**PROGRAMA DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA EL DESARROLLO**

**PROYECTO No. 84331- GESTIÓN INTEGRAL DE PCBS (POLY CHLORINATED BIPHENYLS) EN COSTA RICA**

**TERMINOS DE REFERENCIA**

**(Consecutivo Adquisiciones 6)**

**Consultoría para la Evaluación Final del Proyecto Gestión Integral de PCBs (Poly Chlorinated Biphenyls) en Costa Rica.**

1. **OBJETO DE LA CONTRATACIÓN**

Realizar una evaluación final en inglés del proyecto en seguimiento la guía de evaluación adjunta Anexo 1.

1. **TAREAS Y RESPONSABILIDADES**

**Además de las actividades contempladas en el Anexo 1, se requiere que la persona contratada tome en cuenta la siguiente acción**:

Impulsar en el desarrollo de sus tareas y responsabilidades, la promoción de los Derechos Humanos, la igualdad de género y el empoderamiento de las mujeres y las niñas, así como la búsqueda del cumplimiento de los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible y la agenda 2030

1. **PERFIL DE LA PERSONA REQUERIDA:**

**Requisitos y calificaciones**:

* Profesional con grado universitario de Bachiller con preferencia Maestría en Monitoreo y Evaluación, gestión Ambiental, Química, Ingeniería, Administración, Ciencias exactas, Desarrollo Sostenible, Economía, Ciencias Sociales u otras carreras afines)
* Al menos 2 años de experiencia en asuntos relacionados con COPs (POP’s)
* Al menos 5 años de experiencia profesional en el área de Desarrollo, medio Ambiente, Desarrollo Sostenible, con conocimiento técnico en las áreas focales del GEF, y áreas multi-focales y capacidades transversales para Acuerdos Multilaterales Ambientales.
* Al menos 5 años de experiencia en evaluación, monitoreo o implementación de proyectos en un marco de gestión basada en resultados y manejo adaptativo con logros demostrados en la evaluación de organizaciones internacionales, preferiblemente del PNUD-GEF
* Conocimiento demostrado de Monitoreo y Evaluación de GEF
* Conocimiento del sector Ambiental de Costa Rica
* Excelentes destrezas de redacción y escribir reportes en inglés
* Buenas destrezas de comunicación

Otros requisitos:

* **Deseable** conocimiento en Derechos Humano, igualdad de género y empoderamiento de las mujeres y las niñas
* **Deseable** conocimiento sobre la Agenda 2030 para el desarrollo sostenible

**Competencias corporativas**

* *Demuestra integridad con los valores de estándares éticos de Naciones Unidas*
* *Demuestra compromiso a la misión, visión y valores de las Naciones Unidas*
* *Demuestra adaptación y sensibilidad a aspectos culturales, de género, religión, raza, nacionalidad y de edad*
* *Tiene un trato justo para todas las personas*
* *Tiene creatividad e innovación para la coordinación y manejo de actividades*
* *Tiene excelentes destrezas organizacionales y habilidad para desarrollar múltiples tareas efectivamente*
* *Tiene sentido de confidencialidad*

1. **PERÍODO DE LA CONSULTORÍA**

El contrato tendrá una duración de **2 mes** (con 15 días laborables dentro de este periodo), iniciando a partir de la firma del respectivo contrato.

1. **HONORARIOS Y FORMA DE PAGO**

El lugar de trabajo para esta consultoría es desde su casa.En el caso que la de la persona contratada no sea residente de la zona, el proyecto no asume los costos de traslado y estadía en la zona de trabajo.

Las personas oferentes deberán presentar una oferta económica en colones por el valor total de sus servicios profesionales para las tareas solicitadas por la consultoría. Los costos de las actividades tales como talleres, reproducción de materiales, desplazamiento local para visitas de terreno y comunidades en funciones de la consultoría, corren por cuenta del proyecto y no deben ser incluidos en la oferta económica. Todos los gastos de viáticos y transporte corren por cuenta de la persona consultora. Correrá por cuenta y responsabilidad de la persona contratada, el personal de apoyo y de campo que necesite contratar para realizar la evaluación final. Correrá por cuenta y responsabilidad de la persona contratada, los gastos en que incurra por el empleo de herramientas tecnológicas (software, hardware) y otras herramientas para realizar la evaluación~~.~~

Los honorarios serán pagados en colones y se harán en 3 tractos cada tracto se pagará, **10 días después de la aprobación** por parte del Coordinador Nacional del Proyecto, de cada uno de los productos y contra presentación de factura timbrada y/o electrónica según corresponda. El plazo máximo de la consultoría es de **2** meses, pero se puede presentar los productos antes de los plazos estipulados

Esta Consultoría se realizará bajo la supervisión del Coordinador Nacional del Proyecto y del oficia de Desarrollo Sostenible del PNUD.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PRODUCTOS** | **PLAZO DE ENTREGA** | **Porcentaje de Pago total** |
| **Primer Producto**: Plan de Trabajo/misión (Mission Work-plan.) según el detalle del product especificado en la página 16 de estos TdR | *10 días después de la firma de contrato* | *10%* |
| **Segundo Producto**: Primer borrador de evaluación  (Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report) según el detalle del producto especificado en la página 16 de estos TdR | *3 semanas después de realizada la mission de evaluación* | *30%* |
| **Tercer Producto**: Reporte de Evaluación Final (aprobado por PNUD CO y RTA)  (Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report) según el detalle del product especificado en la página 16 de estos TdR | *1 semana después de la reivisión del borrador de evaluación.* | *60%* |

1. **EVALUACION DE LAS OFERTAS**

* Para la evaluación de las propuestas se utiliza un procedimiento que consta de dos etapas mediante el cual la evaluación de la propuesta técnica se realiza con anterioridad a la apertura y comparación de cualquier propuesta económica. Sólo se abrirá la propuesta económica de las ofertas que obtengan al menos **700** de la calificación total de **1000** puntos correspondiente a la evaluación de las propuestas técnicas.
* La propuesta técnica se evaluará sobre la base de su correspondencia o adecuación con respecto a los Términos de Referencia (TDR’s).
* En la segunda etapa se compararán las propuestas económicas de todos los oferentes que hayan obtenido la calificación mínima de 700 puntos en la evaluación técnica. El puntaje máximo por el factor precio que se puede obtener es de 300 puntos. Este puntaje será adjudicado a la oferta económica más baja. Todas las ofertas restantes recibirán puntaje en proporción inversa a la oferta económica menor.
* La Oferta Económica deberá incluir un detalle de cada actividad cotizada por separado, de manera que se refleje el desglose de costos para cada producto.

El puntaje del Factor Precio (Oferta Económica) se determinará por medio de la siguiente fórmula[[1]](https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/" \l "m_3516725885190571633__ftn1):

                                        PFP=     (POMB / PO)    \*  300

Donde:

PFP = Porcentaje del Factor Precio

POMB = Precio Oferta Más Bajo

PO  = Precio Oferente

Criterios Evaluación calidades y experiencia.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluación de calidades y experiencia  Formulario 1 | | Puntaje Máximo | Oferente | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | E |
| Calidades y experiencia del oferente | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| 1 | * Profesional con grado universitario de Bachiller con preferencia Maestría en Monitoreo y Evaluación, gestión Ambiental, Química, Ingeniería, Administración, Ciencias exactas, Desarrollo Sostenible, Economía, Ciencias Sociales u otras carreras afines) | Bachiller: 75 ptos  Master o PhD:  100 pts |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | * Al menos 2 años de experiencia en asuntos relacionados con COPs (POP’s) | Max. 100 ptos  3 o más años exp. 100ptos  2 años de experiencia 50 ptos  Menos de 2 años 0 puntos |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | * Al menos 5 años de experiencia profesional en el área de Desarrollo, medio Ambiente, Desarrollo Sostenible, con conocimiento técnico en las áreas focales del GEF, y áreas multi-focales y capacidades transversales para Acuerdos Multilaterales Ambientales. | Max. 100 ptos  8 o más años exp. 100ptos  Entre 5 y 7 años de experiencia 75 ptos  Menos 5 años 0 puntos |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * Al menos 5 años de experiencia en evaluación, monitoreo o implementación de proyectos en un marco de gestión basada en resultados y manejo adaptativo con logros demostrados en la evaluación de organizaciones internacionales, preferiblemente del PNUD-GEF | Max. 200 ptos  7 o más años exp. 200ptos  Entre 5 y 6 años de experiencia 150 ptos  Menos 5 años 0 puntos |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * Conocimiento demostrado de Monitoreo y Evaluación de GEF * Knowledge of UNDP and GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policies **(10%)** | Max: 100 pts  Más de 6 años de experiencia laboral demuestra Conocimiento en Monitoreo y Evaluación de GEF: 100pts  4-5 años de experiencia laboral demuestra Conocimiento en Monitoreo y Evaluación de GEF: 70pts  2-3 años de experiencia laboral demuestra Conocimiento en Monitoreo y Evaluación de GEF: 50pts  1 año de experiencia laboral demuestra Conocimiento en Monitoreo y Evaluación de GEF: 20pts |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * **Conocimiento del sector Ambiental de Costa Rica** * Knowledge of Environmental Sector in Costa Rica (preferably MINAE). **(20%)** | Max: 200 pts  Más de 6 años de experiencia laboral demuestra Conocimiento Del sector ambiental en Costa Rica: 200pts  4-5 años de experiencia laboral demuestra Conocimiento Del sector ambiental en Costa Rica: 150pts  2-3 años de experiencia laboral demuestra Conocimiento Del sector ambiental en Costa Rica: 100pts  1 año de experiencia laboral demuestra Conocimiento Del sector ambiental en Costa Rica: 50pts |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * Excelentes destrezas de redacción y escribir reportes en inglés * Excellent English Writing and reporting skills (present at least 3 references of documents prepared). **(10%)** | Max: 100pts  Tres ejemplos de reportes escritos en inglés, tienen muy alta calidad de redacción:  100pts  Tres ejemplos de reportes escritos en inglés, tienen buena calidad de redacción:  75pts  Tres ejemplos de reportes escritos en inglés tienen calidad de redacción satisfactoria:  50pts  Tres ejemplos de reportes escritos en inglés tienen calidad de redacción poco satisfactoria:  25pts |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * Buenas destrezas de comunicación: * Good communication skills and positive interrelation. **(10%)** * Presentar un documento de ejemplo de evaluación anterior | Max: 100pts  Documento de ejemplo de evaluación demuestra Muy Buena claridad de planteamientos y buenas destrezas de comunicación: 100pts  Documento de ejemplo de evaluación demuestra buena claridad de planteamientos y buenas destrezas de comunicación: 75pts  Documento de ejemplo de evaluación demuestra Satisfactoria claridad de planteamientos y destrezas de comunicación: 50pts  Documento de ejemplo de evaluación demuestra poca claridad de planteamientos y destrezas de comunicación débiles: 0pts |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TOTAL de puntos 1000Ptos | |  |  |  |  |  |

El(la) oferente deberá presentar una propuesta económica detallada en colones por el valor total del producto/servicio, en la cual deben estar incluidos los montos por concepto de honorarios, hospedaje, alimentación, transporte, materiales y cualquier otro gasto incluyendo sus viáticos si aplica.

Se adjudicará la oferta que obtenga el puntaje total más alto.

1. **REQUISITOS DE LA APLICACIÓN**

Las personas que deseen postularse para esta consultoría deben presentar la siguiente documentación:

1. **Carta de la persona que presenta oferta al PNUD** confirmando interés y disponibilidad utilizando el modelo proporcionado por el PNUD(**Formato Adjunto**) se debe incluir un párrafo indicando cómo su labor y esta consultoría va a acelerar el cumplimiento de los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible y fortalecer la igualdad de género.
2. **Hoja de vida** actualizada que aporte la información necesaria para demostrar las calificaciones académicas, conocimiento y experiencia que la faculten para el desempeño de las tareas solicitadas en estos términos de referencia.
3. **Oferta económica en dólares US$,** que indique el precio fijo total del contrato, todo incluido, sustentado con un desglose de los gastos, según el formato proporcionado. Si la persona Oferente trabaja para una organización / empresa / institución, y él / ella espera que su empleador cobre un costo de administración en el proceso de liberarlo/la al PNUD bajo un Acuerdo de Préstamo Reembolsable (RLA por sus siglas en inglés), la persona Oferente deberá indicar en este punto, y asegurarse que todos los gastos se encuentren debidamente incorporados en la propuesta financiera presentada al PNUD.
4. **Copias de títulos universitarios** y los comprobantes necesarios para demostrar las calificaciones solicitadas.
5. **Propuesta de trabajo** con un nivel de detalle suficiente para comprender la estrategia y enfoque de abordaje y un cronograma de actividades, tomando en cuenta lo indicado en los presentes términos de referencia.
   * Propuesta técnica en español.
   * Propuesta Económica en español.

La presentación de todos los requisitos descritos anteriormente es obligatoria, la falta u omisión de alguno(s) de los requisitos invalida la oferta, por ser considerada como incompleta.

Las aplicaciones deberán dirigirse únicamente a la dirección electrónica [adquisiciones.cr@undp.org](mailto:adquisiciones.cr@undp.org), indicando en el asunto del correo: **CI/CRI/2019/No. 84331/ FINAL EVALUATION PCBs.**

La oferta técnica y la oferta económica deberán adjuntarse en **documentos separados.**

Debe enviarse cada documento en archivos separados, que no superen los 35Mb, identificados por el nombre del documento y de la persona oferente, adjuntos en un único correo. En caso de superar los 35MB, favor enviar los adjuntos distribuidos en varios correos.

Este proceso está dirigido a personas naturales en carácter individual.  Cualquier oferta recibida de una persona jurídica o de dos (2) o más personas será rechazada

La fecha límite para la recepción de aplicaciones a esta consultoría es el día **24 de febrero de 2019, hasta las 23:59 hora de Costa Rica.**

No se atenderán consultas técnicas o administrativas vía telefónica y deberán dirigirse únicamente a [adquisiciones.cr@undp.org](mailto:adquisiciones.cr@undp.org)como máximo el **18 de febrero del 2019 hasta las 23:59 horas de Costa Rica.**

**Solamente se contactarán las personas seleccionadas**

***Se invita a las mujeres a presentar sus ofertas***

**Annex I**

Date: Enero 2018

|  |
| --- |
| **Services required:** Consultancy services to carry out the Terminal Evaluation of the project “Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of Poly Chlorinated Biphenyls in Costa Rica”.  **Time of contract:**  2 months  **Begins:** 1/3/2019 **Ends:** 30/4/2019  **Number and project Name:** 00084331Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs in Costa Rica  **Objective:** The overall objective of the Terminal Evaluation is to analyze the implementation of the project, review the achievements made by the project to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes. It will establish the relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of results.  The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/gef/undp-gef-te-guide.pdf>  **Name of supervisor of products and services:** Kifah Sasa, Programme Officer – UNDP / Jose Alberto Rodriguez–DIGECA - Ministry of Environment and Energy  **Travel requirements:** Travel to Costa Rica City (1)  **Work place:** Home-based and Costa Rica City  **Payments:** According to TOR’s |
|  |

1. **BACKGROUND**

In accordance with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Global Environment Fund’s (GEF) monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation.

These terms of reference set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs in Costa Rica Project.

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Country: | COSTA RICA |
| ATLAS Award ID: | 00070216 |
| PIMS Number: | 4092 |
| GEF Focal Area | POPs |
| GEF Strategic Objective: | POPs SP-1 and POPs SP-2 |
| GEF Budget (USD): | $1.930.000 |
| Co-Financing Budget (USD): | $ 8.709.274 |
| Project Document Signature date: | Costa Rica, |
| Date of first disbursement: | November 2013 |
| Original Planned Closing Date: | December 2017 |
| Executing Agency: | DIGEGA-MINAE |
| Date Mid Term Evaluation took place: | February-April, 2017 |

**Objective and Scope**

This Terms of Reference is for the conduct of a Terminal Evaluation UNDP project-- Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs in Costa Rica, funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), with a grant of US$ 1.930.000. UNDP is the GEF implementing agency for the project.

The central objective of this project is to minimize risks of exposure from PCBs to Costa Ricans, including vulnerable populations, and to the environment, while promoting Costa Rica’s compliance with Stockholm Convention requirements for PCB management and destruction.

The project, led by Costa Rica’s Ministry of Environment and Energy (DIGECA), would achieve this objective through creation of an enabling environment for decommissioning and destruction of Costa Rica’s remaining estimated inventory of 1350 tons of PCB wastes. PCB wastes to be destroyed during the project period would include Costa Rica’s official (reported) inventory of 1350 tons and part of those wastes identified and decommissioned within three industrialized states and one municipality. The enabling environment would be established via four project components: (1) development and implementation of strategies and activities for strengthening Costa Rica’s institutional capacity within central and state governments for environmentally sound management and destruction of PCBs, including legislation and enforcement (2) facilitation of expansion and/or upgrading of interim storage so that Costa Rica has adequate safe central and regional interim PCB storage facilities for its national PCB inventory, with particular emphasis on access to facilities by small- and medium-size enterprises (SMEs) (3) establishment and demonstration of a nationally-coordinated, comprehensive servicing system for PCB management, and (4) raising awareness of legal obligations and best practices for PCB management and destruction in the private and public sectors through outreach and training.

**The main stakeholders of this TE are:**

* DIGECA- Ministry of Environment
* Electric Service Provision Companies (Coopelesca, Coopealfaroruiz, Coopesantos, Coopeguanacaste, Empresa de Servicios Públicos de Heredia, Junta Administrativa del Servicios Eléctrico Municipal de Cartago, Instituto Costarricense de Electricidad, Compañía Nacional de Fuerza y Luz.
* Final users of Project results: enterprises, organizations, universities

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

**Evaluation approach and method**

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluators are expected to use the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact in the evaluation, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects. A suggestive set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included in Annex D, however the evaluators are expected to amend, complete, discuss, validate, justify and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, 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, UNDP Country Office, DIGECA, project country teams, UNDP GEF staff (both in the region and at HQ) and other key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct field missions to the selected project countries - identified in Annex A. Interviews will be held with the key organizations and individuals, a list of stakeholders to consult will be provided for the evaluators, and consultations will be held with key stakeholders on the ground. If possible, the consultants will liaise with M&E consultants that are assisting the PACC and PACC+ country project management units. The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, log frames, project reports – including project implementation reviews (PIR), project budget revisions, midterm review and associated management response, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for the conduct of an evidence-based Terminal Evaluation. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex C of this Terms of Reference. Any additional documentation that the evaluator seeks will be made available by UNDP and its partners where available. If any are not available, the evaluator will be provided an explanation as to why the requested documentation is not available and this will also be taken into account in the final terminal evaluation including rating for overall performance of the project.

The project evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies and should maintain a clear focus on results. The evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary and present its methodological proposal as part of their inception report to UNDP on the progress of the terminal evaluation. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing conclusions based on evidence against the evaluation criteria. The evaluation team will also respond to the questions and comments raised on the evaluation by internal and external reviewers of the results ascertained.

**Evaluation criteria & 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), 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 competed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in TOR Annex D.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating Project Performance** | | |
| Criteria |  | Comments |
| **Monitoring and Evaluations: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | | |
| Overall quality of M&E | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| M&E design at project start up | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| M&E plan implementation | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | | |
| Overall Quality of Project Implementation / Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Implementing Agency Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Executing Agency Execution | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Outcomes: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** | | |
| Overall Quality of Project Outcomes | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR) | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Effectiveness | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Efficiency | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability: Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), Unlikely (U)** | | |
| Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Financial resources | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Socio-economic | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Institutional framework and governance | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Environmental | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (MS), Negligible (N)** | | |
| Environmental Status Improvement | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Environmental Stress Reduction | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Progress towards stress/status change | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Overall Project Results | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |

**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$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Grants | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| 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. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the country office evaluation plan.

**Impact**

The evaluator will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

**Conclusions, recommendations & 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 CO in Costa Rica. The evaluator will be responsible for liaising to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

**Evaluation timeframe**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timing** | **Deliverables** |
| Preparation | 3 days including travel time | * Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (PIRs and other evaluation reports, products, etc.); * Familiarization with overall development situation of country (based on reading of UNDP- Common Country Assessment and other reports on the country). * Detailed mission programme preparation, including methodology, in cooperation with the UNDP Country office. * Initial telephone discussion with UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor |
| Evaluation Mission | 5 days  **The dates for the mission have to be: 8 to 12 April**  **2019** | * Meeting with UNDP Country office team and DIGECA staff; * Meetings with key stakeholders in country * Joint review of all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs * Interviews with key beneficiaries and stakeholders, including representatives of local authorities, local environmental protection authorities, local community stakeholders, etc. |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 7 days | * Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, UNDP RCU and DIGECA. * Drafting of report in proposed format * Telephone review of major findings with DIGECA, UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RTA * Completing of the draft report and presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions within 2 weeks. |
| Final Report | 2 days | * Presentation of final evaluation report within 1 week. |

**Evaluation deliverables**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| Inception Report | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| Presentation | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| Draft Final Report | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| Final Report \* | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\* When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

**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'.

**Specifications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10% | Following approval of work and mission plan after contract signature. |
| 30% | Following submission of first drat terminal evaluation report and an oral presentation of main findings of the evaluation to UNDP CO and Project Team before the mission is concluded in order to allow for clarification and validation of evaluation findings:   * Review key documentation of the project. UNDP Guidelines for Evaluations and carry out a meeting with DIGECA and UNDP to agree on dates and other issues to develop and inception report. * Review documentation, prepare and carry out interviews with key actors, and present a first draft of the evaluation reports a well as an oral presentation of the main findings. |
| 60% | Following submission and approval (UNDP CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report:   * Integrate comments received from DIGECA and UNDP into the final Evaluation Report. * Evaluation Report which is to be in line with the Report Outline described in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects (approved by UNDP and DIGECA) |

Annex A – Project logical framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:**  **Consolidate the national capacities to promote environmental sustainability, the management of disaster risks and sustainable territorial planning.** | | | | | |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:**  **Public institutions and civil society strengthen capacities to address and reduce the negative impact of climate change, the reduction of the ozone layer, solid waste management, integrated management of water resources, and persistent organic pollutants in accordance with international agreements.** | | | | | |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):**  **Catalyzing environmental finance** | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: 1. Phase out of POPs and reduce POP releases.** | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: 1.4 POPs waste prevented, managed and disposed of, and POPs contaminated sites managed in an environmentally sound manner. 1.5 Country capacity built to effectively phase out and reduce releases of POPs.** | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: 1.4.1. Amount of PCBs and PCB- related waste disposed of, or decontaminated, measures in tons as recorded in the POPs tracking tool. 1.5.1. Progress in developing and implementing a legislative and regulatory framework for environmentally sound management of PCBs, and for the sound management of chemicals in general, as recorded through the POPs tracking tool.** | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective[[1]](#footnote-1)**  **Minimize risks of exposure from PCBs to people and the environment in Costa Rica.**  **(equivalent to output in ATLAS)** | Quantity of PCBs (liquids and solids) destroyed in the project period (2013-2017).  Quantity of PCB material safeguarded. | 1000 MT PCBs destroyed pre- project through exports and in-country treatment.  National inventory but outdated. | 1350 MT of PCBs (liquids and solids) disposed of in an environmentally sound manner.  All known PCBs safely stockpiled. | Certificate of destruction.  National database on stockpiled PCBs. | The assumption is that 1350 MT would be available for destruction and that national disposal solutions (if relevant) would be accepted by the civil society as a result of the project.  **Risk**: Low |
|  | Number of environmental, health and customs authorities' personnel trained to monitor compliance of Stockholm Convention requirements and national norms. | Environmental, health and customs authorities' personnel do not have the knowledge and training to execute control and monitoring of the PCB stockpiles in the country. | 30 officials of the environmental, health and commerce authorities trained to control the commerce, storage, transport, treatment and final disposal of PCBs,  1 Norm developed and validated  4 guidelines / manuals developed by end of the project | Lists of attendance of workshops and training sessions.  1 norm validated  Manuals and guidelines on PCB management published. | Costa Rica has an inter-ministerial committee that deals with Chemical related issues and are expected to have a high interest in receiving proper training.  **Risk:** Low |
|  | Number of safe PCB management and disposal options  Number companies trained and implementing the new regulatory guidelines  Number of inspectors / enforcement officers trained to enforce national laws / norms on PCB management | The country has no centralized facility for treatment PCB contaminated transformers.  No guidelines for PCB management in place.  Limited knowledge about PCB management among environmental inspectors. | At least one treatment/disposal alternative (interim storage/transfer station) in operation at the end of the project.  8 companies trained and implementing the new regulatory guidelines.  20 maintenance and other personnel at PCB holders trained in safe PCB handling.  4 inspectors/enforcement officers trained to enforce national laws/norms on PCB management. | Disposal Certificates. Natio­nal and international consultants' reports on the establishment/operation of interim storage/transfer station.  Monitoring reports  Reports from training of inspectors | Regulatory framework and permits for operation of interim storage/transfer station in place  Agreement among Electrical Utility and Distribution companies to develop a common centralized solution.  **Risk:** Medium |
| **Outcome 1[[2]](#footnote-2)**  **Strengthened Institutional Capacity in Costa Rica for the environmentally sound management of PCBs.** | Number of PCB management regulations developed and validated by regulating institution.  Number of inspectors trained to conduct site visits for the verification of compliance of the regulations for PCB management.  Number of inspections carried out during project implementation (2013-17)  Number of potential contaminated sites  Number of national inventories updated on line with information from electrical companies on contaminated equipment and oils identified and inventories eliminated.  Number of reports submitted to the Stockholm Convention Secretariat  National PCB Management and Elimination Plan | PCB management is not established by regulations and norms that guarantee their environmentally sound management.  The regulating institution does not have trained inspectors that can evaluate the environmentally sound management of PCBs.  Currently contaminated sites have not been identified.  The national inventory was done in 2005 and was based on out of service equipment and primarily with Clor-N- Oil testing.  Currently one annual report is submitted to the SC Secretariat. | PCB management regulations and environmentally sound management norms developed and validated.  At least 4 inspectors trained in PCB management evaluation and enforcement.  At least1 inspection made by inspectors to each electrical sector company per semester.  A preliminary inventory of potentially PCB contaminated sites.  PCB data base operating with on line reporting from electrical sector companies with inventory update information.  1 annual report on PCBs submitted to the Stockholm Convention Secretariat.  National PCB Management and Elimination Plan approved and in implementation process | PCB management regulation developed, validated, and distributed among the electrical sector companies and other interested stakeholders.  Training completion certificates.  Semester Inspection reports  Reports from quarterly updated PCB inventory  .  Stockholm Convention report with updated and verifiable information on PCB inventory and contaminated equipment and oil elimination.  National PCB Management and Elimination Plan | The formulation and approval of regulations and norms could be a slow process due to political pressure and the Ministry of Health as national authority would have to approve the regulation also.  There may be resistance from PCB holders against approval of new norms and regulations for PCB management.  It is assumed that sites where PCB equipment has been storage could represent potentially contaminated sites.  It is assumed that updated inventories will include the equipment that belong to private entities or individuals that are under the distribution companies supervision.  **Risk**: Low |
| **Outcome 2**  **Environmentally sound management and interim storage of PCBs,** | Number of Electrical sector companies with PCB management plans, developed and presented to national authority for approval.  Number of Guidelines and technical standards for the environmentally sound management of PCBs approved.  Number of Occupational health and safety guidelines issued and implemented by electrical sector companies.  Number of trainers trained on Best practices for PCB Management | There is a lack of a national environmental management plan that includes an elimination plan so that electrical companies can use as guidelines for their activities, regarding their PCB issues.  No guidelines and technical standards are currently being used.  Occupational health and safety issues are important when evaluating potential risk for workers who have already been exposed to PCBs in the past and to prevent future incidents  No trainers trained. | PCB environmentally sound management practices implemented in at least 7 electrical sector companies.  7 PCB owners with management plans presented to regulating institution and compliance verified.  1 set of Guidelines and technical standards for management of PCB equipment established and implemented (transportation, storage, management and disposal).  1 set of national occupational health and safety standards for PCB management formulated for national application, approved by regulating authority and in operation in electrical sector companies.  A minimum of 10 trainers trained on Best Practices for PCB management. | Copy of PCB management plans  Copy of Guidelines and technical standards.  Copy of Occupational Health and safety guidelines  Reports from train the trainers seminars. | The national authority for approval of hazardous waste management plans is the Ministry of Health which could be a slow process.  National guidelines and technical standards will be approved by both Ministry of Health and Environment.  The local communities may be against the establishment of a hazardous waste interim storage/transfer station in their area.  The Environmental Impact Assessment could be a slow process due to the interim storage/transfer station being a hazardous waste and decontamination center. |
| Number of Designs for Interim storage/transfer station.  Number of Environmental Impact Assessments for Interim storage/transfer station.  Number of Technical standards developed for interim storage/transfer station.  Interim storage/transfer station built and ready for operation. | No design for interim storage/transfer station exists currently.  No EIAs prepared.  No Technical standards for interim storage/transfer station have been developed.  No interim storage/transfer station in operation. | 1 Design for interim storage/transfer station developed according to international best practices.  1 Environmental impact assessment developed and approved.  Technical standards developed and implemented according to national conditions for Interim storage/transfer station, including design, operation, interim storage, and management of hazardous substances.  .  1 Interim storage/transfer station in operation according to developed standards and national law. | Copy of design  Copy of approval of EIA  Interim storage/transfer station operation permitting approved.  Copy of approved Technical standards for interim storage,  .  Copy of operation license/permit for Interim storage/transfer station. | EIA will be approved by the Technical Environmental Secretariat, which could be a long lasting process.  It is understood that the interim storage may be in each electrical company and the transfer station could be operated virtually or that a centralized interim storage/transfer station could be established depending on the existing conditions at the time of its planning.  Risk: Medium |
| **Outcome 3**  **Environmentally sound destruction of PCBs and management of contaminated equipment.** | National Coordination mechanism established among PCB holders and government companies in operation.  Environmentally sound destruction of existing PCB inventory.  Feasibility study for interim storage/transfer station administration completed.  Number of agreements between PCBs holders to develop interim storage/transfer station. | The only option for the decontamination, treatment and disposal of PCB contaminated equipment and oils is through exportation to installations at very high cost.  There is no technically and economically viable alternative to exporting which needs to be developed, in order for the PCB owners to complete the elimination process and fulfill the Stockholm Convention goals  No formal agreement exists among the 7 PCB holders in the country. | National Coordination mechanism operating.  A feasibility study completed to determine the best available technological alternative and the interim storage/transfer station options.  Environmentally sound alternative for decontamination, treatment and disposal of PCB contaminated equipment and oils made available for electrical sector companies and other PCB owners.  Public Private Partnership developed for the interim storage/transfer station administration.  1 agreement reached between interested parties regarding interim storage/transfer station operation. | Meeting minutes and attendance lists.  Environmentally sound destruction of 1350 tons of PCB equipment and oils (>50 ppm)..  Destruction or treatment certificates presented to national authority.  Public private partnership feasibility study completed to analyze the alternative for interim storage/transfer station operation and results implemented.  Copy of agreement | There may be insufficient financial resources available, for PCB environmentally sound disposal, among the electrical sector companies due to present national budget constraints. |
| Number of feasibility studies to determine if low concentration PCB oils s can be destroyed locally. | Low concentration PCB oils cannot be destroyed locally and no study has been conducted to evaluate the feasibility. | 1 study to determine if PCB contaminated oils with less than 5.000 ppm are destroyed locally (where ODS will be destroyed). | Copy of final report. |
| **Outcome 4**  **Awareness raising and communication.** | Number of Awareness raising and communications strategies developed.  Number of workshops with populations living close to Interim storage/transfer station. | Currently no awareness raising and communication strategy has been developed regarding PCBs and the risk it poses to the people and the environment.  Physical location of interim storage/transfer station has not yet been determined, and therefore no communication exists with potentially affected population. | 1 Awareness raising strategy developed and implemented with the main stakeholders (electrical sector companies, regulating institutions and general public).  4 Community workshops carried out for population living close to the interim storage/transfer station to inform about the benefits of interim storage/transfer station in terms of environmental protection and technical safeguards put in place for the operation. Regular workshops on a yearly basis as follow up this activity. | Awareness raising publications distributed among electrical sector companies and interested communities.  Copy of workshop reports and random interviews with relevant population. | There may be concerned among the population about the approval of the environmental viability of a hazardous waste interim storage/transfer station. |
| **Monitoring, adaptive feedback, outreach and evaluation.** | Number of high quality monitoring and evaluation documents prepared during project implementation | No documents in baseline situation. | 4 Quarterly Operational Reports submitted to UNDP each year  1 annual APR/PIR submitted to UNDP each year.  1 Mid-term evaluation.  1 Final evaluation  MTE and FE must include an lessons learned section and a strategy for dissemination of project results. | Reports submitted to UNDP | It is assumed that the project manager will prepare all the reports that are required by the GEF and UNDP.  Risk: Low |

Annex B – List of documents to be reviewed by the evaluator

* Project Document
* Cooperation agreements signed between UNDP and donors
* Project Technical Reports
* Annual work plans including budgets
* Annual Project Reports (APR)
* Project Implementation Review (API/PIR)
* Quarterly/six monthly Progress Reports (QPRs) and quarterly Financial Reports (FRs)
* Multipartite Review Meeting (MPR) Reports
* Project board meetings/Project board meeting minutes,
* Mid-term evaluation report

Annex C – Evaluation questions

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?

Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

Annex D – Ratings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating scores | | |
| Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E  Execution | Sustainability ratings: Relevance ratings | Relevance ratings |
| 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency  5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings  4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS):there were moderate shortcomings  3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings  2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency  1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability  3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks  2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | 2. Relevant (R)  1. Not relevant (NR)  Impact Ratings:  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |

Annex E – 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**  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 F – Evaluation Report Outline

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)

1. Introduction

* Purpose of the evaluation
* Scope & Methodology
* Structure of the evaluation report

2. Project description and development context

* 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

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated[[3]](#footnote-3))

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

The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total

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

* 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
* Itinerary
* List of persons interviewed
* Summary of field visits
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix
* Questionnaire used and summary of results
* Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

1. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally, Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory [↑](#footnote-ref-3)