**INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT NOTICE**

Date: 10 February 2013

**Country: Jordan**

**Description of the assignment:**

**International Consultant to Conduct a Mid-term Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Post Title:** | **International Consultant to Conduct a Mid-term Evaluation** |
| **Starting Date:** | Early March |
| **Duration:** | 12 working days during March, **out of which 6 working days in Jordan, and 6 working days home based.** |
| **Location:** | Jordan – Amman, and home based |
| **Project:** | **Implementation of Phase I of a comprehensive Poly Chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) management system in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan** |

To apply, kindly read the procurement notice, attach the following documents as one file and attach to the following link: <http://jobs.undp.org/>

1. CV
2. Technical proposal
3. Financial proposal

No later than 18 February, 2013

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail to [mohammad.alatoom@undp.org](mailto:mohammad.alatoom@undp.org), Mr. Alatoom will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

* 1. **BACKGROUND & CONTEXT**

The world community had initiated global efforts to regulate and control POPs, and in 2001 the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants was adopted which then entered into force in 2004. PCBs were listed in the initial register of twelve (12) POPs and have been since then controlled by the Convention. All parties which acceded or ratified the Convention assumed specific obligations to ensure safe POPs management.

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan signed the Convention in 2002 and ratified it in 2004. By becoming a party, the Government had taken on the mandatory obligations to implement the Convention and the control measures identified in its guidance text.

The first step towards meeting the obligations was the development and formulation of the National Implementation Plan (NIP) for Stockholm Convention. The NIP was prepared and transmitted to the Stockholm Convention Secretariat in December 2006.

The requirement to deal with PCBs has been identified in the NIP of Jordan. It was reported that no PCBs were ever produced in the country or re-exported, and that some of the old electrical equipment could contain PCBs. The PCB equipment was in fact an imported product originating from other countries. The two main chemical which were suspected to be in the equipment were limited to Askarel and Sovtol. The survey which was carried out at that time was focused on transformer type of equipment due to time limitations, and thus no study over the other types of equipment was performed – capacitors and circuit breakers were not covered by the survey. Resulting from the initial study, the NIP had reported that PCB materials have been found to be in power electrical equipment such as transformers and in oil reserve.

The primary locations for transformers were the Al-Husain Power Plant (5 pieces of equipment amounting to around 11 tons of PCB oil and 1.5 tons of PCB oil stored at the facility) and the Irbid Electricity Distribution Company (4 pieces of transformers showed PCB contamination with 1.5 tons of PCB containing oil estimated). The former site accounted for 90% of PCB materials available in the country.

During the NIP stage, the lessons learned from the field surveys were that it was rather difficult to obtain required information on electrical equipment in the utility and industrial sectors since no accurate documentation on the PCB equipment was available, specifically for the equipment procured and installed prior to 1980. The NIP further proposed urgent actions on a comprehensive and detailed survey of the oil electric equipment across the electricity distribution companies to create a better picture on the PCB material inventory available in the country. The NIP also listed regulatory measures which were in place in 2005 to initiate the control over the PCB management. There have been no regulations which would control the handling of PCBs and their safe disposal; however, a ban on import of import and use of oil with PCB content of above 0.005% PCB by weight was introduced by the Ministry of Health in 2005. It was also concluded, after the NIP initial studies were completed, that the lack of laboratory capacity to identify PCBs was one of the main barriers for completing the PCB inventory, and no designated storage places for PCB materials which would meet internationally established standards were identified in Jordan. The low level awareness among a significant number of stakeholders was detected during the NIP formulation, and all these aspects were summarized in the NIP Action Plan which was adopted in June 2006. To date, the NIP has received limited follow-up implementation due to the need for international technical assistance.

In 2010, however, the GEF, through UNDP, had provided project formulation assistance in order to revisit the NIP data on the PCB issue, perform additional industry contacts and inventory cross-checks in order to a technical assistance package to install internationally recognized and viable system for sage PCB management in Jordan.

The Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase has allowed contacting and visiting several major owners (users) of power equipment in the country. Among them are:

(-) All entities of the utility sector (IDECO, EDCO, NEPCO, JEPCO, CEGCO) – though not all locations;

(-) The national oil refinery company,

(-) Two mines of the phosphate industries,

(-) The potash mining company at the Dead Sea area,

(-) The international Queen Alia Airport at the city of Amman, and

(-) The LaFarge subsidiary at Fuheis.

**PROJECT GOAL, OBJECTIVES, OUTCOMES and OUTPUTS:**

The developed GEF project scenario will provide necessary tools and increase technical capacity of the country to meet the requirements with respect to the Stockholm Convention with the overall objective of safeguarding the environment and health from PCB impacts at the national and global levels. A comprehensive system for environmentally sound management and disposal of PCB materials will be put in place, including up-to-date and functional PCB regulatory standards aligned with internationally recommended benchmarks. The system will allow the required capacity building at the national level with a demonstration element targeting PCB material disposal abroad. The demo disposal component envisaged in the project will further re-enforce the awareness raising effect to ensure that industrial sector is fully aware of the Government requirements and approaches for safe PCB management through its ultimate disposal.

The project was formulated to address the identified principal barriers as outlined in the previous section.

The following paragraphs list the main project components included in the Project Framework:

**Component 1: Regulatory and administrative strengthening for PCB management.** The component aims at the formulation of relevant laws and regulatory measures for effective control of PCB handling in the country: hazardous waste classification, equipment registration, labeling and status reporting of PCBs.

Through quality training and information dissemination workshops, the component will achieve better awareness level on the regulatory system and its requirements.

**Component 2: Improving PCB inventory and technical capacity for Environmentally Sound Management (ESM) of PCB equipment and materials**. Importantly, this component will address the barriers associated with the incomplete knowledge on the PCB inventory in the country through stimulating expanded sampling and testing of equipment oil. It will be aligned with removing limitations identified in the PCB analytical capacity sector, and specifically in the field, at the electric equipment owners. The component will further help in establishing a functional PCB equipment database. Further, it will develop ESM system for the direct application by enterprises with specialized trainings in the proper handling of PCB equipment. The in-house capacity of the private/public sector companies will be improved to prepare them to manage PCB equipment safely and minimize PCB releases, human exposure and equipment cross-contamination. Finally, it will address the highly recommended need for infrastructure upgrade to have proper interim storages which will serve the project needs within its timeframe and beyond prior to final PCB disposal abroad.

**Component 3: Demonstration projects for testing ESM system and disposal of PCB containing equipment**.

This element has been designed to test the feasibility and reliability of all the previously described project components performing together in a holistic PCB management system for meeting practical suitability of the project’s approach.

**Component 4: Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach and evaluation**

This component is expected to ensure that the project delivers sustained results for the country and for the replication of the experience elsewhere where it is appropriate and according to dominant circumstances.

1. **Scope of work**

Within the context outlined above, UNDP seeks the recruitment of an international consultant to support the achievement of the following project mid-term evaluation objectives:

Conduct a mid-term evaluation of the PCBs Project in line with internal procedures of UNDP and GEF guidlines. The scope of Objective One should cover the following:

The scope of the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluators will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. It will also attempt to evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues contribution to targets not adequately achieved.

The key product expected from the Mid-term evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, follow requirements as indicated in Annex E.

The terminal evaluation report will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions. The report will have to provide convincing evidence to support its findings/ratings.

The report together with its annexes shall be presented in electronic form in MS Word format.

The consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring engagement with the project team, project partners and key stakeholders.

The consultant is expected to use interviews as a means of collecting data on the performance and success of the project. Questionnaires prepared by the consultant can be distributed to national project partners, facilitated by participating implementing agencies

**3. METHODOLOGY**

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported and GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_C:)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the Ministry of Environment and other stakeholder agencies, GEF OFPs, UNDP Country Offices, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment.

**Evaluation criteria and ratings**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex E](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental : |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

**Project finance / co-finance**

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Mainstreaming**

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

**Impact**

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts.

**Conclusions, recommendations and lessons**

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

**Implementation arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Jordan CO. UNDP Jordan will issue and manage the contract. The Project Team and Country Offices involved will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, coordinate with the Government etc.

*Although the Consultant should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.*

**Evaluator ethics**

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

**4. DELIVERABLES**

Below are the required activities and expected outputs (deliverables), based on the objectives and scope of work stated above, respective timelines/deadlines and number of working days:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output** | **Timeline** |
| 1. Agenda of meetings’ and reports submission time plans | 2 days after signing the contract and meeting with Project’s management team for initial sources of information |
| 1. Debriefing meeting on evaluation results with Project’s stakeholders, and delivery of an inception report | After conclusion of the mission |
| 1. A first draft of the evaluation report | 15-20 March |
| 1. Final evaluation report responding to all comments from Project’s stakeholders. | 20-30 March |

1. **REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

**A) Education:**

* Advanced university degree in management or public administration or planning/strategic planning or development or project management/evaluation or environmental science and management or environmental law and policy or any other relevant major.
* A degree in topics relevant to themes of Stockholm Convention, Basel Convention) or very relevant fields to the Hazardous Materials Management.

**B) Professional Experiences & Skills:**

* Preferably 10 years of professional experience in fields relevant to public administration or planning/strategic planning or development or project management/evaluation or environmental science and management or environmental law and policy or any other relevant major.
* Preferably 5 years of experience in Hazardous Material Management or very relevant fields to the Stockholm and Basel Conventions’ themes or any relevant filed.
* Minimum 5 years’ experience in conducting evaluation of similar projects
* Sound knowledge about results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation).
* Fluency in written and spoken English
* Full computer literacy

**C) Competencies**

* Strong interpersonal skills, communication and diplomatic skills, ability to work in a team
* Ability to plan and organize his/her work, efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results
* Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback
* Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations
* Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities
* Keeps abreast of available technology, understands its applicability and limitations, willingness to learn new technology

1. **DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.**

* Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:
* 1. Proposal:

(i) Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work

(ii) Provide a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work.

* 2. Financial proposal
* 3. Personal CV including past experience in similar projects and at least 3 references

**FINANCIAL PROPOSAL**

**Lump sum contracts**

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount including fees, travel cost (ticket), DSA, while local transportations (local travel means inside Jordan (IRBID, ZARQA, KARAK, MAAN, AQABA and others) will be covered by the project. Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump sum amount.

1. **EVALUATION**

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodologies:

Cumulative analysis

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

\* Technical Criteria weight; 80%

\* Financial Criteria weight; 20%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 60 point would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Criteria*** | ***Weight*** | ***Max. Point*** |
| *Technical* | *80%* |  |
| Having carried out similar or related work |  | *40* |
| Technical approach and methodology and work plan demonstrating a clear understanding of the job to be done |  | *40* |
| *Financial* | *20%* | *20* |

1. **DURATION OF MISSION**

# The expected duration of this assignment is up to 3-4 weeks consisting of approximately (12 working days) to conduct necessary meetings and finalize the evaluation report.

**Annex A Project Results Framework:**

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:**  Enhanced capacities for safer management of hazardous waste |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**  (i) amount of Hazardous (PCB) waste disposed correctly according to international criteria, and (ii) percentage reduction in the number of PCB contaminated areas |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):**  Environmentally sound management and disposal of PCB in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:**  **Objectives:** To reduce and eliminate production, use and releases of POPs  **Program:**  (1) POPs SP1 Strengthening Capacities for NIP Development and Implementation,  (2) POPs SP2 Partnering in Investments for NIP Implementation |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:**   1. GEF eligible countries have the capacity to implement the measures required to meet their obligations under the Convention, including POPs reduction measures. As such measures will address the full range of chemicals (e.g., pesticides, industrial chemicals, and unintentionally produced by-products). Countries will also be implementing measures that will improve their general capacity to achieve the sound management of chemicals. 2. Sustainably-reduced POPs production, use, and releases, through phase-out, destruction in an environmentally sound manner, and use of substitute products and alternative processes, that lead to reduced environmental and health risks resulting from POPs. |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:**  (1)Indicators for Outcome 1:  (a) legislative and regulatory framework in place in supported countries for the management of POPs and the sound management of chemicals in general;  (b) Strengthened and sustainable administrative capacity, including chemicals management administration within the central government in supported countries;  (c) Strengthened and sustainable capacity for enforcement in supported countries.  (2) Indicators for Outcome 2:  (a) POPs phased out from use (tons and cost per ton per compound)  (c) POPs destroyed in an environmentally sound manner (tons and cost per  ton per compound and mode of destruction)  (d) Reduced exposure to POPs, measured as the number of people living in close proximity to POPs wastes that have been disposed of or contained |

| Project Strategy | Objectively verifiable indicators | Baseline | Target | Sources of verification | Assumptions |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective: Implementation of a comprehensive PCBs management system in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan | Comprehensive PCB management system is installed on country-wide level through capacity building which is tested and promoted by demonstration for PCB final disposal in order to meet Jordan’s obligation under the Stockholm Convention by the end of the project. | * Lack of up-to-date regulatory measures for PCB control * Lack of national capacity and experience with PCB identification and management * Limited national resources for the implementation of the Convention * Low level awareness on the PCB risks | * Regulatory measures to assist in the identification, labelling, capturing and disposing of PCB materials. * ESM system to cover PCB handling in line with internationally accepted standards. * National capacity to manage PCB is upgraded through transfer of technical advice and specialized trainings * PCB materials are known, labeled, stored and disposed of in environmentally sound ways | * Documented number of regulatory upgrades which are approved in the country * PCB database is functional * Country Convention compliance status reporting. * Project Progress and M&E reports | * Electrical equipment owners are fully committed to support the project’s objective on a sector wide basis * Legislative upgrade and enforcement capacity is ensured by the authorities and the implementation is done in good cooperation with project stakeholders * Accurate monitoring and reporting. |
| **Component 1** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1**  Laws, regulations and guidelines for PCB management developed | Regulations and guidelines for PCB management are in line with international standards including registration, labeling and reporting of potential all PCB and PCB containing materials in use in 2010. | * Lack of appropriate regulatory measures to start controlling the PCB handling aspects in the country * Potentially PCB contaminated equipment goes for metal scrapping without oil testing * No mandatory identification, registration and reporting on PCB equipment is done across the equipment owners * In the absence of controls, private sector does not attach importance to voluntary cooperation measures to improve PCB management practices | PCB regulations and guidelines are commonly developed in order to meet international standards and practices to backstop effective and safe PCB controls. | * Documented number of regulatory upgrades which are approved in the country * Records of published regulatory measures (newspapers, web-site information) * Inventory of PCB equipment is updated and information is documented through regular reports * Project Progress and M&E reports | * Legislative upgrade up to internationally accepted standards and enforcement capacity is ensured by the authorities and the implementation is done in good cooperation with project stakeholders * Electrical equipment owners are fully committed to support the project’s objective on a sector wide basis |
| **Outcome 2**  Sustained and targeted awareness raising on various levels | Information dissemination campaigns ensure availability of printed and electronic information through workshops and work with media | * Significant gaps in knowledge about PCB associated risks * No information products published * Very limited number of workshops held | * Information products developed and published * National workshops are arranged throughout the project’s duration to distribute developed information packages * Media coverage on PCB issues is ensured | * Copies of publications * Documented media appearances and newspaper articles * Number of workshops held and number of participants * Project Progress and M&E reports. * Setup of the web-site | * Professional technical advice is ensured and the quality of information is high * Project stakeholders are receptive of the information and show interest |
| **Component 2** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1** Development of PCB detection and analytical capacity through equipment/ tools and specialized training for analytical surveys | * Country has a comprehensive inventory of PCB containing and contaminated equipment * Reports from personnel responsible for equipment testing. * Labeling of tested equipment showing the new classifications (PCBs free, contaminated above 50 ppm * 2 units of portable sampling and testing equipment are supplied * 2 engineers per utility company are trained in the use of such equipment. | * Analytical capacity is limited to specialized labs with GC equipment, lacks modern protocols for PCB identification and skills for the use of such protocols. GC equipment is expensive per unitary sample test and slow in delivering testing results. * Country does not have a comprehensive inventory of PCB equipment | * All potentially contaminated oil transformers at utility sector and major private industries are tested for PCB. Equipment is labeled and registered * Comprehensive PCB equipment inventory is done and helps accurate reporting to the authorities * PCB equipment is recorded in a centralized manner for the use by authorities and for public information * The database serves reporting obligations to the Stockholm Convention * Analytical capacity is upgraded through the supply of portable equipment and GC protocols and specialized trainings for existing labs. | * Number of PCB equipment inventory reports from private sector * Central database is filled with data on a regular basis and is operational * Project team verifies inventory through direct visits to the project stakeholders. | * Electrical equipment owners are fully committed to support the project’s objective on a sector wide basis * Enforcement capacity is ensured by the authorities and the implementation is done in good cooperation with project stakeholders |
| **Outcome 2** Development of ESM system and specialized training for PCB experts to promote the system’s applicability in practice | Development of ESM system is completed and it’s successful implementation is backstopped by appropriate PCB legislative framework | * PCB equipment handling is unsafe and does not meet any international norms. * Potentially PCB contaminated equipment goes for metal scrapping * Low level awareness of PCB associated risks * No specialized training in safe PCB management has been provided and no capacity exists to prevent PCB releases or equipment cross-contamination * No secure PCB material storage facilities exist | * ESM system is developed * PCB holders are aware of PCB risks associated with equipment maintenance and retirement. * Private sector is trained in identification and registration of PCB equipment * Three regional PCB storage facilities established and upgraded to meet international standards with appropriate training for personnel * Private sector is provided professional services to pick-up, transport and handle indentified PCB materials in ESM manner to prepare the waste for final disposal | * ESM system is approved by law for mandatory application * Number of trained personnel in ESM techniques and methods * Number of companies implementing ESM   . | * Electrical equipment owners are fully committed to support the project’s objective on a sector wide basis * Legislative upgrade and enforcement capacity is ensured by the authorities and the implementation is done in good cooperation with project stakeholders |
| **Outcome 3** Identification and setup of storage facilities for proper interim PCB containment | Three interim PCB accumulation and storage points are installed and meet internationally accepted standards for safety and management by 2012 | * Lack of modern and safe interim PCB accumulation and storage points. * Owners of PCB transformers willing to dispose of the priority hazardous materials in poor condition lack the opportunity to do so. * Unprotected storages for disconnected electrical equipment, including PCB equipment, increase the risks of PCB spread into the environment. | * Three PCB accumulation and storage facilities are upgraded to meet internationally accepted standards and this backstops the functioning of the ESM system. * All phased out transformers, especially those that are tested for PCB above 50 ppm, PCB capacitors and other PCB materials are stored in safe and environmentally sound manner which meets internationally practices * Uncontrolled PCB releases from stored disconnected PCB equipment are minimized. | * National/international tenders for the infrastructure upgrade and reports/certification by international experts on the storage management setup system. * Approval of facilities by authorities * Project Progress and M&E reports. | * All 3 foreseen interim storages are agreed by the owners. * ESM system regulations are adopted in time * Operation team at interim storages is well trained and equipped. |
| **Component 3** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1**  Development of capacity to securely transport, handle, package, securely stockpile PCB wastes and disposal of stockpiles (pure and contaminated) | * Incoming inventory reports from the interim storages on quantities, characteristics and origin of the PCB materials. * Trained personnel at the storage sites to assist in transporting the waste material to storage/handling sites, safe PCB oil draining, packing and securing the wastes by 2012. * Additional tests for cross-contaminated equipment which underwent oil replacement (equipment contamination level allowed at 1,000 ppm upper limit level) * Disposal of 40 tons of pure and 100 tons of contaminated PCB materials by export to a licensed disposal facility by 2014. | * Limited capability in the safe handling of PCB materials. * PCB equipment is sent for scrap and contamination of media and exposure of workers continues. | * National capacity to handle PCB materials for final safe disposal is improved. * Economical solution for oil transformers with contamination below 1,000 ppm PCB in the oil is developed. * Equipment containing PCB (40 tons) and oil contaminated with PCB above 50 ppm (100 tons) will be disposed of according to international standards and practices for all times. * Number of PCB contaminated transformers is reduced in the country allowing minimizing further equipment cross-contamination. | * Data reporting on packed PCB materials from storage facilities * PCB content certificates for previously PCB contaminated equipment after PCB oil was replaced. * Approvals for PCB material shipment in line with the Basel convention requirements * Project tender documentation * Destruction certificates for PCB materials received from licensed disposal facilities abroad. | * Electrical equipment owners are fully committed to support the project’s objective on a sector wide basis * PCB materials are accumulated at storage locations in quantities allowing for international tenders. * PCB oil is drained/changed in transformers in ESM manner by trained personnel. Health of the workers is protected by PPE. * Basel convention notification documents are prepared and cleared for PCB waste export. |
| **Component 4** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1**  Project results are evaluated, used in adaptive management and replicated | M&E and adaptive management applied to project in response to needs, mid-term evaluation findings with lessons learned extracted. | * No Monitoring and Evaluation system * No evaluation of project output and outcomes | * Monitoring and Evaluation system developed during year 1. * Mid-term-evaluation of project output and outcomes conducted with lessons learnt at 30 months of implementation. * Final evaluation report ready in the end of project | * Project document inception workshop report. * Independent mid-term evaluation report. * Final evaluation report | * Availability of reference material and progress reports * Cooperation of stakeholder agencies and other organizations. |

Annex B: Evaluation Questions

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * How and why have project outcomes and strategies contributed to the achievement of the expected results? Have the project outcomes contributed to national development priorities and plans? | * tbd[[2]](#footnote-2) | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Are the project’s objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within the project’s timeframe? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Were the capacities of executing institutions and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
|  | * What are the underlying factors beyond the project’s immediate control and to what extent they have influenced outcomes and results? How appropriate and effective were the project’s management strategies for these factors. | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * To what extent have the project objectives and outcomes, as set out in the Project Document, project’s Logical Framework and other related documents, have been achieved? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Review planned strategies and plans for achieving the overall objective of the project within the timeframe. | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the assumptions made by the project right and what new assumptions that should be made could be identified? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the project budget and duration planned in a cost-effective way? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How and to what extent have implementing agencies contributed and national counterparts (public, private) assisted the project? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * How useful was the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to it? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Were the risks identified in the project document and PIRs the most important and the risk ratings applied appropriately? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How and to what extent have project implementation process, coordination with participating stakeholders and important aspects affected the timely project start-up, implementation and closure? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Do the outcomes developed during the project formulation still represent the best project strategy for achieving the project objectives? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How have local stakeholders participated in project management and decision-making? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project? What could be improved? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Does the project consult and make use of skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the implementation and evaluation of project activities? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * Was project sustainability strategy developed during the project design? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * How relevant was the project sustainability strategy? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there a sufficient public/ stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * How has the project contributed to the reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |
|  | * Are the project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? | * tbd | * tbd | * tbd | |

Annex C: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings  5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

Annex D: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex E: Evaluation Report Outline[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **i.** | **Opening page:**   * Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project * UNDP and GEF project ID#s. * Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report * Region and countries included in the project * GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program * Implementing Partner and other project partners * Evaluation team members * Acknowledgements |
| **ii.** | **Executive Summary**   * Project Summary Table * Project Description (brief) * Evaluation Rating Table * Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons |
| **iii.** | **Acronyms and Abbreviations**  (See: UNDP Editorial Manual[[5]](#footnote-5)) |
| **1.** | **Introduction (4-5 pages)**   * Purpose of the evaluation * Scope & Methodology * Structure of the evaluation report |
| **2.** | **Project description and development context (2-3 pages)**   * Project start and duration * Problems that the project sought to address * Immediate and development objectives of the project * Baseline Indicators established * Main stakeholders * Expected Results |
| **3.** | **Findings (20 pages)**  (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | **Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons (3-5 pages)**   * 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 * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | **Annexes**   * ToR * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. tbd – to be determined by consultant in consultations with the project team [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)