



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent terminal evaluation of project

*Removal of Technical and Economic Barriers to Initiating the Clean-up Activities
for Alpha-HCH, Beta-HCH and Lindane Contaminated Sites at OHIS*

UNIDO ID: 100122

GEF Project ID: 4385

| 11/2022 |

Contents

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	3
1.	Project factsheet	3
2.	Project context	3
3.	Project objective and expected outcomes	4
4.	Project implementation arrangements	4
5.	Main findings of the Mid-term review (MTR).....	5
6.	Budget information	6
II.	SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	7
III.	EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY.....	7
1.	Data collection methods	8
2.	Evaluation key questions and criteria.....	8
3.	Rating system	10
IV.	EVALUATION PROCESS	11
V.	TIME SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES	11
VI.	EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION.....	11
VII.	REPORTING.....	12
VIII.	QUALITY ASSURANCE	13
	Annex 1: Project Logical Framework.....	14
	Annex 2: Job descriptions.....	32

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1. Project factsheet¹²

Project title	Removal of Technical and Economic Barriers to Initiating the Clean-up Activities for Alpha-HCH, Beta-HCH and Lindane Contaminated Sites at OHIS
UNIDO ID	100122
GEF Project ID	4385
Country(ies)	Republic of North Macedonia
Project donor(s)	GEF
Project approval date/GEF CEO endorsement date	12 August 2014
Planned project start date (as indicated in project document/or GEF CEO endorsement document)	1 January 2015
Actual project start date (First PAD issuance date)	1 January 2015
Planned project completion date (as indicated in project document/or GEF CEO endorsement document)	February 2020
Actual project completion date (as indicated in UNIDO ERP system)	31 March 2023
Project duration (year): Planned: Actual:	5 ys 7 ys
GEF Focal Areas and Operational Programme	POPs
Implementing agency(ies)	UNIDO
Executing Partners	Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning
Donor funding	USD 3,100,000
UNIDO input (in kind, USD)	USD 50,000
Co-financing at CEO Endorsement, as applicable	USD 12,450,000
Total project cost (USD), excluding support costs	USD 15,650,000
Mid-term review date	April-June 2019
Planned terminal evaluation date	October 2022 – March 2023

(Source: Project document, UNIDO ERP system)

2. Project context

The Organic Chemical Industry of Skopje AD (OHIS) was affected by the historical production of lindane, an organochlorine pesticide. The lindane plant was put into operation since 1964 and manufactured lindane until 1977, when its production ceased due to changing market conditions and negative environmental impact. Lindane, the gamma isomer of hexachloro-cyclohexane (HCH) was produced by the process of photo-chlorination of benzene. The produced mixture also contained other HCH isomers, i.e. alfa-, beta- and delta-HCH. Approximately 37,000 cubic meters of alfa-, beta- and delta-HCH were ‘temporarily’ stockpiled in open dumpsites, consisting of a concrete pool covered with a layer of soil.

¹ Data to be validated by the Consultant

According to the National Implementation Plan (NIP) of the Republic of North Macedonia, although HCH was not included in the list of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) chemicals at the time of preparing the NIP, HCH was to be considered in the strategic planning due to the existing quantities of industrial waste containing technical mixture of HCH isomers in North Macedonia. Lindane (HCH) was included in the review, because it has all the characteristics that POPs have – persistency, bioaccumulation, toxicity, low volatility.

The realization of the project “Removal of Technical and Economic Barriers to Initiating the Clean-up Activities for Alpha-HCH, Beta-HCH and Lindane Contaminated Sites at OHIS” is expected to enable the Republic of North Macedonia to handle and remediate the contaminated site, by setting up a sustainable mechanism to ensure a sustainable clean-up operation at the selected HCH-contaminated site for future industrial use, and to protect human health and the environment from their adverse effects by reducing and eliminating the releases of and exposure to HCHs (6,000 m³ or 10,700 tons to be disposed within the project period).

3. Project objective and expected outcomes

The project objective is to set up a sustainable mechanism to ensure a durable and continued clean-up operation at the selected HCH-contaminated site for future industrial use, and to protect human health and the environment from their adverse effects by reducing and eliminating the releases of and exposure to HCHs.

The achievement of the project objectives was envisaged through the following four technical components and related expected outcomes, besides Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and project management:

Component I – Legal framework and institutional capacities

Expected Outcome: Legal framework and institutional capacities to support, justify and evaluate the clean-up of the OHIS site contaminated by alpha-HCH, beta-HCH and lindane established, enhanced and enforced

Component II – Characterization of the site and risk assessment

Expected Outcome: Characterization of the HCH contaminated site completed, risk assessed and risk management options defined

Component III – Clean up strategies and plan.

Expected Outcome: Contaminated site clean-up plan and strategies established and key stakeholders including local communities ready to cooperate

Component IV – Establishment of clean up mechanism and operations.

Expected Outcome: Clean-up operation initiated and the execution mechanism in place to sustain the clean-up operations beyond the project period

4. Project implementation arrangements

UNIDO is the GEF Implementing Agency (IA) for the project. A project focal point was to be established within UNIDO to assist with project execution. This focal point was meant to consist of dedicated core staff, supplemented by support from support staff colleagues on a part-time as required basis, supervised by a senior professional staff engaged in the management and coordination of UNIDO’s POPs and chemical

management program. UNIDO was to make these services available as part of its in-kind contribution to the project.

Among the main stakeholders involved in the project implementation:

- Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning (MoEPP), lead Agency for the project with the role of coordinating, participating, facilitating and monitoring the execution at national level;
- MoEPP's POPs unit, responsible for the preparation and implementation of NIPs at national level;
- The State Environment Inspectorate (SEI), responsible for inspecting and supervising the enforcement of laws and regulations in the domain of environment;
- Ministry of Health (MoH), responsible for creating the conditions of development of the industry, regulation of internal market, development of the energy sector and incentives to stimulate businesses;
- Ministry of Finance (MoF), responsible to maintain stable public financing and stable macroeconomic framework.

5. Main findings of the Mid-term review (MTR)

Conducted in mid-2019, the MTR provided important insights over the project implementation. Among the main findings:

- Relevance: the project is consistent with the Country's priorities and it is considered highly relevant by all the interviewed stakeholders in the Republic of North Macedonia;
- Effectiveness: outcome 1 and 2 were already completed by the time the MTR took place, n.3 was under implementation and 4 hadn't started yet;
- Efficiency: at the time of the MTR, project resources in terms of funding and expertise had been used in line with the project document to produce results;
- Gender: Despite not being included in the baseline studies nor needs assessment, gender-focused groups have been made part of the project throughout the implementation.

The MTR has the following key recommendations:

- Tendering procedure for the selection of technology provider to be initiated as soon as realistically possible
- Adoption of Rules of Procedure for the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and Terms of Reference (TOR) for PSC - acceptance if no substantive objection within 7 days, in future projects
- Remaining activities to be expedited without any further delays
- The amended Law on Environment to be adopted as soon as practically possible
- Capacity building to be continued for all stakeholders
- MOEPP should have a register/database for contaminated sites
- Awareness-raising activities to be continued
- Clean-up operation and other related activities to be expedited to the extent realistic
- Continuation of remediation activities of contaminated sites
- MOEPP should consider preparing a National Plan, including budget, for the years after project completion, to continue with remediation activities
- Contaminated sites' projects could be prioritized under the GEF-7 cycle.

6. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown

Project outcomes/components	Donor (GEF)(\$)	Co-Financing (\$)	Total (\$)
Outcome 1	123,500	24,150	147,650
Outcome 2	110,300	1,761,100	1,871,400
Outcome 3	73,300	1,003,900	1,077,200
Outcome 4	2,514,800	8,956,750	11,471,550
M&E	78,100	9,600	87,700
Total (\$)	2,900,000	11,755,500	14,655,500

Source: Project document

Table 2. Co-Financing source breakdown

Name of Co-financier (source)	In-kind	Cash	Total Amount (\$)
MoEPP <i>National Government</i>	6,125,000	6,275,000	12,400,000
UNIDO <i>GEF agency</i>		50,000	50,000
Total Co-financing (\$)			12,450,000

Source : Project document

Table 3. UNIDO budget allocation and expenditure by budget line

Budget line	Items by budget line	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	Total	
										(USD)	%
2100	Contractual Services	18,808	114	155,355	64,064	-654	1,000,000	1,208,169	-617	2,445,239	81,2
4500	Equipment	0	0	1,884	11,495	0	37	148,433	70	161,919	5,4
3500	Int. meetings	0	0	0	6,212	0	0	0	0	6,212	0,2
1500	Local travel	8,488	1,421	0	227	2,695	4,267	1,269	60	18,427	0,6
1700	Nat. Consult./Staff	45,781	0	12,589	47,042	53,675	52,059	57,077	28,248	296,471	9,9
5100	Other Direct Costs	2,677	1,485	6	4,548	3,293	2,617	3,124	719	18,469	0,6
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	6,225	18,165	9	10	18,206	8,382	8,332	0	59,329	1,9
300	Train/Fellowship/Study								6,414	6,414	0,2
Total		83,994	23,201	171,860	135,616	36,916	1,069,382	1,428,425	36,916	3,012,480	100%

Source: Project document and UNIDO Project Management ERP database as of **20 September 2022**

Table 4. UNIDO budget allocation and expenditure by component

#	Project components	Total allocation (at approval)		Total expenditure (at completion)	
		USD/Euro	%	USD/Euro	%
1	Legal framework and institutional capacities to support, justify and evaluate the clean-up of the OHIS site contaminated by alpha-HCH, beta-HCH and lindane established, enhanced and enforced	125,500	4%		

2	Characterization of the HCH contaminated site completed, risk assessed and risk management options defined	110,300	3,3%		
3	Contaminated site clean up plan and strategies established and key stakeholders including local communities ready to cooperate	73,300	2,1%		
4	Clean up operation initiated and the execution mechanism in place to sustain the clean up operations beyond the project period.	2,514,800	82%		
5	M&E	78,100	2,3%		
6	Project management	200,000	6,3%		
	Total	3,100,000	100%		

Source: Project document and UNIDO Project Management ERP database as of 20 September 2022

II. SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation is to independently assess the project to help UNIDO improve performance and results of ongoing and future programmes and projects. The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in January 2015 to the estimated completion date in December 2022.

The evaluation has two specific objectives:

- (i) Assess the project performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence, and progress to impact; and
- (ii) Develop a series of findings, lessons and recommendations for enhancing the design of new and implementation of ongoing projects by UNIDO.

III. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The TE will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy³, the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle⁴, and UNIDO [Evaluation Manual](#). In addition, the GEF Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies will be applied.

The evaluation will be carried out as an independent in-depth exercise using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project will be informed and consulted throughout the process. The evaluation team leader will liaise with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EIO/IED) on the conduct of the evaluation and methodological issues.

The evaluation will use a theory of change approach⁵ and mixed methods to collect data and information from a range of sources and informants. It will pay attention to triangulating the data and information

³ UNIDO. (2018). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (UNIDO/DGB/2018/08)

⁴ UNIDO. (2006). Director-General's Administrative Instruction No. 17/Rev.1: Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle (DGAI.17/Rev.1, 24 August 2006)

⁵ For more information on Theory of Change, please see chapter 3.4 of UNIDO [Evaluation Manual](#)

collected before forming its assessment. This is essential to ensure an evidence-based and credible evaluation, with robust analytical underpinning.

The theory of change will depict the causal and transformational pathways from project outputs to outcomes and longer-term impacts. It also identifies the drivers and barriers to achieving results. The learning from this analysis will be useful for the design of the future projects so that the management team can effectively use the theory of change to manage the project based on results.

1. Data collection methods

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

- (a) **Desk and literature review** of documents related to the project, including but not limited to:
 - The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports, mid-term review report, technical reports, back-to-office mission report(s), end-of-contract report(s) and relevant correspondence.
 - Notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project.
- (b) **Stakeholder consultations** will be conducted through structured and semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion. Key stakeholders to be interviewed include:
 - UNIDO Management and staff involved in the project; and
 - Representatives of donors, counterparts and stakeholders.
- (c) **Field visit** to project sites in Republic of North Macedonia.
 - On-site observation of results achieved by the project, including interviews of actual and potential project beneficiaries.
 - Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Country Office(s) representative to the extent that he/she was involved in the project, and the project's management members and the various national [and sub-regional] authorities dealing with project activities as necessary.
- (d) **Online data collection** methods: will be used to the extent possible.

2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

The key evaluation questions are the following:

- 1) How well has the project performed? Has the project done the right things? Has the project done things right, with good value for money? How well has the project fit?
- 2) What are the project's key results (outputs, outcome and impact)? To what extent have the expected results been achieved or are likely to be achieved? To what extent are the achieved results to be sustained after the completion of the project?
- 3) What are the key drivers and barriers to achieve the long term objectives? To what extent has the project helped put in place the conditions likely to address the drivers, overcome barriers and contribute to the long term objectives?
- 4) What are the key risks (e.g. in terms of financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental risks) and how these risks may affect the continuation of results after the project ends?
- 5) What lessons can be drawn from the successful and unsuccessful practices in designing, implementing and managing the project?

The table below provides the key evaluation criteria to be assessed by the evaluation. The details questions to assess each evaluation criterion are in annex 2 of UNIDO [Evaluation Manual](#).

Table 5. Project evaluation criteria

#	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
A	Progress to impact	Yes
B	Project design	Yes
1	• Overall design	Yes
2	• Logframe	Yes
C	Project performance	
1	• Relevance	Yes
2	• Effectiveness	Yes
3	• Coherence	Yes
4	• Efficiency	Yes
5	• Sustainability of benefits	Yes
D	Cross-cutting performance criteria	
1	• Gender mainstreaming	Yes
2	• M&E: ✓ M&E design ✓ M&E implementation	Yes Yes
3	• Results-based Management (RBM)	Yes
E	Performance of partners	
1	• UNIDO	Yes
2	• National counterparts	Yes
3	• Donor	Yes
F	Overall assessment	Yes

Performance of partners

The assessment of performance of partners will **include** the quality of implementation and execution of the GEF Agencies and project executing entities in discharging their expected roles and responsibilities. The assessment will take into account the following:

- Quality of Implementation, e.g. the extent to which the agency delivered effectively, with focus on elements that were controllable from the given implementing agency’s perspective and how well risks were identified and managed.
- Quality of Execution, e.g. the appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services.

Other assessments required by the GEF for GEF-funded projects, for non GEF projects these topics should be covered as applicable:

The terminal evaluation will assess the following topics, for which **ratings are not required:**

- Need for follow-up:** e.g. in instances financial mismanagement, unintended negative impacts or risks.
- Materialization of co-financing:** e.g. the extent to which the expected co-financing materialized, whether co-financing was administered by the project management or by some other organization; whether and how shortfall or excess in co-financing affected project results. **At the terminal evaluation point, the Project Manager will update table 3 on co-financing and add two more columns to submit to the evaluation team: 1) Amount of co-financing materialized at mid-term review (MTR); and 2) Amount of co-financing materialized at terminal evaluation (TE). The**

evaluation team has the responsibility to validate and verify the co-financing amount materialized during the evaluation process. This table MUST BE included in the terminal evaluation report, as per requirement by the GEF.

- c. **Environmental and Social Safeguards**⁶: appropriate environmental and social safeguards were addressed in the project’s design and implementation, e.g. preventive or mitigation measures for any foreseeable adverse effects and/or harm to environment or to any stakeholder.
- d. **Updated Monitoring and Assessment tool of core-indicators**: The project management team will submit to the evaluation team the up-to-date core-indicators or tracking tool (for older projects) whereby all the information on the project results and benefits promised at approval and actually achieved at completion point must be presented. The evaluation team has the responsibility to validate and verify updated core-indicators during the evaluation process. This table MUST BE included in the terminal evaluation report, as per requirement by the GEF.
- e. **Knowledge Management Approach**: Information on the project's completed Knowledge Management Approach that was approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval.

3. Rating system

In line with the practice adopted by many development agencies, the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division uses a six-point rating system, where 6 is the highest score (highly satisfactory) and 1 is the lowest (highly unsatisfactory) as per table below.

Table 6. Project rating criteria

Score		Definition	Category
6	Highly satisfactory	Level of achievement presents no shortcomings (90% - 100% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	SATISFACTORY
5	Satisfactory	Level of achievement presents minor shortcomings (70% - 89% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	
4	Moderately satisfactory	Level of achievement presents moderate shortcomings (50% - 69% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	
3	Moderately unsatisfactory	Level of achievement presents some significant shortcomings (30% - 49% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	UNSATISFACTORY
2	Unsatisfactory	Level of achievement presents major shortcomings (10% - 29% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	
1	Highly unsatisfactory	Level of achievement presents severe shortcomings (0% - 9% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	

⁶ Refer to GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1 available at: http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meetingdocuments/C.41.10.Rev_1.Policy_on_Environmental_and_Social_Safeguards.Final%20of%20Nov%2018.pdf

IV. EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation will be conducted from October 2022 to February 2023. The evaluation will be implemented in five phases which are not strictly sequential, but in many cases iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping:

- 1) Inception phase: The evaluation team will prepare the inception report providing details on the evaluation methodology and include an evaluation matrix with specific issues for the evaluation to address; the specific site visits will be determined during the inception phase, taking into consideration the findings and recommendations of the mid-term review.
- 2) Desk review and data analysis;
- 3) Interviews, survey and literature review;
- 4) Country visits (whenever possible) and debriefing to key relevant stakeholders in the field;
- 5) Data analysis, report writing and debriefing to UNIDO staff at the Headquarters; and
- 6) Final report issuance and distribution with management response sheet, and publication of the final evaluation report in UNIDO website.

V. TIME SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from October 2022 to March 2023. The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned for January 2023. At the end of the field mission, the evaluation team will present the preliminary findings for key relevant stakeholders involved in this project in the country. The tentative timelines are provided in the table below.

After the evaluation field mission, the evaluation team will draft the TE report which will be submitted 4 to 6 weeks after the end of the mission. The draft TE report is to be shared with the UNIDO Project Manager (PM), UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, the UNIDO GEF Coordinator and GEF OFP and other stakeholders for comments. The ET leader is expected to revise the draft TE report based on the comments received, edit the language and submit the final version of the TE report in accordance with UNIDO ODG/EIO/EID standards. The evaluation team will present online the evaluation findings and recommendations to UNIDO staff in the Headquarters afterwards.

Table 7. Tentative timelines

Timelines	Tasks
Nov-Dec 2022	Desk review and writing of inception report
December 2022	Online briefing with UNIDO project manager and the project team based in Vienna.
January 2023	Field visit to Macedonia
February 2023	Preparation of first draft evaluation report Internal peer review of the report by UNIDO's Independent Evaluation Division and other stakeholder comments to draft evaluation report
March 2023	Debriefing of the evaluation findings and recommendations to UNIDO stakeholders in Vienna (online).
March 2023	Final evaluation report

VI. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluation consultant acting as the team leader and one national evaluation consultant. The evaluation team members will possess a mixed skill set and experience including relevant technical expertise, evaluation, social and environmental safeguards and gender. Both consultants will be contracted by UNIDO.

The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions annexed to these terms of reference. The evaluation team is required to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including terminal evaluation verification on request to the GEF partnership up to three years after completion of the terminal evaluation.

According to UNIDO Evaluation Policy, members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the project under evaluation.

The UNIDO Project Manager and the project management team in Macedonia will support the evaluation team. The UNIDO GEF Coordinator and GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP) will be briefed on the evaluation and provide support to its conduct. GEF OFP(s) will, where applicable and feasible, also be briefed and debriefed at the start and end of the evaluation mission.

An evaluation manager from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division will provide technical backstopping to the evaluation team and ensure the quality of the evaluation. The UNIDO Project Manager and national project teams will act as resourced persons and provide support to the evaluation team and the evaluation manager.

VII. REPORTING

Inception report

This Terms of Reference (ToR) provides some information on the evaluation methodology, but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager, the Team Leader will prepare, in collaboration with the team member, a short inception report that will operationalize the ToR relating to the evaluation questions and provide information on what type and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). It will be discussed with and approved by the responsible UNIDO Evaluation Manager.

The Inception Report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework (“evaluation matrix”); division of work between the evaluation team members; field mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable⁷.

Evaluation report format and review procedures

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (with a suggested report outline) and circulated to UNIDO staff and key stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or responses, or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft report will be sent to UNIDO’s Independent Evaluation Division for collation and onward transmission to the evaluation team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

⁷ The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

The evaluation team will present its preliminary findings to the local stakeholders at the end of the field visit and take into account their feed-back in preparing the evaluation report. A presentation of preliminary findings will take place at UNIDO HQ afterwards.

The evaluation report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, what was evaluated, and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

VIII. QUALITY ASSURANCE

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on methodology and process of UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, providing inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report and evaluation report by UNIDO's Independent Evaluation Division).

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO's evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation report are reviewed by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, which will submit the final report to the GEF Evaluation Office and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.

Annex 1: Project Logical Framework

Interventions	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (Baseline)	Target (TBD is to be determined during the project phase)		Means Verification	of Assumptions	Mitigation Measures
		Mid-term	End of project			
<p>Project Objective</p> <p>The country is capable of completing the site clean up at OHIS by engaging the sustainable mechanism established for cleaning up the OHIS contaminated site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Number of new businesses (Baseline: 0); □ Amount of incremental investment by key stakeholders for sound management of chemicals (0) 	1 TBD	1 TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ National reports to the Stockholm Convention on identified and disposed HCH quantities; □ Evaluation reports including interviews with stakeholders and the operating entity; □ Site visit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ∅ The project is the national and municipal government priority; ∅ Sustainable financial input follows after the project ends; ∅ Adequate financial input will be additionally provided to finish the site clean 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The project design and proposal is developed in consultation with the government and co-financing partners; □ An operating entity will be chosen considering the technical, business, and socio-economic capacities to sustain a clean up operation

<p>Outcome 1: Legal framework and institutional capacities to support, justify and evaluate the clean-up of the OHIS site contaminated by alpha-HCH, beta-HCH and lindane established, enhanced and enforced</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Number of management plan, environment laws and regulation approved/enacted (0) <input type="checkbox"/> Number of guidelines, tools and procedures enabling contaminated site management (identification, prioritization, risk assessment and remediation) (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of companies adopting best practices (0) 	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of regulations and documents; <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting minutes; <input type="checkbox"/> Project Progress Reports 	<p>Ø Development and adoption of proposed laws, regulations, and technical guidelines will be smoothly executed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Project staff will monitor review and foster enactment of legal and regulatory measures and technical tools and provide the relevant counterparts with technical support
<p>Output 1.1: Legal acts and institutional and technical tools prepared to ensure the completion of the OHIS site clean up operations and building capacities towards contaminated sites management in general</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Contaminated site regulations harmonized in accordance to the Stockholm Convention and EU requirements, by respecting the country specific conditions, prepared, reviewed, agreed and approved (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of legal acts prepared (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of stakeholders including site owners involved 	<p>1</p> <p>3</p> <p>5</p> <p>3</p> <p>(30/30)</p>	<p>1</p> <p>3</p> <p>5</p> <p>3</p> <p>30/30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Minutes of the meetings with lists of participants; <input type="checkbox"/> Analysis and recommendation reports; <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of prepared legal acts and revised legislation; <input type="checkbox"/> Project Progress Report; <input type="checkbox"/> Records of published and posted changes and upgrades in the regulatory measures and acts 	<p>Ø Key stakeholders agree on regulatory measures and are committed to supporting the project objectives during the consultation process;</p> <p>Ø Law-making and regulatory bodies cooperative to collect information and responsive to recommendations;</p> <p>Ø Government commitment to timely processing and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Additional awareness raising on the government plans will be promoted through workshops and direct contacts with the stakeholders; <input type="checkbox"/> Willingness of project parties has been documented through the commitment letters; <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant stakeholders are invited as Steering Committee members and closely informed of

	<p>in the regulatory preparation with gender segregation information (0);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of round table discussions and workshops on policy improvement (0);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of participants (male/female) (0/0);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of environment policies, strategies, laws, regulation approved/enacted including POPs threshold levels and remediation values, consistent with the internationally accepted standards in different media (0)</p>	1	1	(newspapers, website, official gazette);	enforcing of required regulations	<p>the project's needs on the new regulations;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Government officials are closely involved in project planning so that the new regulations are practical, enforceable and meeting the needs at the national governments and municipalities</p>
Output 1.2: Technical tools (guidelines, procedures, instructions) for contaminated site management prepared and approved	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of new guidelines, procedures, instructions for environmental officers and the potential contaminated site clean up operators developed, reviewed and agreed (0);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of stakeholders involved</p>	1 5 3 20/20	1 5 3 20/20	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Minutes of the meetings with lists of participants</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Analysis and recommendation reports;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Copies of prepared guidelines, procedures, instructions;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Records of</p>	<p>∅ The preparation of guidance and procedures is in good cooperation with all involved parties;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> ∅ Government and key stakeholders are committed to timely adopting of required guidelines and tools</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Ensure technical tools to be produced in close consultation with the users to ensure the tools are practical, understandable and implementable</p>

	<p>in the technical tools preparation (0);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of round table discussions on technical tools improvement (0);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of participants (male/female) (0/0);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Technical tools submitted to responsible authority for their approval (0)</p>	1	1	<p>published and posted guidelines, procedures and instructions (newspapers, website, official gazette);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Progress Report</p>		
Output 1.3: Environmental officers, contaminated site owners and the potential contaminated site clean up operators trained on practical usage of the prepared guidelines, procedures and instructions	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of environmental officers and persons from the contaminated site owners and potential clean up operators trained on practical use of the technical tools (male/female) (0/0);</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of trainings held (0);</p>	36/18	36/18	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Training reports on covered subject and a list of trained persons;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Copies of training materials and modules;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Progress Report</p>	<p>∅ There are capacities of and resources given to environmental officers to absorb the training content and carry out the contaminated site identification and risk assessment;</p> <p>∅ Private sectors will follow and implement instructions from the provided trainings and guidelines on contaminated sites management</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> MoEPP will enhance its personnel to have the sufficient work force and technical capacities enough to institutionalize the clean up operations;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Private sectors will be provided with legal framework and administrative support to generate an enabling environment for the environmental practice to be sustained;</p>
1.4: Laboratory personnel trained for sampling and analyses standards and protocols for POPs/HCH	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of available MoEPP and IPH laboratories for sampling and analysis of POPs in different</p>	2	2	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Accreditation documents;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Training certificates;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A list of trained</p>	<p>∅ Sufficient laboratory capacities are available to</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Well trained staff will be selected;</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The clean up operation will incorporate chemical</p>

	media (oil, air, soil, water) biological matrices (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of trained laboratory personnel (male/female) (0/0)	5/5	5/5	laboratory personnel	absorb the training content; Ø Laboratories are willing to invest their time and resources to get accredited for and to maintain the POPs analysis in different matrices	analysis as a step important to confirm the completion of the cleaned part of the contaminated site; The government will ensure and enforce, when needed, the laboratory tests are mandated during the site clean up operation as indicated in the guidelines.
Outcome 2: Characterization of the HCH contaminated site completed, risk assessed and risk management options defined	<input type="checkbox"/> HCH contaminated site characterized and risk assessed (0)	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> Progress report; <input type="checkbox"/> Site investigation report; <input type="checkbox"/> Risk assessment report	<input type="checkbox"/> The site owner and community around the HCH contaminated site will grant access to the sites to have the sites adequately characterized and risk properly assessed	<input type="checkbox"/> The director in charge of the contaminated site is involved since the project design phase; <input type="checkbox"/> Communities will be contacted through public hearing and awareness raising events
Output 2.1: Site characterization, i.e. detailed site investigation completed by sampling and analyses based on the sampling plan developed during PPG	<input type="checkbox"/> HCH contaminated site investigation completed (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed site investigation report prepared (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of boreholes installed with number of samples collected and	1 1 50 boreholes and 130 samples	1 1 50/130	<input type="checkbox"/> Sampling plan; <input type="checkbox"/> Site visit to boreholes; <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory analysis results of the environmental and biological matrices; <input type="checkbox"/> Check lists of the detailed site investigations;	<input type="checkbox"/> The site owner and community around the HCH contaminated site will grant access to the sites to have the sites adequately characterized and risk properly assessed	<input type="checkbox"/> The director in charge of the contaminated site is involved since the project design phase; <input type="checkbox"/> Communities will be contacted through public hearing and awareness raising events

	analyzed (0 boreholes and 0 samples)			<input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the detailed site investigation report;		
Output 2.2: Survey of groundwater for drinking and irrigation purposes conducted	<input type="checkbox"/> Detailed survey of the groundwater for drinking and irrigation purposes prepared (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of wells/boreholes installed for survey preparation and monitoring and number of domestic wells investigated (0 water samples from wells)	1 20	1 40	<input type="checkbox"/> Survey report with sampling points indicated; <input type="checkbox"/> Records of samples and analytical results; <input type="checkbox"/> Site visit and labels on wells identified as inappropriate for drinking and irrigation purposes;	∅ Local communities will arrange and allow access for samples collection and will follow the eventual water use restrictions as needed	<input type="checkbox"/> Local communities will have opportunities to be informed of the project activities as part of the awareness raising activities
Output 2.3: Current risk assessment analyses updated and the risk management options defined	<input type="checkbox"/> Risk assessment analyses, prepared as part of previously developed feasibility studies, updated based on the detailed site investigation results (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of meetings on risk management options definition (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of participants (male/female) (0/0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of community members informed of the risk	1 1 10/10 20/20 1	1 1 10/10 40/40 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the updated risk assessment study; <input type="checkbox"/> Minutes of the meetings with lists of participants; <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the risk management option decision; <input type="checkbox"/> Project Progress Report	∅ The area of the contamination (particularly groundwater) is not too large for the project to properly assess the risks for the workers on site and community residents in the neighborhood of the contaminated site	<input type="checkbox"/> The scope and geological limit of the risk assessment analysis will be defined with information initially available

	(male/female) (0/0); <input type="checkbox"/> A report on risk management with risk reduction options defined and agreed (0)					
Outcome 3: Contaminated site clean up plan and strategies established and key stakeholders including local communities ready to cooperate	<input type="checkbox"/> A clean up strategic plan (both for project and beyond project) prepared and ready for execution (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Consensus of the general public obtained as legally required (TBD)	1 3 TBD	1 3 TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of reports and plans; <input type="checkbox"/> Comments given by the general audience and local residents at the public hearing/awareness raising meetings; <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of publications (brochures, pamphlets, leaflets, municipality newspaper, web site link)	Ø Development of plans, strategies, public information campaigns and inclusion of the private sector as investors will be smoothly executed ØThe level of awareness, responsiveness and interest to implement the cleanup plan and strategies will be increased	<input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion of the government/communal authorities in plans development process and continuous information dissemination on project decisions
Output 3.1: Contaminated site clean up operation/remediation plan and groundwater management plan prepared for prevention of further contamination and adverse human health impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Contaminated site and groundwater management plan (both for project and beyond project) prepared and ready for execution (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Financial business plan of the remediation operation assessed (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of	1 1 5	1 1 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Copy of contaminated site and groundwater management plan; <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of communications on the planning; <input type="checkbox"/> Project Progress Reports	Ø The site remediation and groundwater management plan will be designed in a way to allow a smooth transition from the project phase to post-project operation mechanism; Ø All stakeholders will agree on the site	<input type="checkbox"/> Awareness raising events will inform the stakeholders of the project activities and will provide feedback opportunities to be adopted for the project activities; <input type="checkbox"/> Additional consultations and

	stakeholders involved in the planning (0)				remediation and groundwater management plan for achieving the acceptable level of risk	trainings of the stakeholders.
Output 3.2: Consensus among the general public and major stakeholders built for the establishment/improvement of OHIS contaminated site	<input type="checkbox"/> Types of awareness propagation materials (brochures, web page, etc.) prepared and published (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of public hearing and awareness raising meetings (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of participants (male/female) (0/0); <input type="checkbox"/> A report on cost-benefit analysis justifying the site clean up prepared (0)	2 2 40/40 1	2 2 40/40 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Comments given by the general audience and local residents at the public hearing/awareness raising meetings; <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of publications (brochures, pamphlets, leaflets, municipality newspaper, web site link); <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the cost-benefit analysis report; <input type="checkbox"/> Minutes of the meetings with lists of participants	Ø The general public and the major stakeholders are familiar and supportive of the forthcoming clean-up activities; Ø Different target groups will maintain their interests in ensuring the HCH dumps are treated properly and sustainably; Ø The bidding of the OHIS site that have been attempted many times in the past will consider the project's needs and future clean up plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Awareness raising events will inform the stakeholders of the project activities and will provide feedback opportunities to be adopted for the project activities; <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness raising materials prepared in a manner understandable for the general audience; <input type="checkbox"/> Cost-benefit analysis confirming the benefit of the community from the clean up action
Output 3.3: City development plan and zoning of OHIS site reviewed and revised	<input type="checkbox"/> A city development plan and zoning with relevant operation permits revised and granted (0);	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of updated urban development plans; <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of operation permits	Ø City development plan will be updated by incorporating the project's clean-up plan including the definition of	<input type="checkbox"/> The project management will ensure cooperation between scientific institutions and City Council in making

					remediation target values to match with the future use of the cleaned up site	decision on the desired land use
Outcome 4: Clean up operation initiated and the execution mechanism in place to sustain the clean up operations beyond the project period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Amount of HCH waste and contaminated soil disposed of (0 tons); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of companies adopting best practices (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of new businesses (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Potential private operators and investors identified (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Amount of incremental investment by key stakeholders for sound management of chemicals (TBD until the operating entity will be determined) 	0 1 1 3 TBD	6,000 m3 (10,700 tons) 2 1 3 TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of reports, permits, plans, analytical results; <input type="checkbox"/> Record of the HCH decontamination operations; <input type="checkbox"/> Site visit to the decontamination operations; <input type="checkbox"/> Project Progress Reports; <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation reports 	<p>Ø There are clean up technologies that are affordable and capable of decontaminating the site within the resources that will be made available by the project, government, and investors;</p> <p>Ø A sustainable clean up business operation will be successfully established with a solid business and financial planning;</p> <p>Ø Sufficient political will, demonstrative support and financial commitment of the government to the project will ensure the project activities be delivered in a timely manner;</p> <p>Ø The operating entity will respect the occupational safety and environmental practice guidelines</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Potential technology providers were consulted with the project's needs during the PPG phase, and more details will be clarified in the beginning of the project phase; <input type="checkbox"/> Project staff will provide the relevant counterparts with technical support and will organize additional meetings and workshops to overcome the obstacles <input type="checkbox"/> High-level consultations, as well as civil society and NGOs could play a major role in regaining political commitment. The signed endorsement letter confirms the commitment of the Government

Output 4.1: ToR for the selection of the technology/service providers for the HCH contaminated site remediation prepared	<input type="checkbox"/> ToR for the remediation technology option selection prepared (0);	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the ToR for the remediation technology option selection;	∅ The criteria for evaluation and selection of adequate technical service provider will consider technical, socio-economic and environmental factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Drafting ToR will involve key governmental stakeholders to incorporate relevant requirements for establishing a sustainable clean up operations from technical, socio-economic, and environmental viewpoints
Output 4.2: Technology/service providers selected	<input type="checkbox"/> Number of available disposal, remediation technologies for the HCH-contaminated site evaluated and selected (0);	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> Technical evaluation report; <input type="checkbox"/> Contract signed with the selected bidder	∅ There are clean up technologies that are affordable and capable of decontaminating the site within the resources that will be made available by the project, the Government, and the investors	<input type="checkbox"/> Potential technology providers were consulted with the project's needs during the PPG phase, and more details will be clarified in the beginning of the project phase
Output 4.3: Parties (private sectors, state owned companies or PPP contractual agreement form) interested as potential operators identified and investors as potential clean up operators consulted	<input type="checkbox"/> Number of potential private operators and investors identified with interests to run the clean up operating entity (0)	3	3	<input type="checkbox"/> Letters or communications of interests received from potential private operators; <input type="checkbox"/> Feasibility study for the mode of engagement of the private partner	∅ The potential clean-up operators are identified and the most suitable mode of private sector involvement is agreed; ∅ The financial and other incentives given	<input type="checkbox"/> Potential private sectors will be kept informed of the project updates and major decisions

					by the government are adequate to attract the potential operators	
Output 4.4: Operating entity selected and established	<input type="checkbox"/> HCH clean up operator with qualified institutional capacity for HCH clean up evaluated and selected (1); <input type="checkbox"/> The selected operating entity strengthened for technical and analytical capacities as needed (1)	1 1	1 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the ToR for the bidding to select an operating entity fulfilling the eligible criteria; <input type="checkbox"/> Operating entity selection technical evaluation report; <input type="checkbox"/> Public registration record of the entity	∅ There is a local company with sufficient technical capacities and human resources for cleanup of the HCH contaminated site	<input type="checkbox"/> Some limited training events will be held for the potential operators. They will be kept informed of the project status, which will facilitate their business plan development and consequently investment decisions.
Output 4.5: Clean up operation/remediation and business plan prepared by the selected operating entity in consultation with the technical providers and all stakeholders and approved by the PSC	<input type="checkbox"/> Clean up operation/remediation and business plan indicating financial implications formulated and approved (1); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of meetings on formulation and agreement of the plans (2); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of participants (male/female) (42/18);	1 2 20/20	1 2 20/20	<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the remediation and business plans; <input type="checkbox"/> Minutes of the meetings with lists of participants	∅ Site cleanup operation/remediation and business plan are appropriate to provide the needed directions and information on safe remediation activities and business challenges and financial impacts	<input type="checkbox"/> The selected operating entity will be involved in each step of the operation and business plan formulation

<p>Output 4.6: Needed permits for the technology treatment installation (EIA, IPPC) obtained</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The needed permits for the installation of the HCH treatment technology obtained (0)</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>3</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Copies of Governmental/Local authorities permits (EIA, IPPC, permit for handling, collection and treatment of hazardous wastes, etc.) for operation of the technology treatment installation</p>	<p>Ø Local community will accept the installation of the treatment facility in their neighborhood; Ø Government and local community institutions are committed to timely processing and permitting the treatment technology installation</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Awareness raising and sensitization of technology and additional consultations with the government/local community authorities; <input type="checkbox"/> Round table discussions between the government, local community authorities and NGOs will assure that the facility will meet the highest safety standards and operate respecting the best working practices and procedures for protection of human health and the environment, supported by regular inspections and monitoring program</p>
<p>Output 4.7: A monitoring program, system established in the location</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> A monitoring system in the HCH contaminated site installed (0)</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Site visit for monitoring equipment installed; <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory reports on examined environmental matrices confirming the successfulness of the remediation</p>	<p>Ø The installed monitoring programme is sufficient to evaluate and document successfulness of the treatment and eventual HCH emissions and</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The scope of the environmental (particularly groundwater) pollution beyond the OHIS site will be examined at the onset of the project implementation phase, and this monitoring system will be installed</p>

				with number of samples analyzed	exposure during the treatment	to monitor the area of interest for the project and neighboring communities; <input type="checkbox"/> The fluctuating atmospheric conditions, then historical cases of how the site is affected by these conditions, will be examined. If the flood risk is indeed higher, the project will evaluate the cost-effectiveness of a project activity to secure the contaminated site from a possible flood occurrence
Output 4.8: Clean up operation executed	<input type="checkbox"/> HCH contaminated site remediation technology installed (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of companies adopting best practices (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Amount of incremental investment by key stakeholders for sound management of chemicals (0)	1 1 TBD	1 2 TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Report on technology installation including custom clearance documents, e.g. bill of lading; <input type="checkbox"/> Technology acceptance report signed by stakeholders; <input type="checkbox"/> Records related to site preparation to receive the technology to be	Ø Local community will accept the installation of the treatment facility in their neighborhood	<input type="checkbox"/> Round table discussions between the Government, local community authorities and NGOs will assure that the facility will meet the highest safety standards and operate respecting the best working practices and procedures for protection of human health and the environment, supported by regular

			installed; <input type="checkbox"/> Site visit		inspections and monitoring program
<input type="checkbox"/> Number of trainings for the selected operating entity personnel on proper handling of the remediation technology (technical aspect related to the maintenance, repair and operation of the plant, and safety aspect related to the protection of the workers and environment during the operation) (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of trained persons (male/female) (0/0); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of jobs created (male/female) (0/0)	<p>1</p> <p>7/3 3/1</p>	<p>1</p> <p>7/3 3/1</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Training reports with the list of the operating entity technical personnel and trained persons; <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the training materials	<p>Ø Sufficient technical, personnel and logistical capacities are available at the Operating Entity to absorb the training content and to fully accept the recommendation and gears for safe technology operation</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> The selection of the operating entity will consider the commitment and capacities which secure to establish a sustainable clean up operation
<input type="checkbox"/> Amount of HCH waste and contaminated soil disposed of (0 tons); <input type="checkbox"/> Number of companies adopting best practices (0);	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>TBD</p>	<p>6,000 m3 (10,700tons)</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Record/log for incoming and outgoing material at/from the clean up operator technology/site; <input type="checkbox"/> Record of financial transactions related to the clean up	<p>Ø The operating entity will respect the occupational safety and environmental practice guidelines; Ø A sustainable clean up business operation will be successfully established with a solid business and</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Frequent inspections ensure that the operating entity to follow the best working practices in order to ensure safe handling and incident avoidance; <input type="checkbox"/> Potential technology providers were

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Number of new businesses (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Capping of the HCH dump or other dump containment installed (0); <input type="checkbox"/> Amount of incremental investment by key stakeholders for sound management of chemicals committed for a sustainable mechanism of the clean up operation at the OHIS site (0) 		<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">TBD</p>	<p>operation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Disposal reports including laboratory results confirming the successfulness of the treatment, if export all accompanying notification documents and consents; <input type="checkbox"/> Import, transit and export consents for the disposal of the HCH-containing waste abroad and the freight documentation; <input type="checkbox"/> Integrity (tightness) tests reports for HCH dump capping or other dump containment. <input type="checkbox"/> "Use permit" for HCH dump capping or other dump containment. 	<p>financial planning;</p> <p>Ø Sufficient political will, demonstrative support and financial commitment of the government to the project will ensure the project activities will be delivered in a timely manner</p>	<p>consulted with the project's needs during the PPG phase, and more details will be clarified in the beginning of the project phase;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Project staff will provide the relevant counterparts with technical support and will organize additional meetings and workshops to overcome the obstacles; <input type="checkbox"/> High-level consultations, as well as civil society and NGOs could play a major role in regaining political commitment. The signed endorsement letter confirms the commitment of the Government
--	---	--	---	--	--	--

<p>Outcome 5: Project management structure established, and monitoring and evaluation conducted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Project management structure established (1); <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations adequately conducted according to the GEF's standard (0) <input type="checkbox"/> Project Reports and monitoring and evaluation of project implementation prepared (0) 	<p>1 0</p> <p>as in the M&E plan</p>	<p>1 1</p> <p>as in the M&E plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Official nomination of Project Steering Committee members; <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting minutes of PSC; <input type="checkbox"/> Sub-contract including the establishment of the project management structure; <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation reports; <input type="checkbox"/> Project Reports 	<p>Ø</p> <p>Project management/ coordination structure fully dedicated and responsible for effective and efficient project implementation in a timely manner;</p> <p>Ø Project stakeholders will be flexible enough to adapt to changing situations;</p> <p>Ø Evaluation will be conducted as soon as the project implementation is completed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Regular PSC meetings will track and evaluate project progress and make necessary changes; <input type="checkbox"/> Project progress reports will be prepared to confirm that project outcomes and objectives are met; <input type="checkbox"/> Project work plan and budget will be reviewed and confirmed each year, which can accommodate changes in the implementation environment. <input type="checkbox"/> Carefully selected success indicators and the adaptive monitoring practice will enable timely implementation and high quality results
<p>Output 5.1: Project results monitored and reported</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Project Management Unit (PMU) established (0) with each member's responsibility clearly described in job descriptions and with gender segregation 	<p>1 (2/1)</p>	<p>1 (2/1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Nomination letters for the members of the PMU; <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the contracts with the members of the PMU 	<p>Ø The project staff will stay with the project and contribute to absorbing the technical knowledge and institutional memories</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Carefully selected and well-trained project staff will be appointed

information (male/female) (0/0);					
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Steering Committee (PSC) established (0) and held twice a year and members recruited with gender segregation information (male/female)(0/0);	1 (7/4)	1 (7/4)	<input type="checkbox"/> Decision for the establishment of the multistakeholder PSC with list of the members; <input type="checkbox"/> Minutes of the meetings of the PSC;		<input type="checkbox"/> Letters of commitment from the Government institutions have been obtained; <input type="checkbox"/> Political commitment and awareness will be sustained through awareness raising activities; <input type="checkbox"/> Project progress information will be properly disseminated
			<input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the Project Inception Workshop Report; <input type="checkbox"/> updated indicators; <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the biannual Progress Reports; <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the Annual Project Implementation Reports; <input type="checkbox"/> Annual updated work plans; <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the	Ø PSC is committed to ensure the project is smoothly implemented by providing technical and political guidance Ø Project management/ coordination structure fully dedicated and responsible for effective and efficient project implementation in a timely manner;	<input type="checkbox"/> Project progress closely monitored against the original work plan and impact indicators; <input type="checkbox"/> Clear mandate and impact indicators will assure compliance to the work plan and budget; <input type="checkbox"/> Proper communication channels are established;

				Periodic Thematic Reports; <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the Project Closure Workshop Report <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the Project Terminal Report; <input type="checkbox"/> Minutes of the meetings	Ø Key stakeholders share information critical for the project monitoring and evaluation	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Project progress reports prepared at least biannually and work plans updated as needed (0)	5	10	<input type="checkbox"/> Copy of audit reports	Ø Project evaluation is adequately conducted according to the GEF's standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Project progress closely monitored against the original work plan and corrective actions are performed as needed
Output 5.2: Project evaluated meeting the GEF's evaluation criteria	<input type="checkbox"/> Mid-term external evaluation held (0)	0	1	<input type="checkbox"/> Copy of Mid-term external evaluation report	Ø Project evaluation is adequately conducted according to the GEF's standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Project progress closely monitored against the original work plan and corrective actions are performed as needed
	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal external evaluation held (0)	0	1	<input type="checkbox"/> Copy of Terminal external evaluation report		

Annex 2: Job descriptions



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

Title:	International waste management expert, team leader
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Missions:	Republic of North Macedonia
Start of Contract (EOD):	30 November 2022
End of Contract (COB):	31 March 2023
Number of Working Days:	37 working days spread over the above mentioned period

1. ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EIO/IED) is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides evidence-based analysis and assessment on result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Independent evaluations provide credible, reliable and useful assessment that enables the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. ODG/EIO/IED is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

2. PROJECT CONTEXT

Detailed background information of the project can be found the terms of reference (TOR) for the terminal evaluation.

The international evaluation consultant/team leader will evaluate the project in accordance with the evaluation-related terms of reference (TOR). S/he will perform, inter alia, the following main tasks:

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
<p>1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data). Define technical issues and questions to be addressed by the national technical evaluator prior to the field visit. Determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument if needed. In coordination with the project manager, the project management team and the national technical evaluator, determine the suitable sites to be visited and stakeholders to be interviewed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjusted table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. Identify issues and questions to be addressed by the local technical expert 	6 days	Home-based
<p>2. Prepare an inception report which streamlines the specific questions to address the key issues in the TOR, specific methods that will be used and data to collect in the field visits, confirm the evaluation methodology, draft theory of change, and tentative agenda for field work. Provide guidance to the national evaluator to prepare initial draft of output analysis and review technical inputs prepared by national evaluator, prior to field mission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft theory of change and Evaluation framework to submit to the Evaluation Manager for clearance. Guidance to the national evaluator to prepare output analysis and technical reports 	3 days	Home based
<p>3. Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ (included is preparation of presentation).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning; Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant. 	1 day	Through skype/zoom
<p>4. Conduct field mission to Macedonia ⁸.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct meetings with relevant project 	7 days	Macedonia. Specific

⁸ The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
	stakeholders, beneficiaries, the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP), etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; • Evaluation presentation of the evaluation’s preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country, including the GEF OFP, at the end of the mission. 		project site to be identified at inception phase.
5. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed. 	2 day	Online
6. Prepare the evaluation report, with inputs from the National Consultant, according to the TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the National Consultant and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report. Share the evaluation report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft evaluation report. 	14 day	Home-based
7. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final evaluation report. 	4 day	Home-based

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education:

Advanced degree in environment management, engineering, development studies or related areas.

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 15-20 years' experience in hazardous waste management including waste collection, transfer, recycling, treatment and disposal facilities.
- Knowledge of project management, development and review of policies, legislation and guidelines
- Experience in development of national or municipal waste management plans as well as hazardous and health care waste management plans
- Knowledge about technical cooperation, development work and international development priorities and frameworks
- International working experience in developing countries

Languages:

Fluency in written and spoken English is required. All reports and related documents must be in English and presented in electronic format.

Absence of conflict of interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

WE LIVE AND ACT WITH INTEGRITY: work honestly, openly and impartially.

WE SHOW PROFESSIONALISM: work hard and competently in a committed and responsible manner.

WE RESPECT DIVERSITY: work together effectively, respectfully and inclusively, regardless of our differences in culture and perspective.

Core competencies:

WE FOCUS ON PEOPLE: cooperate to fully reach our potential –and this is true for our colleagues as well as our clients. Emotional intelligence and receptiveness are vital parts of our UNIDO identity.

WE FOCUS ON RESULTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES: focus on planning, organizing and managing our work effectively and efficiently. We are responsible and accountable for achieving our results and meeting our performance standards. This accountability does not end with our colleagues and supervisors, but we also owe it to those we serve and who have trusted us to contribute to a better, safer and healthier world.

WE COMMUNICATE AND EARN TRUST: communicate effectively with one another and build an environment of trust where we can all excel in our work.

WE THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX AND INNOVATE: To stay relevant, we continuously improve, support innovation, share our knowledge and skills, and learn from one another.



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

Title:	National expert – Team member
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	Travel to potential sites within Republic of North Macedonia
Start of Contract:	October 2022
End of Contract:	February 2023
Number of Working Days:	30 days spread over the above mentioned period

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EIO/IED) is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides evidence-based analysis and assessment on result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Independent evaluations provide credible, reliable and useful assessment that enables the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. ODG/EIO/IED is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

PROJECT CONTEXT

Detailed background information of the project can be found the terms of reference (TOR) for the terminal evaluation.

The national evaluation consultant will evaluate the projects according to the terms of reference (TOR) under the leadership of the team leader (international evaluation consultant). S/he will perform the following tasks:

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
Desk review Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information; in cooperation with the team	Evaluation questions, questionnaires/interview guide, logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context;	4 days	Home-based

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
<p>leader, determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in English (questionnaires, logic models);</p> <p>If need be, recommend adjustments to the evaluation framework and Theory of Change in order to ensure their understanding in the local context.</p>	<p>A stakeholder mapping, in coordination with the project team.</p>		
<p>Carry out preliminary analysis of pertaining technical issues determined with the Team Leader.</p> <p>In close coordination with the project staff team verify the extent of achievement of project outputs prior to field visits.</p> <p>Develop a brief analysis of key contextual conditions relevant to the project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report addressing technical issues and question previously identified with the Team leader • Tables that present extent of achievement of project outputs • Brief analysis of conditions relevant to the project 	6 days	Home-based
<p>Coordinate the evaluation mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with project staff in the field.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed evaluation schedule. • List of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. 	2 days	Home-based
<p>Coordinate and conduct the field mission with the team leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required;</p> <p>Consult with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks.</p> <p>Conduct the translation for the Team Leader, when needed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations of the evaluation’s initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission. • Agreement with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks. 	10 days (including travel days)	In Macedonia. Specific project site to be identified at inception phase.
<p>Follow up with stakeholders regarding additional information promised during interviews</p> <p>Prepare inputs to help fill in information and analysis gaps (mostly related to technical issues) and to prepare notes,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of draft evaluation report prepared. 	8 days	Home-based

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
<p>tables to be included in the evaluation report as agreed with the Team Leader.</p> <p>Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and proof read the final version.</p>			

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree in environmental science, political science or other relevant discipline like developmental studies with a specialization in climate change.

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 5 years of experience in project management and project development in environment management and climate sector
- Good knowledge in institutional framework and governance in environment management and climate change
- Good experience in organizing, coordinating and facilitating stakeholder workshops, focus groups.
- Experience and knowledge in environment management, waste management are a plus
- Experience in project monitoring and evaluation is an asset
- Familiarity and experience in development projects and programmes and working experience with international development agencies is an asset.

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English and in Macedonian is required.

Absence of conflict of interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

WE LIVE AND ACT WITH INTEGRITY: work honestly, openly and impartially.

WE SHOW PROFESSIONALISM: work hard and competently in a committed and responsible manner.

WE RESPECT DIVERSITY: work together effectively, respectfully and inclusively, regardless of our differences in culture and perspective.

Core competencies:

WE FOCUS ON PEOPLE: cooperate to fully reach our potential –and this is true for our colleagues as well as our clients. Emotional intelligence and receptiveness are vital parts of our UNIDO identity.

WE FOCUS ON RESULTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES: focus on planning, organizing and managing our work effectively and efficiently. We are responsible and accountable for achieving our results and meeting our performance standards. This accountability does not end with our colleagues and supervisors, but we also owe

it to those we serve and who have trusted us to contribute to a better, safer and healthier world.

WE COMMUNICATE AND EARN TRUST: communicate effectively with one another and build an environment of trust where we can all excel in our work.

WE THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX AND INNOVATE: To stay relevant, we continuously improve, support innovation, share our knowledge and skills, and learn from one another.