

**TERMS OF REFERENCE for conducting
Terminal Evaluation for the project financed within
Special Programme Trust Fund (Round 7)**

PART 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

Project name and number: *“Scaling up sustainable management of chemicals and waste in Moldova to accelerate transition to a toxic free environment”*

(M99/M1-32CML-000001/SB-007154.01.14.01.20/11218/14AC0005)

Project implementer: Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Moldova and Public Association Experts Association PRO MEDIU.

Period of implementation: 23 January 2025 – 31 March 2027.

Summary description of the project: The project is financed under the seventh round of the Special Programme Trust Fund. Its objective is to lead national efforts towards a toxic free environment and sustainability by enhancing national actors’ capacities for the sound management of chemicals and waste, improving enforcement of legislation and strengthening market control mechanisms.

The project comprises the following five measures:

- i) Multisectoral stakeholder cooperation and communication through Working Group meetings, workshops and project coordination.
- ii) Improved knowledge and information through a regulation on classification, labelling and packaging implementing GHS, a gender-responsive survey and awareness campaign, training and a regional GHS/GFC event in Chișinău.
- iii) Stronger enforcement through a regulation on restrictions and prohibitions of chemicals, a study visit, peer-to-peer exchanges and training for environmental authorities.
- iv) Knowledge-building and sustainable consumption through a curriculum for chemical consultants, a packaging and Deposit Refund System awareness campaign, and separate waste collection in ten schools under “Green Corner in my school”.
- v) Monitoring, independent evaluation, financial audit and arrangements for sustaining project results.

Date of expected submission of the final evaluation report: 31 March 2027.

PART 2. TERMINAL EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND OUTPUTS

The objective of the independent terminal evaluation is to provide an impartial assessment of project implementation, identify achievements and challenges, and assess performance against the approved objectives, outcomes and targets. The evaluation shall cover the full implementation period, including approved amendments and the revised logical framework.

The evaluation shall determine how the project contributed to sustainable institutional capacity for chemicals and waste management, including implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata conventions and the Global Framework on Chemicals (GFC). It shall provide lessons and practical recommendations to the Ministry of Environment, PRO MEDIU and the Special Programme Secretariat.

PART 3. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

Evaluation criteria

The project shall be assessed against three criteria: relevance, effectiveness and sustainability. The evaluator shall prepare an evaluation matrix linking the questions below to indicators, sources and methods, taking account of any Secretariat requirements confirmed at inception.

A. Relevance

- 1) To what extent was the project design realistic and clearly articulated, particularly the logical framework, objective, outcomes, indicators and targets, and aligned with Moldova's institutional needs and chemicals and waste priorities?
- 2) To what extent did the project build upon the already existing initiatives, such as the Moldova 4th Special Programme project?

B. Effectiveness

- 3) To what extent were the project objective, outcomes and outputs achieved across the five measures, including regulatory development, coordination, enforcement capacity, gender-responsive activities, professional training and public and school awareness?
- 4) To what extent were the targets in the approved logical framework and the project's Core Indicator Scorecard achieved? Assess changes in government capacity and coordination under Core Indicator 1, and integration of chemicals and waste management into national and sector planning and relevant reporting under Core Indicator 2.
- 5) What factors contributed to achievement or non-achievement of results, including management, use of resources, monitoring, stakeholder participation and gender equality? Distinguish delivery of activities and materials from evidence of their practical use and benefits.

C. Sustainability

- 6) To what extent will project results be sustained, considering institutional ownership, staffing, financing and continued use of regulatory tools, coordination arrangements, training, the curriculum and school programmes? Identify the principal risks and follow-up needs.

PART 4. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation shall use a rigorous approach to produce impartial, accurate, evidence-based and forward-looking findings and recommendations. Information shall be cross-

checked across documents and stakeholder accounts to reduce bias. The evaluator shall agree the evaluation schedule, evidence cut-off, stakeholder sample and analytical approach with the project partners at inception.

a) Desk research

The evaluator shall review the project application and agreement, approved amendments, revised logical framework, work plans and budgets; progress and expenditure reports; the project's Core Indicator Scorecard; and relevant national policies and legislation. Evidence shall include regulatory packages, consultation and meeting records, participant lists, training materials and feedback, the gender survey and campaign reports, curriculum and school activity records, equipment handover and use records, and available certified expenditure verification reports.

b) Interviews and questionnaires

The evaluator shall consult project management, the Ministry of Environment, PRO MEDIU, the Environment Agency and Inspectorate for Environmental Protection, and a justified sample of other partners and beneficiaries, including curriculum partners, business and worker associations, NGOs and school representatives. Interviews may be supplemented by questionnaires and selected site visits where useful. Participation and benefits shall be examined with attention to gender and inclusion.

c) Analysis and validation

Findings shall be assessed against the latest approved results framework and supported by traceable evidence. The evaluator shall compare baseline, target and achieved values using the SP7 scorecard supplied by the project team, explain any data gaps and distinguish project contributions from external influences. Financial verification findings may inform the evaluation; the evaluator is not required to issue an audit opinion.

The evaluator shall remain independent of project implementation, disclose conflicts of interest and protect confidential information. PRO MEDIU and the Ministry of Environment shall facilitate access to documents and stakeholders. Factual comments shall be considered without compromising the evaluator's independent judgement.

PART 5. DELIVERABLE

Terminal Evaluation Report: Following data collection and analysis, the evaluator shall submit a draft report in English. It shall be concise, well-structured and evidence-based, with a main text of no more than 20 pages, a separate Executive Summary of up to two pages, and supporting annexes. The report shall describe the methodology, present findings against the three evaluation criteria and assess achievement of the logical framework and core indicators.

The report shall follow the outline in Annex I. Recommendations shall be supported by findings and conclusions and identify who should take action and how.

The draft terminal evaluation report will be sent to project stakeholders for comments in an open and transparent manner. After integration of the comments of the project stakeholders, the expert will produce a final evaluation report.

The final report shall be provided in editable Word and PDF formats, in English. The accepted report shall be submitted to the Special Programme Secretariat at unepchemicalsspecialprogramme@un.org.

PART 6. EXPECTED QUALIFICATIONS OF THE EVALUATOR

The evaluator shall have:

- A professional background in environmental sciences or another relevant discipline;
- At least five years of experience evaluating environmental technical cooperation projects, preferably in chemicals and waste management;
- Strong conceptual and methodological skills, including gender-responsive and governance evaluation methods;
- Experience in interviewing, data processing and evidence-based analysis;
- Familiarity with OECD/DAC evaluation quality standards;
- Strong communication and report-writing skills in English and Romanian;
- Independence from the project's design and implementation and no conflicting interests.

PART 7. WORKLOAD AND SUBMISSION

The expected workload is 30-35 working days. The assignment shall be completed no later than 31 March 2027.

Interested candidates shall submit their CV in English and financial offer by 6 November 2026 to info@pro-mediu.md or tuguitatiana@ymail.com

Annex I

Outline for Evaluation Report

This outline lays out the evaluation report format. The evaluator will be required to follow this format in order to assure compliance with the quality standards established by United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards. The Final Evaluation Report should not have more than 20 pages (excluding annexes).

Title and opening pages

Provide the following basic information:

1. Name of the Evaluation
2. Timeframe of the Evaluation, and date of the report
3. Location (country, region, etc.) of the Evaluation
4. Names and/or organizations of evaluators
5. Name of the organization commissioning the Evaluation
6. Table of contents listing tables, graphs, figures and annexes, with page references
7. List of acronyms and abbreviations

Executive Summary

Include in a stand-alone section (max 2 pages):

1. Overview of the Evaluation
2. Evaluation methodology
3. Conclusions
4. Recommendations

Introduction

1. Describe the **background of the project or programme**, including:
 - a) the implementing structure (including partners, phases of intervention, etc.)
 - b) the resources
 - c) the timeline and countries covered
 - d) the beneficiaries
 - e) the logical framework/strategic framework (use annexes if needed)
2. Explain the **objectives and scope of Evaluation**:
 - a) describe the purpose of the Evaluation
 - b) describe the scope of Evaluation, including:
 - the time period countries covered by Evaluation

- the evaluation criteria and questions used (use annexes if needed)

Methodology

1. Explain the data collection: describe each data collection tool
2. Explain the data analysis: describe how data was analysed to answer the evaluation questions
3. Summarize the rationale for selection of methodology

Findings

Organize findings in sections according to Evaluation criteria (relevance, etc.)

- a) Structure findings around the Evaluation questions (readers should make a direct connection between what was asked and what was found)
- b) Highlight in each section the key findings by inserting them in a separate box
- c) Present findings as clear statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data

Conclusions

- The conclusions should focus on the most significant issues and be logically linked to the key findings.
- Provide an overall judgement of 2-3 sentences for each Evaluation criterion

Examples:

The project is found to be fully/partially/not relevant, because...

The project is found to be fully/partially/not effective, because...

The project is found to be fully/partially/not sustainable, because...

- Assess overall the strengths, weaknesses, challenges or solutions

Recommendations

- Based on the findings and conclusions, provide no more than five recommendations.
- The recommendations should be:
 - Concise and action-oriented, following the structure: “who should do what and how”
 - Supported by the evidence provided in the report

Report annexes

Annexes should include the following to provide the report user with supplemental background and methodological details that enhance the credibility of the report:

- TORs
- List of persons interviewed, and sites visited, by date
- List of documents referenced

- Evaluation matrix
- Addition information on methodology, etc., as necessary



MOLDOVA SP7 - CORE INDICATOR SCORECARD

- **RED: Proposed target scores and evidence requirements**
- **Light blue: Selected criteria and supporting information**
- **Bright blue: Scoring levels adapted to the SP7 logical framework**

INDICATOR 1

Extent of strengthened government capacity and coordination mechanisms to support development and implementation of national strategies for chemicals and waste management as a result of Special Programme funding.

Criterion 1.1: To what extent does the project strengthen functioning cooperation on chemicals and waste among authorities and other stakeholders?

Fill the box just below with a shading color for the statement that is correct.

0	1	2	3	4	5
No functioning mechanism for the relevant chemicals and waste dialogue is evidenced.	Contacts or consultations are ad hoc, with limited stakeholder participation.	Regular, structured Working Group meetings involve government and non-government stakeholders; participation and issues discussed are recorded.	Regular coordination includes the relevant authorities and stakeholders, consideration of gender and vulnerable groups, and documented decisions with assigned follow-up.	Stakeholders actively share information, coordinate implementation and demonstrate follow-up of agreed actions between meetings.	An established, inclusive mechanism functions beyond the project, with institutional ownership, routine joint work and evidence of continued coordination.

Baseline:

Target:

Explain in max. 30 words why you selected the statement just above:

Attach documentation as proof: Working Group mandate or terms, membership, agendas and minutes; attendance by institution and sex where available; decisions and action trackers; final workshop report; interviews confirming follow-up.

Log frame commitments: One inception workshop; one final workshop/conference; four Working Group meetings; monthly management meetings.



Criterion 1.2: To what extent can environmental authorities apply improved knowledge and tools in chemicals and waste regulation and market control?

Fill the box just below with a shading color for the statement that is correct.

0	1	2	3	4	5
The planned project training and exchange programme has not started; this does not imply that national expertise is absent.	Training needs, agendas, materials and participants are identified for the planned study visit, peer exchange, training sessions or regional event.	Planned exchanges or training events are delivered and documented; coverage of the full programme or evidence of learning remains incomplete.	The planned study visit, peer exchange, two training sessions and regional event are delivered; participation is verified and feedback or assessments demonstrate relevant learning.	Participants demonstrate use of acquired knowledge or tools in authorization, inspection, market control or preparation of relevant regulatory instruments.	Beneficiary authorities incorporate the methods or materials into routine work and further training, with continuing professional cooperation.

Baseline:

Target:

Explain in max. 30 words why you selected the statement just above:

Attach documentation as proof. Means of verification: Study-visit concept, delegate list and report; Romanian peer-to-peer mission report; inspection checklists; training materials and attendance; before/after assessments or feedback; examples of application; regional event records; equipment use records where relevant.

Log frame commitments: One study visit with 10 authority/project representatives; one peer-to-peer activity with 15 Moldovan and 3 Romanian representatives; two training sessions for environmental authorities representatives; one regional event with 40 participants.

Criterion 1.3: Have the gender-responsive campaign, packaging and DRS awareness campaign, and Green Corner in my school programme improved information, knowledge and practical participation in chemicals and waste management?

Fill the box just below with a shading color for the statement that is correct.

0	1	2	3	4	5
The project gender-responsive,	Survey methods, target audiences,	Some survey, training, communication or	All three activity packages are	Evidence shows use of survey findings or	Partner institutions and schools continue the



packaging/DRS and school campaigns have not started.	materials, communication channels and participating schools are identified or being prepared.	school activities are delivered, but the full package or its evidence remains incomplete.	completed: survey, gender-sensitive materials and three training events; packaging/DRS materials with likes and shares; separate collection activities in ten schools, with records of collected waste where applicable.	materials by partners, improved audience knowledge, and continued use of separate collection arrangements in participating schools.	information, training and collection activities, with assigned responsibilities and integration into their routine programmes.
Baseline: Target: Explain in max. 30 words why you selected the statement just above: Attach documentation as proof. Means of verification: Survey report; gender-sensitive materials; three training reports, attendance and feedback; packaging/DRS materials and dissemination records; dated social media statistics; list of ten schools, activity reports, collection arrangements and waste quantity/volume records; follow-up evidence of learning, use and continuation Log frame commitments: Activity 2.2: survey on women's occupational and consumption exposure, gender-sensitive information materials and three training events. Activity 4.2: packaging/DRS promotion materials or initiative output, likes and shares. Activity 4.3: separate waste collection programme in ten schools, with recorded waste volumes. Output baselines 0; retain each activity target separately.					

INDICATOR 2

Degree of integration of chemicals and waste management into national and sector planning, formally proposed, adopted or being implemented, including required reporting to relevant conventions and voluntary reporting to SAICM/GFC.

Criterion 2.1: What stage has the project-supported GHS regulation on classification, labelling and packaging reached?

Fill the box just below with a shading color for the statement that is correct.

0	1	2	3
The specific instrument has not been developed or formally proposed.	The regulatory package is completed, consulted and formally proposed through the competent national procedure.	The regulation is formally adopted, but application or enforcement is not yet operational or evidenced.	The regulation is in force and operational implementation or enforcement is demonstrated.

Baseline:

Target:

Explain in max. 30 words why you selected the statement just above:

Attach documentation as proof. Means of verification: Draft Government Decision; information note; concordance table; regulatory impact assessment; synthesis of comments; consultation minutes and attendance; formal submission; adoption/publication and commencement documents if applicable; implementation evidence for level 3.

Log frame commitments: One regulation on classification, labelling and packaging; consultation involving 20 authority representatives. Project output baseline 0; target 1 regulatory package and 20 participants.

Target basis: The log-frame requires elaboration of one regulation and consultation, without a separate adoption or enforcement target. Level 1 is proposed if formal submission is verified; drafting alone is recorded below that milestone.

Criterion 2.2: What stage has the project-supported regulation on restricted and prohibited chemicals reached?

Fill the box just below with a shading color for the statement that is correct.

0	1	2	3
The specific instrument has not been developed or formally proposed.	The regulatory package is completed, consulted and formally proposed through the competent national procedure.	The regulation is formally adopted, but application or enforcement is not yet operational or evidenced.	The regulation is in force and operational implementation or enforcement is demonstrated.

Baseline:

Target:

Explain in max. 30 words why you selected the statement just above: _____

Attach documentation as proof. Means of verification: Draft Government Decision and accompanying note, concordance table, impact assessment and synthesis; consultation records and formal submission; adopted text and publication if applicable; compliance guidance and enforcement records for level 3.

Log frame commitments: One regulation on restricted and prohibited chemicals. The indicator text refers to 20 consultation participants, while its bracketed target is 1; verify one consultation/output and the participant total separately and record the clarification.

Criterion 2.3: To what extent is the chemical consultant curriculum integrated into the responsible training institution's professional education arrangements?

Fill the box just below with a shading color for the statement that is correct.

0	1	2	3
No equivalent curriculum for the intended chemical consultant training is available.	The curriculum is developed and formally submitted or proposed to the competent education/training institution.	The curriculum is formally approved or adopted by the competent institution, but delivery is not yet demonstrated.	The approved curriculum is being delivered, with teaching arrangements, participant records and evidence of assessment or completion.

Baseline:

Target:

Explain in max. 30 words why you selected the statement just above: _____

Attach documentation as proof. Means of verification: Curriculum and learning outcomes; professional and legal alignment review; submission and institutional approval documents; implementation arrangements, teaching staff, enrolment, course materials, assessment and completion records if available.

Log frame commitments: One curriculum for certification/professional training of qualified chemical consultants; project output baseline 0 and target 1.

