**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)**

**for UNDP-supported GEF-financed project**

**Job title: International Consultant on Project Terminal Evaluation**

**Project title:** **Elimination of obsolete pesticide stockpiles and addressing POPs contaminated sites within a sound chemicals management framework (PIMS #4905)**

**Project: Output ID: 00091031 / Project ID: 00081909**

**Contract modality: Individual Contract (IC)**

**Duration: mid-April – mid-September 2021 (estimated 25 consultancy days)**

**Duty station: Home based and one mission to Armenia (alternatively distant support,**   **depending on COVID-19 restrictions)**

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 “**Elimination of obsolete pesticide stockpiles and addressing POPs contaminated sites within a sound chemicals management framework” (PIMS #4905)** implemented through the UNDP jointly with the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Emergency Situations, in partnership with the staff of the Deputy Prime Minister’s office, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia, with other line ministries and with Yerevan Municipality. The project started on May 26, 2015 and is in its sixth 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’ (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf> ).

1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

The objective of the project is to protect human health and the environment globally as well as locally through elimination of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and obsolete pesticide (OP) stockpiles and addressing associated contaminated sites within a sound chemical’s management framework. The project is directed jointly by the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry Emergency Situations in partnership with Yerevan Municipality, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Health. The project was designed to meet this objective by eliminating a large POPs pesticide burial site that represents the major POPs stockpile and waste legacy for the country. In total, approximately 4,123 tons of POPs waste in the form of heavily contaminated soil, 1,052 tons of POPs pesticides and other obsolete pesticides needed to be recovered, secured and ultimately treated and destroyed in an environmentally sound manner. A further 8,500 tons of less severely POPs contaminated soil was identified to be securely contained. Additionally, the project intended to provide critically needed hazardous waste infrastructure and national technical capability for the ongoing management of POPs and other chemical hazardous wastes as well as supporting the strengthening of institutional and regulatory capacity within the overall chemicals’ management framework.

The project objective was planned to be achieved through the four main components:

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

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

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

**Component 4:** Project Monitoring and Evaluation

The project contributes to:

* **UNDAF Outcome 7 and CP Outcome 4 (13), CPAP Output 1.3**: “By 2020, sustainable development principles and good practices for environmental sustainability resilience building, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and green economy are introduced and applied”.
* **Strategic Plan 2018-21 Outcome 1:** Advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions

**Output: 1.4.1.** Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains.

The project contributes to the following **SDGs**:

[Goal 9: Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure](http://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/envision2030-goal9.html)

[Goal 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities](http://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/envision2030-goal11.html)

[**Goal 12: Responsible Consumption and Production**](http://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/envision2030-goal12.html)

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

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

The extended end date of the project is 31 December 2021.

1. **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 will promote accountability and transparency and will assess the extent of project accomplishments.

The Terminal Evaluation of the project will be performed in the final year of the project implementation, with purpose to assess what was achieved or if the expected outcome was not achieved during the base and extended years, will determine the reasons for any failure. The TE will consolidate opinion/interpretations of all sides who in this or other way were involved in the project implementation. That will help build a general picture on direct and circumstantial factors affecting the course of the project, considering that over the past three years at least three critical situations: i) “Velvet revolution”; ii) the COVID-19 pandemic; iii) the Nagorno-Karabakh military conflict and regional instability that enormously affected the project implementation processes.

Definitely, after the information collection, the analysis will be an important part of the TE to show lessons and what can be learned for the future similar projects, initiatives, situations. It will be important to also attract as many as possible former officials – who worked closely with the project as Project Management Board members, for a comprehensive opinion collection. Findings of the TE will be shared with stakeholders and will also serve as a useful source of reference for professional networks, the staff of similar projects in other countries, and other practitioners in the area.

The timing of the TE is defined according to the project extended new end date – 31 December 2021. The TE will be conducted during April – September 2021. The mission to Armenia will depend on the COVID-19 situation and the associated travel limitations. However, it’s recommendable to conduct the mission (online or in the country as will be defined) before snap elections in Armenia in June 2021. Besides the fact-finding mission and drafting the report by the TE expert, it is important to consider also the time necessary for the review and feedback to the draft report by stakeholders.

In such evaluations, the face-to-face meeting for conducting in-depth interview is very important to assure the open communication, transparency, completeness of information, etc. However, considering the COVID-19 created limitations, if the mission to Armenia is impossible, the evaluation will be conducted remotely.

1. **TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

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

The TE Evaluator will review the 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 the annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the Evaluator will considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE Evaluator 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 Evaluator 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.

Ideally, the evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Armenia (can be realized depending on elimination of the COVID-19 restrictions). If the smooth travel and in country accommodation, meetings will be possible to arrange without losing mission days, then this will be the preferred arrangement for conducting the evaluation. The alternative format practiced by the CO during the recent year, will be the scheduling and organizing on-line video-interviews with project stakeholders, experts, and beneficiaries.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should consist of interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including (executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, members of the Project Management Board/Advisory Committee, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.), but not limited to:

* UNDP Country Office in Armenia
* Members of the Project Management Board – representing 7 line-ministries, Yerevan Municipality (including former members, as available)
* Contractors and partners of the Project
* Consultants involved in the project

The Nubarashen obsolete pesticides landfill is the only site of the project, so the TE Evaluator may conduct field visit to this site, located in South-East of Yerevan city.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE Evaluator 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 Evaluator 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 Evaluator.

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.

1. **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

*(*[*http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE\_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf*](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf) *)*.

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

1. Project Design/Formulation

* National priorities and country drivenness
* 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

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 (\*)
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) (\*) and Executing Agency (\*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (\*)
* Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

1. 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 Evaluator 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 the 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 Evaluator 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:

**Table 2: Evaluation Ratings for “Elimination of obsolete pesticide stockpiles and addressing POPs contaminated sites within a sound chemicals management framework” full-size project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating\* |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| 1. Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| 1. Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| 1. Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability |  |

\*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)

1. **TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the TE will be **25 effective person-days** over a time period of 22 *weeks* starting from **15 April 2021**. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timeframe in 2021 | Activity |
| ***09 April*** | Application closes |
| ***19 April*** | Selection of TE Evaluator |
| ***27 April*** | Preparation period for TE Evaluator (handover of documentation) |
| ***11 May*** | Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report |
| ***18 May*** | Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; start of TE mission |
| ***During***  ***20 May - 04 June*** | TE remote mission (dates may be adjusted if the visit will be conducted): stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc. |
| ***08 June 2021*** | Mission wrap-up remote meeting & presentation of initial findings (for the visit the date will be adjusted to 04 June); earliest end of TE mission |
| ***30 June*** | Preparation of draft TE report |
| ***20 July*** | Circulation of draft TE report for comments |
| ***30 July*** | Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail, finalization of TE report |
| ***27 August*** | Preparation and Issuance of Management Response |
| ***15 September*** | Expected date of full TE completion |

*If applicable, the options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.*

1. **TE DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Deliverable | Description | Timing | Responsibilities |
| 1 | TE Inception Report | TE Evaluator clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE | No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: ***18 May 2021*** | TE Evaluator submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 2 | Presentation | Initial Findings | End of TE mission:  ***08 June 2021*** | TE Evaluator presents to Commissioning Unit and project management |
| 3 | Draft TE Report | Full draft report *(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)* with annexes | Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission:  ***30 June 2021*** | TE Evaluator submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by 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 have not) been addressed in the final TE report *(See template in ToR Annex H)* | Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report:  ***30 July 2021*** | TE Evaluator submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit |

\*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 - <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

1. **TE ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s TE is the UNDP Armenia Office.

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

1. **TE TEAM COMPOSITION**

The terminal evaluation will be performed by one international evaluator in a team with evaluation support assistant. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. The international evaluator will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report.

As mentioned, one national specialist will assist the international evaluator in organizing and conducting the mission (in the format that will be agreed), in connecting with parties involved in the evaluation and in collecting information, will support with translations (written and oral), will assist in taking notes and will contribute with interpreting interviewee provided information and reflection in the TE report, also will assist in adjusting the TE itinerary.

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 selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Required qualification | Rating points | Weight , % |
| Education | 10 | 10% |
| * Master’s degree in natural, chemical, social sciences, engineering, economics, or other closely related field. Advanced education is considered an asset |
| Experience |  | 50% |
| * Minimum 7 years of relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies | 10 |  |
| * Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios | 5 |
| * Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Chemicals and Waste focal area | 5 |
| * Experience in evaluating projects | 15 |
| * Experience working in CIS countries and in the Caucasus countries | 15 |
| * Minimum 10 years of experience in relevant technical areas | 10 |
| * Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and the Chemicals and Waste Focal Area; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis | 5 |
| * Excellent communication skills | 5 |
| * Demonstrable analytical skills | 5 |
| * Project evaluation/review experience within UN system and GEF financed projects will be considered an asset | 10 |
|  |  |  |
| Language   * Fluency in written and spoken English | 5 | 10% |

1. **EVALUATOR ETHICS**

The TE evaluator 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’ [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines). 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.

1. **PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Deliverable |
| 60 | For deliverables 1, 2, 3.  Payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report and its approval by the Commissioning Unit. |
| 40 | For deliverable 4.  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%[[1]](#footnote-1):

* 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.

1. **APPLICATION PROCESS**

**TE evaluator will be selected from the UNDP RBEC vetted roster**

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

1. **Offeror’s Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability** using the template to be provided by UNDP
2. **CV**, including Education/Qualification, Processional Certification, Employment Records /Experience
3. **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](https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_%20Individual%20Contract_Offerors%20Letter%20to%20UNDP%20Confirming%20Interest%20and%20Availability.docx&action=default). 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։ [silva.abelyan@undp.org](mailto:silva.abelyan@undp.org) indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of **“Elimination of obsolete pesticide stockpiles and addressing POPs contaminated sites within a sound chemicals management framework**” full sized project, no later than day/time indicated in the distribution email. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

1. **TOR ANNEXES**

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

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

| **Objective/Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Mid-term target** | **End-project target** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:** Protection of health and environment through elimination of obsolete pesticide stockpiles and addressing contaminated sites within a sound chemicals management strategy | Obsolete pesticides (OPs) stockpiles including POPs pesticides (Category 1 waste) and highly contaminated soil (Category 2 waste) are securely packaged and/or stored pending elimination; low contaminated soil (Category 3 waste) stored pending backfilling | The major current obsolete pesticides (OPs) stockpile site and major remaining location of POPs pesticides at the Nubarashen burial site is in a state that creates a risk to health and the environment. And has expanded to create a significant contaminated site  Lesser stockpiles and associated site contamination exist unaddressed at 24 OP storehouses  Contaminated soils classified sufficiently to constitute a potent risk remain uncontained at some of these storehouse sites | 1,052 t of obsolete pesticides (OPs) and POPs pesticides (Category 1 waste) excavated, packaged and securely stored pending removal and environmental sound disposal  4,123 t of highly contaminated POPs waste/soil (Category 2 waste) and  8,500 t of POPs low contaminated waste/soil (Category 3 soil) excavated and safeguarded for temporary storage on-site | Removal of 1,052 t of obsolete pesticides (OPs) and POPs pesticides (Category 1 waste) for environmentally sound disposal  4,123 t of Category 2 waste safeguarded and securely stored on-site before treatment  8,500 t of Category 3 waste/soil securely stored on-site before backfilling |
|  | Major stockpiles of OPs and POPs pesticide wastes have been disposed in an environmental sound manner | No elimination of national stockpiles of OPs has been attempted | Commercial arrangements made for the export and disposal of 1,052 t of Category 1 waste  Technology selection and demonstration along with commercial arrangements made for the treatment/disposal of 4,123 t of Category 2 waste | 1,052 t of Category 1 waste exported and disposed  4,123 t of Category 2 waste treated/disposed  8,500 t of Category 3 waste/soil backfilled and monitored at the restored and stabilized Nubarashen ex-burial site |
|  | National legal instruments and regulatory framework for hazardous waste (HW) and contaminated sites are updated with gaps filled, conflicts resolved and consistent with relevant international requirements | Current legal and regulatory framework for HW and contaminated site management has significant gaps and conflicting provisions | Completed analysis and definition of current gaps and requirements for legal and regulatory changes documented and actions agreed  (to be completed when Component 3 inputs received) | Respectively updated regulatory framework for chemical HW management documented |
|  | Core national technical capacity in place relative to HW management, risk assessment and contaminated site management | Limited technical capacity in key areas of expertise and support infrastructure | Identification and documentation of key methodologies and scope for the required risk assessment and initial application in the project activities | Environmental and health risk assessment methodologies documented, disseminated and implemented as part of the national regulatory assessment process for chemical HW and contaminated site management  Professionals in regulatory agencies, academia, NGOs and environmental service providers trained on their application |
|  | Co-financing is available timely to complete the planned activities | Government commitment letter on 16,02 million USD co-financing including in-kind and cash contribution | Development of a plan on timely availability of necessary co-financing cash component developed and agreed with the Government | Timely availability of necessary co-financing cash component |
| **ACTIVITY 1. Capture and Containment of Obsolete Pesticide Stockpiles and Wastes** | | | | |
| **Outcome 1.1:**  Removal of priority OP and POPs pesticides waste from the Nubarashen burial site, secure containment of residual contamination on-site, site stabilization and restoration, with the site secured under appropriate institutional arrangements providing effective access limitations, monitoring and future land use control, all endorsed by an informed public | Detailed site assessment, design documentation, tender specification, implementation procedures including Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) procedures, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and required approvals in place to initiate Nubarashen burial site works | Preliminary site assessment completed during PPG  Conceptual design for waste excavation and containment, site stabilization completed during the PPG  No formal EIA or site approvals initiated | Detailed design with supporting tender documents and site clean-up specifications developed  EIA and formal approvals in place  Operational procedures including EHS procedures in place and utilized | Implementation of designed works, conformance of operational procedures with approved conditions verified |
| Volume of Category 1 waste excavated and removed and volume of Category 2 waste/soil excavated, displaced for temporary secure storage on-site and secure containment in stabilized Nubarashen ex-burial site | An estimated 5,175 t of Category 1 and Category 2 waste is found in and around the Nubarashen burial site  Risk assessments identified the need to ensure removal of high risk POPs waste | Excavation and packaging of 1,052 t Category 1 waste for secure temporary storage on-site  Excavation and safeguarding of 4,123 t of Category 2 waste for secure temporary storage on-site | Removal of 1,052 t Category 1 waste for secure temporary storage  Displacement of 4,123 t of Category 2 waste for secure temporary storage on-site and containment in stabilized Nubarashen ex-burial site after environmentally sound treatment |
| Excavation, displacement and secure storage of 8,500 t of Category 3 soil and backfilling in stabilized Nubarashen ex-burial site | Containment of pure pesticide burial cells compromised  Contamination has spread to soil across and around the Nubarashen site | Excavation, displacement of 8,500 t of Category 3 soil for secure temporary storage on-site | On-site secure permanent backfilling of 8,500 t of Category 3 soil at the restored and stabilized Nubarashen ex-burial site |
| Availability of restoration, monitoring and access control provisions for the Nubarashen burial site and completion of civil works to stabilize the surrounding land and drainage system | Only temporary containment works in place involving basic drainage, and cover of the burial site itself  Site is generally intact but poorly maintained and sparsely vegetated, subject to erosion, drainage blockage and surrounding geotechnical and hydrogeological instability  Basic ground water monitoring capability in place  Site security and access control as part of an emergency measures order but general public access to area permitted | Upgraded and enforced public access controls  Upgraded access roads, security controls and site protection measures suitable for the active excavation and restoration works  Temporary repairs and modification to on-site upstream and downstream drainage to assure minimum water ingress during active site excavation and remediation works | Fully restored site with sustainable phytoremediation vegetation, appropriately fenced and gated with signage including a 100m buffer zone around the former burial site  Upgraded and functional site drainage system  Permanent measures to maintain land stability upstream and downstream of site  Long term monitoring program in place and funded by national budgets  Institutional arrangements made respecting long-term land use of the site and surrounding territory |
|  | Availability of trained capability in the practical handling/management of chemicals HW and contaminated site clean-up | Limited national capability in the practical management of hazardous chemicals wastes and contaminated site clean-up | Training delivered to 20 national technical and regulatory staff in support of Nubarashen burial site HW waste excavation, packaging, secure storage, transportation and site restoration operations | Developed sustainable operational capability in the public and private sector for chemical HW and contaminated site clean-up management |
|  | High level of public awareness, engagement and support for the clean- up activities and ongoing custody and monitoring arrangements for the Nubarashen burial site supported by appropriate awareness products | Limited awareness on the site, risks and activities being undertaken with respect to its clean-up | 3 public consultation events held and 10 public documents/web/media products produced | 5 public consultation events held and 15 public documents/web/media products produced (cumulative numbers)  Survey indicating the views of affected public stakeholders conducted upon completion |
| **Outcome 1.2:** Development of the national chemical hazardous waste (HW) management site and upgrading with secure storage and basic infrastructure capacities to allow the secure storage of chemical HW | Availability of detailed design documentation, tender specification, implementation procedures including EHS procedures, EIA and required approvals to initiate the chemical HW management site development | Ministry of Emergency Situations site in Kotayk marz assessed as suitable for development  Preliminary conceptual design survey and cost estimate complete  Initial public consultation with authorities and local public undertaken | Developed detailed design with supporting tender documents and construction specifications for chemical HW site development  EIA and formal approvals in place  Operational procedures including EHS procedures developed and utilized | Implementation of designed works, conformance of operational procedures with approved conditions verified |
| National chemical HW management site developed and operates to international standards and number of trained and equipped staff for the practical operation of the facility | No suitable chemical HW storage or management facilities available in Armenia | Construction and upgrading works of the national chemical HW management site completed to national and international standards  Training delivered to 10 national technical and regulatory staff in support of national chemical HW facility operations  National chemical HW management site operational and being used for the storage of chemical HW | National chemical HW management site utilized for general chemical HW management activities on a sustainable basis  Sustainable operational capability for chemical HW management facility developed |
| Number of public consultation held and public documents/web/ media products delivered to display high level of public awareness, engagement and enhancement support for the national chemical HW facility activities | Initial public consultations with local authorities and affected public stakeholders undertaken | 3 public consultation events held and 5 public documents/web/media products delivered | 5 public consultation events held and 10 public documents/web/media products delivered |
| **Outcome 1.3:** Remaining significant historical obsolete pesticides (OPs) storehouses addressed, OP stocks packaged and removed and residual site contamination cleaned up | Availability of completed/ documented screening assessments of identified historical OP storehouse stockpile sites and volume of OP stockpiles and cleaned residuals packed and removed to storage | Fragmented historical assessment and inventory work consolidated for project preparation  24 OP stockpile sites identified and up to 6 sites considered priorities for substantive clean-up  Preliminary commitment for EU funding of initial work pending | EU/Ministry of Agriculture - MoA/FAO administered site assessment, packaging and surficial clean-up undertaken to make available 150 t of OPs and residuals for storage and environmentally sound disposal arranged by FAO  Public consultation conducted at priority OP storehouse sites | Under MoA supervision the former priority OP storehouse sites are maintained for other productive uses |
| Availability of completed/ documented detailed contaminated site and risk assessments and remediation/clean-up designs on identified priority storehouse sites and a number of public consultation events held at number of priority storehouse sites and public acceptance of actions | Limited site assessment work done by local and international NGOs  No dedicated public consultation activities on priority sites to date | Preliminary site assessment reports received from MoA and reviewed/evaluated  Priority OP storehouse sites for substantive clean-up agreed with MoA and MNP | Detailed contaminated site and risk assessments and remediation/clean-up designs on identified up to 6 priority OP storehouse sites completed/documented  6 public consultation events held in the communities of 6 priority OP storehouse sites |
| Volume of OPs stockpiles packed, removed from a number of priority OP storehouse sites and residual site contamination cleaned-up | No clean-up activity undertaken at any OP storehouse site | No action | Excavation/removal, disposal and/or containment of up to 150 t of POPs waste from up to 6 priority OP storehouse sites completed |
| **ACTIVITY 2. Obsolete Pesticide Stockpile and Waste Elimination** | | | | |
| **Outcome 2.1:**  Export and environmentally sound disposal of Category 1 waste | Volume of Category 1 waste exported and disposed under an environmentally sound | No destruction of POPs pesticides, POPs wastes or OPs yet undertaken | International pre-qualification of Category 1 waste disposal facility, tender and contract documents prepared and implemented  Export from Armenia and environmentally sound disposal of 1,052 t Category 1 waste for destruction at a qualified disposal facility | Environmentally sound disposal of any contingency volumes of Category 1 waste at a qualified disposal facility |
| **Outcome 2.2:** Environmentally sound treatment of Category 2 waste/soil | Volume of treated Category 2 waste below the low POPs content and demonstration of commercial viability of the Category 2 waste/soil treatment technology in Armenia | No highly contaminated soil treatment/remediation facilities available in the country | International pre-qualification of Category 2 waste treatment technology, tender and contract documents prepared and implemented  Waste treatability testing of candidate shortlisted technologies completed  Site preparation arrangements for hosting the feasible technology as required completed | Environmentally sound treatment of 4,123 t of Category 2 waste to levels below the low POPs content |
| Number of national technical personnel completed operational training, availability of service providers of a modern contaminated soil treatment technology | No currently qualified technical personnel or service providers in Armenia for treatment of POPs contaminated soil | 20 national technical personnel trained on a modern contaminated soil treatment technology | 20 national technical personnel qualified on a modern contaminated soil treatment technology operation |
| **ACTIVITY 3. Institutional and Regulatory Capacity Strengthening for Sound Chemicals Management and Contaminated Sites** | | | | |
| **Outcome 3.1:** Legal/regulatory and technical guidance tools for management of chemical wastes, including POPs, and, contaminated sites management within a national sound chemicals management framework strengthened | Policies, legislation and regulatory measures respecting chemical HW and contaminated sites management reviewed, updated and appropriate revisions implemented | Basic framework legislation in place but has gaps, inconsistencies and conflicts with international standards and obligations under Stockholm and Basel Conventions | Systematic review and clarification of existing legislation and regulations on chemical HW and contaminated sites management completed  Action plan for streamlining and filling gaps in existing legislation consistent with international practice adopted and implemented | List of project specific legislative and regulatory review measures |
| Availability of technical guidance on environmental and health risk assessment methodologies and practices applicable to chemical HW and contaminated sites and on operational and EHS procedures for chemical HW handling, transport, storage and disposal, developed in accordance with international practices and a number of relevant national personnel trained | While requirements exist in legislation requiring technical guidelines on operational safety procedures for hazardous chemicals waste handling, transport, storage and disposal to be in place these have not been developed and adopted  Limited national expertise exists in implementation of operational procedures for HW management  No nationally adopted guidance materials exist for environmental and health risk assessment | Draft guidance materials on environmental and health risk assessment methodologies and practices applicable to chemical HW and contaminated sites developed in accordance with international practice prepared and reviewed  Draft guidance materials on operational and EHS procedures for chemical HW handling, transport, storage and disposal consistent with international practices prepared and reviewed  Training program on chemical HW handling, transport, storage and disposal developed  Training sessions involving at least 10 train-the-trainers is undertaken | Guidance materials on environmental and health risk assessment methodologies/practices and on operational and EHS procedures applicable to chemical HW and contaminated sites handling, transport, storage and disposal consistent with international practice adopted and implemented  At least 50 relevant technical professionals from regulatory authorities, academia, NGOs and environmental service provider personnel in regulatory and private sectors attained relevant certification for completion of the national training program |
| **Outcome 3.3:**  Basic national capacity for effective POPs containing hazardous chemicals sampling and analysis developed, operational to be certified to international standards | Availability of adopted national strategy for rationalization and upgraded national laboratory capability to serve a sound chemicals management framework focusing for POPs analysis and management | Highly fragmented under-equipped and resourced laboratory infrastructure distributed across the regulatory, academic and private sector  Lack of fully creditable capability to service the needs of regulators and the industrial/private sector | National laboratory enhancement strategy developed, endorsed by major institutional and public stakeholders and endorsed for implementation by the government | National laboratory enhancement strategy supporting the availability of capability for effective hazardous chemicals sampling and analysis for sound POPs chemicals management implemented |
| Number of designated national laboratories upgraded with suitable capability for POPs hazardous chemical waste sampling/analysis and number of laboratory personnel completed training program | Reasonably good but somewhat outdated capability in MNP regulatory laboratory and one modern academic laboratory.  Growing number of private sector laboratories  Variable levels of training and qualifications in existing laboratory personnel | Selection of 2 designated laboratories from regulatory and academic/private sector for upgrading  Approved specifications and plans for upgrading of designated laboratories  10 technical personnel from designated laboratories and regulatory institutions trained | 2 designated laboratories upgraded and operational  Long term national budget commitments and/or business plans in place ensuring sustainable operation of upgraded laboratories  15 technical laboratory personnel from designated laboratories and regulatory institutions completed training program |
| Number of designated national laboratories initiated introduction of international certification methods and practices | Only one laboratory operating with partial internationally certified methods | 1 designated laboratory initiated introduction of international certification methods and practices for POPs analysis | 2 designated laboratories initiated introduction of international certification methods and practices for POPs analysis |
| **Activity 4. Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation** | | | | |
| **Outcome 4:** Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach, and evaluation | M&E and adaptive management applied to project in response to needs, mid-term evaluation findings with lessons learned extracted | No Monitoring and Evaluation system  No evaluation of project output and outcomes | Monitoring and Evaluation system developed  Mid-term evaluation of project output and outcomes conducted with lessons learned | Final evaluation report developed in the end of the project |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | 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**

1. 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

1. Acknowledgements
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms and Abbreviations
4. 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

1. 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

1. 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

1. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating[[2]](#footnote-2))

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
  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)
  1. 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

1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

* Main Findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons Learned

1. 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 at 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, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)* | *(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 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 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings Table** | |
| 1. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating[[3]](#footnote-3) |
| M&E design at entry |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  |
| Overall Quality of M&E |  |
| 1. Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight |  |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution |  |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution |  |
| 1. Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance |  |
| Effectiveness |  |
| Efficiency |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  |
| 1. Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources |  |
| Socio-political/economic |  |
| Institutional framework and governance |  |
| Environmental |  |
| Overall Likelihood of 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 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 “Elimination of obsolete pesticide stockpiles and addressing POPs contaminated sites within a sound chemicals management framework” UNDP Project PIMS #4905**

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 Evaluator’s**  **response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE Evaluator as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE Evaluator, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit’s senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

   <https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See ToR Annex F for rating scales. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)