

Mid-Term Review Terms of Reference (MTR)

Project Name: National Program for the environmental Sound Management and Live Cycle Management of Chemical Substances – PNGQ, for its acronym in Spanish

Functional Name: Independent consultancy for the Midterm Review (MTR)

Duration: 60 business days of effective work within a period of up to 90 calendar days

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the terms of reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the Full-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed project titled *National Program for the environmental Sound Management and Live Cycle Management of Chemical Substances* (PIMS 5706) implemented through the Ministry of the Environment and Water of Ecuador (MAAE, for its acronym in Spanish), which is to be undertaken in 2021. The project started on August 17th, 2018 and it is in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated after the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*¹.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project arises through the Government of Ecuador's request for assistance from the GEF and UNDP to protect human health and the environment by improving the sound life-cycle management (LCM) of chemicals of concern, with a particular focus on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and mercury (Hg). Both are persistent substances that do not readily break down in the environment, bio-accumulate in the food chain and can travel long distances far away from the place where they have been released. Because of their detrimental impact on human and environmental health, they are considered a global threat, impacting poor communities the most, because they face the highest risk of exposure due to their occupations, living conditions and reliance on polluted water and food. The objective of the project is to protect human health and the global environment from the impact of harmful chemicals, in particular Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and mercury (Hg).²

The project aims to achieve a reduction in the use and release of such chemicals by:

- 1) Strengthening national institutional capacity and the regulatory and policy framework for the Sound Management of Chemicals (SMC) founded upon a Life-Cycle Approach, by training 706 people (212 female and 494 male); building the capacity of 12 private and public institutions and revising/developing 16 policies, regulations and standards.
- 2) Eliminating obsolete (POPs) pesticide stockpiles (by 30 tonnes), increasing the sound disposal of empty pesticide containers by 90 tonnes; reducing the use of new POPs contained in products (by 30 tonnes); and, reducing the release of unintentionally produced POPs (by 25 g-TEQ/yr).
- 3) Reducing the use and releases of mercury from Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) at a non-industrial level (by a total of 2 tonnes), and products containing mercury (by 35 ky/yr).
- 4) Raising awareness of 11,778 people (3,533 female and 8,245 male) on the sound management of chemicals in their Life-Cycle Management, ensuring project monitoring and disseminating project

¹ http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf

² PRODOC, page 7.

results and experiences.³

This project contributes to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): SDGs 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15.

Additionally, it contributes to the country outcome 4 included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document, which establishes "by 2018, support has been provided to strengthening institutional and citizen capacities to promote the rights of nature, create conditions for sustainable low-emission development, and improve the resilience and risk management facing the impacts".

Furthermore, this project is linked to output 1.3 of the UNDP Strategic Plan: "Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste"⁴.

The strategies for the expected products from the UNDP Country Program Action Plan, plans, and budget instruments are formulated and applied focused on priority groups, with special emphasis on those affected by gender inequality, the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem goods and services, climate change, the promulgation of resilience, dissemination of sustainable energy alternatives and proper handling of chemicals and contaminants.

The resources allocated to the project by GEF reach US \$8,490,000 which, together with cash and in-kind counterpart resources, total US \$49,061,428, to be expended until August 2023.

In the PRODOC (p. 48, VII Governance and Management Arrangements), it is stated that "As GEF implementing agency, UNDP is ultimately accountable and responsible for the delivery of results, subject to their certification by MAAE, as Implementing Partner. UNDP shall provide project cycle management services as defined by the GEF Council that will include the following:

1. Providing financial and audit services to the project.
2. Overseeing financial expenditures against project budgets.
3. Ensuring that activities including procurement and financial services are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP/GEF procedures.
4. Ensuring that the reporting to the GEF is undertaken in line with GEF requirements and procedures.
5. Facilitate project-learning, exchanges with and outreach within the GEF family.
6. Contract the project mid-term and final evaluations and trigger additional reviews and/or evaluations as necessary and in consultation with the project counterparts".

In the same document (p. 19, Outcome indicator 4.2), it is noted that: "**29 GEF UNDP M&E requirements met and adaptive management applied in response to needs and Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) findings.** GEF and UNDP M&E requirements include: 1 inception workshop conducted and report issued; 5 PIRs completed/submitted; 1 audit completed (frequency as per UNDP Audit policies); 10 project board meetings held; 5 monitoring and supervision missions conducted; 1 Mid-Term GEF Tracking Tool updated; **1 Gender Assessment of project impact completed (as part of MTE); 1 independent Mid-term Review (MTR) conducted (translated into English) and management responses submitted;** 1 GEF Sec oversight missions conducted⁵; 1 Terminal GEF Tracking Tool updated; 1 Independent Terminal Evaluation conducted (translated into English) and management responses submitted".

Taking into consideration that the start date of the project was August 2018, and its end date is scheduled for August 2023, the mid-term evaluation is expected to take place in the first quarter of 2021.

³ PRODOC, page 2.

⁴ PRODOC, page 31. Project Results Framework.

⁵ In March 2020 the Program was visited by a GEF's authorized reviewer, however, the activities were interrupted by the COVID 19 pandemic.

In this context, the Ministry of the Environment and Water of Ecuador, through the Undersecretary of Environmental Quality and the Directorate of Management of chemicals substances, hazardous and non-hazardous residues and wastes, with the support of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) as implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), require hiring a consultancy to perform the mid-term evaluation of the PNGQ project, from the beginning of the project (August 2018), until the mid-date of its execution.

Synoptic Table:

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Project Title: | National Program for the environmental Sound Management and Live Cycle Management of Chemical Substances | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | 9203 | | at endorsement (Million US\$) | At September 2020 (Million US s\$) |
| UNDP Project PIMS ID: | 5706 | GEF Financing: | 8.490.000 | 3.284.138,56* |
| Country | Ecuador | IA / AE own: | | |
| Region: | Latin America | Government: | 36,640,180 | 1.111.082,17* |
| Focal Area: | Ministry of the Environment and Water | Other: | 3,931,248 | 1.035.984,96* |
| Operational Program: | | Total co-financing: | 40,571,428 | 2.147.067,13* |
| Implementing Agency: | PNUD | Total expenditure of the project: | 49,061,428 | 5.431.205,69* |
| Other partners involved: | Ministry of energy and non-renewable natural resources | Signature of the project document (start date of the project): | Tarcisio Granizo, Minister of Environment; Rebeca Illescas, Minister of Mines; Arnaud Peral, UNDP Resident Representative March 22, 2018 | |
| FA Objectives (OS / SP): | To protect human health and the environment by adopting the environmentally sound and live cycle management of chemical substances in Ecuador. This project has 4 components, these are: 1. Strengthen institutional | Closing date (operational): | August, 2023 | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>capacity and the regulatory and policy framework for the Sound Management of Chemicals (SMC) based on a Life-Cycle Approach; 2. Eliminate POPs stockpiles and reduce the use and release of initial and newly listed POPs (including those contained in products); 3. Implementation of measure for reduction and elimination of Hg from priority sectors; and, 4. Raise awareness, ensure project monitoring and disseminate project results and experiences.</p> | | |
|--|---|--|--|

* **Note:** These amounts will be updated at start-up of the MTE.

3. MTR PURPOSE

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure to identify the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project’s strategy, its risks to sustainability and its gender assessment.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

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

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach⁶, ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders⁷ is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to:

Ministry of the Environment and Water of Ecuador (MAAE, for its acronym in Spanish), Ministry of Energy and Non-Renewable Natural Resources (MERNNR, for its acronym in Spanish), Geological and Energy Research Institute (IGE, for its acronym in Spanish), PlanetGold Program, Environmental and Social

⁶ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.

⁷ For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

Remediation Program (PRAS, for its acronym in Spanish) and the Amazon Without Fire Program (PASF, for its acronym in Spanish) which is part of the MAAE, Decentralized Autonomous Governments (Municipality of La Libertad, Prefecture of El Oro and the Artisan Production Association *Orfeoro-ASORF*), Central Bank of Ecuador and BanEcuador B.P (public banks), the Phytosanitary Regulation and Control Agency (AGROCALIDAD, for its acronym in Spanish), the Chemical Producers Association of Ecuador (APROQUE, for its acronym in Spanish), the Crop Protection and Health Industry Association (APCSA, for its acronym in Spanish), the Chamber of Industry for Innovation and Agricultural Technology (INNOVAGRO, for its acronym in Spanish), Heifer Ecuador (NGO), *Jancheras*⁸ Association “Unión y Progreso”, the Metropolitan Public Company for Integral Solid Waste Management (EMGIRS, for its acronym in Spanish) which is part of the Municipality of Quito; as well as other institutions, senior officials and managerial staff, technical and task team/component leaders, key experts and the consultants in the subject area, members of the project’s board of directors, academia, local governments and civil society organizations, etc.

Additionally, the MTR consultant is expected to conduct field missions and meetings with officials and/or technical/specialist teams according to the following table:

| No. | Institution / stakeholder | Location | Number of meetings | Duration of visit | City/Province | Interview/ Field visit |
|-----|---|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | PNGQ Project | Quito | 1 | 1 day | Quito - Pichincha | Interview |
| 2 | UNDP ⁹ | Quito | 2 | | Quito - Pichincha | Interview |
| 3 | 1 Ministry of the Environmental and Water of Ecuador (MAAE) 2 GEF Operational focal point 3 Environmental and Social Remediation Program (PRAS) - MAAE and/or Amazon Without Fire Program (PASF) - MAAE | Quito | 2 | | Quito - Pichincha | Interview |
| 4 | Ministry of Energy and Non-Renewable Natural Resources (MERNNR) | Quito | 1 | 1 day | Quito - Pichincha | Interview |
| 5 | Geological and Energy Research Institute (IGE) | Quito | 1 | | | Field visit |
| 6 | Central Bank of Ecuador | Quito | 1 | | | Interview |
| 7 | Phytosanitary Regulation and Control Agency (AGROCALIDAD) | Quito | 1 | 1 day | Quito - Pichincha | Interview |
| 8 | Chemical Producers Association of Ecuador (APROQUE) | Quito | 1 | | | Interview |
| 9 | Metropolitan Public Company for Integral Solid Waste Management (EMGIRS) | Quito | 1 | | | Field visit |
| 10 | Decentralized Autonomous Government Cayambe (Municipality) | Cayambe | 1 | 1 day | Cayambe - Pichincha | Field visit |
| 11 | Decentralized Autonomous Government La Libertad (Municipality) | La Libertad | 1 | 2 days | La Libertad - Santa Elena | Field visit |

⁸ In Ecuador, the term *Jancheras* refers to women miners who are working in landfills outside of mines, selecting residual ore.

⁹ The evaluator must meet before starting the mission with a high level representative of UNDP, and must interview very broad and strategic topics.

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 12 | Crop Protection and Health Industry Association (APCSA) | Guayaquil | 1 | | Guayaquil - Guayas | Interview |
| 13 | Chamber of Industry for Innovation and Agricultural Technology (INNOVAGRO) | Guayaquil | 1 | | | Interview |
| 14 | Ecuaquímica (Pesticide company) | Guayaquil | 1 | | | Interview |
| 15 | 1 Decentralized Autonomous Government El Oro (Prefecture) 2 Orfeoro Craft Production Association (ASORF) | Machala/ Portovelo | 1 | 2 days | Portovelo-Zaruma/Machala - El Oro | Field visit |
| 16 | APROPLASMIN ¹⁰ | Machala | 1 | | | Interview |
| 17 | Mineral analysis laboratory for strengthening | Portovelo | 1 | | | Field visit |
| 18 | Ore processing plant (EYMEN CORPORATION, other) | Camilo Ponce Enríquez | 1 | 2 days | Camilo Ponce Enríquez - Azuay | Field visit |
| 19 | Heifer Ecuador (NGO) and Jancheras Association “ <i>Union y Progreso</i> ” | Camilo Ponce Enríquez | 1 | | | Field visit |
| Total: | | | 21 interviews | 10 days | | |

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR consultant and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR consultant 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 MTR report.

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

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR consultant will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*¹¹ for extended descriptions.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

¹⁰ Association of owners of beneficiation plants, smelting and refining of mineral substances of the Province of El Oro.

¹¹ Available at:

https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwiH5v6PhrjCAhUN7FMKHRFhBj8QFggmMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fweb.undp.org%2Fevaluation%2Fdocuments%2Fguidance%2FGEF%2Fmid-term%2FGuidance_Midterm%2520Review%2520_EN_2014.pdf&usq=AOvVaw2SqTXXf9AP4ytNKX8CfKrT

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions.
- Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context of achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document (PRODOC).
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women’s groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Log frame:

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

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; color code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red). This information is available as Annex A.

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

| Project Strategy | Indicator ¹² | Baseline Level ¹³ | Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported) | Midterm Target ¹⁴ | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁵ | Achievement Rating ¹⁶ | Justification for Rating |
|-------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Objective: | Indicator (if applicable): | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1: | Indicator 1: | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2: | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 2: | Indicator 3: | | | | | | | |
| | Indicator 4: | | | | | | | |
| | Etc. | | | | | | | |
| Etc. | | | | | | | | |

Indicator Assessment Key

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyze the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify the remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review the overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken on time? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

Work Planning:

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

¹² Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

¹³ Populate with data from the Project Document

¹⁴ If available

¹⁵ Colour code this column only

¹⁶ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Finance and co-finance:

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

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing | Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US\$) | Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$) | Actual % of Expected Amount |
|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL | | | |

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards the achievement of project objectives?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious

constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
 - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
 - The identified types of risks¹⁷ (in the SESP).
 - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

Reporting:

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

Communications & Knowledge Management:

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

iv. Sustainability

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

¹⁷ Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR consultant will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.¹⁸

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

The MTR consultant should make no more than 15 recommendations in total.

Ratings

The MTR consultant will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for rating scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for National Program for the environmental Sound Management and Live Cycle Management of Chemical Substances - PNGQ.

| Measure | MTR Rating | Achievement Description |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Project Strategy | N/A | |
| Progress Towards Results | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |

¹⁸ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.
MTR ToR for GEF-Financed Projects - Standard Template - June 2020

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 4 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Project Implementation & Adaptive Management | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| Sustainability | (rate 4 pt. scale) | |

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be 60 business days of effective work within a period of up to 90 calendar days, starting on the date of the contract signing, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. The time that the reference group, composed by the project's Steering Committee members, takes to review the reports/findings and other documentation is not taken into account in the total duration. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

| TIMEFRAME | ACTIVITY |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <i>Contract signing date</i> | Handover of Project documents. |
| <i>14 days after contract signing</i> | Preparation: Review of Project documents and preparation of MTR inception report in Spanish |
| <i>30 days after contract signing</i> | Evaluation mission: Stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| <i>60 days after contract signing</i> | Draft Evaluation Report: Presentation of initial findings, in Spanish** |
| <i>90 days after contract signing</i> | Final report: MTR report in English and Spanish |

*These are tentative dates. MAAE and UNDP will send comments on deliverables within 10 business days, after reception.

** This report should be reviewed by committee members, the RTA and, in certain cases, the RR.

| TIMEFRAME* | ACTIVITY |
|--------------------------|---|
| <i>January 11, 2021</i> | Application closes |
| <i>February 10, 2021</i> | Select MTR Team |
| <i>February 15, 2021</i> | Contract signing date |
| <i>February 15, 2021</i> | Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents) |
| <i>March 01, 2021</i> | Document review and preparing the MTR Inception Report in Spanish |
| <i>March 12, 2021</i> | Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- the latest start of MTR mission |
| <i>March 26, 2021</i> | MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits |
| <i>March 30, 2021</i> | Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission |
| <i>April 13, 2021</i> | Preparing a draft report and send it to PNGQ |
| <i>April 25, 2021</i> | Review - project's Steering Committee members |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| <i>May 5, 2021</i> | Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report) send it to PNGQ |
| <i>May 17, 2021</i> | Preparation & Issue of Management Responses (PNGQ) |
| <i>May 18, 2021</i> | Concluding Stakeholder Workshop |
| <i>May 19, 2021</i> | Expected date of full MTR completion |

*These are tentative dates.

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

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
|---|---|--|---|
| MTR Inception Report | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method, in Spanish | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to the reference group, composed by the Project's Steering Committee members. |
| Presentation | Initial Findings, in Spanish | End of MTR mission. | Evaluator submits to the reference group. |
| Draft MTR Report | The full report, (per annexed template) with annexes in Spanish | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to the reference group. Also, to be reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs, others |
| Final Report and Management Responses in Spanish and English * | Full report (using guidelines on the content outlined in Annex B) with annexes. Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report, as well as the Management Response matrix, indicating how the recommendations will be addressed. | Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on a draft | Evaluator submits to the reference group for final approval and before uploading to UNDP ERC. |

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

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is the UNDP/GEF Country Office.

The Evaluator will be responsible for all logistics arrangements that his/her field visit could imply (assignment, including daily fee, per diem and travel costs). In addition, he/she will present all documents including the main report and annexes in Spanish first, once they are approved, the Evaluator will translate them and present them in English.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

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

The selection of the consultant will be done following the next criteria:

Education

- Master's degree in environmental sciences, chemical engineering, hazardous waste, mining and related topics.
- Undergraduate degree in environmental sciences, chemical engineering or similar fields.

General experience:

- Work experience in relevant technical areas (chemicals) of at least 8 years.

Specific experience:

- Experience in at least five (5) evaluations that follow result-based management methodologies, including SMART indicators and reconstruction or validating baseline scenarios;
- Verifiable experience in evaluating at least two (2) UNDP or GEF projects, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English and Spanish.

10. ETHICS

The MTR consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The MTR team 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 MTR team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

Payment will be made based on the presentation and approval of the products/deliverables of this consultancy. The products must be delivered, and payments made, according to the following table:

| <i>Products</i> | <i>Timing</i> | <i>Value</i> |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------|
| Product 1 MTR Inception Report | 14 days after contract signing | 20% |
| Product 2 Draft MTR Report | 60 days after contract signing | 40% |
| Product 3 Final MTR Report in English and Spanish approved by the SC and RTA and TE Audit Trail | 90 days after contract signing | 40% |

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%¹⁹:

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

12. APPLICATION PROCESS²⁰

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

The application must be written in Spanish or English and should contain:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)²¹ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)²²);
- 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.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:

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

¹⁹ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the MTR team 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 MTR team, 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

²⁰ Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP:

<https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>

²¹

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

²² http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

MTR ToR for GEF-Financed Projects - Standard Template - June 2020

Evaluation Criteria:

Technical proposals (P11 and technical offer) will weight a maximum of 70% and only the consultants that meet the technical phase with a minimum score of 49/70 or more, will continue to the review of the economic proposal, which will weight a maximum of 30%.

The evaluation criteria are the following:

| Criteria | Points | Percentage |
|--|--------|-------------|
| CVs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General experience • Specific experience | 100 | 30% |
| Technical proposal | 100 | 40% |
| Economic proposal | 100 | 30% |
| | | 100% |

| Rating parameter | Criteria | Score | Percentage |
|--------------------|---|--------------|------------|
| CV | Education: | | 30% |
| | • Master's degree in environmental sciences, chemical engineering, hazardous waste, mining and related topics. | 20 | |
| | • Undergraduate degree in environmental sciences, chemical engineering or similar fields. | 10 | |
| | • Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish and English. | 10 | |
| | General experience: | | |
| | • Work experience in relevant technical areas (chemicals) of at least 8 years. | 20 | |
| | Specific experience: | | |
| | • Experience in at least five (5) evaluations that follow result-based management methodologies, including SMART indicators and reconstruction or validating baseline scenarios | 20 | |
| | • Verifiable experience in evaluating at least two (2) UNDP or GEF projects, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years. | 20 | |
| | TOTAL | 100 | |
| Technical Proposal | Methodology, agenda and implementation schedule: | | 40% |
| | • Appropriate understanding of the nature of work and understanding of the ToR. | 25 | |
| | • Development of the relevant aspects of the work with a sufficient level of detail. | 25 | |
| | • Development of an appropriate conceptual and methodological framework for the work to be performed. | 25 | |
| | • The appropriate sequence of activities and planning. | 25 | |
| | | TOTAL | |

| Economical proposal | Score | Percentage |
|---|------------|------------|
| The highest score (30%) will be awarded to the most economical offer and the inverse proportional to the other offers. | | |
| Only the technical proposal that meets the technical phase with a minimum score of 49/70 or more, will continue to the review of the economic proposal, which will weight a maximum of 30%. | 100 | 30% |

ToR ANNEX A: Table. Progress towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

| This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): SDGs 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15. | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document: Outcome 4: by 2018, support has been provided to strengthening institutional and citizen capacities to promote the rights of nature, create conditions for sustainable low-emission development, and improve the resilience and risk management facing the impacts. | | | | | | | | |
| This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan: <u>Output 1.3:</u> Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste. | | | | | | | | |
| | Objective and Outcome Indicators | Baseline | Mid-term Target | End of Project Target | Assumptions | Midterm level and assessment²³ | Achievement Rating²⁴ | Justification for Rating |
| Project Objective: To protect human health and the environment by adopting the environmentally sound and live cycle management of chemical substances in Ecuador. | 2 new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at the national level. | No new partnerships with funding for sustainable management solutions of chemicals and waste established yet | 2 new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of chemicals and waste established at the national and/or sub-national level. | 2 new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of chemicals and waste established at the national and/or sub-national level. | <i>1 financial institution and 1 legal gold buyer are interested in signing an agreement with the project.</i> | | | |
| | 80 of new jobs created (24 jobs for females and 56 jobs for males) through solutions for the management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste. | 0 new jobs created yet through solutions for the management of chemicals and waste. | 32 new jobs created (9 for females and 23 for males) through solutions for the management of chemicals and waste. | 80 new jobs created (24 for females and 56 for males) through solutions for the management of chemicals and waste. | <i>In addition to jobs created by the project (e.g. project consultancies, CFM) project partners fund jobs for ASGM pilot plan operators and trainers.</i> | | | |
| | 31,187 direct project beneficiaries (9,356 of females and 21,831 of males) for which the risk of hazardous chemicals and waste has been reduced. | 0 direct project beneficiaries. | 9,356 direct project beneficiaries (2,807 female and 6,549 male) for which the risk of hazardous chemicals and waste has been reduced. | 31,187 direct project beneficiaries (9,356 female and 21,831 male) for which the risk of hazardous chemicals and waste has been reduced. | <i>People trained by the project, communities living within a 1 km radius of a cleaned-up contaminated site, and project stakeholders subjected to project awareness campaigns are safeguarded from exposure to chemicals as a result of the project and/or adequately informed to safeguard themselves and their immediate families (of 4).</i> | | | |

²³ Color code this column only

²⁴ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU
MTR ToR for GEF-Financed Projects - Standard Template - June 2020

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Component/Outcome 1 Component 1: Strengthen institutional capacity and the regulatory and policy framework for the Sound Management of Chemicals (SMC) based on a Life-Cycle Approach. | Four (4) financial and capacity building plans developed and implemented and the capacity of 12 private or public entities increased to enable them to address chemicals of concern. | <i>National reporting on POPs and Hg statistics/indicators is done but requires further improvement.</i> <i>Entities with roles/responsibilities about the LCM of chemicals coordinate to some extent, but not with all entities that have such roles/responsibilities.</i> | 2 financial and capacity building plans developed and implemented to benefit private or public entities and enable them to address chemicals of concern. | Four (4) financial and capacity building plans developed and implemented and the capacity of 12 private or public entities increased to enable them to address chemicals of concern. | <i>An inter-ministerial agreement for the establishment of the ICM and its Working Groups is approved during the life-time of the project.</i> | | | |
| | | | 1.1.1 Development of 2 capacity building plans and 2 financial plans to improve the national reporting on statistics/indicators for POPs, Hg and other chemicals of concern. 1.1.2 Interagency Coordinating Mechanism (ICM) and its working groups established to improve coordination, collaboration and decision-making on issues about SMC. 1.1.3 Capacity built of 10 institutions to improve the monitoring of chemicals of concern, Hg, POPs and products containing POPs and Hg through tailored training workshops. ²⁵ 1.1.4 Capacity of two (2) analytical laboratories increased enabling them to comply with the National Accreditation Service requirements. | | | | | |
| | Sixteen (16) policies, regulations and standards to achieve the LCM of chemicals revised and/or developed. | <i>The Government of Ecuador has a fairly sound policy and regulatory framework in place to ensure the LCF of chemicals of concern. However, Ministerial Agreements/Plans and guidelines need to be improved for the mgnt. and phase-out of POPs/Hg in products; mgnt of UPOPs, OPs, contaminated sites, HCWM, ASGM mine closure, ASGM waste mgnt, among others.</i> | 5 policies, regulations and standards to achieve the LCM of chemicals revised and/or developed. | 16 policies, regulations and standards to achieve the LCM of chemicals revised and/or developed. | <i>The project can create sufficient momentum with its partners that Ministerial Agreements, guidelines, standards, national plans and industry incentives not be approved during the lifespan of the project, will be approved after the project has closed.</i> | | | |
| | | | 1.2.1 Three (3) Ministerial Agreements (MAs) and their application guides, to address the LCM of Chemicals revised and/or developed and submitted for approval. 1.2.2 Nine (9) tools (guidelines, standards, methodologies, etc.) for the management of chemicals of concern revised/developed. 1.2.3 Two (2) national plans developed for the replacement of POPs or Hg containing products and the management of POPs or Hg containing wastes. 1.2.4 Two (2) Industry incentives developed and proposed for implementation that support conversion to processes which pose less risks and result in less harmful products. | | | | | |
| Component/ Outcome 2 Component 2: Eliminate POPs stockpiles and | 120 tonnes of obsolete POPs and non-POPs | AGROCALIDAD/APSCA and INNOVAGRO inventoried in 2016 ~ 600 sites and | 0 tonnes of obsolete POPs and non-POPs pesticides and | 120 tonnes of obsolete POPs and non-POPs pesticides and related waste disposed of. | <i>AGRCALIDAD/APSCA/INNOVAGRO will launch/complete the OPs inventory in 2017.</i> | | | |

²⁵ (i.e. UPOPs, POPs and Hg in Products, Pesticides and ASGM related institutions)

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| reduce the use and release of initial and newly listed POPs (including those contained in products). | pesticides and related waste disposed of. | identified a quantity of 5 tonnes of obsolete pesticides. No pesticide-contaminated sites have been identified. APCSA and INNOVAGRO collect 40% of empty pesticide containers, leaving an accumulated 2,135 tonnes (by 2019) inadequately disposed of. | related waste disposed of. | | APCSA/INNOVAGRO will cover additional costs for the treatment of the increase in collected pesticide containers. APCSA/INNOVAGRO can increase the number of Centralized Storage Facilities and cover associated staff costs. A state institution signs an agreement to make a temporary storage facility for OPs available. | | | |
| | | | 2.1.1 One (1) In-depth inventory (incl. characteristics of the impacted (work) population and gender dimensions) of “old” and “new” POPs pesticides, non-POPs pesticides, pesticide-contaminated sites and storage facilities completed in partnership with AGROCALIDAD/INNOVAGRO and APCSA. 2.1.2 At least 30 tonnes of obsolete pesticides were repacked, transported and disposed of at a licensed treatment/disposal facility. 2.1.3 Clean up or remediation of at least one (1) pesticide-contaminated site completed. 2.1.4 Empty pesticide container collection, transportation, recycling and disposal increased by 90 tonnes. | | | | | |
| | 25 grams TEQ of UPOPs releases reduced. | Most relevant UPOPs sources in Ecuador (Nov. 2016 PPG baseline assessment): Medical waste incineration (48.19 g-TEQ/yr); Landfills, Waste Dumps and Landfill Mining (16,74 g-TEQ/yr); Household Heating and Cooking – Biomass (13,36 g-TEQ/yr); Waste Burning and Accidental Fires (7.14 g-TEQ/yr); Iron and Steel Plants (6.25 g-TEQ/yr); Biomass Burning (5.35 g-TEQ/yr); and Biomass Power Plants (1.15 g-TEQ/yr). | 5 g-TEQ/yr of UPOPs releases reduced. | 25 g-TEQ of UPOPs releases reduced. | Facilities are willing to partner with the project and grant access to allow for in-depth baseline assessments. 2 facilities/companies interested in improving BEP practices and introducing BAT technologies by making use of tax and industry incentives to finance the introduction of improved practices with project support. | | | |
| | | | 2.2.1 Assessment of UPOPs generating processes/practices completed at seven (7) facilities (including 5.500 hectares of agricultural lands). 2.2.2 Recommendations prepared for BEP/BAT interventions at seven (7) facilities. 2.2.3 BEP/BAT introduced to reduce UPOPs releases at two (2) project sites/facilities. 2.2.4 Clean up or remediation of at least one (1) UPOPs contaminated site completed. | | | | | |
| | 30 tonnes of new POPs releases were reduced. | Priority new-POPs are thought to be PFOs and C-octaBDE (Nov. 2016 PPG baseline assessment) and | The use and release of new POPs reduced by 0 tonnes. | The use and release of new POPs reduced by 30 tonnes. | UNIDO NIP update to be launched in 2017 provides data on new-POPs in products that can be used by the GEF/UNDP project. | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | are potentially contained in products like ABS, high impact polystyrene with ABS, treated leather, etching agents, ferric chloride, aviation hydraulic fluids, insecticides and flame retardants. | <p>2.3.1 Ten (10) imported products ²⁶ suspected of containing new POPs (PFOs/c-otaBDE) were analyzed to verify the existence of new POPs.</p> <p>2.3.2 A Cost-Benefit Analysis and Cost-of-Inaction assessment conducted (incl. identification and quantification of differentiated social benefits and costs between women and men) to inform the selection of alternatives and waste management/treatment options for the top 2 priority POPs containing products.</p> <p>2.3.3 Phase-down (with SENA) and waste management of top two (2) priority POPs containing products demonstrated in selected sectors/areas.</p> | | <i>Cost-effective alternatives can be identified and are available to replace the top 2 priority POPs containing products.</i> | | | |
| Component/ Outcome 3 Component 3: Implementation of measure for reduction and elimination of Hg from priority sectors. | 2 tonnes of mercury use/releases reduced from ASGM at a non-industrial level. | Mercury releases in the 3 areas prioritized by the project (source: Dec. 2016 PPG ASGM Hg Baseline assessment): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Portovelo (Aproplamin) – 1,638 kg Hg/yr ▪ Ponce Enriquez (Bella Rica) – 2,318 kg Hg/yr ▪ Chinapintza – 1,184 kg Hg/yr | Mercury use/releases from ASGM reduced by 500 kg/yr at a non-industrial level ²⁷ . | Total mercury use/releases from ASGM were reduced by a total of 2 tonnes at a non-industrial level. | <i>Institutions or gold processing plants are willing to host the mobile training plant.</i> <i>Permitting requirements and processes do not significantly slow down the installation or mobility of the mobile training plant.</i> | | | |
| | | | <p>3.1.1 Comprehensive mercury baseline assessment (incl. sex-disaggregated and gender-specific data ²⁸) completed for all ASGM project sites (Camilo Ponce Enríquez, Portovelo and Chinapintza) at a non-industrial level.</p> <p>3.1.2 Mobile training plant installed at “home base” location and operationalized.</p> <p>3.1.3 350 ASGM miners and mining communities trained (of which at least 30% are women, and 5% are indigenous).</p> <p>3.1.4 At least 5 processing plants (at least 2 occasionally used by women) supported in improving their ore processing.</p> <p>3.1.5 At least 3 mining groups²⁹ (of which 1 containing women miners) supported in their formalization processes.</p> <p>3.1.6 Demonstration pilot focusing on gravity recovery of Hg from contaminated tailings implemented.</p> | | <i>Despite perverse incentives to keep ore extraction yields low, processing plants are interested to work with the project to increase yields.</i> <i>Project support is sufficiently tailored to the needs of women miners to make a difference in their livelihoods.</i> <i>Ecuador NAP project (UNIDO) provides data on Hg use in ASGM that can be used by the GEF/UNDP project.</i> | | | |
| | 35 kg/yr of mercury use/releases avoided from priority sectors (other than ASGM). | Ecuador’s priority Hg containing products are (Nov. 2016 PPG baseline assessment): Medical devices (40 tonnes of medical products | Mercury releases from priority sectors (other than ASGM) reduced by 10 kg. | Mercury releases from priority sectors (other than ASGM) avoided by 35 kg/yr. | <i>Cost-effective alternatives can be identified and are available to replace the top 2 priority POPs containing products.</i> | | | |
| | | | 3.2.1 Comprehensive national mercury baseline assessment completed for medical devices and lighting | | | | | |

²⁶ ABS, high impact polystyrene with ABS, treated leather, etching agents: ferric chloride, aviation hydraulic fluids, insecticides, flameretardants.

²⁷ Everything that is not processed in processing plants, meaning “Chanchas” or “at domestic level” (this latter will not be possible)

²⁸ Sex, age, ethnicity, levels education, main diseases, family income, population characteristics, heads of households, time use, family members' roles, among other relevant data.

²⁹ One in each of the project’s locations. A mining group can be a mining company, a mining cooperative, a cohesive society group an association (jancheras).

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | <p>containing ~ 164 kg of Hg, were in use in 2016 (MSP)) and energy-saving lamps (28 kg of mercury is contained in 144 tonnes of lamps currently in use and imported during the period (2013-2016).</p> <p>2 Hg baselines have been conducted, one in preparation of the project (Nov. 2016 PPG baseline assessment) and 1 in 2008 (National Mercury Release Inventory).</p> <p>For public hospitals, MSP/MAE have signed an agreement and developed a plan to phase-out Hg containing medical devices. For private hospitals and the general public, no plan/agreement is yet in place.</p> <p>No sound treatment/recycling options exist for Hg containing products.</p> | <p>products, and assessment conducted on the impact on women/men.</p> <p>3.2.2 List of available alternatives for Hg containing medical devices and Hg containing lighting products identified (incl. assessment of their costs and benefits).</p> <p>3.2.3 Assessment concluded of existing disposal and treatment options (national/international level) for mercury-containing products and their wastes.</p> <p>3.2.4 A Cost-Benefit Analysis and Cost-of-Inaction assessment (incl. identification and quantification of differentiated social benefits and costs between women and men) conducted to inform the selection of mercury-free alternatives and waste management/treatment options.</p> <p>3.2.5 Phase-in of mercury-free alternatives piloted in 1 high profile HCF facility.</p> <p>3.2.6 Electricity sector pilot project implemented to support the phase-out and/or improved management of spent mercury-containing lamps.</p> <p>3.2.7 The environmentally sound treatment/disposal of 10 tonnes of mercury-containing waste products demonstrated.</p> | | | | | |
| | <p>Access to finance improved for ASGM sector through the development/improvement of 2 financial products.</p> | <p>In 2016, 136 million USD in loans was granted to the mining sector in Ecuador, of which 23 million US\$ was granted to the mining sector in the project's priority areas, of which ~8 million was granted to the mining of precious metals.</p> <p>92.61% of credit volume was mainly placed by private banks, 6.98% by public financial institutions; 0.31% by mutuals and 0.1% by financial companies.</p> | <p>1 financial product developed/improved to increase access to finance for ASGM sector</p> | <p>2 financial products developed/improved to increase access to finance for ASGM sector</p> | <p><i>1 financial institution and 1 legal gold buyer are interested in signing an agreement with the project.</i></p> <p><i>1 industry and 1 gold processing plant are interested in applying tax incentives to finance cleaner production.</i></p> | | | |
| | | | <p>3.3.1 At least one (1) financial entity has developed/improved a product that serves the ASGM sector.</p> <p>3.3.2 One (1) competitive funds mechanism (CFM)³⁰ established to finance five (5) environmental and social entrepreneurship and technology innovations within the ASGM.</p> <p>3.3.3 At least 2 plants (1 ASGM processing plants and 1 industry) have made use of existing tax incentives to finance cleaner production systems.</p> | | | | | |

³⁰ The CFM model is taken from the GEF Small Grants Programme. Methodologies, procedures and monitoring will be applied according SGP application.
MTR ToR for GEF-Financed Projects - Standard Template - June 2020

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | The Central Bank of Ecuador (BCE) purchases gold from ASGM miners, provided that the gold has a licit origin. 2 tax incentives for the ASGM sector exist (LRTI - 10.7 & LRTI-37'). | 3.3.4 Responsibly produced gold (10 % produced by women) by a project beneficiary purchased at a higher price by a public or private legal buyer. | | | | |
| Component/ Outcome 4 Component 4: Raise awareness, ensure project monitoring and disseminate project results and experiences. | 11,778 people (3,533 females and 8,245 males) of whom awareness has been raised on the sound management of chemicals. | The project has raised awareness of 0 people on the sound management of chemicals. | Awareness raised of 3,533 people (1,060 female and 2,473 male) on the sound management of chemicals. | Awareness raised of 11,778 people (3,533 female and 8,245 male) on the sound management of chemicals. | <i>People trained by the project, and project stakeholders subjected to project awareness campaigns are aware of the impact of chemicals of concern and have in turn informed their immediate families (of 4).</i> | | |
| | 29 GEF UNDP M&E requirements met and adaptive management applied in response to needs and Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) findings. | 0 GEF M&E requirements met by the project. | 13 of GEF M&E requirements met and adaptive management applied in response to needs and Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) findings. | 29 of GEF M&E requirements met and adaptive management applied in response to needs and Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) findings. | <i>The project team and UNDP CO can meet all the GEF M&E requirements and within the time planned.</i> | | |
| | 28 Case study reports, publications, presentations, (web-based) articles, etc. summarizing lessons-learned, best practices and experiences, disseminated at the national, regional and global levels. | 0 publications, presentations, (web-based) articles, etc. summarizing lessons-learned, best practices and experiences, disseminated at the national, regional and global levels. | 10 Case study reports, publications, presentations, (web-based) articles, etc. summarizing lessons-learned, best practices and experiences, disseminated at the national, regional and global levels. | 28 Case study reports, publications, presentations, (web-based) articles, etc. summarizing lessons-learned, best practices and experiences, disseminated at the national, regional and global levels. | <i>The project will be able to make use of existing knowledge platforms (GEF GOLD, Swiss ASG – IKH, old CASM site) to disseminate case study reports, publications, presentations, articles etc.</i> | | |

Indicator Assessment Key

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Green = Achieved | Yellow = On target to be achieved | Red = Not on target to be achieved |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|

ToR ANNEX B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR consultant

1. PIF
2. UNDP Project Document (PRODOC)
3. Gender Strategy and Action Plan
4. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Semestral progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools/Core indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm (specific Core Indicators for this project's focal area)
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by project Team
13. Other documents required by the consultant

The following documents will also be available:

14. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
15. UNDP country programme document(s)
16. Minutes of the *PNGQ* Board Meetings and other meetings
17. Project site location map.
18. Any additional documents, as relevant.

ToR ANNEX C: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report ³¹

i. Basic Report Information *(for the opening page or title page)*

- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and GEF Project ID#
- MTR time frame and date of MTR report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- MTR team members
- Acknowledgments

ii. Table of Contents

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*

- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
- MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- A concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table

2. Introduction *(2-3 pages)*

- Purpose of the MTR and objectives
- Scope and Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations of the MTR
- Structure of the MTR report

3. Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*

- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
- Project Implementation Arrangements: a short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list.

4. Findings *(12-14 pages)*

4.1 Project Strategy

- Project Design
- Results Framework/Log frame

4.2 Progress Towards Results

- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Management Arrangements
- Work planning
- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

³¹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Reporting
 - Communications & Knowledge Management
- 4.4 Sustainability
- Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic risks to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
- 5.1 Conclusions
- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
- 5.2 Recommendations
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
6. Annexes
- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Rating Scales
 - MTR mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed MTR final report clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*) or *Core Indicators*
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* *GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure')*

ToR ANNEX D: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|--|--|---|---|
| Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results? | | | |
| (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 documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc. | (i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc. |
| | | | |
| Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far? | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation? To what extent has progress been made in the implementation of social and environmental management measures? Have there been changes to the overall project risk rating and/or the identified types of risks as outlined at the CEO Endorsement stage? | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

ToR ANNEX E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review for consultants³²

Evaluators/The 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 rights not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's rights 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 the evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
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

MTR the consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of the consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____
(date)

Signature: _____

³² www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Ratings

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

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

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

ToR ANNEX G: MTR Report Clearance Form

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By: | |
| Commissioning Unit | |
| Name: _____ | |
| Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |
| UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor | |
| Name: _____ | |
| Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |

ToR ANNEX H: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on **(date)** from the Midterm Review of **(project name)** (UNDP Project ID-**PIMS #**)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and not by the person’s name, and track change comment number (“#” column):

| Author | # | Para No./ comment location | Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report | MTR team response and actions taken |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Author | # | Para No./ comment location | Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report | MTR team response and actions taken |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

