systematic action on identification and	• Framework legislation is under implementation inclusive of delivery of awareness programs and initial reporting and data collection.	• Regulations fully implemented with prioritized inventories and action plans. • Training delivered to a total of 200 technical	• Task specific reports and technical documentation. • Supervisory consultant reports.	• Holders of contaminated sites fail to fully disclose site conditions or agree to cooperate

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
		addressing POPs contaminated sites yet taken. • No effective financing mechanism in place to support contaminated site legacy issues	• Site assessment initiated on pilot sites. • Initial training delivered to 50 technical professionals in site and risk assessment and remediation technology	professionals in site and risk assessment and remediation technology • Site assessment, clean up design and initial containment/monitoring completed on 3 demonstration sites and regulatory mandated site evaluations on 4 sites.	• Documentation on training program delivery including quality feedback	on initiating priority clean ups. • Positive interest (site holders and service providers in training opportunities
	Tracked and quantified continuing reductions in U-POPs release from major industrial sectors	• Although data on U-POP emission are available for some sectors, priority sector like I&S still lack of confirmed U-POP emission information and cost/effectiveness of BAT/BEP	• Plants for the measurement of U-POPs emission identified. E-POPs measurement plan finalized. U-POP emission measurement starts in at least one third of the identified facilities. • BAT/BEP demonstration plan finalized and agreed with relevant sectors, as a minimum including Kardemir and Isdemir facilities.	• U-POPs measurement completed for the selected facilities. • BAT/ BEP demonstration completed. • Potential reduction of U-POPs measured for each BAT/BEP demonstration. • Technology and cost/effectiveness consideration of the BAT/BEP technology available.	• Sampling and analytical reports. • U-POPs measurement reports for each facility • BAT/BEP preliminary and final report for each demonstration.	• A sound experimental procedure aimed at measuring at minimizing sampling uncertainty will be developed in cooperation with plant owners. • The large co-financing commitment will ensure that enough resources are available to conduct a successful measurement of U-POPs emission and BAT/BEP effectiveness. This will allow the derivation of realistic quantification of U-POPs releases and related countermeasures.
	Turkey can claim developed country status respecting POPs and	• Turkey has initiated a program targeting EU harmonization in this area.	• Complete gap identification of all areas required for EU regulatory	• Full EU regulatory harmonization achieved.	• Task specific reports and	• Continued public policy commitment to EU harmonization

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
	sound chemicals management, with an institutional and regulatory framework fully harmonized with that of the EU and with including active participation as a donor and provider of environmental services to developing countries.	• A growing technical and service provider capability in this area exists but is not fully capable of meeting international standards. • No focused international technical assistance programs are in place in this area for developing countries.	harmonization with respect to POPs, sound chemicals management and HW regulation generally. • Initiation of planning for TA programs on POPs and chemicals management for developing countries. • Active contributions to the Global PIOs monitoring network being delivered	• Sustained compliance with the SC. •	technical documentation. • Supervisory consultant reports. •	and to adopting a developed country donor role.
Component 1: Elimination of Current POPs Stockpiles and Wastes						
Outcome 1.1 - Elimination and infrastructure removal from remaining POPs pesticide storage sites	Elimination of 3,038 t of POPs pesticides and POPs waste from the Merkim site and its environmentally sound destruction, including 2,800 t during project implementation.	• Elimination to date limited to approximately 500 t of POPs pesticides since 2007, including 238 t eliminated in anticipation of GEF support.	• All material on site packaged and removed either to interim storage or through to destruction • Operational/Safeguards training provided to 20 site staff. • Informed neighbours and public on planned activities	• All POPs pesticides and POPs waste from Merkim site eliminated in an environmental sound manner	• Inventory control and waste tracking documentation. • Supervisory consultant reports. • Regulatory inspection reports • Independent due diligence peer review reports • Documentation on training program delivery including quality feedback	• No regulatory barriers exist to undertaking the work. • Timely export/transit country/import approvals for destruction received. • Sufficient resources available
	Building demolition, removal, contaminated soil, restoration and monitoring of the Merkim site	• No action with respect to the site except for passive enterprise care and custody	• Building demolished and 4,000 t of materials removed and disposed of in a secure landfill • Informed neighbours and public on planned activities	• Site clean-up/remediation complete with 200 m^3 of contaminated soil removed and disposed of in a secure HW landfill. • Site restored and monitored	• Supervisory consultant reports. • Regulatory inspection reports • Disposal tracking documentation	• No regulatory barriers exist to undertaking the work. • Sufficient resources available

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
	Elimination of 30 t of obsolete pesticide stocks	• Currently accumulating stockpiles of OPs in MoA custody	• Material packaged collected, and delivered to Merkim disposal contractor for disposal by MoA.	• OP delivered eliminated with Merkim POPs pesticides	• Supervisory consultant reports. • Regulatory inspection reports • Disposal tracking documentation	• MoA is has resources to arrange for packaging, collection and delivery for coordinated disposal under arrangements for Merkim waste.
Outcome 1.2: Elimination of high concentration PCBs and PCB contaminated equipment stockpiles.	Elimination of minimum of 200 t of existing and pending PCB based equipment stockpiles	• Current PCB pending stockpiles available for elimination of approximately 650 t (excluding 500 t targeted for 2014 elimination under UNEP/MAP project).	• At least 200 t of currently/pending stockpiles exported for environmentally sound destruction	• Additional stockpiles of equipment being phased out eliminated using savings and available resources as may occur	• Inventory control documentation. • Supervisory consultant reports. • Regulatory inspection reports • Disposal tracking documentation • Independent due diligence peer review reports	• No regulatory barriers exist to undertaking the work • Quantities of PCB equipment for elimination are not increased and exceed available resources. • Timely export/transit country/import approvals for destruction received.
Outcome 1.3: Qualification of existing and developing POPs destruction facilities	Izaydas HTI facility fully qualified and permitted for POPs destruction inclusive of required upgrading and test burns	• Izaydas facility without proven capability to manage halogenated waste streams including POPs	• Required facility upgrading to materials handling, storage, APC systems completed for commercial halogenated (POPs) waste market • Test burn demonstrating capability to destroy POPs pesticides and PCBs completed and documented. • Informed neighbours and public on planned activities and results	• Izaydas facility fully permitted and actively participating in the national and potentially regional market for POPs destruction.	• Test burn performance reports • Regulatory inspection reports and issued permits • Supervisory consultant reports.	• Facility has the capability to be upgraded for required environmental performance. • Public and owner acceptance for participation in this market nationally and regionally. • National policies allowing potential import of POPs wastes

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
Component 2: Planning and Capacity Building for Environmentally Sound Management of Future PCB Stockpiles						
Outcome 2.1: Implementation of national PCB regulation	Number of technical annex and guidance documents to the existing PCB legislation developed. Number of PCB owners on role and duties in relation to PCB rules (sampling, labelling, reporting), gender disaggregated	• Missing technical guidance on how to comply with the regulation has low to poor technical enforcement	• 3 Guidance document drafted. • 10 PCB owners (power generation and manufacturing industries) have a complete understanding of their role and duties. •	• Public control authorities have the capacity to monitor and verify compliance of PCB owners with the Turkey PCB regulation. • 30 PCB owners (power generation and manufacturing industries) have a complete understanding of their role and duties. • A guidance document on PCB regulation drafted in coordination between governmental and industrial stakeholders and adopted.	• Training reports (pre and post training assessment reports, training materials). • PCB regulation guidance document text and formal adoption.	Risk: training not effective – low participation in training. Countermeasures / assumptions: at PPG stage a high interest and commitment has been observed on PCB related issues. TO ensure its effectiveness, training will be preceded by a training needs assessment, and followed by test and questionnaires to measure the improvement of knowledge of the participants
Outcome 2.2: Systematic approach for the analytical determination of PCB in electrical equipment, labelling and inventory	Number of trained staff from industry on sampling, labelling, reporting, and prevention of cross contamination performed and certified Amount of sampling and analysis of transformers carried out Update of the PCB database with data on cross contaminated	• Industry managers and technical staff lack awareness and knowledge on PCB issue with specific reference to cross –contamination. • Analytical data on PCB contaminated equipment still limited • The PCB database established by the government does not contain information on	• At least one third of analytical data made available • Industry managers and technical staff knowledgeable on the technical, environmental and financial aspect of cross-contaminated PCB equipment	• Industry managers and technical staff knowledgeable on the technical, environmental and financial aspect of cross-contaminated PCB equipment. • A substantial set of analytical data made available and entered into the PCB database established by MoEU. • 8000 transformers sampled and analysed	• Training reports (pre and post training assessment reports, training materials). • PCB regulation guidance document text and formal adoption.	• Risk: the main risk is the unavailability of electric industry of having their equipment sampled. This risk has been addressed at PPG stage, in the course of which awareness of industrial sector raised significantly, as testified by the

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
	transformers.	PCB cross contaminated equipment				number of electric industries expressing commitment to the project.
Outcome 2.3: Development and adoption of national PCB equipment treatment, phase out and retirement plan	Number of main industrial stakeholders from power generation and manufacturing industry consulted on PCB management plan priorities. PCB national management plan developed and adopted	• A national plan for PCB management, with special reference with cross PCB contaminated equipment is missing • No consultants on the topic	• First draft of the country national plan completed	• A country national plan for the phase out or treatment of PCB contaminated equipment, including specific sub-plans for the largest industries (electric power companies and large electricity consumers) drafted agreed among stakeholders and adopted.	• National plan and sub-plans for the phase out or treatment of contaminated equipment.	• Reliable and quantitative data will be made available by project implementation to ensure that the phase out and retirement plan is sound and sustainable
Outcome 2.4: Improvement of storage and maintenance of cross contaminated PCB equipment	Number of standards and Guidance Documents for prioritizing, maintenance, handling and storage of PCB contaminated equipment on-line, in use or temporarily stored issued. Physical or operational measures adopted for preventing release of PCB or human exposure to PCB from equipment on-line, in use or store.	• PCB contaminated transformers are not identified and therefore their management is weak.	• The knowledge on the management of PCB contaminated transformers is available in form of standard guidance documents. • Feasibility analysis of facility upgrade completed. • 2 standard and guidance documents issued • 3 companies adopting BEP	• The knowledge on the management of PCB contaminated transformers is available in form of standard guidance documents; • Facilities and methodologies for the environmentally sound temporary storage of PCB contaminated equipment are upgraded and available in the country. • 5 standard and guidance documents issued • 7 companies adopting BEP	• Standard and guidance documents draft and final reports	• Industry has shown commitment and made available a substantial amount of co-financing to ensure that there will be enough resources to develop physical capacity of capture, store and monitor PCB containment equipment. In this framework, the project will deliver the necessary technical assistance to ensure compliance with SC requirements.
Outcome 2.5: Verification of decontamination technology for PCB contaminated transformers remaining	Quantity of PCB contaminated equipment cleaned by technology demonstration, and demonstration reports released.	• Beside incineration and exporting for disposal of pure PCB transformers, there is no capacity in the country to decontaminated cross-contaminated transformers.	• Feasibility analysis completed. • Technology tested and contract with technology or service provider signed. • A feasibility study supported by technical	• A feasibility study supported by technical and financial grounds to assess decontamination technologies completed. • A technology for treating cross-contaminated transformers which is	• Feasibility study preliminary and final report. • Technical specification and Bidding documents for the technology.	A risk exist that the technology is not suitable, sustainable, effective or affordable. This will be addressed by selection of proven

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
in service and its pilot demonstration	Quantity of material recycled Value of recycled material Number of jobs created Quantity of CO_2 emissions reduced		and financial grounds to assess decontamination technologies completed.	compliant with the Stockholm Convention and economically viable is available in the country. • At least 500 tons of low contamination PCB equipment treated • USD 5 Mio material worth recycled. • At least 10 jobs created • 100,000 tons CO_2 emissions reduced by replacement of old transformers by new equipment	• Site visits – supervision reports • Proof of performance report of the technology, • Treatment logs	commercial technologies that have been successfully used elsewhere worldwide. This will further assured by a sound procurement phase which ensures that the technology procured fulfils technical and economical requirements. The final acceptance of the technology will be subjected to the successful completion of a proof of performance test.
Component 3: Unintended POPs Release Reduction						
Outcome 3.1: Determination and verification on an enterprise level of source and technology specific U-POPs emissions	Determination and verification on enterprise level of current PCDD/F emission factor – sintering plants and / or EAF Determination Determination and verification on enterprise level of current U-POPs emission factors - non-ferrous metal (Cu, Al, Zn) production Determination and verification on enterprise level of current U-POPs	• Emission factors for priority sectors assessed based on sampling and analytical data are missing. • There is the need to increase sampling and analytical capacity for PCDD/F at industrial stack	• Methodology report for U-POPs emission factor • At least one third of sampling and analysis carried out • Training material for sampling and analysis of PCDD/F at the stack delivered	• The determination of U-POPs factor on sintering plants, EAF, non-ferrous metal production, cement kiln has been reassessed based on both process consideration, sampling and analysis of U-POPs at exhaust gases, sampling and analysis of correlated pollutants (chlorine, particulate matter) • 5 factories adopting BEP • At least 10 laboratory staff trained on sampling and analysis of PCDD/F at industrial stacks	• Sampling and analytical reports; U-POPs emission factor reports • Training materials, reports, training attendance sheets	Risk • Sampling and testing of industrial stacks to generate U-POPs emission factor may lead to inconsistent results due to intrinsic sampling and analysis variability Assumption / countermeasures • Adoption of internationally accepted sampling

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
	emission factor for other priority sectors Number of companies adopting BEP Number of people trained on PCDD/F sampling and analysis					and analytical methods, QA/QC procedures for PCDD/F analysis and sampling conducted during stable operational conditions of the plants will minimize the risk of inconsistent results. Accurate measurement of the operational related parameters (temperature, fuel properties, raw properties of the materials fed to the plant) will also ensure to reduce variability of the estimate
Outcome 3.2: Provision of training and technical assistance on BAT/BEP for priority industrial sectors	Number of people trained on U-POPs inventory. Number of people trained on BAT-BEP in priority sectors	• The awareness and knowledge on U-POPs and BAT/BEP is still low and need to be strengthened.	• • Training material prepared. • At least 25 technical professionals trained on BAT-BEPs (gender disaggregated).	• Training on U-POPs inventory, sampling and analysis performed: Training of at least 50 technical professionals on BAT-BEPs in 10 priority industrial sector (gender disaggregated).	• Training reports (pre and post training assessment reports)	
Outcome 3.3: Development of a national U-POPs release reduction plan	Regulatory assessment report on U-POPs completed; Priority intervention areas identified. National U-POPs release reduction plan with risk based and cost-effectiveness priorities developed.	• A U-POPs national reduction plan in Turkey is still missing, although the country is participating in initiatives aimed at implementing EU-IPPC like regulation.	• Assessment of regulatory gaps. • Preliminary identification of priority areas and release reduction priorities.	Assessment of the regulatory gaps with reference to SC requirement and EU-IPPC regulation performed. Identification of areas with the highest priorities and cost/effectiveness in term of U-POPs reduction • Development of the national U-POPs release reduction plan for priority sectors with risk-based and cost/effectiveness priorities.	Regulatory assessment report. • National U-POPs release reduction plan	• Reliable and quantitative information on the cost and type of intervention for each specific sector are available based on international and national experience.
Outcome 3.4: Demonstration of BAT/BEP in industrial	Number of sectors in which BAT / BEP has been effectively	• Although EU IPPC Directive is not enforced yet, companies exporting to	• Demonstration facilities selected.	• -2 demonstrations and assessments of BAT/BEP in the iron and steel sector	• Demonstration methodologies	Risk • High costs associated with

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
priority source categories	demonstrated. Number of companies adopting BAP/BEP Amount of incremental investment made Quantity of mercury releases reduced Quantity of I-TEQ/a reduced Quantity of CO_2 releases reduced	the EU are generally required to produce in compliance with BAT/BEP principles. However, few BAT/BEP process has been demonstrated in the country in priority sectors like I&S and non-ferrous metal.	• BAT/BEP to be demonstrated agreed with enterprises. • Demonstration methodologies report completed, including sampling and analytical schedule. • At least 3 of the 6 planned demonstrations started.	(sintering plants) completed. • 2demonstrations and assessments of BAT/BEP in the iron and steel sector (Electric arc furnaces) completed. • -2 demonstrations and assessments of BAT/BEP in the non-ferrous metal sector (copper, aluminium, and zinc) completed. • 6 companies adopting BAP/BEP • USD 30 Mio incremental investment • 5 grams TEQ/a reduction • 100,000 tons CO2 emissions reduced by BAT/BEP introduction •	report for each relevant sector. • BAT/BEP assessment report for each priority sector.	demonstration of BAT/BEP. Assumption / countermeasures • The project will provide technical and financial assistance for the assessment of BAT when these are implemented by the plants as co-financing contribution. • • In some cases, BEP demonstration may be preferred over BAT to minimize cost, or BAT may be comparatively tested among plants equipped with it against
Component 4:Management Capacity for POPs Contaminated Sites						
Outcome 4.1: Implementation of the "Soil Pollution Control and Point-Source-Contaminated Sites Regulation"	Soil Pollution Control and Point-Source-Contaminated Sites Regulation implemented with operational reporting, inventories and prioritized actions implemented.	• Regulation developed and passed but not implemented. • Limited awareness on the part of potential holders of contaminated sites. • No coordinated development of financing mechanisms beyond application of a simple polluter approach. • Limited technical capability in key assessment and technology related disciplines.	• Framework legislation is under implementation inclusive of initial reporting and data collection within the three governing management information systems. • Financial mechanism study initiated • Delivered awareness program on implementation of the regulations	• Framework legislation is fully implemented inclusive impeded and fully operational reporting and data collection within the three governing management information systems. • Financial mechanism study completed and options being pursued • Training delivered to a total of 100 professionals in site and risk assessment	• Task specific reports and technical documentation. • Regulatory reporting • Supervisory consultant reports. • Documentation on training program delivery including quality feedback	• Potential holders of contaminated sites make timely information submissions and comply on follow up actions required under the regulations. •

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
			• Training delivered to 100 professionals in site and risk assessment • Training delivered to 100 total of professionals in remediation technologies	• Training delivered to a total of 100 professionals in remediation technologies		
Outcome 4.2: : Undertaking priority POPs contaminated sites assessments and clean up measures under the "Soil Pollution Control and Point-Source-Contaminated Sites Regulation"	Demonstration site assessment/clean up design completed and containment/remediation/ monitoring initiated on three priority contaminated sites	• Action on cleaning up contaminated sites limited to fragmented initiatives driven primarily by individual enterprise initiatives.	• regulatory site assessment/site specific technology study initiatives started • Site assessment/clean up design completed on three priority sites	• regulatory site assessment/site specific technology study initiatives completed. • agreements with contaminated sites' holders made for arrangements for clean-up in place for three priority contaminated sites. • Containment/remediation/ monitoring initiated for three priority contaminated sites	• Task specific reports and technical documentation. • Regulatory reporting • Supervisory consultant reports	• Co-financing available for clean-up of the three priority contaminated sites.
Component 5: Institutional and Regulatory Capacity Strengthening for POPs and Sound Chemicals Management						
Outcome 5.1: Legislative framework updated and adopted consistent with convention obligations adopted.	Legal and regulatory framework governing POPs and HW import/export fully harmonized with EU standards and compliant with the SC. Detailed planning policy and action plan in place and under implementation for developemnt of a broadly based POPs and chemicals waste	• Basic regulatory framework in place with gaps respecting EU harmonization, SC and Rotterdam, Convention compliance. • Gaps in required infrastructure and services capability to support the above and no planning to address it.	• Rotterdam Convention accession process completed, and requirement integrated/embed into national legislation and regulations. • Gap analysis study on HW and POPs management infrastructure and services capability requirements initiated.	• Turkey has a legal and regulatory framework for POPs and HW management fully harmonized with the EU and compliant with the SC and which supports provision of related services in the region. • An endorsed policy and action plan in place and being acted on related to the development of comprehensive HW and POPs management infrastructure,	• Progress reports and technical outputs from EU IPA program documentation •Task specific reports and technical documentation •Supervisory consultant reports	• Continued public policy commitment to EU harmonization and development of modern HW management capability

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
	mamagement infrastructure and services cability					
Outcome 5.2:Strengthened technical capacity including operational POPs monitoring, supporting analytical capability, and planning related research and development capability	Multi-media POPs monitoring capability and active participation contribution to the Global POPs Monitoring Network Expanded qualification of private sector POPs analytical and monitoring service capability available to government and others. Action Plan initiated for national R&D capability related to POPs and sound chemicals management.	• Comprehensive national POPs monitoring program limited to water basis and only fragmented monitoring of other media. • Regulatory analytical capability restricted to a single state research agency which limits enforcement activities • No targeted R&D programs related to POPs issues.	• Active participation in the Global POPs Monitoring Network initiated • Qualification and supporting training for expanded laboratory and monitoring capability initiated • Planning process for development of a POPs R&D program initiated	• Expanded and coordinated multi-media POPs monitoring programs in place and operational. • 5 private laboratories and service providers qualified for regulatory work. • POPs and chemicals management R&D program in place and financed	•Task specific reports and technical documentation • Supervisory consultant reports	• Continued policy commitment to expanded private sector laboratory utilization and directing resources to POPs and sound chemicals management R&D.
Outcome 5.3 Development and implementation of modern tools for a national sound chemicals management framework	EU REACH regulatory framework for sound chemicals management adopted in Turkey Supporting chemicals management information system, training and an increased level of awareness respecting sound chemicals management	• Developing but fragmented regulatory framework for sound chemicals management • Limited information availability, awareness at the user and public levels respecting chemicals management	• Development of a national chemicals profile and the REACH approach to chemicals management initiated. • Supporting information management systems under development • Training of 50 technical professions in sound chemicals management delivered. • 2awareness events and products produced.	• National chemicals profile in place and adopted • REACH approach to sound chemicals management adopted and operationalized in Turkey supported by an effective information management system • Overall delivery of training to 100 technical and management professions • 4 total awareness events and products produced for industry and the public	•Progress reports and technical outputs from EU IPA program documentation •Task specific reports and technical documentation • Supervisory consultant reports • Documentation on training program delivery including quality	• EU programs are sustained and policy commitment maintained to a sound chemicals management regime.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
					feedback	
Component 6: Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation						
Outcome 6: 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.

ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE expert

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
	Additional documents, as required

ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

i. Title page
   - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
   - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
   - TE timeframe and date of final TE report

- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
- TE Team members

ii. Acknowledgements
iii. Table of Contents
iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
   - Project Information Table
   - Project Description (brief)
   - Evaluation Ratings Table
   - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
   - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
   - Purpose and objective of the TE
   - Scope
   - Methodology
   - Data Collection & Analysis
   - Ethics
   - Limitations to the evaluation
   - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
   - Project start and duration, including milestones
   - 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
   - Immediate and development objectives of the project
   - Expected results
   - Main stakeholders: summary list
   - Theory of Change
4. Findings
   (in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating[4])
   4.1 Project Design/Formulation
   - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
   - Assumptions and Risks
   - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
   - Planned stakeholder participation
   - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

   4.1 Project Implementation
   - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
   - Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
   - Project Finance and Co-finance
   - Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
   - UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues
   - Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

[4] See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

4.2 Project Results and Impacts
- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting Issues
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic/Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
   - Main Findings
   - Conclusions
   - Recommendations
   - Lessons Learned
6. Annexes
   - TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
   - TE Mission itinerary, including summary of field visits
   - List of persons interviewed
   - List of documents reviewed
   - Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
   - Questionnaire used and summary of results
   - Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
   - TE Rating scales
   - Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
   - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
   - Signed TE Report Clearance form
   - *Annexed in a separate file*: TE Audit Trail
   - *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level?			
(include evaluative questions)	*(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted,*	*(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)*	*(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with*

	quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)		*stakeholders, etc.)*
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)			

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

Independence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including the hiring unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. Independence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An independent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported ratings by those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten general principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: utility, credibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national evaluation capacities, and professionalism).

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 imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out the project's Mid-Term Review.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

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: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

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

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report for *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID)* **Reviewed and Cleared By:**

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE expert to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.

To the comments received on *(date)* **from the Terminal Evaluation of** *(project name) (UNDP Project PIMS #)*

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Institution/ Organization	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE expert response and actions taken