

CONSULTANT TERMS OF REFERENCE

GENERAL INFORMATION

INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT (IC)
PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM

Advertisement for Recruitment of International Individual consultant for a Consultancy service to undertake Project Midterm Review (MTR)

Procurement Notice Ref. No.:

Published (Posted on): , 2021

Submission Deadline: -----2021 @ 5:30 PM in the Afternoon (UTC+03:00) Addis Ababa/Nairobi Time Zone

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Services/Work Description: To undertake Project Mid Term Review (MTR)

Project/Program Title: PCB Management in Ethiopia to meet the 2025 Stockholm Convention deadline – Phase 1

Post Title: International Individual Consultant to undertake Project Mid Term Review (MTR)

Consultant Level: Level (C)

Duty Station: Addis Ababa with travel to the selected Regions as deemed necessary

Expected Places of Travel:

Expected Start Date: August 1, 2021 immediately after the Contract Agreement is concluded

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the medium-sized project titled “PCB Management in Ethiopia to meet the 2025 Stockholm Convention deadline – Phase 1” Project implemented through the Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission (EFCCC). (PIMS5861) implemented through the through the Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission (EFCCC). The project started on the 4th of April 2019 and is in its third year of implementation, which is to be undertaken in four years, and is in its second year of implementation. 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* (www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Brief project description: The project intends to support Ethiopia with the necessary technical and financial assistance to reduce the risks posed by PCBs to the environment and human health. As the present inventory from the National Implementation Plan (NIP) is not sufficiently detailed to plan a full-size project, the project is designed to either confirm the lower bracket in terms of amount of PCBs in the country, and fully address the PCB issue in Ethiopia as part of this Phase 1 project; or identify additional PCBs thus justifying a phase 2 follow-up PCB project. The present project will include the identification and disposal of 150 t of PCB-contaminated equipment and waste.

The objective of the project is to strengthen the capacity of national stakeholders to manage PCBs as well as to achieve PCBs elimination, as identified as a priority in Ethiopia’s NIP—a first Phase to achieve ESM of PCBs by 2025.

The project will be implemented in partnership with the relevant institutional and industrial stakeholders, i.e. the Environment, Forests and Climate Change Commission (EFCCC), Ethiopian Electric Power (EEP), Ethiopian Electric Utility (EEU), Metals and Engineering Corporation (METEC), and other holders of PCB-containing equipment. The project will ensure that an adequate level of sustained capacity for the sound management of PCBs would have been built for the management of any further such hazardous waste identified after the project's closure.

The project will consist of the following four components which are:

1. Strengthening of legal frameworks, administrative processes and technical preparedness for the sound management of PCBs in Ethiopia
2. Strengthening national capacity for PCB management throughout the lifecycle
3. ESM of PCBs liquids and equipment in use or out of service
4. Monitoring, evaluation, and replication

The description of the project by component, outcome, and output is presented below-

Component 1: Strengthening of legal frameworks, administrative processes and technical preparedness for the sound management of PCBs in Ethiopia

This component will support Ethiopia to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the national and institutional legal framework, key stakeholders, and gaps and overlaps, and to prioritize needs. After the comprehensive review and assessment, a decision will be made to draft new legislation specifically on PCBs or to strengthen the existing ones with inclusion of PCB-specific provisions. The assessment will also address institutional capacity and arrangements for the management of PCB, and gaps and overlaps will be identified and addressed through consultation and coordination processes. In addition to the legal instruments to be put in place for PCB management and disposal, a national PCB tracking system to prevent illegal importation of equipment likely to contain PCBs will be developed. This will involve periodic technical visits to the PCB holders, which will provide technical support and advice to purchase PCB-free transformers, capacitors, and related equipment; and preventing exports of suspected PCB-containing transformers. As part of the actions to prevent PCB-related accidents, the current chemical response procedures and mechanisms will be strengthened and piloted.

Internal guidelines and procedures targeted for utility companies and step-by-step approaches for those working with equipment and oil likely to contain PCBs will be developed and training provided for all the affected workers. The utility companies will be requested to sign off on these guidelines and procedures to confirm their commitment.

Component 2: Review and strengthening of national capacity for PCB management throughout the lifecycle

This component will support Ethiopia to review and strengthen data collection and management capacity, as well as to develop detailed PCB management plans at the facility level. A comprehensive PCB training programme will take place, covering PCB inventories, analysis, prioritization, and development of management plans.

The inventory database will also provide a platform for characterization of PCB waste streams. This characterization will then facilitate a feasibility study of using cost effective, technologically robust, and available technologies to promote environmentally sound management and disposal of PCBs. About 33,000 pieces of transformers and capacitors will be inventoried covering all 10 regions of Ethiopia. The outcomes of the feasibility study will form a basis for the development of PCB management plans.

Furthermore, this component will result in improved generation/collection of data, information, and monitoring of PCBs providing solid support to sound decision-making and planning process for ESM of PCBs. Comprehensive guidance on operation and maintenance of PCB-contaminated equipment, identification and labelling procedures, handling, transportation, temporary storage, and disposal will be developed.

Additionally, a national PCB management plan will be developed and tested at the national and facility levels. The national PCB tracking system will also be tested. Training will be provided at the beginning of the implementation of each activity.

Under this component, an awareness raising strategy will also be developed, awareness materials such as brochures, project cards, meeting banners and posters, for different target groups, will be developed and disseminated at the different levels – communities, technicians and policy-makers. Media briefing events both at mid-level managers (facility managers) and high-level (ministers, members of parliament and chief

executives) will be planned and executed. Furthermore, local communities will have access to awareness raising materials in their own local languages and trainings for the community leaders will be organized. All these efforts will be geared towards ensuring that there is better understanding of the problem and ensure protection of the population and the environment from adverse effects of PCBs. The awareness raising will also contribute to generating political support for the project.

Component 3: ESM of PCBs liquids and equipment in use or out of service

This component will minimize and to a greater degree eliminate the risk of adverse effects of PCBs in the population and the environment. The database information will provide the required information to characterize the PCB waste streams and concentrations in the various matrices where PCBs are found. PCB-containing transformers and capacitors will be collected and transported to four central temporary storage facilities. Based on waste characterization outcomes, management and disposal options will be evaluated. The project will establish priorities according to the conditions of the PCB stocks and to the location. In that sense, the PCB management plans, developed in the previous project component, will guide facilities in their maintenance and disposal operations. The evaluation of disposal options will take into account the levels of PCB concentrations and the condition of the equipment. To reduce costs, a dechlorination approach will be explored. For example, the treatment or disposal of contaminated transformers which are relatively new and in good working order might only require a dechlorination approach – whereas old, defective and highly contaminated transformers in low- or high-risk areas might require a different approach. These types of transformers and capacitors will be considered for dismantling at licensed facilities and will be incinerated with PCB oil at an incineration facility meeting international standards as defined by the Stockholm Convention. More importantly, the national PCB management team will decide on the PCB thresholds using internationally acceptable approaches and characterize the risk categories. The final decisions for treatment or disposal include several options. For example, incineration in cement kilns (if practical), or export for destruction. The process for evaluating these options will be robust and will include considerations such as: condition of the equipment, convention requirements, PCB concentrations in the waste streams, and local conditions.

Furthermore, under this component, selected locations designated to serve as sites for PCB temporary storage facilities will be environmentally- and human-risk assessed. Management plans including emergency response plans for each temporary facility will be developed and implemented for each site. 150 metric tonnes of PCB oil transformer carcasses, capacitors, and contaminated soils are expected to be shipped out of the country and disposed of through high temperature incineration (standards, licensing scheme, and licensed facilities to incinerate PCBs are currently not available in Ethiopia). The estimation of 150 metric tonnes of PCB oil transformer carcasses, capacitors and contaminated soils is based on the preliminary NIP data, the 33,000 transformers in the country, and the trends from other countries of similar nature, based on the experience of UNITAR in other countries. The precise figure will be confirmed during project implementation.

Based on other experiences from the region, the total cost of PCB disposal including transportation is in the range of USD 3,500-4,500 per ton. Factors that impact the cost include location of the port of exit, composition of PCB waste, inland transportation, and distance from the origin of PCB waste (Ethiopia) to the final destination. Djibouti will be the port of exit for the Ethiopian PCB materials; Djibouti has been a point of transit for other hazardous waste exports for disposal operations in the past. This possibility was confirmed by a representative of Djibouti, provided that necessary support documentation as per the Basel and Stockholm Conventions are provided to the competent authority in Djibouti.

Training (both theoretical and practical) will be conducted before the commencement of each activity planned under this component.

Considering the training required and the potential additional costs linked to the fact that Ethiopia is a landlocked country, which can make the operations more complex and costly, a total cost of USD 900,000 for 150 tonnes has been estimated for this component, which corresponds to USD 6,000 per tonne. This is a reasonable estimate of the expected overall costs for this disposal operation and the required necessary preparation for it. Moreover, as the project will enable the development of a comprehensive foundation for PCB management (which can also be applied to other POPs and chemicals management), subsequent projects, such as a phase 2 PCB project (which will not require foundational activities), will be implementable at greatly reduced costs compared to other PCB projects.

Component 4: Monitoring, evaluation and replication

Under this component, an internal project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) team will be constituted. The M&E team will regularly provide quarterly reports on project performance, stakeholders' views on project impacts, and recommendations for improvements. Yearly lessons-learned reports will be prepared and disseminated. Lessons learnt and case study reports for each demonstration project (e.g. upgrading temporary storage sites) will be prepared for each project milestone, endorsed by national stakeholders, and shared internally and externally with other project countries such as Kenya and others, where similar projects are envisaged, and generally with countries implementing PCB management projects. Best practices for introduction of ESM will be identified, documented, and disseminated to participants, other stakeholders and Parties of the Stockholm Convention. The national project website will be developed for engagement, sharing good practices, guidance/tools, and experience. End-of-project publications will be prepared and disseminated.

At the end of its lifetime, the project is anticipated to dispose or treat at least 150 tonnes of equipment containing PCB (in pure and contaminated forms).

The project budget consisted of USD 1,990,000 of GEF grant funding, USD 150,000 of UNDP TRAC resources, which total of USD 2,140,000 and co-financing (in kind), from the Government of Ethiopia (EFCCC, EEP, EEU and Ethio-Group Engineering) of total USD 8,200,000.

The project has been in implementation all the ten (including the newly formed region) regional states and two City Administrations using the regional Environment, Forest and Climate Change bureaus as focal points for the project at region level. The project is implemented by the Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission (EFCCC) in partnership with Ethiopia Electric Utility (EEU), Ethiopia Electric power (EEP) and Ethio- Engineering Group. The project has a project office at EFCCC under the Compliance Monitoring and Compliance Directorate General, the Director being the National Project coordinate, with a Project Manager. The project also has a steering committee comprised of Deputy Commissioner of the EFCCC, Ministry of Finance, EEU, EEP, Ethiopia Public health Institute (EPHI), Chemical and Cement Input Industrial Development Institute and UNDP. The steering committee supervises the overall implementation and puts Directions on issues concerning the implementation of the project. The project office reports physical and financial performance report to the EFCCC and UNDP; and UNDP reports to the donor, GEF, following its reporting requirements.

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 with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

MTR are very instrumental to assess the project progress so far and check whether the project is on Track or need adjustments. This exercise result is very instrumental for the donor, UNDP, Project Management Unit and implementing partner (Environment, Forest, and Climate Change Commission). Moreover, the timing of the MTR review fits with UNDP Ethiopia Country office evaluation time table. Accordingly, the office will benefit from its result to assess its quality assurance responsibility.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The MTR team will review the baseline and midterm

GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Ethiopian Electric Utility (EEU), Ethiopian Electric Power (EEP), Ethio-Engineering Group, Ethiopian Conformity Assessment Enterprise (ECAE); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

The specific design and methodology for the MTE should emerge from consultations between the MTR team 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 team 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 evaluation must be clearly outlined in the MTR Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team.

The final report must describe the full MTE 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.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Following the declaration by WHO and considering their local situations, countries has been restricting overseas travel since and Ethiopia has also been setting different requirements for travel including negative test results and quarantine for 7-14 days. Nowadays travel restrictions are getting loose, however, if it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys, and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

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

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

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

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

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. 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 (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- 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/Logframe:

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

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe 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*; colour 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).

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

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹	Baseline Level ²	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ³	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁴	Achievement Rating ⁵	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 analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify 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 overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- 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/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

¹ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

² Populate with data from the Project Document

³ If available

⁴ Colour code this column only

⁵ 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 by the Commissioning Unit and project team, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

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
Government					
Government					
Government					
		TOTAL			

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes each co-financing amount as ‘investment mobilized’ or ‘recurrent expenditures’. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

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 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 risks⁶ (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 fulfil 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

⁶ 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.

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Register 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:

Financial risks to sustainability:

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

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

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

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

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

Environmental risks to sustainability:

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

Conclusions & Recommendations

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

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team 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 team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team 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 ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (“PCB Management in Ethiopia to meet the 2025 Stockholm Convention deadline – Phase 1”)

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
---------	------------	-------------------------

Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 31 calendar days over a time period of 9 weeks and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS	COMPLETION DATE
Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission)	<i>3 days</i>	<i>August 5, 2021</i>
MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	<i>15 days</i>	<i>August 22, 2021</i>
Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission	<i>1 day</i>	<i>August 23, 2021</i>
Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission)	<i>8 days</i>	<i>September 2, 2021</i>
Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft)	<i>4 days</i>	<i>September 30, 2021</i>

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

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission August 15, 2021	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission August 5, 2021	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit

3	Draft MTR Report	Full draft report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission Sept 25, 2020	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft Sept 30, 2021	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

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

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Develop unit of the UNDP Ethiopia Country Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team and will provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants (one international and one national) will conduct the MTR –the International Consultant (Team Leader) with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The Team Leader will *be responsible for the overall design and writing of the Mid Term Evaluation report within the agreed deadline.* The National Consultant will *assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the Mid Term itinerary. Moreover, due to the current COVID_19 situation, the TL and the National consultants will agree on the field visit and conducting face to face stakeholders’ discussion.*

As indicated above the National Consultant will work with the Project Team and is fully responsible in preparing meeting meetings with appropriate stakeholder, assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, developing work and travel to Protected areas depending the COVID-19 pandemic situation.

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

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

Education

- A Master’s degree in Natural Science, Environmental Science, Economics or other closely related field (15 points)

Experience

- Relevant experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (15 points)
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (15 point)
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity Focal area (illegal wildlife trade); (15 point)
- Experience in evaluating projects; (5 point)
- Experience working in Africa; (5 point)
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; (15 point)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity focal area; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. (5 points)
- Excellent communication skills; (5 points)
- Demonstrable analytical skills; (5 points)
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.
- Fluency in Amharic and knowledge of local language is an asset.

10. ETHICS

The MTR team 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 SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR 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%⁷:

⁷ 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

- 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. Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required))	70%	100
▪ Criteria a. Educational relevance: close fit to post		10
▪ Criteria b. Understanding the scope of work and organization of the proposal		50
▪ Criteria c. Experience of similar assignment		30
▪ Criteria d. Previous work experience in Africa/ Ethiopia		10
Financial (Lower Offer/Offer*100)	30%	30
Total Score	Technical Score * 70% + Financial Score * 30%	

13. APPLICATION PROCESS⁸

The recruitment of the TL will use the HQ roster and for the local consultant RSC roster list will be used. (Adjust this section if a vetted roster will be used)

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)⁹ provided by UNDP;
- CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)¹⁰);
- 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)
- 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.

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

⁸ Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

⁹

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

¹⁰ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

All application materials should be submitted to the address (fill address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for (“PCB Management in Ethiopia to meet the 2025 Stockholm Convention deadline – Phase 1”) Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY: (fill email) by (**time and date**). Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team

(The Commissioning Unit is responsible for compiling these documents prior to the recruitment of the MTR team so that they are available to the team immediately after contract signature.)

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)
7. Quarterly 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 *(fill in specific TTs 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

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the (Project Title: PA Management & IWT Enforcement Ethiopia) Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Any additional documents, as relevant.

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹¹

- i. Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTR team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*

¹¹ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
 3. Project Description and Background Context (3-5 pages)
 - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
 - Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
 4. Findings (12-14 pages)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
 - Reporting
 - Communications & Knowledge Management
 - 4.4 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
 5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 - 5.2 Recommendations
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

6. Annexes

- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- MTR mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*) 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 C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

(Draft questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit with support from the Project Team)

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 question(s))	(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?			
Since project implementation is lagging behind the schedule set out in the project document, MTR should come with options/proposal how to speed up implementation to achieve all project activities within project duration, ie by May 2023.			

--	--	--	--

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

¹² <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

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

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

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

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report 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 G: 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 (“PCB Management in Ethiopia to meet the 2025 Stockholm Convention deadline – Phase 1”) (UNDP Project ID-PIMS 5861)

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

HOW TO APPLY

Interested consultant with required qualification and experience must submit their applications through: <https://etendering.partneragencies.org> UNDP/ETH10/Event ID: **ETH2781**