NATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT – TERMINAL EVALUATION OF SOUND CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT MAINSTREAMING AND UPOPS REDUCTION IN KENYA (PIMS 5361) PROJECT.

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Nairobi Kenya with travel
Application Deadline: 31 May 2021
Type of Contract: Individual Contract
Assignment Type: Consultancy - Project Terminal Evaluation
Languages Required: English
Project: UNDP-GEF-Financed Project (Sound Chemicals Management Mainstreaming and UPOPs reduction in Kenya (PIMS 5361)
Starting Date: 10 June 2021
Expected Duration of Assignment: 40 working days spread over ten weeks
Reference: KEN/IC/2020/015

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the ***full-sized*** project titled ***Sound Chemicals Management Mainstreaming and UPOPs reduction in Kenya (PIMS 5361)*** implemented through the ***UNDP/Ministry of Environment and Forestry***. The project started on the ***21 July 2016*** and is in its ***5th and last*** year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects' (Guidance for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

UNDP wishes to procure the services of a **National Consultant** to support the Team Leader in undertaking the Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP GEF Sound Chemicals Management mainstreaming and UPOPs Reduction in Kenya (PIMS 5361) Project.

This project intends to protect human health and the environment by managing the risks posed by production, use, import and export of chemicals and reducing / preventing the release of U-POPs and toxic compounds originating from the unsafe management of waste in two key sectors: Health Care Waste and Municipal Waste. These sectors are among the highest priorities identified in the reviewed and updated NIP. On the Health Care Waste Management side, the project will adopt an integrated approach aimed at increasing the proper management of waste within the hospital facilities (increasing segregation, reducing waste generation) and by replacing the dangerous disposal waste modalities currently adopted (open burning or burning in single chamber incinerators) by SC-compliant equipment.

Training will be delivered both at Health Care Facility level and in classroom training events and will be based on the WHO blue book guidance tailored to the country needs. On the municipal waste side, the project intends to reinforce the 3R (Reduce, Reuse, Recycle) economy on two specific waste streams, by enhancing their upstream collection, ensuring the quality of recovered material, and securing access to national market by promoting cooperation with domestic industries. This is for providing a valid alternative to the dumpsite economy and preventing the release in the environment of U-POPs and toxic substance upon open burning of these waste streams. The project also includes a component related to the sound management of chemicals, by implementing activities on U-POPs monitoring, upgrading of the relevant regulation on chemicals, and establishing a PRTR database.

The project's goal is the "Reduction of the release of U-POPs and other substances of concern and the related health risks, through the implementation of environmentally sound management of municipal and healthcare wastes and of an integrated institutional and regulatory framework covering management of and reporting on POPs."

The project comprises four complementary components to be implemented over a 5-year period. The interventions are cost-shared by the GEF support of USD 4,515,000 and partner co-finance of USD 21,009,805. Each component addresses a different barrier and has discrete outcomes, defined as follows: -

- Component 1. Streamlining sound management of chemicals and waste into national and county development activities through capacity building of MENR, MOH, county governments of Nairobi, Kisumu, Nakuru and Mombasa and the NGOs.
- Component 2. Introducing environmentally sound management of health care waste in selected healthcare facilities; policy and strategic plans to prepare them to adopt BAT and BEP disposal.
- Component 3. Demonstration of sound healthcare waste disposal technologies in a selected number of healthcare facilities in each county.
- Component 4. Minimizing releases of unintentionally produced POPs from open burning of waste.
- Component 5. Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, outreach and evaluation.

The Ministry of Environment and Forestry (ME&F) (Government) is the project's Implementing Partner that coordinates the participation of other stakeholders that include: the Ministry of Health (MoH); National Environment Management Authority (NEMA); Government Chemist Department (GCD); Water Resource Authority (WRA); University of Nairobi (UoN); Kenya Association of Manufacturers (KAM); Kenya Disaster Concern (KDC); and the Greenbelt Movement (GBM).

The project contributes to the attainment of the UN Development Assistance Framework **(UNDAF)** Outcome 3.3: By 2022, people in Kenya benefit from sustainable natural resource management, a progressive and resilient green economy and the UNDP Country Programme Document (**CPD)** Output 4.2: Improved institutional and community capacity to deliver pro-poor, sustainable natural resource management initiatives through the following activities:

- Improve the country legislation on chemicals by defining quality and technical standards for disposal processes;
- Increase the knowledge and awareness of risk related to chemicals with a life cycle perspective;
- Build capacity on adoption and use of Best Available Techniques (BAT) and Best Environmental Practices (BEP) in health and solid waste management; and
- Build capacity of the country to monitor the presence of POPs with focus on air quality, atmospheric emissions and specific waste streams.

Two main observed changes since the implementation of the project in 2017 include: the enhanced capacity of responsible agencies to implement the Stockholm Convention (SC) and SAICM – awareness of their roles and alignment of policies/legislations to the SC; the BEP and BAT for treatment and disposal of health care waste demonstrated – more than 200 trained on and 13 facilities equipped for the treatment and disposal of the heath care waste.

3. TE PURPOSE

The National Consultant will support an International Team Leader Consultant to undertake this Terminal Evaluation.

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

The 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. The evaluation will also make recommendations for sustainability, replication and scaling up that will be used by the project partners to build on the gains made during the project.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

Engagement of stakeholders, which is to be led by the National Consultant is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Ministry of Health, National Environment Management Authority, Water Resources Authority, University of Nairobi, Kenya Association of Manufacturers, Green Belt Movement, Health facilities, County Governments Local community solid waste management enterprises groups, among other key project stakeholders.

Additionally, the TE team (National Consultant, especially given the evolving Covid 19 situation) is expected to conduct field missions or virtual reviews to **the project target counties of Mombasa, Nairobi, Nakuru and Kisumu**, including the following project sites – sample of health care facilities, solid waste management groups and dumpsites.

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

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

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

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

The objectives of the evaluation are:

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

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

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

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

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

ii. Project Implementation

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

iii. Project Results

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

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.

- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

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

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for *Sound Chemicals Management Mainstreaming and UPOPs reduction in Kenya (PIMS 5361)*

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

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 40 working days over a time period of 10 weeks starting on 10th June 2021 and ending by 31 August 2021. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
31st May 2021	Application closes

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

10th June 2021	Selection of TE team (contract signing)
14th – 25th June 10 days	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation), Document review and analysis for TE Inception Report Preparation
5th June 2021	Submission of 1st Draft Inception Report
28th June 2021 – 29th June 2021 - 2 days	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
29th June 2021 – 12th July - 10 days	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, virtual interviews, field visits, etc.
12th July 2021 – 1	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
13th July 2021 – 22nd July- 8 days	Preparation of draft TE report
23rd July 2021	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
26th July 2021- 09 August 2021 - 11 days	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
09 August 2021 – 11th August - 3 days	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
12th August 2021 – 1 day	Concluding Virtual Stakeholder Workshop
19th August 2021 – 2 days	Approval of the final TE Report
31 August 2021	Expected date of full TE completion

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

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: 14th June 2021	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: 12th July 2021	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report *(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)* with annexes	Within 2.5 weeks of end of TE mission: 29th July 2021	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report *(See template in ToR Annex H)*	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: 29th August 2021	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

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

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the **UNDP Country Office in Kenya**.

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

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one international (1) and one national (1) consultant.

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

The TE is expected to be **majorly a virtual evaluation**, with the consult(s) based at their home station due to COVID-19 restrictions and safety protocols.
Only the national consultant will be expected to conduct a field visit to the project locations in the target project counties of Mombasa, Nairobi, Nakuru and Kisumu. However, if travel is possible for the international consultant, Nairobi shall be the duty station of the consultant and they will participate in the field visit.

Travel:

- International travel may be required to Kenya during the TE mission;
- The BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: https://dss.un.org/dssweb/
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION – National Consultant

The National Consultant will support the International Team Leader especially the local context of the project, including the site visits and interviews. The National Consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The National Consultant will support the International Consultant who will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of reports (inception, draft, final etc). The International Consultant will be accountable to UNDP for the delivery results on this assignment.

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

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

Team Member - National Consultant (100%)

Education

- Master's degree in Environmental Sciences, Natural Resources Management, Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), Waste management, Chemical sciences, Engineering, Health or other closely related field (10 marks).

Experience

- At least 5 years' experience with results-based management project mid-term or terminal evaluations, preferably for GEF/sound chemicals management projects (25 marks).
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (10 marks).
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to sound chemicals management (10 marks).
- Knowledge of and experience working in Kenya or East Africa on chemicals management is an asset (10 marks).
- Minimum 5 years of experience in relevant technical areas (20 marks).

- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and the Chemicals ad Waste Focal Area; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis (5 marks).
- Excellent communication skills; demonstrable analytical skills; and project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset (5 marks).

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English with fluency in oral (3 marks),
- Kiswahili is an asset (2 marks).

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

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

  Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%[3]:
  - The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
  - The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
  - The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS[4]

Presentation of Proposal:

Interested and qualified candidates should submit their applications which should include the following:

1. Detailed Curriculum Vitae

2. Proposal for implementing the assignment - template provided

[3] The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:
https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default

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

3. Offerors letter to UNDP- template provided

Note: The successful applicant will be required to complete a UNDP Personal History Form (P11) form prior to contracting.

Applications should be received through the UNDP e Tendering Portal on or before 5.00 P.M Kenyan Time (GMT+3.00) on Monday, 31 May 2021.

Firms are not eligible for this consultancy assignment. Open to national individual consultants only.

Incomplete applications will be disqualified automatically.

All applications should be submitted through the UNDP eTendering portal.

- If already registered, please go to https://etendering.partneragencies.org and sign in using your username and password, and search for the **event**:
  Business Unit: **UNDP1**

  Event ID:
- If you do not remember your password, please use the "Forgotten password" link. Do not create a new profile.
- If you have never registered in the system before, please complete a one-time registration process first by visiting https://etendering.partneragencies.org and using the below generic credentials:
  Username: **event.guest**

  Password: **why2change**

Detailed user guide on how to register in the system and submit the proposal can be found at:

https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/procurement/business/resources-for-bidders.html

Email submission of applications will not be accepted.

Email submission of applications will not be accepted. Queries about the position can be directed to undp.kenya.procurement@undp.org

Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

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

TOR ANNEXES

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

ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: Reduction of the releases of U-POPs and other substances of concern and of the related health risk through the implementation of ESM of municipal and healthcare waste and of an integrated institutional and regulatory framework covering management and reporting of POPs.	Existence of a SC compliant institutional and regulatory framework covering management and reporting of POPs. Amount of U-POPs releases in the environment from HCW disposal avoided. Amount of U-POPs release in the environment from municipal waste disposal avoided.	Chemicals have received heightened attention in Kenya. Kenya is an active participant in SAICM, being current president of ICCM4, a Party to Rotterdam, Basel, Stockholm Conventions and signatory to the Minamata Convention on Mercury. Despite having good policies, strategies, guidelines and legislation on solid waste, the country continues to dump most of its waste in sites that require eventual open burning.	Guidelines for relevant institutions on how to streamline chemicals management into their policies, strategies and action plans Updated pieces of relevant legislation Review of the HCWM guidelines Selection of health care facilities that can be used to demonstrate environmentally sound management of HCW At least 50% of HCW is disposed in ESM 30% of Municipal waste recycled through recycle, reuse and recovery methods	Guidelines in place Economic instruments in manufacture, use, import, export of chemicals in use reflecting the hazards that specific chemicals pose NEMA audit reports for the participating facilities Interim Review of the HCF on how much has been disposed through 3R, non burn technologies incineration Report on UPOPs emission Reduction Reports from participating NGOs and CBOs	Assumptions The MENR and MOH continue to have joint plans. MENR liaises properly with the National Treasury and the Ministry of Planning to highlight importance of chemicals in national development MOH prioritises HCW in its strategic plan 2015-2020 The selected CBOs and NGOs participate effectively in the project The steering committee operates in an effective way. Risks (low): Institutions losing momentum and commitments. Difficulties in securing and sustaining co-financing. Difficulties related to procurement and permitting of equipment.
COMPONENT 1. STREAMLINING SOUND MANAGEMENT OF CHEMICALS AND WASTE INTO NATIONAL AND COUNTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES THROUGH CAPACITY BUILDING OF MENR, MOH, COUNTY GOVERNMENTS OF NAIROBI, KISUMU, NAKURU AND MOMBASA AND THE NGOs – CBOs					

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 1.1 Policies, strategies regulatory and policy framework integrating the provisions of streamlining chemicals management into development activities (specifically those of the Stockholm convention and the SAICM recommendations) adopted and institutional capacity on U-POPs and waste management enhanced.					
1.1.1: Overall policy framework and specific regulatory measures covering environmentally sound management of chemicals in general and POPs in particular through chemicals life cycle management developed and implemented.	Availability of a completed and comprehensive gap analysis. Availability of a nationally endorsed roadmap for improving the existing regulations. Number of new or reviewed regulatory acts to take into account in a consistent manner the current provisions of the SC convention on POPs, with respect to the overall number of relevant regulatory norms to be reviewed identified in the gap analysis.	A preliminary analysis of the Kenyan policy and legal framework on chemicals affected by the SC has been carried out under the SAICM activities. Most of the existing regulations need to be amended for ensuring compliance with the Stockholm Convention, Rotterdam Convention, the Basel Convention and the Minamata Convention on Mercury and other related MEAs[5] ratified by the country. The existing legislation is not adequately providing an integrated and	Gap analysis completed within 12 months from the project start. A policy and legislation review roadmap approved within 24 months from project start. The identified polices and legislation regulation/s or their associated norms are amended for compliance with the SC requirements.	Intermediate and final review reports of gap analysis. Minutes of meetings, consultation workshops reports, etc. Formal acts related to the submission/ approval of new or amended norms.	**Assumptions** Although it is recognized that the improvement of regulations is not sufficient, nevertheless it is assumed that a better and sustainable regulatory system is the first step toward a sound management of POPs and Chemicals in general (covered by SAICM). The GoK is committed in ensuring compliance with SC requirements. **Risk (Low):** Law making process is relatively straightforward in Kenya thus this activity presents a low risk rating. The subsequent steps (enforcement and implementation) are much more complex.

[5] Those closely related to chemicals such as the Vienna Convention, Montreal Protocol and its amendments, UN Framework convention on Climate Change and health regulations.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		consistent framework for the management of waste, chemicals and chemical pollution in the Country in line with Kenya's international obligations as party and signatory to the said MEAs.			
1.1.2: Key institutions[6] have knowledge and skills to formulate and implement necessary chemicals and waste environmental policies, consistent with sound chemicals management principles and obligations under international agreements	Availability of capacity building needs assessment report. Existence of a Training Institution on Chemical Management.	Based on the outcome of the Kenya chemical profile (2011), there is a general need in Kenya to provide training programs on chemical information work or about collecting, collating, storing, retrieving and disseminating information on risks and hazards of chemicals. In addition, there is an urgent need to review the capacity of institutions that	Capacity building needs assessment for central and local institutions in charge of chemical management completed within 12 months from project start. Training materials tailored to the Kenyan situation, developed on POPs management, POPs monitoring, chemical emergency response and 3R of waste. At least 2 Excellence Training Centres on chemicals management established at a main Academic institution.	Capacity building needs assessment report. Training material (presentations and textbooks) Training plan and curricula of the Chemical Training Centre. Training reports. Records of trainee examinations before and after the training (acceptance tests and post-training tests).	**Assumption.** The GoK is committed in improving the capacity of governmental and industrial staff in the sound management of chemicals and waste, by facilitating and supporting a certified training of key personnel. Willingness of institutions to take on-board new staff on Chemicals Management **Risk (Low):** If well planned, a good and effective training activity will be successfully implemented. Adoption of advanced training techniques and of a formal training assessment are key

[6]**MENR, MOH, COUNTY GOVERNMENTS OF NAIROBI, KISUMU, NAKURU AND MOMBASA, AND THE NGOs (selected at the start of project implementation).**

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		implement existing chemical management and environmental regulations.	At least 200 staff coming from all Kenyan counties and affiliated to governmental institutions, chemical industry and waste management companies selected and trained At least 2 training cycles (totally 10 days each) performed during project implementation. Effectiveness of training measured by means of pre-training and post-training examination of the participants Trainees who successfully pass post-training examination receive a certificate in Chemical management. . An award for most successful trainees consisting in contracts on Chemical Management at key Kenyan Institutions established.		for reducing risk of ineffective training.
1.1.3 Key institutions have incorporated sound management of chemicals and	Number of POPs units at local and central environmental authorities	The management of chemicals and waste in Kenya is very low at all	Guidance and procedures for the integration of POPs issues in: chemical management,	Guidance documents for central and local authorities. Training reports.	**Assumptions** Willingness to meet obligations to MEAs is strengthened by the current constitution.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
wastes, including POPs, in their activities.	trained and established. Availability of guidance documents on POPs and chemical management for local and central authorities. Availability of inspection reports.	levels (national / county). Although a certain number of regulations are in place, their enforcement in specific areas is minimal. Existence of Public Health Officers in the selected HCFs	environmental permitting, waste management are developed for the local and central environmental authorities. Units on POPs management are trained and established in key local and central institutions. At least 6 inspections / year on the fulfilment of POPs regulation in the country performed.	Service contracts for staff of local environmental authorities. Meeting and site visit reports	NEMA and MOH increases their inspection staff **Risks (medium):** The trained inspectors are not retained by the respective institutions, especially the counties and NEMA, meaning that the institutional memory must be strong to maintain the benefits of the training in the longer run.
1.1.4 National coordinating meetings on POPs held regularly (4 times per year) without GEF financial support	Availability of the formal act for the establishment of the National Chemical Management Coordination Office (NCMCO). Number of coordination meetings held.	Because of lack of policy requirement, the committee is formed on a need basis. Considering the Terms of Reference for inter-ministerial coordination developed under SAICM, the project will operationalize this coordination in a sustained manner.	A National Chemical Management Coordination Office (NCMCO) established at the Ministry of Environment, composed by representatives of relevant Ministries. Coordination Meetings of the National Chemical Management Coordination Office	Regulation establishing the National Chemical Management Coordination office. Meeting reports of the NCMCO.	**Assumptions** The key institutions will dedicate at least one officer to the work of the committee **Risks (medium):** The key institutions will not dedicate enough resources to the work of the committee.
Outcome 1.2 Monitoring activities intensified and strengthened and PRTR database in place.					

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
1.2.1 At least 70% of laboratory analyses in research and monitoring institutions required to monitor the implementation of national policy on hazardous chemicals and wastes being carried out on a cost recovery basis	Availability of a national plan for monitoring of POPs which establishes a market-based mechanism.	Based on the Kenya National Profile, most laboratories lack sufficient equipment for proper analysis. There are few laboratories which are equipped with analytical instruments for analysing POPs. The most serious issue is however the fact that the laboratories work mainly with discontinuous project funds therefore their operation is not fully sustainable.	Capacity building and equipment upgrading needs identified. National plan for environmental and industrial monitoring, which identifies POPs monitoring obligations for key industrial and waste management activities developed and implemented. A financial mechanism for ensuring the sustainability of POPs laboratories based on incentives and environmental taxes established and piloted for at least one year. • Two key laboratories on POPs analysis accredited following ISO 17025 standards and associated accreditation schemes • Up to 80 laboratories technicians and government staff trained on POPs monitoring related	Capacity building report on POPs analysis. Preliminary and final national plans on POPs monitoring obligations. Reports on the implementation and piloting of a financial mechanism on POPs monitoring. The selected labs are (or not) accredited or in the process of accreditation. Number of lab technicians trained and regularly analysing POPs.	**Assumptions.** The analytical laboratories (GCD/WARMA) are interested in expanding their capability to POPs. **Risks (medium)** Lack of expertise in the institutions National plans are not implemented

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			activities following international standards and requirements.		
1.2.2 70% of universities nationwide include issues of hazardous chemicals and wastes, risks and legislation, in their curriculum	Number of universities including curricula on chemical risk assessment and management of hazardous chemicals and hazardous waste.	Undergraduate and postgraduate programmes in various areas of chemicals management are offered at various universities which include both public and private universities. However a coordinated approach towards addressing matters pertaining to chemicals management is missing.	▪ University curricula for chemical risk assessment and management of hazardous chemical and hazardous waste adopted by at least 70% of training institution. ▪ One cycle of curricula completed in at least 2 universities within the project timeframe.	Revised curricular Number of universities with training, and reporting changes in their curriculum	**Assumptions** Universities are ready and interested to include POPs issues in their curriculum. **Risks (medium):** Lack of willingness and capacity to revise curriculum. Lack of dedicated personnel.
1.2.3. PRTR Database and reporting system in place.	Regulatory tool for the implementation and enforcement of POPs / PTS reporting and PRTR established.	No PRTR Database and reporting system in place.	By the end of the project, a circular drafted and submitted to GoK for approval related to implementation and enforcement of POPs monitoring and PRTR system to ensure sustainability of the PRTR related Demonstration of an	Draft and final PRTR regulation PRTR preliminary reports.	**Assumptions** The institutions are aware and interested in establishing a PRTR system to improve the control of emission sources. **Risks (medium):** Funds will not be allocated to run PRTR Lobbies opposing the establishment of PRTR

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			Information Management System to support PRTR A POPs/PTS database established to contain data related to industrial sources, and POPs contaminated sites in 2 Kenyan provinces, and all the country-wide available data on POPs environmental monitoring.		
COMPONENT 2. INTRODUCE ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND MANAGENENT OF HEALTH CARE WASTE IN SELECTED HEALTHCARE FACILITIES; POLICY AND STRATEGIC PLANS TO PREPARE THEM TO ADOPT BAT AND BEP DISPOSAL.					
Outcome 2.1 Personnel of hospital facilities and control authorities at central and county levels have enough capacity guidance and equipment to manage healthcare waste in an Environmental Sound Manner					
2.1.1 Procedures and guidelines for the assessment and implementation of hazardous waste management at healthcare facilities built on lessons and examples from the application of the I-RAT tool under the GEF4 /UNDP Global projects and on the WHO bluebook "Safe Management of Wastes from	Evidence that the guidelines for the Environmentally Sound Management of HCW, including rapid assessment based on the I-RAT tool, have been developed and officially adopted.	The "National Guidelines for the Safe management of HCW" are not currently implemented in the pre-selected HCFs, do not contain any indication on the assessment of HCWM effectiveness, and are not fully compliant with the chemicals-related	▪ Revision/development of HCWM guidelines based on the last edition of the WHO bluebook (tailored to various facility types) which include tool and procedures for rapid assessment of HCWM ▪ The above guidelines are officially adopted by all the pre-selected HCFs.	Draft of revised HCWM guidelines Meeting minutes Draft regulations Acts of official adoption of the reviewed HCW guidelines by the MOH administration and the project HCFs.	**Assumptions** Project HCFs have the willingness and need to adopt an official guidance on best HCWM practices. **Risks (high):** The guidance is formally adopted but not fully enforced.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Health-care Activities" developed and adopted		MEAs, especially the SC.			
Output 2.1.2 A national healthcare waste handbook containing guidelines for HCWM drafted and adopted by the MOH, including introduction of non-mercury devices in the HCFs	Availability of the healthcare waste management handbook and documentary evidence that it has been officially adopted. Updated and reviewed Waste Regulations dating from 2006	The "National Guidelines for Safe Management of Healthcare waste" need to be updated to be compliant with best HCWM practices. Based on the preliminary survey of project HCFs, even the existing guidelines are not being implemented.	▪ Revision/development of emission and discharge standards on monitoring HCWM practices. ▪ Development of technical regulations for HCWM equipment and supplies. ▪ Development of standards on technologies for the processing and final disposal of HCW. ▪ Development of procedure and guidance for the replacement of mercury devices with non mercury	▪ Draft, revised or adopted of the national healthcare waste handbook. ▪ Workshop and meeting minutes concerning the development and approval of the handbook. .	**Assumptions** The government of Kenya and specifically the MOH are available to update and disseminate guidelines on HCWM compliant with the SC. **Risks (low):** Lack of agreement on specific issues (for instance, technical specifications for incineration)
Outcome 2.2 Implementation of BAT/BEP at selected hospital facilities successfully demonstrated and measured against the baseline					
Output 2.2.1 Hospital personnel at all levels trained on the implementation of the above procedures	Number of staff from the project HCFs trained.	Very limited training has been carried out in a small number of the preselected HCFs.	▪ All the staff of the HCF will receive training on HCWM. ▪ At least 200 staff from the project HCFs trained	Training reports. Certificate of attendance. Outcome of post-training tests	**Assumptions:** All the project HCFs are willing to have their staff trained on BAT/BEP of healthcare waste. **Risk (low):** Due to the shortage of staff or frequent turnover in hospital staff, not all the staff can participate in the training.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Output 2.2.2 Baseline assessment of each healthcare facility based on the assessment procedures developed in 2.1.1 carried out, and waste management plans based on the baseline assessment level drafted and implemented	Baseline assessments conducted for all project facilities	None of the preselected HCFs underwent a detailed baseline assessment	▪ I-RATs conducted for each of the HCFs participating / benefitting from the project. ▪ UPOPs releases before implementation of BAT/BEP determined for each project facility.	Baseline reports (including I-RAT reports and UPOPs release assessments).	**Assumptions**: All project HCFs are willing to participate in baseline assessments and are open to sharing information related to their current HCWM practices. **Risk (low):** Baseline assessment incomplete / carried out in an unsatisfactory way.
Output 2.2.3 ESM management of healthcare waste (based on WHO bluebook) implemented in 4 facilities in each county (12 facilities in total) including replacement of mercury devices with non mercury	All the project HCFs have introduced BEP in a satisfactory manner.	The preliminary surveys conducted during PPG stage indicated that all the HCFs need a substantial improvement concerning the segregation, collection, transport, storage, and disposal of HCW.	▪ Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) signed with all project HCFs. ▪ HCWM committees of all HCFs strengthened or established where missing. ▪ HCWM policies, procedures and plans developed and implemented at each project HCF. ▪ HCFs supported in minimizing waste streams, improving segregation and introducing recycling activities. ▪ Each HCF evaluated to verify introduction of BEP practices.	▪ MOUs ▪ HCWM plans of project HCFs ▪ Assessment report after HCWM plan implementation.	**Assumptions**: HCFs are willing to sign MOUs and the MOU signature process does not slow down the launch of the HCF's HCWM activities. The implementation of best HCWM practices is sustained for the whole duration of the project and beyond. **Risks:** Turnover of the staff/consultant in charge of implementing environmentally sound practices in the hospital

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			▪ At least 2000 mercury devices replaced by non mercury devices and safely stored pending disposal		
Output 2.2.4 Final assessment of the healthcare facility to measure results achieved with the implementation of the ESM against baseline is carried out and estimates amount of U-POP releases avoided.	Availability of final assessment report based on the HCWM guidance.	Although figures from preliminary assessment of some HCFs have been reported in the National HCW management plan, no measurement of the effectiveness of implementation of BET/BAP has ever been attempted in any HCF in Kenya.	▪ Final assessment conducted for each of the HCFs participating/ benefitting from the project with the assistance of properly trained project consultants. ▪ UPOPs after implementation of best practices in HCWM determined for each project facility.	▪ Final assessment reports. ▪ UPOPs release estimation reports.	**Assumptions** Project healthcare facilities sustain the best HCWM practices in compliance with the guidance developed by the project and establish a reliable monitoring procedure. **Risks (medium):** Previous project demonstrated the key role of project consultant in sustaining best HCWM practices in HCFs.
COMPONENT 3. DEMONSTRATION OF SOUND HEALTHCARE WASTE DISPOSAL TECHNOLOGIES IN A SELECTED NUMBER OF HEALTHCARE FACILITIES IN EACH COUNTY					
Outcome 3.1. Feasibility analysis and procurement of ESM technologies for healthcare waste disposal completed					
Output 3.1.1 Feasibility study and terms of reference for non-combustion or low-U-POPs emission technologies for healthcare waste disposal in selected hospitals or waste management facilities drafted.	Availability of feasibility study. Availability of cost-effectiveness analysis.	The existing "National Guidelines for Safe management of health care waste" and the "National Health Care Waste Management Plan for Kenya 2008-2012" do not contain any indications on the	▪ Cost-effectiveness and feasibility analysis of centralized treatment facilities in comparison with the current situation (one small treatment facility for each HCF) carried out. ▪ Technical specifications for HCW treatment	Feasibility analysis report Technical specification and term of reference for non-combustion disposal equipment and for APCS.	**Assumptions** The government of Kenya and more specifically the Ministries in charge of HCWM recognize the need for better specification for HCW treatment. Technologies for the disposal of HCW that suit the specific Kenyan situation are identified.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		compliance of the technology with the SC, and still mention the Montfort incinerator as a viable option for the disposal of HCW	technologies drafted and approved. ▪ Technical specification for APCS and for the upgrading of a recent double chamber incinerator to be compliant with the SC drafted and approved.		**Risks (low):** Feasibility studies and TOR not suitable for the specific Kenyan situation.
Outcome 3.2 BAT/BEP technologies for the disposal of healthcare waste successfully established and demonstrated, with a potential reduction of U-POPs emissions in the order of 19gTeq/year					
Output 3.2.1 Demonstration and performance assessment of the technologies in the selected facilities completed (at least 4 facilities or an overall amount of waste in the order of 630t/yr)	Number of non-incineration technologies that are operational. Number of incinerators reviewed and upgraded to the SC BAT/BEP requirements, and operational. Amount of U-POPs release prevented by means of implementation of better disposal practices.	Currently in none of the pre-selected HCFs a non combustion technology for the treatment of HCW is operational. Currently none of the incinerators installed at pre-selected HCFs fulfil SC BAT criteria; in some cases even the most elementary APCSs are missing. The current emissions of PCDD/F of the pre-selected facilities	▪ Non-incineration technologies procured, installed and tested servicing at least 11 HCFs. ▪ Procurement of an initial set of HCWM related supplies for at least 12 HCFs. ▪ Staff trained in the operation and maintenance of the technologies installed at the HCFs ▪ HCFs supported in the implementation of their plans (including recycling activities) as well as monitoring practices. ▪ Agreements between CTFs and PFs drafted and signed for each PFs served by a CTF.	▪ Photos of procured non-incineration equipment and of the revamped incinerator. ▪ Certificates of training completion and attendance sheets of training sessions. ▪ HCF visit reports ▪ Photos of recycling practices.	**Assumptions** Thanks to UNDP experience in the field, procurement of non-incineration technologies and procurement of HCWM supplies does not run into major challenges. There is at least one incinerator among the existing incinerators in the pre-selected facilities which may be successfully revamped to fulfil SC requirements. A proper HCWM upstream will sustain the establishment of non-combustion technologies. **Risks** (medium): Although some of the existing incinerators are very new and

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		amount to an estimated 19 gTEq. Currently in Kenya there are no Centralized Treatment Facilities - each HCF has its own treatment plant.			provided with a secondary combustion chamber, their limited size may still prevent their upgrading with sophisticated APCPS. Procurement of equipment may present uncertainties which are not completely under the control of the project stakeholders.
Output 3.2.2 Waste disposal activities of hospital facilities/programs are documented and their performance is evaluated to exemplify best practices in health-care waste management.	Proof of Performance test reports available Proof of performance tests in at least three non-combustion disposal facilities and at least one revamped incinerator available. HCW hazardous waste manifests available for at least 630 t of HCW yearly.	Due to the lack of monitoring equipment, measurements of PCDD/F at the stack of incinerators were never taken in Kenya. Experience on the conduction of Proof of Performance tests for both combustion and non-combustion technologies is missing in the country.	The release of at least 19 gTEq / yr of PCDD/F prevented thanks to the installation of BAT disposal technologies. Proof of performance tests for at least three non-combustion disposal facilities and at least one revamped incinerator carried out.	▪ Certificate of analysis of PCDD/F at the stack of incinerator facilities before and after their upgrade ▪ Hazardous waste manifests for the HCW processed by means of non-combustion equipment or by revamped incinerators. ▪ Monitoring and progress reports	**Assumptions.** At least one pre-selected project facility is keen to have the incinerator revamped to BAT/BEP and sustain it after project end. At least three pre-selected project facilities are keen to shift from incineration to non-combustion technologies for the disposal of HCW and to sustain the technology after project end. **Risks (medium):** Difficulties / delay in procurement, installing, testing, the equipment. Lack of the required infrastructures or utilities to run the equipment smoothly.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
					Delay in permitting of the new equipment.
Output 3.2.3 Useful replication toolkits on how to implement best practices and techniques are developed	Toolkit for replication of best practices made available.	The existing national guidelines and plans do not include any toolkit for the implementation of SC compliant disposal technologies.	A practical toolkit for the replication of CTFs or single-facility BAT/BEP in other counties is drafted and endorsed by the government. The toolkit will be properly disseminated to relevant stakeholders.	Draft and final toolkit Meeting / workshop minutes. Official toolkit endorsement document	**Assumptions** The dissemination of a practical toolkit on HCW disposal technologies to relevant stakeholders will effectively facilitate the implementation of BAT disposal technologies **Risks (low):** Toolkit not adequately disseminated / understood by the target institutions.
COMPONENT 4. MINIMIZING RELEASES OF UNINTENTIONALLY PRODUCED POPS FROM OPEN BURNING OF WASTE.					
Outcome 4.1. Awareness raising and capacity strengthening on ESM of solid waste ensured.					
Output 4.1.1 Awareness raising activities for the communities and the municipalities aimed at enhancing 3Rs of waste	Level of awareness on 3Rs of different stakeholders as from interviews and questionnaires significantly raised.	Awareness of the environmental impacts of improper management of municipal waste practices is generally limited. In addition, there is limited public awareness of the regulatory and institutional framework regarding POPs and hazardous	Awareness raising materials (printed or broadcasted) on 3Rs of materials which, if wasted, can generate U-POPs and toxic substances, developed and published for the 3 municipalities of Mombasa, Kisumu and Nakuru. At least 3 awareness raising workshops on 3Rs dedicated to the representatives of	Awareness raising materials. Awareness raising workshop minutes.	**Assumptions** The most effective way to prevent open burning of plastics and other PCDD/F generating waste is to raise awareness on the benefits of recycling. **Risks (Low):** Low awareness resulting in the difficulties in the collection of sufficient amount of plastic. Difficulties in the promotion of upstream waste segregation.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		chemicals in general.	environmental authorities performed. At least 3 awareness raising event for the public at large in the 3 regions of Mombasa, Nakuru and Kisumu carried out.		Limited response from the public to the awareness campaigns
Output 4.1.2 Regulatory framework for the recovery of waste materials (glass, organic, plastic) and for licensing of the recovery activity at county and central levels improved to integrate SC requirements	Availability of improved regulatory framework which includes rules for 3Rs and preventing U-POPs emissions through cessation of open burning Waste guidelines include SC provisions Prioritisation of plastic waste	The Waste Management Regulations (2006) establish rules for the management of municipal waste, including provisions for licensing of collection, transportation, and running landfills. However the enforcement of this regulation is low.	Waste management regulation and its enforcement improved to facilitate the reduce, recycle and recovery approach with special reference to waste which may generate toxic substances when burnt. Special provisions facilitating communities to perform upstream collection of recyclable waste and prevent unsafe dumping.	Gap Analysis of existing municipal waste regulation in Kenya Final and preliminary draft of improved regulation or of planned measures for its better enforcement	**Assumptions** Although not sufficient, proper waste regulation and enforcement rules are necessary conditions for ensuring the safe management of waste **Risks (Medium):** Although necessary, proper waste regulation and enforcement rules are not sufficient for ensuring the safe management of waste

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Output 4.1.3. Counties provided with training manuals, and technical assistance for the management of solid wastes.	Availability of training manuals tailored for counties. Number of staff from counties who received technical assistance.	Inadequate training on 3Rs of specific municipal waste streams is carried out for municipality and local authorities in charge of municipal waste management at the counties.	At least 6 field training initiatives for communities and 3 training-for-trainer initiatives for municipalities in Mombasa, Kisumu and Nakuru, aimed at enhancing 3Rs of specific waste streams waste on the basis of the 3R approach performed. At least 50 people trained for each training initiative.	Training reports Training materials Attendance sheets	**Assumptions** The most effective way to prevent open burning of plastics and other PCDD/F generating waste is to train local communities to carry out up-stream recycling of waste. **Risk (high):** Communities not interested / not committed in undertaking upstream segregation of plastic. .
Outcome 4.2 Sound Management of solid waste in targeted municipalities implemented with the support of NGOs, with a reduction of unintentionally produced POPs from the burning of solid waste of 23 g I-TEQ/year (20 % of the current estimate of 247 g I-TEQ/year). Emergency plan to reduce exposure of population to harmful substances implemented.					
Output 4.2.1 Communities selected for demonstrating plans of actions for the reduction of solid waste open burning by increasing 3Rs of waste.	Number of communities which are engaged in recycling of waste under the project.	In Kenya there are a number of CBOs (Community Based Organizations) which are already operating in the field of waste recycling, however the limit of these activities is that most of the waste is recycled only after being dumped in landfills,	At least one community for each site (Nairobi, Nakuru and Kisumu) is engaged and supported for conducting project activities. Selected communities and their representatives identified and officially recognized under the project. Memorandum of understanding and	Meeting minutes. Preliminary and final list of selected communities. Memorandum of understanding signed by the selected communities. Community projects on 3Rs signed by local or central GoK	**Assumptions** Although communities are mostly informal entities, it will be possible to identify communities and their representatives and to establish a mechanism to coordinate and monitor their activities. **Risks (Medium)** Difficulties related to the low level of coordination and planning in community may hinder a community-based

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		therefore the quality is very low.	community driven projects on 3Rs with resources, list of activities and timeframe are agreed and signed by government and community representatives.	representatives and the communities.	project if a continuous coordination with the project is not ensured.
Output 4.2.2. Initiatives for reducing, reuse and recycle of waste and for composting, collection of compostable municipal waste for communities in three counties of Nairobi, Mombasa and Nakuru implemented with a PPP approach and supervised with the support of NGOs.	Number of initiatives identified, properly designed and implemented on 3Rs. Waste accounting system in place. Amount of organic compostable waste collected at the source (not at the landfill) and processed for recycling. Amount of U-POPs releases prevented due to recycling activities and	Currently, although a certain number of initiatives on waste recycling are being carried out by communities operating directly at the dumpsites, the recycling of compostable waste occurs mainly by processing paper or wood in briquettes for replacing coal in domestic stoves. These initiatives are in general not SC compliant and may imply exposure of people to U-POPs. Non-recyclables are open burnt by the communities which operate at landfill.	At least one initiative aimed at collecting and recycling organic or compostable waste which, if burned, would generate U-POPs is identified, designed and implemented for each of the three sites. At least 500 tons of compostable material successfully collected from the source (not on the dumpsites) and re-used or re-cycled (waste to energy being not considered as suitable recycling activity), documented by a proper waste accounting system in place. The recycling activity is organized at industrial scale with the support of industrial partner(s).	Preliminary and final text of collection and recycling projects agreed. Reports generated by the waste accounting system (by means of simplified waste manifest system) Project Monitoring reports Project site visit minutes and photos. Workshop reports	**Assumptions.** There is a potential market for recyclable organic waste which may sustain an activity of collection and recycling upstream of the dumpsite. Local community's authorities may benefit from waste recycling economy both in terms of improvement of health conditions and creation of new, more formal jobs. **Risks (high):** Existing dumpsite communities may oppose the development of any activity which will prevent waste to enter the dumpsites.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	open burning avoidance.				
4.2.3. Local initiative for the re-use / recycling of other non-hazardous waste streams (i.e. plastics).	Number of initiatives identified, properly designed and implemented on 3Rs of plastic waste. Waste accounting system for recycled plastic in place. Amount of plastic collected at the source (not at the landfill) and processed for recycling. Amount of U-POPs releases prevented due to recycling activities and open burning avoidance.	Currently, although a certain number of initiatives on waste recycling are being carried out by communities in all the landfills, the recycling occurs mainly by collecting plastic or other materials at the dumpsites and by selling it at very low cost to waste traders. The direct selling of artisanal articles made of recovered plastic is very ineffective The issue of recycling of plastic bags is largely unanswered. Non-recyclable plastics are often open burnt by the communities which operate at landfill.	At least one initiative aimed at collecting and recycling plastic waste which, if burned, would generate U-POPs is identified, designed and implemented for each of the three sites. At least 30 tons/month of plastic successfully collected from the source (not on the dumpsites) and re-used or re-cycled, documented by a proper waste accounting system in place. Domestic industrial stakeholders involved for facilitating the placing on the market of recovered plastic at industrial scale.	Preliminary and final text of collection and recycling projects agreed. Reports generated by the waste accounting system (by means of simplified waste manifest system) Project Monitoring reports, Project site visit minutes and photos. Workshop reports	**Assumptions.** The potential market for recyclable plastic waste is big enough to sustain an activity of collection and recycling upstream of the dumpsite. Local communities' authorities may benefit from the waste recycling economy both in terms of improvement of health condition and creation of new jobs. **Risks (medium**): Existing dumpsite communities may oppose the development of any activity which will prevent waste to enter the dumpsites. Previous bilateral project on plastic recycling at dumpsite failed.
4.3 Municipal waste disposal sites with adequate management practices (non-burn).					

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
4.3.1 Prioritization of open-burning landfills to be closed and cleaned up, emergency plans including social and resettlement issues and cleanup plans for at least 3 landfills drafted.	Prioritisation of dumpsites in Kenya established. Emergency plans for limiting the release of U-POPs and other toxic chemicals from dumpsite are available for at least 3 dumpsites. Clean-up plans for 1 landfill are available.	A number of clean-up and remediation plans have been drafted in the recent years for the Nairobi dumpsite; however none of these plans have been implemented. Remediation plans need to be designed involving communities living at the dumpsite to increase probability of implementation.	Dumpsites in the main Kenyan cities prioritised for intervention and emergency countermeasures based on health risk assessment, ecosystem risk assessment and socio-economic and criteria. Emergency plan for three priority dumpsites, aimed at reducing release of U-POPs and other toxic chemicals, and at reducing exposure to POPs of the population, drafted. At least one remediation plan for a priority dumpsite, based on the economy of waste recycling, drafted with the involvement of dumpsite communities.	List of priority dumpsites agreed with the GoK. Emergency plan for 3 priority dumpsites. Clean-up plan	**Assumption** Although none of the previous clean-up plans was implemented, is still useful to study the situation at priority landfills with a wider perspective to integrate lessons learnt and propose more feasible clean-up plans. Emergency plans, which objectives are limited to the prevention of U-POPs release and reduction of people exposure, have a greater probability of being implemented. **Risks (high):** Historically, the risk of failure is very high. The risk may be minimized by reducing the scope of remediation plans to prevention of U-POPs releases and limitation of people's exposure to chemicals.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
4.3.2. Emergency measures for reducing release of contaminants in the environment and the exposure of the population implemented in one high priority site.	Number of people who benefit from reduction of exposure to chemicals released by the dumpsite. Amount of the release reduction of U-POPs and other chemicals from implementation of emergency measures.	None of the clean-up plans drafted in the past was implemented. No emergency measure for reduction of U-POPs release from open burning at dumpsites or reduction of people exposure to chemicals released by the dumpsite ever attempted.	The exposure of at least 5,000 people to chemicals released from dumpsites is halved, thanks to the adoption of emergency measures. The release of at least 20 gTEq/yr of PCDD/F avoided by means of emergency measures directly aimed at preventing open burning of waste. The release of at least 3 gTEq/yr of PCDD/F avoided by means of activities implemented under output 4.2.3. aimed at preventing recyclable waste to enter dumpsites burning of waste.	Reports from site visits. Surveillance reports conducted at the dumpsites where emergency measures have been put in place. Monitoring reports. Sampling and analysis reports. Documented interviews with people from local communities.	**Assumptions.** Simple emergency measures (surveillance; fencing; incentives) may be effective in preventing open burning at landfills and at avoiding exposure to U-POPs. **Risks (high):** The effectiveness of any measure to be implemented at dumpsites requires a sound approach for involving dumpsite communities and ensuring their support.
Component 5. Project Monitoring and evaluation					
Outcome 5.1. Project monitoring, including PIR, Annual and quarterly workplans, Annual and Quarterly Progress Reports.					
Output 5.1.1 Project steering committee established.	Steering committee appointed.	N/A	National Steering Committee established		
Output 5.1.2 Progress report drafted and approved	Availability of Quarterly progress reports (QPRs) and annual ones (APRs)	N/A	Inception report and progress report as per monitoring plan drafted and approved.		

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Output 5.1.3 Workplans drafted and approved	Availability of Quarterly (QWP) and Annual (AWP) workplans	N/A	Quarterly and Annual workplans as per monitoring plan drafted and approved		
5.2. Project evaluation and audit					
5.2.1.Mid term evaluation completed.	Availability of completed mid-term evaluation report.	N/A	Mid-term evaluation completed.		
5.2.2 Terminal evaluation completed	Availability of terminal evaluation report.	N/A	Terminal evaluation completed.		
5.2.3 Financial audit completed.	Availability of financial audit report.	N/A	Financial audit completed.		

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

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

ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

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

ii. Acknowledgements

iii. Table of Contents

iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
   - Project Information Table
   - Project Description (brief)
   - Evaluation Ratings Table
   - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
   - Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
   - Purpose and objective of the TE
   - Scope
   - Methodology
   - Data Collection & Analysis
   - Ethics
   - Limitations to the evaluation
   - Structure of the TE report
3. Project Description (3-5 pages)
   - Project start and duration, including milestones
   - Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
   - Problems that the project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
   - Immediate and development objectives of the project
   - Expected results
   - Main stakeholders: summary list
   - Theory of Change
4. Findings
   (in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating7)
   4.1 Project Design/Formulation
   - Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
   - Assumptions and Risks
   - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
   - Planned stakeholder participation
   - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

   4.1 Project Implementation
   - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

[7] See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

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

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

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

ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

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

ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

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

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Evaluator: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales

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

ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

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

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

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

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

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

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