GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMINAL EVALUATION OF COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND MANAGEMENT OF PCBS IN MONTENEGRO

Project Title:	*PIMS 5562 Montenegro - Comprehensive Environmentally Sound Management of PCBs in Montenegro*
Functional Title:	International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation
Duration:	Estimated 25 days (per consultant) over a period of May 2022 - September 2022, including field mission to Montenegro.

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the *full-sized* project titled *Comprehensive Environmentally Sound Management of PCBs in Montenegro (PIMS #5562)* implemented through the *UNDP Montenegro*. The project started on the 16th January 2017 and is in its *5th* year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects' (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The project Comprehensive Environmentally Sound Management of PCBs in Montenegro intends to support the country with the necessary technical and financial assistance to ensure that all the remaining PCBs in the country (estimated in not less than 900 t of PCB contaminated equipment, waste and soil) are identified and disposed of. The project will be implemented side by side with the relevant institutional and industrial stakeholders, i.e. the Ministry of Ecology, Spatial Planning and Urbanism, private and state owned companies, holders of PCB containing equipment. Although the project expects to solve all remaining PCBs issues in the country, it will also ensure that enough capacity for the sound management of PCBs would have been built for the management of any further such hazardous waste identified in time after project's closure.

The disposal or decontamination of PCBs in Montenegro presents a number of issues and risks. First of all, the reliability of initial PCB inventory is very low and mostly limited to phased out equipment that needs to be disposed of. In Montenegro where most of information on PCBs from NIP inventory comes from disconnected equipment. This is due to the fact that electrical equipment (transformers, capacitors) when in good operating condition are usually not inspected for PCB content. The reasons are that:

- the cost of replacing transformer and capacitor is capital intense (very high), and
- the sampling and analysis of in-use equipment is a complex task requiring a significant coordination effort (for instance, coordination with maintenance schedule of electric equipment).

A second feature is that, being not immediately perceived as a hazard by the common public, the issue of PCBs is very often given a low priority from the authorities. Therefore, the existing legislation on PCB is not effectively enforced. As explained in the chapter above, although the Montenegrin legislation is well advanced and generally compliant with the Stockholm convention and the EU directive on PCBs management, and the government updated the inventory of PCB waste, the requirements related to the PCB management plans, and PCB "logbooks" are almost completely disregarded. In the absence of a sound level of enforcement of current legislation, even the industry's commitment to address the issue of PCBs – given the high costs related to the decontamination or disposal (with subsequent replacement) of contaminated equipment – is low. For this reason, the national PCB management situation can be effectively addressed only if the government's commitment and capacity are high.

A third feature is the lacking of PCB treatment technologies at local level. This is a common feature in many countries supported by UN/GEF projects in PCBs management. This usually results in industries undertaking substantial investment for shipping PCB contaminated equipment for abroad, typically EU, for disposal. In the case of Montenegro, there are no technologies for treatment of low PCB-contaminated equipment or disposal facilities available for high PCB contaminated equipment or waste, therefore until now only the highly PCB contaminated equipment has been to date treated by shipping and disposal abroad.

The project strategy is therefore designed to address simultaneously all these important aspects as outlined below.
1) Increasing national PCB management capacities and the enforcement of the legislation. This will require working side by side with the control authorities (mainly the Ministry of Ecology, Spatial Planning and Urbanism) and the key stakeholders (the electric power industry and other potential owners of PCB containing equipment) to:

- develop and implement a practical guidance on PCB environmentally sound management (ESM);
- provide assistance in fulfillment of legal obligations towards recording and reporting PCB related information;
- conduct inspections at sites where electrical equipment (transformers, capacitors) operates,
- train operators and officers on both sides – the governmental authorities and PCB equipment/waste owners.

2) Increasing the industry and general awareness. PCBs are very often a not very well known environmental issue. Except for extremely high pollution levels, resulting in acute and immediate health impacts, the toxic effect of PCBs (increase of cancer probability) is delayed in time and not associated to any "visible" pollution like black smoke from open burning or factories' stacks or turbidity in water. Therefore, the PCB hazard is usually not perceived as an immediate threat by many. However, an unsafe disposal of PCBs results in the contamination of food chain and other environmental media (like, for instance, sediments and soil) which may last for years. PCBs have been recently (March 2013) re-assessed by the IARC and are now classified as "known human carcinogens (class 1)" compared to the previous "probable human carcinogens (class 2)" category. There is therefore the need to inform the main stakeholders and the public at large on the benefit brought by the project so that the government and the industry are encouraged in undertaking necessary actions.
3) Engagement of stakeholders. As in other environmental programmes, only in case of key stakeholder's buy-in, the project's goals can be satisfactorily achieved. No major change in current practices can be achieved if there is little or no awareness of the risks posed by PCBs, and if stakeholders do not feel the need to address the PCB management issue once and for all. As previously described in more detail, the project had identified at PIF stage a number of important stakeholders which will be involved in all project activities during its implementation. Besides MoSDT, which will be the national implementing institution, key PCB holders, like EPCG (both for electricity generation and distribution) and KAP were informed on the project's related benefits and on the expected and required level of commitment towards it. As a result, they participated proactively in all the project development activities, including providing lists of their power equipment and facilitating oil sampling and analysis for PCB content. More stakeholder engagement, by involving other line Ministries, academic institutions and NGO sector is

planned during the project implementation which will too include civil society associations, trade unions, and other beneficiaries.
4) Strengthening the reliability of information through updating of the PCB inventory. At PIF stage, the only available information was related to the list of phased-out PCB equipment and waste, a few pure PCB transformers, online or stored at KAP, oil tanks and contaminated material (sawdust, soil, waste) potentially contaminated by PCBs. Due to the low enforcement of the legislation, there was very little information available on the concentration of PCB online equipment. The information concerning the number, age and level of contamination of PCB equipment is indeed essential for both management purposes and identification of the proper treatment / disposal technologies. This situation was already evident at the PIF formulation stage, and therefore the main focus in the preliminary inventory carried out during preparation of the FSP project document concerned existing offline and online equipment at EPCG company. At same time, only limited PCB content in transformers stored or online at KAP was re-confirmed, including that data on PCB contaminated soil. The project will continue consolidating the PCB inventory by undertaking dielectric oil sampling and analytical determination of PCBs in 3,000 pieces of equipment during the first two years of its implementation.
5) Provide know-how and financial support on the technologies for the disposal of PCB equipment. Clearly, one of the central issues on the side of PCB ESM concerns the availability of technical and financial resources for PCB disposal. In the absence of a sound know-how related to disposal operations of PCB contaminated equipment, the cost / benefit ratio is always very high, for the following reasons:

- the options allowing the chemical destruction of the PCBs in the dielectric oil without destroying the oil itself are usually not considered, so that the dielectric oil, which is usually a very expensive asset, is lost;
- the planning of PCB equipment phasing out is not aligned with their residual value, so that very often a strategy aimed at minimizing the cost of disposal of PCB contaminated equipment is not pursued; and
- the legal aspects related to the storage of PCB containing equipment under maintenance versus PCB phased out equipment (to be considered waste) are usually neglected, exposing therefore owners of PCB equipment to a severe liability risk.

The project budget from the GEF Trust Fund is 3,5 mil USD, UNDP TRAC resources are 50,000 USD and total co-financing is 19,803,691 USD.

During 2020 and 2021 Covid-19 pandemic influenced implementation of the project. Namely, lockdowns throughout 2020 and beginning of 2021 interfered the work planned for contaminated site investigation, and delayed the work on site clean-up. Already arranged trainings on ESM of PCB had to be postponed. Montenegro had a large number of Covid cases during the two years of the pandemic, around 230,000 cases, which is 35% of the population. Also, around 2,700 Covid-19 related deaths were reported. The delays in project implementation caused by Covid-19 resulted with the no-cost extension being granted for one additional year.

3. TE PURPOSE

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

The evaluation will cover all the activities undertaken by the project. In scoping and during the implementation of the evaluation, key stakeholders of the project will be involved, such as the members of the project steering committee including representatives from the government institutions (Ministry of Ecology, Spatial Planning and Urbanism, Center for Eco-toxicological Research- CETI, Institute for Public Health) and private sector (owners of PCB equipment). It also examines the efficiency and effectiveness of the project in terms of achieving expected results and evaluates the relevance and sustainability of achievements. An evaluation carried out through an analysis of results, should provide the basis for the follow-up to the project if there is a need for that.

Therefore, the main responsibility of the evaluation team is to examine the following elements: the project design, the objectives established and results achieved; different aspects of the project such as sustainability, monitoring and evaluation, and efficiency; the project strategy and development; the relationship among the different actors

and their specific roles; the attainment of the results, objective and impacts of the project; the effectiveness of the strategy undertaken by the project; the financial, administrative and managerial aspects of the project; the project´s compliance with the rules and procedures of the project's administrative, financial and reporting system, verify that all is in accordance with the rules and regulations of UNDP and GEF.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to *Ministry of Ecology, Spatial Planning and Urbanism, Environmental Protection Agency, The Administration for Inspection Affairs, Companies that have PCB contaminated equipment, Center for Eco-toxicological Research*; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions to Podgorica and Bar, including the following project sites UNIPROM-KAP and CEDIS in Podgorica and HEMOSAN in Bar.

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

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

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

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

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below.

A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

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

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

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

ii. Project Implementation

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

iii. Project Results

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

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and

provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

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

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for the project *Comprehensive Environmentally Sound Management of PCBs in Montenegro*

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

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *25 working days* over a time period of 18 *weeks* starting on *17th May 2021*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
25 April 2022	Application closes
14 May 2022	Selection of TE team
17 May 2022	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)

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

17 – 28 May 2022, 4 days	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
3 – 10 June 2022, 2 days	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
20-27 June 2022, 7 days	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
27 June 2022	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
28 June – 20 July 2022, 10 days	Preparation of draft TE report
21 July – 12 September 2022	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
13 – 20 September 2022, 2 days	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
13 September 2022	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
20 September 2022	Expected date of full TE completion

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

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: *by 28 May 2022*	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: *by 27 June 2022*	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report *using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C* with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: *by 20 July 2022*	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report. *See template in ToR Annex H*	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: *by 20 September 2022*	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

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

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

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

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is the Country Office Montenegro.

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

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of *two independent evaluators* will conduct the TE – *one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one team expert, National Consultant.* The team leader will *lead the process of evaluation and be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report.* The team expert will *assist the team leader in data collection and analysis, assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the TE itinerary.*

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

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

Education

- A Master's degree in electrical/agriculture/environment/chemicals/engineering or economy, or other closely related field - 10%

Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies; - 10%
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; - 10%
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to *Chemicals/Waste GEF Focal Area; - 10%*
- Experience in evaluating projects; - 20%
- Experience working in *Montenegro, Western Balkans, CIS countries; - 10%*
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years; - 10%*
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *Chemicals/Waste;* experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis; - 5%
- Excellent communication skills; - 3%
- Demonstrable analytical skills; - 2%
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset. – 5%

Language

- Team leader - fluency in written and spoken English. – 5%

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

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

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%[3]:

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

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

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

12. APPLICATION PROCESS[4]

TE evaluator will be selected from the UNDP RBA vetted roster.

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability using the template to be provided by UNDP

b) CV, including Education/Qualification, Processional Certification, Employment Records /Experience

c) Financial Proposal that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address: .....@undp.org indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of "Comprehensive Environmentally Sound Management of PCBs in Montenegro" full sized project, no later than day/time indicated in the distribution email. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

[3] The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE 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 TE 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

[4] Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP
https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx

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

13. TOR ANNEXES

(Add the following annexes to the final ToR)

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

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

Project Results Framework

This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):					
This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document: *Balanced and equitable regional economic growth based on sustainable planning and use of natural resources that will provide high quality of life and long term economic opportunities for its inhabitants.*					
This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan: *Output 1.3: 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***
Project Objective: ***Comprehensive identification and disposal/treatment of PCB contaminated equipment and waste in the country***	*National environmentally sound management (ESM) system of PCB chemicals and waste drafted, and implemented by 2020* *700 tons of pure PCBs and 200 tons of low-concentrated PCBs/related waste are safely managed and disposed of/decontaminated by the end of the project, thus reducing global and local environment from exposure to these hazardous wastes*	*People and workers are currently exposed to the risk posed by PCB containing equipment stored or online. Financial resources were used to buy disposal service abroad without creating job opportunities*	*Comprehensive national PCB inventory is mid-way through* *ESM guidance materials drafted and an initial training of PCB holders planned for and carried out* *The risk for the population surrounding plant and storage facilities*	*Existing storage facilities for PCBs are assessed and upgraded to international standard to allow PCB removal/decontamination operations* *The risk for the population surrounding plant and storage facilities containing PCBs*	*Identified PCB contaminated equipment are under control and secured for disposal until technologies or service delivered by the project are available.* *Handling of PCB equipment and disposal activities are carried out in an environmentally safe way without any harm to the environment and the health.* *The public-private partnership established is effective and sustainable and will continue to bring economic and*

		in the country. *Current PCB management regulation has some deficiencies and requires appropriate capacity and cooperation from PCB equipment/waste owners to be enforced* *No national PCB management plan prepared and comprehensively implemented as of now.* *No comprehensive ESM system is in place to address the national PCB*	*containing PCBs is minimized thanks to safety measures preventing PCB release in the environment.*	*is minimized through t sound disposal of at least 700 + 200 tons of PCB contaminated equipment and waste* *Local firms / institutions benefitting from the establishment of a public-private partnership on PCB management.*	*environmental benefit to the Montenegrin population after project closure.*

		situation, and power equipment is exposed to continuous cross-contaminatio n			
	Amount of PCB equipment identified and listed in the PCB inventory and included in the national management plan	*A systematic PCB inventory, including PCB identification and labelling is missing.*	*At least 2,000 pieces of equipment tested to verify their PCB content, out of which PCB containing equipment is identified and labelled for future treatment or disposal.* *National PCB database established and maintained to help with priority decision-making*	*At least 3,000 pieces of equipment tested to verify their PCB content.* *PCB containing equipment is identified and labelled for future treatment or disposal out of which* *PCB containing equipment is stored or secured for disposal under the GEF project.* *Measures to prevent release of PCBs in the*	*Potential PCB owners are willing to facilitate sampling and analysis of their equipment.* *The capacity of the country to carry out sampling and analysis of dielectric oil and waste for PCB quantification is large and reliable enough to timely carry out sampling and analysis activities.*

				environment are in place.	
	Amount of PCB contaminated equipment and waste treated or disposed of	*Around 173 tons of equipment containing PCBs sent abroad for disposal from 2007 to 2009.* *Around 36 tons of PCB contaminated soil sent abroad or disposal.* *No PCBs disposal/deco ntamination technology available in the country.*	*Based on final inventory amounts, temporary storage locations identified and upgraded to meet international standards.* *Pure PCB waste is prepared for export to HTI plants for final disposal, and PCB contaminated oil is treated via rented or purchased PCB dehalogenation technology.* *The most cost-effective PCB dehalogenation technology has been selected and rented/procured.* *Appropriate EIA/SIA*	*At least 700 tons of equipment containing PCB (in pure and contaminated forms) and at least 200 tons of PCB containing waste or soil are treated or disposed of in compliance with Stockholm Convention and Basel Conventions' requirements.* *Disposal/cleanin g certificates obtained.*	*Identified PCB containing equipment and waste amount to at least 700+200 tons and is properly stored for treatment or disposal under the project.* *The technology or service for the disposal of PCB equipment and waste (within the country or abroad) will be selected and procured/rented in a cost-effective manner to stay within the project's budget and timing constraints.* *Disposal of 700+200 tons of PCB equipment or can be completed within project and budget constraints.*

			procedures for making the rented/procured technology operational are completed, and location to host the technology selected and confirmed.		
Component/Outcome 1 ***Capacity strengthening on PCB management.***	*Number of operators of the electric sector and of the environmental control authority trained on and feel confident in practically applying the ESM system for PCBs.* *Number of technical and procedural guidance documents compliant with Stockholm Convention and national regulation completed and endorsed.* *Gender Dimension in the context of PCBs issue in Montenegro completed, strategies for better Gender Mainstreaming in POPs related activities identified.*	*No or insufficient technical level guidance materials on ESM for PCB management exists.* *No training on PCB issued delivered to operators in the electric sector countrywide.* *Only staff at the central level in MoSDT and research institutions is*	*- Guidance document drafted for sampling of online and offline equipment, handling storage and disposal of PCB containing waste and equipment, and discussed in one dedicated workshop.* *- Using the guidance material, at least one training session covering 50 operators of the electric sector implemented* *- Procedural and guidance documents for environmental authorities on*	*- Guidance document for sampling of online and offline equipment, handling storage and disposal of PCB containing waste and equipment developed and adopted.* *- Two training session covering at least 20 equipment operators (engineers and technicians) in the electric power sector* *- Procedural and guidance documents for environmental*	*Prospects for adoption of technical guidance lines are high, and related consultations initiated and ongoing.* *Equipment operators willing to attend training and apply knowledge practically in joint work with the project.* *Trainers have extensive experience in the field of PCB management.*

		knowledgeable about POPs in general and PCB issues in particular *No gender dimension study ever carried out on POPs in Montenegro.*	*Stockholm and Basel convention, EU regulation on POPs and PCBs, BAT and BEP for PCB treatment and disposal operation drafted and discussed in a dedicated workshop.-* *- One training session covering at least 25 officers from the relevant ministries and research institutions carried out.* *- Dissemination of project objectives and midterm results through establishment of a website, broadcasting, workshops, with enhancement on gender related issues* *- Gender Dimension study completed.*	*authorities on Stockholm and Basel convention, EU regulation on POPs and PCBs, BAT and BEP for PCB treatment and disposal operation adopted.* *- Two training sessions for at least 20 officers from the relevant ministries and institutions carried out. .* *- Dissemination of project achievements through regular updating of website content, broadcasting, workshop, with enhancement on gender related issues*	

	Level of enforcement of the Montenegro's law on PCB management strengthened, measured through the number of owners of electrical equipment complying with the regulation.	*The national regulation on PCB is not enforced.* *No or insufficient technical level guidance materials on ESM for PCB management exists.* *Individual (company-specific) PCB Management plans and logbooks required under the regulation are not submitted.* *The current penalty policy is not applied or not effective due to the low*	*- Gap analysis with special reference to enforcement needs completed at mid-term.* *- Technical assistance to the environmental authorities on the enforcement of the law and technical regulation related to PCBs delivered through specialized trainings and joint participation of project staff and government representatives in at least 5 site inspections followed by assessment of the cases.* *-Company-wide PCB management plans drafted by participating companies*	*- Advisory support and required technical assistance in the implementation of the country technical regulations and guidance on PCBs and POPs in view of the alignment with EU regulation delivered through continuous project support.* *- Technical assistance to the environmental authorities on the enforcement of the law and regulation related to PCBs delivered through joint participation of project staff and government representatives in at least 10 site inspections followed by*	*A fruitful cooperation among project staff, government, and key stakeholders on technical, legal and financial matter is ensured so that the amended / improved regulatory package is implementable, enforceable and sustainable.*

		enforcement level.		*assessment of the cases.*	
Component/ Outcome 2 ***PCB Inventory, planning and*** ***establishment of public-private partnership***	*One consolidated country-wide PCB inventory updated and completed, with appropriate data of sampling dates and analysis results of phased out and in-use equipment*	*An incomplete inventory report developed by MoSDT without analytical data and not including electric equipment from the electric power sector.* *Central consolidated PCB database to track inventory and PCB disposal process is not available*	*- Preliminary survey carried out through sampling and analysis of at least 300 pieces of equipment at PPG stage. Inventory sampling activity plan for 3,000 equipment is well underway at mid-term point. Services for the sampling, analysis of this equipment and establishment of PCB inventory procured* *- Sampling and analysis of at least 2,000 pieces of PCB suspected equipment carried out.* *- PCB containing equipment labelled and entered in a computerized database.*	*- At least 3,000 equipment oil samples have been taken and analysed for quantifying PCB concentration.* *- A dynamic PCB inventory established and made available to authorities and PCB holders through a dedicated website with access policies.*	*Owners of PCB contaminated equipment and waste will facilitate the access to their facilities and the sampling operations.* *Proper chain of custody and quality control procedures is established to ensure the reliability of sampling and analysis operations.*

	2.2 The PCB national management plan is drafted and approved.	*No national PCB management plan developed or available to guide action on addressing PCB matters in the country* *No industry-wide coordinated action is taken to address PCB ESM*	*- The national PCB management plan drafted.* *- First upgrade* *of the National PCB* *Management Plan at midterm based on preliminary inventory data.* *- Resulting one (1) individual PCB management plan drafted by participating companies at mid-term*	*- The national PCB management plan reviewed and adopted.* *- Second upgrade of the National PCB Management Plan at midterm based on inventory data.* *- Resulting (overall) two (2) individual PCB management plans drafted by participating companies (confirmed as a final achievement by terminal evaluation time)*	*Government-led communication strategy on national PCB related effort (legislation, technical regulations, PCB equipment inventory and phase-out/disposal/decontamination) is in place and implemented to ensure better support from PCB equipment/waste owners and other stakeholders.* *A fruitful cooperation among project staff, government, and key stakeholders on technical, legal and financial matter is ensured so that the PCB management plan is implementable and sustainable.*
	2.3 An innovative public-private partnership for the management of PCB contaminated equipment and waste is established and supports national PCB disposal/decontamination effort.	*No public-private partnership established in the country for the management of PCBs.*	*- A public / private partnership for management of PCB contaminated equipment and waste established to conduct the activities related to ESM system on*	*- Business plan and sustainability plan for the public/private partnership verified and amended based on experience gathered in the 1st and 2nd years*	*A public private partnership to conduct ESM of PCB is more effective than a purely private or public institution due the fact that most PCB holders are public/private companies.*

		Cooperation with private sector is not strong to support effective national PCB disposal/decontamination effort.	*PCBs (completed at mid- term)* *- Business plan and sustainability plan for the public/private partnership drafted* *- Appropriate level national communication on the PCB management plan ensured for better cooperation with the private sector*	*of project's activities.*	*Public institutions and private industry willing to establish a partnership to conduct ESM of PCB.*
Component/ Outcome 3 ***Environmentally sound management (ESM) of PCBs***	*3.1 National PCB storage capacity, in terms of a mass of PCB equipment and waste that can be safely stored, of selected storage facilities in the country is available and up to international standards.* *Storage facilities are upgraded and monitored under the project for the safe storage of PCB equipment/oils/waste pending final disposal or decontamination procedures*	*Storage facilities available in industrial sites needing checking and upgrading, in some cases contaminated by PCBs.* *Some industrial companies plan dismantling of storage facilities*	*- Storage facilities for the temporary storage of PCB contaminated* *equipment are identified (to be completed at mid-term)* *- Upgrade of safety and emergency response in selected storage facilities* *- PPE equipment for personnel is available to*	*- At least 2 storage facilities have been upgraded to ensure safe storage of PCB equipment and waste in fulfilment of national and international rules on PCBs.*	*Storage facilities needs only limited intervention to ensure the increase of their safety up to the required standards.* *Storage facilities can be upgraded and permitted within planned budget and timeframe.*

		after all identified PCBs are removed from their industrial territories	*ensure safe operations* *- Monitoring over quality of storage over time is ensured by enforcement authorities*		
	Documentary and direct evidence that environmentally sound technologies or services for PCBs disposal/dehalogenation have been identified, assessed and procured	*No PCBs disposal technology available in the country to address pure PCB oils/waste* *No PCB dehalogenation technology is available in the country to address cross-contaminated PCB oils* *No PCB contaminated soil remediation technology is*	*- Identification and technical-economic feasibility analysis of disposal options based on the amount of pure and low-concentration PCBs identified (to be completed at mid-term)* *- Drafting of TORs for the procurement of PCBs disposal/decontamination service and equipment (to be completed at mid-term).* *- EIA process over decontamination plants carried out if needed to enable technology*	*All planned preparatory already achieved at mid-term* *PCB dehalogenation technology is rented/installed in the country to treat low-concentrated PCB oils*	*UNDP experts and national stakeholders establish cooperation so that the technical specification and identification of proper technologies are really suited to the specific country situation and needs.* *Technologies for the safe disposal of waste with high PCB content – up to 60% - and for the treatment of equipment with low PCB content – up to few thousands ppm – are commercially available and vendors of these technologies will submit bids to UNDP tenders.*

		available in the country	*to operate locally (to be completed at midterm)*		
	Amount of equipment or waste containing or contaminated by PCB disposed in an Environmental Sound Way.	*Before GEF/UNDP project, around 173 tons of equipment containing PCBs sent abroad for disposal from 2007 to 2009.* *Similarly, around 36 tons of PCB contaminated soil sent abroad or disposal.*	*- For pure PCBs, existing qualified service providers informed and invited and tender for hazardous waste handling* *- The selected PCB decontamination technologies demonstrated in action as part of procurement activity for their reliability, environmental performance and compliance with national regulation, Stockholm and Basel conventions' requirements (to be completed at mid-term).* *- Associated sub-contracts for export of pure PCB waste and decontamination of low-concentrated in place, and pre-bid*	*-Destruction /treatment of 700 tons of PCB contaminated equipment in progress with disposal certificates obtained* *- Disposal / treatment of 200 t of* *PCB containing waste including contaminated soil completed with disposal certificates obtained*	*UNDP uses experience from other projects to ensure the effectiveness and reliability of technology's choice for both pure/high-concentrated and low-concentrated wastes.* *Selected vendors already familiar with the requirements and activities related to testing of their technologies.* *PCB contaminated equipment and waste are identified, safely stored and secured to their disposal under the project* *No PCB waste transit limitations are in place to block waste export operations* *EIA/SIA assessments are completed to allow PCB dehalogenation technology*

			conferences for interested bidders held to improve quality of received bids		*to be put into operation for low-concentrated PCB containing oils.*
Component/ Outcome 4 ***Knowledge Management and M&E***	*Documentary evidence that project's results sustained and replicated through proper M&E and Knowledge Management actions.*	*N/A*	*- Inception activities carried out, project management structure implemented, KM system including project website established (to be completed in the 1st year of project implementation)*		*All the relevant stakeholders well aware on GEF/UNDP rules as well as National Legislation, and willing to cooperate in the timely establishment of project management structures.*
		N/A	*- Project reporting and planning established and implemented*	*- Project reporting and planning continued until project end*	*Project reporting and planning mechanisms and templates timely communicated and agreed with project management staff at all level.*
		N/A	*- Midterm Evaluation and auditing activities carried out.*	*- Terminal and auditing activities carried out; terminal reporting completed and submitted to GoM, UNDP and GEF.*	*Project stakeholders actively cooperating in all evaluation and auditing activities.* *Evaluation and auditing are carried out in an independent and professional way, with the purpose to enhance*

					project activities and generate recommendations for project success and sustainability after project closure.

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

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

ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

i. Title page
    - Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
    - UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
    - TE timeframe and date of final TE report
    - Region and countries included in the project
    - GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
    - Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
    - TE Team members

ii. Acknowledgements

iii. Table of Contents

iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
    - Project Information Table
    - Project Description (brief)
    - Evaluation Ratings Table
    - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
    - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
    - Purpose and objective of the TE
    - Scope
    - Methodology
    - Data Collection & Analysis
    - Ethics
    - Limitations to the evaluation
    - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
    - Project start and duration, including milestones
    - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
    - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
    - Immediate and development objectives of the project
    - Expected results
    - Main stakeholders: summary list
    - Theory of Change
4. Findings
   (in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating5)
   4.1 Project Design/Formulation
    - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
    - Assumptions and Risks
    - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
    - Planned stakeholder participation
    - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

[5] See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

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

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

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

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level?			
(include evaluative questions)	*(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)*	*(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)*	*(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)*
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
(Expand the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP oversight/implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)			

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

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

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

Signature: _____

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

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

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

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

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

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

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

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

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