

# Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

Template 1 - formatted for attachment to the [UNDP Procurement website](#)

**This is an adjusted standard terms of reference for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF/LDCF/SCCF-financed projects taking into account the impact of COVID-19** on evaluations, including consideration for COVID-19 situation assessment within countries, impact and restrictions on evaluations, alternative approaches, methodologies and considerations to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on evaluations.

Underlying this guidance is a principle of “do no harm”, and a consideration that the safety of staff, consultants, stakeholders and communities is paramount and the primary concern of all when planning and implementing evaluations during the COVID-19 crisis.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

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 *Reducing Releases of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDEs) and Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) Originating from Unsound Waste Management and Recycling Practices and the Manufacturing of Plastics in Indonesia (or PBDEs-UPOPs Project) (PIMS #5073)* implemented through the Implementing Partner/Ministry of Industry of The Republic of Indonesia. The project started on the 16 March 2016 and is in its 4th 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’ [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](#).

## 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT`

Project Title:	Reducing Releases of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDEs) and Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) Originating from Unsound Waste Management and Recycling Practices and the Manufacturing of Plastics in Indonesia			
GEF Project ID:	5052		<u>at endorsement</u> (US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00091789	GEF financing:	3,990,000	
Country:	Indonesia	IA/EA own:	40,000	
Region:	Asia Pacific	Government:	5,000,000	
Focal Area:	Chemicals and Waste	Other:	13,691,594	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	GEF-5 Chemicals Strategy:	Total co-financing:	18,691,594	

	<p>Objective 1: Phase out POPs and Reduce POPs Releases.</p> <p>Production and use of controlled POPs chemicals phased out. (GEF-5 Outcome 1.1)</p> <p>POPs releases to the environment reduced. (GEF-5 Outcome 1.3)</p> <p>Country capacity built to effectively phase out and reduce releases of POPs (GEF-5 Outcome 1.5)</p>			
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Industry	Total Project Cost:	22,721,594	
Other Partners involved:	n.a	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		16 March 2016
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 16 March 2020	Actual: 31 March 2021

*Indonesia is committed to addressing the threats posed by Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) to human health and the environment. The country ratified the Stockholm Convention in 2009 by publishing Law No. 19/2009. Indonesia purpose urgent actions to reduce the impact of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDE), a flame retardant, and UPOP emissions that are harmful to the environment and human health, by reducing the use of PBDE in the plastic manufactures, as well as to improve the recycling and disposal technique to be better and safe.*

*Project of reducing releases of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDE) and Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) originating from unsound waste management and recycling practices and the manufacturing of plastics in Indonesia is a collaboration project between the Indonesia Ministry of Industry and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The project aims to reduce releases of PBDEs and UPOPs by improving overall life-cycle management of plastics and PBDEs-containing plastics through the introduction of alternatives to PBDEs in plastics manufacturing processes and the application of BAT/BEP in plastics recycling and disposal practices.*

*The project supports Indonesia's plastics industry and recyclers in ensuring that no banned PBDEs are used or recycled into new manufactured articles. In addition, environmentally safe and sound operations of municipal and community waste management will be supported in order to reduce harmful releases*

of PBDEs and UPOPs. While the core objective of the project is reducing releases of harmful chemicals, it brings additional benefits in terms of socio-economic and climate change, as it has two activity areas that are inherently climate beneficial i.e. increased recycling and material efficiency and better waste management. The project is structured in the following outputs:

*Project Outcome: To reduce releases of PBDEs and UPOPs by improving overall life-cycle management of plastics and PBDEs-containing plastics through the introduction of alternatives to PBDEs in plastics manufacturing processes and the application of BAT/BEP in plastics recycling and disposal practices.*

*Output 1: Strengthening the national policy and regulatory framework to reduce UPOPs and PBDE releases from plastics manufacturing, recycling and disposal practices*

*Activity Results 1.1: Reduced PBDEs and UPOPs releases resulting from unsound waste management practices through the adoption and implementation of standards/measures, policies, plans and regulations.*

*Output 2: Reducing or eliminating the importation and use of PBDEs in plastics manufacturing*

*Activity Result 2.1: Sufficient national technical expertise built to meet challenges with PDBEs in manufacturing and plastic raw material recycling*

*Activity Result 2.2: PDBE releases to the environment from the manufacturing sector reduced through phase out and introduction of PBDE avoiding quality control of raw material and awareness raising*

*Output 3: Reducing of UPOPs and PDBEs from unsound plastics recycling*

*Activity Result 3.1 Reduced releases of PBDEs as a result of improved handling, storage, recycling and disposal of PBDEs containing wastes and products through the introduction of BAT/BAP in the plastics recycling sector.*

*Activity Result 3.2 Reduced releases of UPOPs as a result of improved raw material (recycled plastics) supply chains as well as the introduction of environmentally sound disposal practices at recycling entities.*

*Output 4: Reducing releases of UPOPs and PBDEs from unsound plastic disposal practices*

*Activity Result 4.1: PBDEs and UPOPs releases to the environment reduced through the implementation of appropriate disposal options for hazardous and unrecyclable plastic waste fractions from both formal and informal recyclers and waste collectors.*

*Output 5: Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation*

*Activity Result 5.1: Monitoring and Evaluation and adaptive management applied in response to needs, mid-term evaluation findings with lessons learned extracted*

*While in this COVID-19 global pandemic situation, as of 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2020 total cases in Indonesia is 91,751 cases, recovered 50,255 cases, and death 4,459 cases. Indonesia had lockdown (Large-scale social restriction or Pembatasan Sosial Berskala Besar/PSBB) since 10<sup>th</sup> April 2020 starting in Jakarta Greater Area. Bandung, West Java, started in 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2020, and East Java in 28<sup>th</sup> April 2020. During the lockdown, several project activities including: development of Mini Depo building in Depok, development of Mini Depo building in Bandung (both in West Java) and development of Mini Depo equipment in Malang City, Malang Regency, and Banyuwangi Regency (all in East Java) have been delayed. Initial expectation the work would be done in the end of September 2020, the delay impacted the work and we expect it will be done in the end of December 2020.*

### **3. TE PURPOSE**

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 project was designed to reduce releases of PBDEs and UPOPs by improving overall life-cycle management of plastics and PBDEs-containing plastics through the introduction of alternatives to PBDEs in plastics manufacturing processes and the application of BAT/BEP in plastics recycling and disposal practices.*

*In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and guidelines, GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) when implementation has completed. This evaluation must follow detailed guidance outlined in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](#).*

*The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.*

*NOTE: Detail any COVID-19 project interventions that should be included in the scope of the evaluation.*

### **4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

*NOTE: In this section, incorporate any adjusted evaluative approaches/methodologies, as relevant, that may be needed to implement the evaluation effectively, including safety guidance, extended desk reviews, primary use of national consultants and virtual stakeholder meetings and virtual interviews by evaluators. These methodologies and approaches plus any limitations faced during the TE process must be detailed in the TE Inception Report and final TE report*

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

The TE team 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 team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team 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 team 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 *UNDP Indonesia Country Office, Ministry of Industry, GEF Operational Focal Point, Ministry of National Planning and Development, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Downstream Plastic Industry Association of Indonesia (APHINDO)*; 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 team is expected to conduct field missions to *Jakarta, Indonesia*, including the following project sites *in Cirebon, Depok, Bandung, Malang, and Banyuwangi*.

If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the TE is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final TE report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the TE schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the TE and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team 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 team must, however, 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 team.

*(Note: The TOR should retain enough flexibility for the evaluation team to determine the best methods and tools for collecting and analysing data. For example, the TOR might suggest using questionnaires, field visits and interviews, but the evaluation team should be able to revise the approach in consultation with the evaluation manager and key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in the TE Inception Report.)*

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.

## **5. 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 [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects](#). 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 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

### 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 team 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 and worst 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 team 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 include results related to 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 Reducing Releases of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDEs) and Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) Originating from Unsound Waste Management and Recycling Practices and the Manufacturing of Plastics in Indonesia**

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating <sup>1</sup>
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	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

## 6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *25 days* over a time period of *2 months* starting on *1<sup>st</sup> August 2020*. TE timeframe is flexible recognizing there will be possible delay due to COVID-19. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
(14 <sup>th</sup> August 2020)	Application closes
(20 <sup>th</sup> August 2020)	Selection of TE team

<sup>1</sup> Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating 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)



(28 <sup>th</sup> August 2020)	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
(1 <sup>st</sup> -3 <sup>rd</sup> September 2020) 3 days (recommended 2-4)	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
(8 <sup>th</sup> September 2020) 1 day	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
(14 <sup>th</sup> -23 <sup>rd</sup> September 2020) 10 days (recommended 7-15)	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
(25 <sup>th</sup> September 2020)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
(28 <sup>th</sup> September-9 <sup>th</sup> October 2020) 10 days (recommended 5-10)	Preparation of draft TE report
(12 <sup>th</sup> October 2020)	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
(14 <sup>th</sup> October 2020)	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
(16 <sup>th</sup> October 2020)	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
(date)	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)
(21 <sup>st</sup> October 2020)	Expected date of full TE completion

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

## 7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2020	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2020	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report ( <i>using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C</i> ) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: 9 <sup>th</sup> October 2020	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: 21 <sup>st</sup> October 2020	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

		have not) been addressed in the final TE report ( <i>See template in ToR Annex H</i> )		
--	--	--	--	--

\*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.<sup>2</sup>

## 8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

*The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Indonesia. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.*

## 9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

*The evaluation team will be composed of one International and one National evaluators. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The International Consultant shall be the team leader, with the national consultant having a supportive role compiling information as required. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.*

### Education

- Master's degree in *chemical science, chemical engineering, natural science, environment science, environmental engineering* or other closely related field;

### Experience

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies (10 marks);
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios for at least 7 years (10 marks);
- Competence in adaptive management, especially on hazardous chemicals or Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) (10 marks);
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations for at least 5 years (5 marks);
- Experience working in Asian countries preferably in Indonesia for at least 3 years (5 marks)

<sup>2</sup> Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years including experience on project monitoring and evaluation (10 marks);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and hazardous chemicals; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (10 marks);
- Excellent communication skills (10 marks);
- Demonstrable analytical skills (10 marks);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (10 marks)
- *Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.*

### Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

## **10. EVALUATOR ETHICS**

The TE team 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.

## **11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

## 12. APPLICATION PROCESS<sup>3</sup>

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)<sup>4</sup> provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)<sup>5</sup>);
- c) 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)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). 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.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of *Reducing Releases of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDE) and Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) Originating from Unsound Waste Management and Recycling Practices and the Manufacturing of Plastics in Indonesia*" or by email at the following address ONLY: [bids.id@undp.org](mailto:bids.id@undp.org) by 14<sup>th</sup> August 2020, 23:59 Jakarta (UTC+7) time. 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

---

<sup>3</sup> Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

<sup>4</sup><https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11\\_Personal\\_history\\_form.doc](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)

(COVID) TE ToR for GEF-Financed Projects – Standard Template for UNDP Procurement Site – June 2020

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.

### **13. TOR ANNEXES**

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- 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)*

<p><b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD Expected CPAP Outcome(s):</b> Responsible national institutions and relevant stakeholders are more effective in managing environmental resources and addressing environmental pollution (CPAP 2011-2015 Outcome 2.1.)</p>
<p><b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b> Strategy and Guidelines developed for the protection of the Environment focusing on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP) reduction (CPAP 2011-2015 Output 2.1.3)</p>
<p><b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</b></p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b> GEF-5 Chemicals Strategy: Objective 1: Phase out POPs and Reduce POPs Releases.</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> Outcome 1.1 Production and use of controlled POPs chemicals phased out. Outcome 1.3 POPs releases to the environment reduced. Outcome 1.5 Country capacity built to effectively phase out and reduce releases of POPs.</p>
<p><b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> <u>Indicator 1.1</u> Amount of POPs not produced or used following demonstration of alternative; measured in tons per year against baseline as recorded through the POPs tracking tool. <u>Indicator 1.3</u> Amount of un-intentionally produced POPs releases avoided or reduced from industrial and nonindustrial sectors; measured in grams TEQ against baseline as recorded through the POPs tracking tool. <u>Indicator 1.5.1</u> 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.</p>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
<p><b>Project Objective:</b> Reduce releases of PBDEs and UPOPs by improving overall life-cycle management of plastics and PBDEs-containing plastics through the introduction of alternatives to PBDEs in plastics manufacturing processes and the application of BAT/BEP in plastics recycling and disposal practices.</p>						

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Reduced PBDEs and UPOPs releases resulting from unsound waste management practices through the adoption and implementation of standards/measures, policies, plans and regulations	Technical by-laws and guidelines on PBDE handling and management.	No PBDE guidelines developed for industry, recyclers or 'waste handlers.	Technical by-laws covering all PBDE life-cycle stages adopted.	Technical by-laws on PBDEs integrated in industrial operations as well as industrial and environmental inspections	Official Gazette. Industrial and environmental inspection protocols and reports	Risk: Delay in adoption as overlapping mandates of ministries Assumption: Project's multi-stakeholder coordination will ensure coordination and agreement between the ministries.
	National Standard on maximum PBDE concentration in products	No National Standard concerning PBDEs exist.	PBDE National Standard developed and adopted			
	Functioning Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) scheme for PBDE containing product groups	The article 15 of Law No. 18/2008 provides legal basis but not applied for PBDE containing plastic yet.	Draft EPR for E-waste plastics adopted	Functioning EPR for e-waste functioning with funding directed to plastic recyclers	Official Gazette. Publications of Ministries of Finance and Environment	Risk: Industry and commerce sectors opposition to EPR and consequent delays.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Sufficient national technical expertise built to meet challenges with PDBEs in manufacturing and plastic raw material recycling	Level of understanding of PBDEs in industry and preparedness to their management	First indicative PBDE inventories compiled in NIP and PPG phase.	Detailed PBDE inventories compiled and industry expert rosters for PBDE management disseminated	Industry experts providing guidance and services for switch to PBDE free flame retardants	Project documentation with full inventory.	Assumption: PBDE use in industry more predominant than initial surveys indicate
<b>Outcome 2.2:</b> PBDE releases to the environment from the manufacturing sector reduced through phase out and introduction of PBDE avoiding quality control of raw material and awareness raising	Number of plastic manufacturers having comprehensive raw material checks for PBDEs	Larger better equipped plastic manufacturers checking all, both virgin and recycled, raw materials	Quality control training established. 20 companies have participated in trainings.	200 companies have benefited from quality control training to ensure raw material is PBDE free.	Project reports  Training participants lists.	
<b>Outcome 3.1:</b> Reduced releases of PBDEs as a result of improved handling, storage, recycling and disposal of PBDEs containing wastes and products through the introduction of	Number of plastic recyclers whose capacity to identify PBDEs and process plastic waste to BAT/BEP is increased:	Rudimentary techniques for plastic processing applied in plastic recycling clusters. No PBDE identification.	PBDE plastic identification equipment and practices introduced. Company wise process amelioration plan done at all	PBDE plastic routinely set aside. BAT/BEP applied at all target processors	Project assessment and training reports.  Municipal environmental inspector reports	Assumption: critical number of plastic processors willing and able to invest in BAT/BEP.



	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
BAT/BAP in the plastics recycling sector.	Target: 12 processors in 2 clusters.		12 selected processors			
<b>Outcome 3.2:</b> Reduced releases of UPOPs as a result of improved raw material (recycled plastics) supply chains as well as the introduction of environmentally sound disposal practices at recycling entities.	Tonnage of PBDE containing plastic separated and safely disposed.  Target:1,000 metric tons	No separation of PBDE containing plastic.	Regular re-collection systems set-up. 50 tons of PBDE plastic safely disposed.	1,000 tons of PBDE containing plastic waste safely disposed.	Receipt and disposal certificate	Risk: Establishment of routine identification scheme takes longer than anticipated to reach goals.
<b>Outcome 4.1:</b> PBDEs and UPOPs releases to the environment reduced through the implementation of appropriate disposal	Number of mini-depos for waste separation established at communities: Target 8	Mini-depos demonstrated in urban areas.	All communities to build mini-depos selected. 4 mini depos built out of which 2 fully operational.	All 8 mini-depos fully operational.	Project documents verification of operational mini-depos	Risk: making mini-depos commercially viable in low income communities.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
options for hazardous and unrecyclable plastic waste fractions from both formal and informal recyclers and waste collectors.	Tonnage of waste diverted from river dumping:  Target: 8 tons a week	10 tons/week of waste is dumped in Surabaya river. About 3 tons is dumped in Cikapundung River weekly	Information, outreach and waste management plans completed. Waste separated at household level.	8 tons of separated household waste composted and sellable fractions sold.	Mini-depo book-keeping. Sold waste. Expert estimations	Assumption: mini-depos established partly at riverbank communities
	Additional tonnage of MSW undergoing sanitary landfilling and waste to energy treatment in Surabaya and Bandung  Target: 250,000 t/a	Bandung has more than 1,000 tons a day of waste is being landfilled. 750 tons/day is not collected. Surabaya generates 2,400 tons MSW. 1,200 tons/day landfilled.	Additional 100,000 t per year MSW collected and disposed.  = 3 g I-TEQ/a	Additional 250,000 t per year MSW collected and disposed.  = 10 g I-TEQ/a	Municipality solid waste authority records.	Risk: Waste to energy project in Bandung and landfill enlargement in Surabaya delayed.
<b>Outcome 5:</b> Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation.	M&E and adaptive management applied to project in response to needs, mid-term evaluation findings with	No Monitoring and Evaluation system, nor evaluation of project output and outcomes.	Monitoring and Evaluation system developed during first year. Mid-term evaluation of project output and outcomes	Final evaluation carried out.	Inception workshop report. APR/PIR. Independent mid-term and Final evaluation report.	None.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
	lessons learned extracted.		conducted with lessons learnt.			

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

#	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	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
14	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
15	Audit reports
16	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
17	Sample of project communications materials
18	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
19	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
20	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)
21	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
22	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
23	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
24	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
25	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
26	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes

## **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<sup>6</sup>)

#### 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

#### 4.2 Project Results

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
- Relevance (\*)
- Effectiveness (\*)
- Efficiency (\*)
- Overall Outcome (\*)
- Country ownership
- Gender
- Other Cross-cutting Issues
- Social and Environmental Standards
- 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 Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

#### 5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

#### 6. Annexes

---

<sup>6</sup> See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Summary of field visits
- 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

*NOTE: Include COVID-19 specific questions, as needed.*

<b>Evaluative Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Sources</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
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?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
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?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring &amp; Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

## 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:	Relevance ratings:	Impact
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>	<p>2 = Relevant (R)</p> <p>1 = Not Relevant (NR)</p>	<p>3 = Significant (S)</p> <p>2 = Minimal (M)</p> <p>1 = Negligible (N)</p>
<p>Additional ratings where relevant:</p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>			

## ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

<b>Terminal Evaluation Report for (Project Title &amp; UNDP PIMS ID) Reviewed and Cleared By:</b>	
<b>Commissioning Unit (M&amp;E Focal Point)</b>	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
<b>Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)</b>	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

## ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE Team 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 Reducing Releases of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDE) and Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) Originating from Unsound Waste Management and Recycling Practices and the Manufacturing of Plastics in Indonesia (UNDP Project PIMS #5073)**

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 team response and actions taken


## Annexes to Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

Templated 2 - formatted for the [UNDP Jobs website](#)

- **ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework**
- **ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team**
- **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 and TE Ratings Table**
- **ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form**
- **ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail template**

### ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

*(Insert the project's results framework)*

<b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD Expected CPAP Outcome(s):</b> Responsible national institutions and relevant stakeholders are more effective in managing environmental resources and addressing environmental pollution (CPAP 2011-2015 Outcome 2.1.)
<b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b> Strategy and Guidelines developed for the protection of the Environment focusing on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP) reduction (CPAP 2011-2015 Output 2.1.3)
<b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</b>
<b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b> GEF-5 Chemicals Strategy: Objective 1: Phase out POPs and Reduce POPs Releases.
<b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> Outcome 1.1 Production and use of controlled POPs chemicals phased out. Outcome 1.3 POPs releases to the environment reduced. Outcome 1.5 Country capacity built to effectively phase out and reduce releases of POPs.

**Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:**

Indicator 1.1 Amount of POPs not produced or used following demonstration of alternative; measured in tons per year against baseline as recorded through the POPs tracking tool.

Indicator 1.3 Amount of un-intentionally produced POPs releases avoided or reduced from industrial and nonindustrial sectors; measured in grams TEQ against baseline as recorded through the POPs tracking tool.

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		
<b>Project Objective:</b> Reduce releases of PBDEs and UPOPs by improving overall life-cycle management of plastics and PBDEs-containing plastics through the introduction of alternatives to PBDEs in plastics manufacturing processes and the application of BAT/BEP in plastics recycling and disposal practices.						
<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Reduced PBDEs and UPOPs releases resulting from unsound waste management practices through the adoption and implementation of standards/measures, policies, plans and regulations	Technical by-laws and guidelines on PBDE handling and management.  National Standard on maximum PBDE concentration in products	No PBDE guidelines developed for industry, recyclers or 'waste handlers'.  No National Standard concerning PBDEs exist.	Technical by-laws covering all PBDE life-cycle stages adopted.  PBDE National Standard developed and adopted	Technical by-laws on PBDEs integrated in industrial operations as well as industrial and environmental inspections	Official Gazette. Industrial and environmental inspection protocols and reports	Risk: Delay in adoption as overlapping mandates of ministries Assumption: Project's multi-stakeholder coordination will ensure coordination and agreement between the ministries.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
	Functioning Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) scheme for PBDE containing product groups	The article 15 of Law No. 18/2008 provides legal basis but not applied for PBDE containing plastic yet.	Draft EPR for E-waste plastics adopted	Functioning EPR for e-waste functioning with funding directed to plastic recyclers	Official Gazette.  Publications of Ministries of Finance and Environment	Risk: Industry and commerce sectors opposition to EPR and consequent delays.
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Sufficient national technical expertise built to meet challenges with PDBEs in manufacturing and plastic raw material recycling	Level of understanding of PBDEs in industry and preparedness to their management	First indicative PBDE inventories compiled in NIP and PPG phase.	Detailed PBDE inventories compiled and industry expert rosters for PBDE management disseminated	Industry experts providing guidance and services for switch to PBDE free flame retardants	Project documentation with full inventory.	Assumption: PBDE use in industry more predominant than initial surveys indicate
<b>Outcome 2.2:</b> PBDE releases to the environment from the manufacturing sector reduced through phase out and introduction of PBDE avoiding quality control of raw material and awareness raising	Number of plastic manufacturers having comprehensive raw material checks for PBDEs	Larger better equipped plastic manufacturers checking all, both virgin and recycled, raw materials	Quality control training established. 20 companies have participated in trainings.	200 companies have benefited from quality control training to ensure raw material is PBDE free.	Project reports  Training participants lists.	

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
<p><b>Outcome 3.1:</b> Reduced releases of PBDEs as a result of improved handling, storage, recycling and disposal of PBDEs containing wastes and products through the introduction of BAT/BAP in the plastics recycling sector.</p>	<p>Number of plastic recyclers whose capacity to identify PBDEs and process plastic waste to BAT/BEP is increased: Target: 12 processors in 2 clusters.</p>	<p>Rudimentary techniques for plastic processing applied in plastic recycling clusters. No PBDE identification.</p>	<p>PBDE plastic identification equipment and practices introduced. Company wise process amelioration plan done at all 12 selected processors</p>	<p>PBDE plastic routinely set aside. BAT/BEP applied at all target processors</p>	<p>Project assessment and training reports.  Municipal environmental inspector reports</p>	<p>Assumption: critical number of plastic processors willing and able to invest in BAT/BEP.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 3.2:</b> Reduced releases of UPOPs as a result of improved raw material (recycled plastics) supply chains as well as the introduction of environmentally sound disposal practices at recycling entities.</p>	<p>Tonnage of PBDE containing plastic separated and safely disposed.  Target:1,000 metric tons</p>	<p>No separation of PBDE containing plastic.</p>	<p>Regular re-collection systems set-up. 50 tons of PBDE plastic safely disposed.</p>	<p>1,000 tons of PBDE containing plastic waste safely disposed.</p>	<p>Receipt and disposal certificate</p>	<p>Risk: Establishment of routine identification scheme takes longer than anticipated to reach goals.</p>



	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
<b>Outcome 4.1:</b> PBDEs and UPOPs releases to the environment reduced through the implementation of appropriate disposal options for hazardous and unrecyclable plastic waste fractions from both formal and informal recyclers and waste collectors.	Number of mini-depos for waste separation established at communities: Target 8	Mini-depos demonstrated in urban areas.	All communities to build mini-depos selected. 4 mini depos built out of which 2 fully operational.	All 8 mini-depos fully operational.	Project documents verification of operational mini-depos	Risk: making mini-depos commercially viable in low income communities.
	Tonnage of waste diverted from river dumping:  Target: 8 tons a week	10 tons/week of waste is dumped in Surabaya river. About 3 tons is dumped in Cikapundung River weekly	Information, outreach and waste management plans completed. Waste separated at household level.	8 tons of separated household waste composted and sellable fractions sold.	Mini-depo book-keeping. Sold waste. Expert estimations	Assumption: mini-depos established partly at riverbank communities
	Additional tonnage of MSW undergoing sanitary landfilling and waste to energy treatment in Surabaya and Bandung  Target: 250,000 t/a	Bandung has more than 1,000 tons a day of waste is being landfilled. 750 tons/day is not collected. Surabaya generates 2,400 tons MSW. 1,200 tons/day landfilled.	Additional 100,000 t per year MSW collected and disposed.  = 3 g I-TEQ/a	Additional 250,000 t per year MSW collected and disposed.  = 10 g I-TEQ/a	Municipality solid waste authority records.	Risk: Waste to energy project in Bandung and landfill enlargement in Surabaya delayed.
<b>Outcome 5:</b>	M&E and adaptive	No Monitoring and Evaluation	Monitoring and Evaluation	Final evaluation carried out.	Inception workshop report.	None.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets		Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
			Mid-term	End of project		
Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation.	management applied to project in response to needs, mid-term evaluation findings with lessons learned extracted.	system, nor evaluation of project output and outcomes.	system developed during first year. Mid-term evaluation of project output and outcomes conducted with lessons learnt.		APR/PIR. Independent mid-term and Final evaluation report.	

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

#	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	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
14	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
15	Audit reports
16	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
17	Sample of project communications materials
18	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
19	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
20	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)
21	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
22	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
23	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
24	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
25	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
26	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes

## **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<sup>1</sup>)

#### 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

#### 4.2 Project Results

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)
- Relevance (\*)
- Effectiveness (\*)
- Efficiency (\*)
- Overall Outcome (\*)
- Country ownership
- Gender
- Other Cross-cutting Issues
- Social and Environmental Standards
- 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 Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

#### 5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

#### 6. Annexes

---

<sup>1</sup> See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Summary of field visits
- 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

*NOTE: Include COVID-19 specific questions, as needed.*

<b>Evaluative Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Sources</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
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?			
<i>(include evaluative questions)</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
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?			
<i>(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring &amp; Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)</i>			

## **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:	Relevance ratings:	Impact
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>	<p>2 = Relevant (R)</p> <p>1 = Not Relevant (NR)</p>	<p>3 = Significant (S)</p> <p>2 = Minimal (M)</p> <p>1 = Negligible (N)</p>
<p>Additional ratings where relevant:</p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A)</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>			

## ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

<b>Terminal Evaluation Report for (Project Title &amp; UNDP PIMS ID) Reviewed and Cleared By:</b>	
<b>Commissioning Unit (M&amp;E Focal Point)</b>	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
<b>Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)</b>	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

## ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

The following is a template for the TE Team 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 Reducing Releases of Polybromodiphenyl Ethers (PBDE) and Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) Originating from Unsound Waste Management and Recycling Practices and the Manufacturing of Plastics in Indonesia (UNDP Project PIMS #5073)**

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 team response and actions taken
