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I. INTRODUCTION

The independent country evaluation of UNIDO activities in Uruguay was approved by the Executive Board as part of the ODG/EVA Work Programme 2014/2015. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the implementation and results of the UNIDO technical cooperation portfolio over the past seven years, i.e., from 2008 to present.

UNIDO has been involved in Uruguay since the 1970ies. By the end of 2013, UNIDO had implemented more than 107 projects with a total allotment of about USD7.3 m. Currently there are three ongoing projects with an allotted budget of USD 2 million.

UNIDO maintains a Field Office in Montevideo, Uruguay since 1999. This office also covers UNIDO regional activities in Argentina, Chile, and Paraguay.

From 2008 to date, the portfolio of UNIDO in Uruguay has been composed of projects to support cooperative commission by promoting, inter alia, sustainable production and employment; institutional strengthening; to improve the development of long-term energy policies and agro-industrial activities; furthermore, to create sustainable institutional mechanisms and updated expertise to facilitate access to export markets for Uruguayan small and medium enterprises.

Uruguay was part of the United Nations reform initiative “Delivering as One”, where the first UNDAF (for 2007-2010) was prepared and subsequently a Joint Programme 2007-2010 was implemented.

This country evaluation will assess in a systematic and objective manner the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the UNIDO interventions. The evaluation will assess the achievements of the interventions against their established objectives, including re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and the appropriateness of the design, specifically in regards to gender equality and empowerment of women as well as environmental sustainability and other cross-cutting issues. The performance of the UNIDO Field Office in Uruguay as regards its function in covering UNIDO activities will also be reviewed, as well as the participation of Uruguay in regional programmes and global forum activities.

II. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Uruguay covers a land area of 176,065 sq km, of which 80% is suitable for agricultural or livestock production. Geographically, Uruguay is the second-smallest nation in Latin America after Suriname. It is bordered by Argentina to its west and Brazil to its north and east, with the Atlantic Ocean to the south and southeast. According to official estimates, the total population was 3.3m at the end of June 2008.¹

Government structure, strategies and policies

Uruguay became an independent republic in 1830. The administrations of President José Batlle y Ordóñez in the early 20th century launched widespread political, social, and economic reforms that established a statist tradition. The country has a presidential government with the president as the executive. The president is directly elected for a five-year term and he/she appoints a council of ministers, comprising the ministers of administrative departments and their deputies; the vice-president is

¹ EIU (2014). Uruguay
president of parliament. Uruguay's political and labor conditions are among the freest on the continent.

**Economic and industrial context**

Uruguay has a free market economy characterized by an export-oriented agricultural sector, a well-educated work force, and high levels of social spending. Following financial difficulties in the late 1990s and early 2000s, economic growth for Uruguay averaged 8% annually during the period 2004-08. The 2008-09 global financial crisis put a brake on Uruguay's vigorous growth, which decelerated to 2.6% in 2009.

Nevertheless, the country managed to avoid a recession and keep positive growth rates, mainly through higher public expenditure and investment, and GDP growth reached 8.9% in 2010 but slowed in 2012-13, the result of a renewed slowdown in the global economy and in Uruguay's main trade partners and Common Market of the South (Mercosur) counterparts, Argentina and Brazil. Uruguay has sought to expand trade within Mercosur and with non-Mercosur members. Uruguay's total merchandise trade with Mercosur since 2006 has increased by nearly 70% to more than $5 billion while its total trade with the world has almost doubled to roughly $23 billion in 2013.

Uruguay's small, open economy offers an attractive investment climate for international investors. The country has a history of democratic regimes and strong property rights, and legislation guarantees that foreign investors receive the same legal treatment as local investors.

The government pushed through framework legislation in mid-2011 to guide public-private partnerships (PPPs), which it hopes will boost private investment in infrastructure. Implementation of infrastructure upgrades under the new PPP framework has been slow but in the first quarter of 2014 appeared to be making some headway.

Inflation is still the government's most pressing policy challenge. Despite some fiscal tightening, it will remain above the 3-7% target until late 2015. Real GDP growth is set to weaken to below 4% in 2014, but the cyclical slowdown will be mild and short-lived, and GDP should rise to around its potential growth rate of 4.5% by 2018.

In 2013, Uruguay's export-oriented agricultural sector contributed to 7.5% of the GDP and employed 13% of the workforce. According to the Uruguayan Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, the country is one of the largest meat producers in the world. It produces about 600,000 tons of beef per year – 150,000 for domestic consumption and 450,000 for export to over 80 countries. This represents one quarter of merchandise exports from Uruguay. Meat and sheep farming in Uruguay occupies approximately 59.6% of the land. The percentage further increases to estimated 82.4%, when cattle breeding was linked to other farm activities such as dairy, forage, and rotation with crops such as rice.

According to FAOSTAT, Uruguay is one of world's largest producers of soybeans (19th), greasy wool (38th), horse meat (40th), beeswax (35th), and quinces (30th). Most farms (25,500 out of 39,120) are family-managed; beef and wool represent the main activities and main source of income for 65% of them, followed by vegetable

---

5 http://faostat.fao.org
farming at 12%, dairy farming at 11%, hogs at 2%, and poultry also at 2%. Beef is the main export commodity of the country, totaling to estimated USD1 billion in 2011.\(^6\)

Agriculture includes soybeans, rice, wheat; beef, dairy products; fish; lumber, and cellulose. Uruguay's National Cooperative of Milk Producers is the main exporter of dairy products in Latin America (in 2006).\(^7\) The main industries include food processing, electrical machinery, transportation equipment, petroleum products, textiles, chemicals, beverages. Banking has traditionally been one of the strongest service export sectors in the country. Uruguay was once dubbed "the Switzerland of America", mainly for its banking sector and stability.

The sectorial GDP and labor force composition for Uruguay is presented in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>GDP (in per cent)</th>
<th>Labor force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>71 (2013 est.)</td>
<td>73 (2010 est.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social context

Uruguay is counted as a “high human development” country (occupying place 51 among the 187 countries that are measured by way of the human development index – HDI\(^8\)) and also as an “upper-middle income”\(^9\) one.

Uruguay is rated to have a high human development, placed on position 51 of the UN Human Development Index in 2012. It is one of the few countries in Latin America and the Caribbean where the entire population has access to clean water.

21% of Uruguay’s population is below the age of 15 years and 38.9% between 25-54 years - the median age in the country 34.3 years. The population growth rate for 2014 is estimated with 0.26% and life expectancy at birth of the total population is to reach 76.81 years. Health expenditure is estimated with 8% of GDP (2011) (world ranking 61). Uruguay’s provision of free primary through university education has contributed to the country’s high levels of literacy and educational attainment. However, the emigration of human capital has diminished the state’s return on its investment in education. Remittances from the roughly 18% of Uruguayans abroad amount to less than 1 percent of national GDP. The emigration of young adults and a low birth rate are causing Uruguay's population to age rapidly.

The total unemployment rate of youth aged between 15 and 24 years is estimated with 18.5%, placing the country in comparison to the world rank 66.

---

\(^6\) ibid

\(^7\) See ref. 4, above

\(^8\) Human Development Report, UNDP (2013) with data for 2012. Uruguay’s score of 0.792 is surpassed in Latin America only by Argentina and Chile.

\(^9\) Classification drawn up by the World Bank on the basis of per capita GDP for 2008. Other countries in the region in the same category are Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Panama, Peru and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).
Country strategy

In Uruguay, the preparation of the first UNDAF (for 2007-2010) and subsequently the Joint Programme 2007-2010 was implemented as part of the pilot of the United Nations reform initiative “Delivering as One”. Both documents, and the accomplishments that have resulted from this experience, were the fruit of collaborative work between the Government of Uruguay and the United Nations, which provided important lessons learned and best practices that formed the basis for the preparation of the UNDAF for 2011-2015. The outcomes identified in this document will be achieved through the joint work of the Government of Uruguay and the United Nations. These outcomes are concentrated in four areas:

(1) Diversification of production and participation in the global economy

Promote the diversification of production and the country’s participation in the global economy, the growth of productive investment and greater incorporation of scientific and technological innovations in production processes, as pillars of economic development. The proposed outcomes are intended to contribute to the achievement of MDGs 1 and 8 and will be achieved through programmes and projects carried out by the agencies of the system with expertise in this area, including UNIDO.

(2) Environmental sustainability

Move towards the implementation of sustainable development models that will foster conservation of natural resources and ecosystems, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and use of renewable sources of energy with the aim of reducing social and environmental vulnerabilities and thus achieving greater social equity and environmental justice.

(3) Equitable social development

Enhance social development (with particular emphasis on the areas of early childhood development, health and education) with a view to reducing inequality and various forms of inequity (including intergenerational, gender, racial and geographic inequity). The outcomes are linked to the achievement of all the MDGs, and to national priorities, relating to social cohesion. An involvement of UNIDO is not foreseen in the framework.

(4) Democratic governance

Strengthen democratic governance at the national and local levels through public involvement, strengthening of State institutions and the comprehensive national human rights protection system, in accordance with the declarations and conventions to which Uruguay is a party. An involvement of UNIDO is not foreseen in the framework

III. UNIDO PRESENCE IN URUGUAY

UNIDO does maintain a UNIDO Field office in Montevideo. This office is also responsible for covering UNIDO activities in Argentina, Chile and Paraguay.
a) Ongoing and completed projects

Three national projects are ongoing amounting to a total budget of around USD1.96 million as presented in Table 2 below. Six projects (and eight sub-allotments) have been completed and most of the funds disbursed.

Table 2: UNIDO portfolio in Uruguay, 2008 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>SAP ID</th>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Total allotment (USD)</th>
<th>Funds remaining (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF/URU/11/001</td>
<td>100041</td>
<td>Modular agro-industrial centre of excellence (MAICE)</td>
<td>1,300,342</td>
<td>240,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP/URU/10/002</td>
<td>105291</td>
<td>Preparation of HCFC phase-out investment activities (refrigeration manufacturing sector)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>19,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF/URU/11/001</td>
<td>120250 (GEF funds – PPG phase)</td>
<td>Uruguay: Towards a green economy in Uruguay; stimulating sustainable production practices and low-emission technologies in prioritized sectors</td>
<td>17,372</td>
<td>6,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF/URU/12/001</td>
<td>120323</td>
<td>Uruguay: Towards a green economy in Uruguay; stimulating sustainable production practices and low-emission technologies in prioritized sectors</td>
<td>590,000</td>
<td>562,238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total (in USD) 1,957,714 828,758

Completed projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>SAP ID</th>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Total allotment (USD)</th>
<th>Funds remaining (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF/URU/12/001</td>
<td>120250 (DO funds)</td>
<td>Towards a green economy in Uruguay: Stimulating sustainable production practices and low-emission technologies in prioritized sectors</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/10/001</td>
<td>104018</td>
<td>Sound management for MERCURY products</td>
<td>231,296</td>
<td>10,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP/URU/10/003</td>
<td>107014</td>
<td>Modular agro-industrial centre of excellence (MAICE) – Preparatory assistance</td>
<td>29,980</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM/URU/08/004</td>
<td>107014</td>
<td>Strengthening cultural industries and improving access to the cultural goods and services of Uruguay</td>
<td>939,861</td>
<td>11,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/08/003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical assistance for the development of policies to promote sustainable production and employment (Central monitoring and coordination)</td>
<td>71,164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/08/A03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical assistance for the development of policies to promote sustainable production and employment (Component 1 – Design instruments for productive promotion)</td>
<td>416,780</td>
<td>11,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/08/B03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical assistance for the development of policies to promote sustainable production and employment (Component 2 – Develop Strategy to support companies’ support)</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/08/C03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical assistance for the development of policies to promote sustainable production and employment (Component 3 - Establish a guarantee fund for companies)</td>
<td>92,500</td>
<td>3,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/08/D03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical assistance for the development of policies to promote sustainable production and employment (Component 4 - Support the cooperative commission)</td>
<td>48,420</td>
<td>3,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/08/002</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional strengthening for the design of economic development strategies - country international insertion and long term energy policies development (Central monitoring and coordination)</td>
<td>38,206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/08/A02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional strengthening for the design of economic development strategies - country international insertion and long term energy policies development (Component 1 - Improve the developing of long term energy policies)</td>
<td>113,173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/08/B02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional strengthening for the design of economic development strategies - country</td>
<td>111,018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures tabled have been estimated from budget information available from UNIDO systems (Infobase/Agresso and SAP) as of June 2014. Therefore, verification will be required by project managers and consolidated during the inception phase.
In addition, some regional projects and global forum activities (see Table 3 below) in which Uruguay is participating (or has participated) will also be considered as part of this country evaluation.

Table 3: Regional projects in which Uruguay is participating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>SAP ID</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Overall Budget (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/08/C02</td>
<td></td>
<td>International insertion and long term energy policies development (Component 2 - Develop country image strategy to promote the country in the international context)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/08/D02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional strengthening for the design of economic development strategies - country international insertion and long term energy policies development (Component 3 - Provide institutional strengthening to promote external direct investment in the country)</td>
<td>107,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB/URU/08/D02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional strengthening for the design of economic development strategies - country international insertion and long term energy policies development (Component 4 - Provide institutional strengthening to design policies regarding intellectual property issues)</td>
<td>77,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (in USD)</td>
<td>2,370,102</td>
<td>41,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (in USD)</td>
<td>4,327,816</td>
<td>870,039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, figures tabled have been estimated from budget information available from UNIDO systems (Infobase/Agresso and SAP) as of March 2014. Therefore, verification will be required by project managers and consolidated during the inception phase.

b) Delivering as One: Uruguay’s experience as a pilot country

The inception of the Delivering as One (DaO) process started in 2004, when the General Assembly called for efforts to improve the coherence and effectiveness of the United Nations System (UNS). On the basis of this mandate, in 2006, the High Level Panel of the United Nations’ Secretary General published the report entitled “Delivering as One”, which puts forward a set of recommendations that include the establishment of a country-level pilot experience based on five pillars, One UN Programme, One Budgetary Framework, One Leader, One Office and One Voice.

The DaO programme is based on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2007-2010 which was agreed with the Uruguayan authorities in April 2006. The DaO experience and the improvements it generated for managing
international cooperation have allowed Uruguay to address a series of borderline structural vulnerabilities characteristic of MICs that compromise the sustainability of the development achieved so far.

The DaO experience in Uruguay is particularly relevant as it provided an opportunity to test new cooperation modalities that, with few resources, may have a high impact in overcoming these vulnerabilities, and contribute to the debate on the role that the United Nations System should play in middle income countries (MICs).

More than 30 State institutions were involved in the execution of the joint projects being financed through the One UN Coherence Fund. In addition, 19 UN Agencies have signed the One UN Programme, ten of which are non-resident.

The “Common programme” includes an “Outputs and Resources Matrix” that describes the main programmes and activities that the agencies were to implement during the period 2007-2008. To complete this matrix UNIDO had followed the same approach of other Agencies, thus, funds already secured together with the funds that were still under negotiation had been included.

Regarding UNIDO, the matrix included current 2007 on-going activities which funds were secured. With regard to years 2008 onwards, the indicated funds included in this matrix were only tentative and depended on the possibility of obtaining Euros 2.5 million from Italy to finance a second phase of the FAE project (UE/URU/04/106).

Additionally, the Observatory for Renewable Energy was also included in the matrix, considering this represented a key activity for UNIDO in the region.

UNIDO, as one of the executing agencies contributed, in particular, to the achievement of:

Outcome 1 (UNDAF) - “By 2010 the country will have advanced in the generation of capacities for the incorporation of knowledge, innovation and diversification in the process of production of goods and services oriented to sustained and sustainable growth.” UNIDO activities focused on two outputs under this component:

- “SMEs’ competitiveness in the access to external markets accomplished”, and
- “Micro and medium-sized enterprises in the rest of the country are in motion”.

In addition, UNIDO was one of the lead executing agencies in two joint projects:

- Institutional Strengthening for the design of economic development strategies: country international insertion and long term energy policies development (FB/URU/08/002/A02-D02); and
- Technical assistance for the design of public policies that promote sustainable production and employment (FB/URU/08/003/A03-D03)

Under the abovementioned “Outputs and Resources Matrix” UNIDO included additionally, the Observatory for Renewable Energy with the consideration that this activity represents a “key” issue for UNIDO in the region.

The country evaluation will review the relevance of UNIDO activities that were implemented under the UNDAF/One UN programme for key stakeholders, including the government, beneficiaries; it will also assess the linkages of the current and
prospective UNIDO portfolio to the results framework under the UNDAF/One UN programme.

IV. THE COUNTRY EVALUATION: Rational and purpose

Overall, the main purposes of the country evaluation are the following:

- To assess the relevance of UNIDO’s interventions in relation to national industrial priorities, strategies and needs, and national and regional development agendas;
- To assess UNIDO’s strategic positioning in the country, including the regional and global perspective;
- To assess the effectiveness of the UNIDO model approach to the country;
- To assess the achievements and/or progress of Technical Cooperation (TC) interventions towards the expected outputs and outcomes outlined in UNIDO project and programme documents;
- To generate key findings, draw lessons and provide a set of clear and forward-looking recommendations.
- The extent to which projects and programmes are in line with the UNIDO Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) agenda, and if ISID-related results can be assessed and how the project or the approach followed has a potential to promote ISID.

The country evaluation will assess in an independent, systematic and objective manner the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness (achievement of outputs and outcomes), impact and sustainability of the interventions under evaluation. The evaluation will assess the achievements of the interventions against their key objectives, including re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and the appropriateness of the design, specifically in regards to gender equality and empowerment of women. It will identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of those objectives.

The evaluation will also look at other cross-cutting issues e.g., coordination, cooperation, synergies between UNIDO projects; One UN partner; fostering of South-South cooperation; UNIDO’s strategic positioning in the country (including regional and global perspectives) and review UNIDO involvement and/or participation in global forum activities.

The assessment will include a review of the performance of the UNIDO Field Office as regards its function in covering UNIDO activities as well as the participation of Uruguay in regional programmes and global forum activities.

Reports and findings from current and past evaluations will be considered. Among other, the country evaluation will follow-up on issues and results from the Delivering as One – Country-led evaluation Uruguay that took place in 2010 and on the independent final evaluation of the joint programme: Strengthening of cultural industries and improvement of access to cultural goods and services from Uruguay (UNIDO project No. FM/URU/08/004). An external evaluation was led by the MDG-F and took place in 2011. In light of the high relevance in the economic and political context, the evaluation will revisit, in form of a post-evaluation outcome review, the project Fostering Uruguayan Entrepreneurial Activities: Support to the SME Sector to Facilitate Access to Export Markets (UE/URU/04/106, UE/URU/04/A06, UE/URU/04/B06). [n.b.: This project was evaluated in 2009 and the follow-up cycle completed in 2010.]
The key users of this evaluation will be UNIDO management and staff at Headquarters, the UNIDO Representation in Uruguay, UNIDO experts, the Government of Uruguay, counterpart agencies and other organizations in the country cooperating with UNIDO, donors, members of the UN Country Team and, not the least beneficiaries. For these stakeholders the evaluation findings and recommendations are expected to provide key inputs for the planning and continual improvement of future cooperation activities.

V. SCOPE AND FOCUS OF THE COUNTRY EVALUATION

The evaluation will cover the full range of UNIDO’s support to Uruguay. It should go beyond a mere documentation of results by trying to assess why projects/programmes have succeeded or not and identify benchmarks and best practices. As well it will identify how these successes and/or failures can be used and/or avoided in order to improve future UNIDO projects in the country.

The evaluation will focus on UNIDO activities in Uruguay since 2008 to present. The more precise scope of the country evaluation will be defined in the inception report.

The evaluation will not evaluate/review all stand-alone projects implemented as of 2008 but it will cover projects considered strategically important in relation to the purpose of the evaluation. The evaluation will assess a portfolio that is representative of UNIDO activities in Uruguay and that is large enough to enable the evaluation team to understand UNIDO’s role and activities in the country and to answer the evaluation questions identified in this TOR.

The country evaluation will take into consideration the following UNIDO thematic evaluations that addressed issues relevant to the country:

- Thematic review of UNIDO’s Agri-business/Agro-industry development interventions (2010)
- UNIDO’s Global Forum function (2013)
- UNIDO Field Office performance (2013)
- UNIDO’s contribution to the Millennium Development Goals (2013)
- UNIDO’s contribution to One UN mechanisms (2012)

In particular, the country evaluation should assess the status of implementation of actions taken in response to recommendations that were issued from past evaluations.

UNIDO’s interventions are implemented within different regions in Uruguay and the evaluation will cover different geographical regions to the extent possible. This will be elaborated in the inception report, taking into considerations possible security issues. For this purpose basic evaluability assessments will be carried out as necessary.

VI. EVALUATION ISSUES AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

A. Issues related to UNIDO’s presence (2008-present) at country and project level

It is important to note that the assessment of UNIDO’s country presence will not simply address individual projects but will consider synergies and complementarities between projects as well as how individual projects contribute to larger objectives. It will include an assessment of the design, implementation and results with regards to:
- Strategic objective; ISID
- Subsector focus;
- Collaboration with and role of counterpart institutions; and
- Programme management and coordination.

Identified evaluation issues/questions in relation to the different OECD/DAC criteria are provided below.

**Relevance**

The degree to which the design and objectives of UNIDO’s programme and projects, and the approach that was used to develop them, is consistent with the needs of the country and with development plans and priorities as well as with UNIDO and donor strategic priorities.

The extent to which the country programme/project was relevant to:

- The development challenges facing the country;
- UNDAF for Uruguay 2011-2015;
- UNIDO’s strategic and regional priorities (e.g., ISID, UNIDO Programme and Budget, Medium-term Programme Framework, the green industry agenda);
- National industrial priorities and strategies;
- The target groups and to UNIDO counterparts;
- Donors, stakeholders and beneficiaries.

**Efficiency**

A measure of how economically inputs (through activities) are converted into outputs. The extent to which:

- UNIDO provided high quality services and inputs (e.g., expertise, training, equipment, methodologies) that led to the production of outputs;
- The resources and inputs were converted to results in a timely and cost-effective manner;
- Coordination amongst and within components of the programme lead to collaboration and cooperation among stakeholders and to the production of outputs;
- The same results could not have been achieved in another, more cost-effective manner; and
- Outputs were produced in a timely manner.
- Efficiency of procurement process/services. (Specific questions are provided as reference and guidance in the Annex F: UNIDO Procurement Services Generic Approach and Assessment Framework).

**Effectiveness**

The extent to which the objectives of programme/project were or are expected to be achieved. The extent to which:

- Objectives/Results (outcomes and outputs) established in programme/project documents were achieved/produced;
- Major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives are identified.
**Sustainability**

The continuation of benefits from an intervention after the project/programme has been completed. The extent to which:

- There is continued commitment and ownership by the government and other stakeholders; and
- Changes or benefits can be maintained in the long term.

**Impact**

The positive and negative, intended and non-intended, direct and indirect changes and long-term effects produced by the project/programme. The extent to which the programme/project contributed to:

- Developmental results (economic, environmental, social);
- The achievement of the MDGs and national development goals.

**Follow-up on past evaluations**

The extent to which:

- Expected results after the evaluation of below projects have been achieved and are sustained:
  
  a) Delivering as One – URUGUAY (ref. Country-led evaluation Uruguay (2010);
  b) UNIDO project *Strengthening of cultural industries and improvement of access to cultural goods and services from Uruguay* (FM/URU/08/004) (external evaluation by the MDG-F, 2011); and
  c) UNIDO project *Fomento a la actividad empresarial Uruguaya: Apoyo al sector de pequeñas y medianas empresas para facilitar el acceso a los Mercados de exportación. Fomento a la Actividad Empresarial Uruguaya-Fase II: Apoyo al Sector de Pequeñas y Medianas Empresas para Facilitar el Acceso a los Mercados de Exportación* (UE/URU/04/106, UE/URU/04/A06, UE/URU/04/B06) (2009);
- Results from the activities under the above projects have triggered new projects/synergies or further impact;
- Recommendations from the abovementioned evaluation were implemented.

**Programme/Project design**

The extent to which:

- A participatory identification process was instrumental in selecting problem areas and counterparts requiring technical cooperation support;
- The programme/project has a clear thematically focused development objective, the attainment of which can be determined by a set of verifiable indicators;
• The programme/projects were formulated based on the logical framework approach, including a coherent results framework, results-oriented and SMART indicators;

B. Evaluation criteria for cross-cutting issues

In addition, specific evaluation criteria and cross-cutting issues will be mainstreamed in the Country evaluation and individual projects. These are:

• Contribution to empowerment of women and gender equality;
• Contribution to environmental sustainability;
• Coordination, cooperation, synergies between UNIDO projects;
• UN cooperation and partnerships;
• Fostering of South-South and sub-regional cooperation (e.g. Mercosur).

C. Assessment of the Field Office

UNIDO’s Field Office (FO) will be assessed with regards to its contribution to UNIDO’s convening, normative and technical cooperation functions and the implementation of its RBM-based Work Plan.

The assessment will be an organizational or functional assessment as opposed to a staff assessment focusing on individuals.

The assessment of the FO will review both administrative and substantive functions of the office and its work. Specifically, the evaluation should review any impact or limitations in relation to UNIDO strategic approaches and/or, programmatic, project design and implementation models being used so far. The FO assessment related to the country evaluation will not duplicate or replace any audit performed by the UNIDO Office of Internal Oversight Services.

The performance of the Field Office will be assessed in relation to three evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. The detailed approach that will be used will be specified in the inception report on the basis of the ANNEX D: UNIDO Field Office Generic Assessment Framework.

Evaluation of global forum activities

Global forum (GF) activities will also be addressed as part of the country evaluation. GF activities are those which are initiated by UNIDO (or the United Nations system) to exchange and disseminate knowledge and information, as well as facilitate partnerships. They intend to produce an “output”, without a pre-identified client, which increases understanding of sustainable industrial development issues. Global forum activities have informative, advocating and normative functions.
The assessment of global forum activities will include:

- UNIDO GF activities nurturing national knowledge and dialogue globally and with regard to industrial development and, at the same time;
- Activities at the national level, including TC projects, contributing to UNIDO GF activities and products.

The selection of global forum activities to be assessed and the methodology to be used will be defined in the inception report. This should be done, considering the ODG/EVA framework for assessing global forum activities.

VII. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

This TOR provides some information as regards the methodology but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. It is instead meant to guide the evaluation team in elaborating an appropriate evaluation methodology and tools that should be further detailed in the inception report.

In terms of data collection the evaluation team should use a variety of methods ranging from desk review (project and programme documents, progress reports, mission reports, Infobase search, Agresso search, SAP search, evaluation reports, other) to individual interviews with counterparts and other stakeholders including beneficiaries, focused group discussions, statistical analysis, surveys and direct observation at project sites.

The evaluation team should ensure that the findings are evidence based. This implies that all perceptions, hypotheses and assertions obtained in interviews will be validated through secondary filtering and cross checks by a triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories.

While maintaining independence, the evaluation will be carried out based on a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all stakeholders. These include government counterparts, private sector representatives, other UN organizations, multilateral organizations, donors, beneficiaries as well as UNIDO- and project staff.

Depending on formal requirements, the complexity and the strategic importance of each project/activity, different approaches can be used for the individual project assessments which will be included in the evaluation:

Project evaluations: Projects for which an independent evaluation report is available will be included in the country evaluation, based on the information contained in the evaluation report. In addition, findings from past evaluations that are of relevance will be considered by this evaluation.

Project assessments: For projects that do not formally require a full-fledged evaluation, or that are not yet due for evaluation but for which a comprehensive assessment is regarded important, a project assessment will be conducted.

In addition, the following methodological components will be applied:

Assessment of the project documentation: including an assessment of project design and intervention logic; a validation of available progress information through field visits and interviews with key stakeholders and beneficiaries and review of progress
and terminal reports; a context analysis of the project to validate implicit and explicit project assumptions and risks, interviews with government agencies and donors regarding the developments and tendencies in the project-specific environment.

Reviews: For projects that are likely to start soon, that have started very recently or that are considered important for other reasons, a review will be carried out. The following methodology will be applied: a review of the available documentation; a validation of the foreseen intervention logic/design with a special focus on the relevance to national priorities, to the country programme, and to UNIDO’s strategic priorities for the region.

Non-TC evaluation issues: The evaluation will use several sources of information such as observations during field visits, interviews with key UN partners of UNIDO and bilateral donors, interviews with national partner institutions, review of available evaluations and studies, interviews with UNIDO HQ staff and project managers. Additional methodological components can be defined in the inception report.

Deviations from this proposed methodology need to be explained and justified in the inception report.

VIII. TIMING

The country evaluation is scheduled to take place between September and November 2014. A field mission for the evaluation is envisaged for October 2014. Table 4 below presents the preliminary schedule.

Table 4: Country evaluation schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Estimated date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection of documentation at HQ</td>
<td>August-September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review by members of evaluation team</td>
<td>October-November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial interviews at HQ to assess scope</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission to Uruguay and presentation of preliminary findings to the</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government and local counterparts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings at HQ</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of report</td>
<td>November/December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection and incorporation of comments</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuance of final report</td>
<td>December 2014 / January 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will include:

1. One senior international evaluation consultant and team leader with extensive experience in managing evaluations/teams who will have the overall responsibility of reviewing the relevant portfolio and to lead the preparation of the inception and country evaluation reports.
2. One senior international evaluation consultant with extensive experience in evaluation who will review the relevant regional portfolio where Uruguay participates and contribute to the preparation of the inception and country evaluation reports in coordination with the team leader.
3. One national evaluation consultant who will participate in the field mission and contribute to the assessments, in particular with a view to assessing the UNIDO activities in the light of national objectives, strategies and policies, cooperation priorities and institutional capacities.

4. One ODG/EVA staff member to cover cross-cutting areas, including country programme framework and field office performance; who will also act as Evaluation Manager.

The international and national consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of the evaluation team members are specified in their respective job descriptions, attached to this TOR in annex A.

All members of the evaluation team must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of any intervention to be assessed by the evaluation and/or have benefited from the programmes/projects under evaluation. As stated above, a member of UNIDO’s Office for Independent Evaluation (ODG/EVA) will manage the evaluation and will act as a focal point for the evaluation consultants. Additionally, the UNIDO Field Office in Uruguay and the respective project teams in the country, and project managers at Headquarters will support the evaluation team and will help to plan and coordinate the evaluation field mission and local briefings.

X. EVALUATION PROCESS AND REPORTING

The evaluation team will use a participatory approach and involve various stakeholders in the evaluation process. The responsibilities for the various evaluation stages are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODG/EVA</th>
<th>UNIDO HQ management</th>
<th>Field Office</th>
<th>Government of Uruguay</th>
<th>Evaluation team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of consultants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment by project managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of background documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews at UNIDO HQ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on inception report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings in the field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings at HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on draft report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation brief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The TOR and the draft report will be shared with the Government, national counterparts, the main donors and relevant UNIDO staff members for comments and factual validation. This consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. The evaluators will take comments into consideration when preparing the final version of the report. The final evaluation report will be submitted 8 weeks after the field mission, at the latest, to the Government of Uruguay, the donors and to UNIDO.

XI. DELIVERABLES
- Inception report
- Draft report
- Final report

XII. QUALITY ASSURANCE

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation. Quality control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on EVA methodology and process, review of inception report and evaluation report). The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality in Annex C. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback.
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UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

INDEPENDENT UNIDO COUNTRY EVALUATION – URUGUAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Senior International Evaluation Consultant – Team leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Duty Station and Location:</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ (Vienna, Austria), Uruguay, and home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/s to:</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ (Vienna, Austria), Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Contract (EOD):</td>
<td>1 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Contract (COB):</td>
<td>31 January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Working Days:</td>
<td>33 days spread over 3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation (ODG/EVA) is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes.

PROJECT CONTEXT

Reference attached Terms of reference.

Duties: The senior international evaluation consultant will participate in the country evaluation in Uruguay according to the evaluation terms of reference. She/he will participate in all evaluation activities and contribute, inter alia, to the assessments and to the preparation of the evaluation reports as per assigned tasks and under the direction of the team leader. He/she will perform the following tasks:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparatory phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Study related programme and project documentation (including progress reports and documentary outputs)</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Analytical overview of available documents and of UNIDO activities in Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Study relevant background information (national policies, international frameworks, other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Study available evaluation reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefing with ODG/EVA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Inputs to methodology and interview guidelines</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Key issues of evaluation identified; Scope of evaluation clarified; Inception report, including the proposed methodology, approach and evaluation programme approved by ODG/EVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Interviews with project managers and key stakeholders at HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Preparation of the inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field mission to Uruguay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Carry out meetings, visits and interviews with stakeholders according to the evaluation programme</td>
<td>12 days (incl. travel)</td>
<td>Uruguay with in-country travel</td>
<td>Information gathered on issues specified in TOR Draft conclusions and recommendations Agreement on structure and content of evaluation report; distribution of writing tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Drafting the main conclusions and recommendations, and present them to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Draft evaluation report outline/structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debriefing at UNIDO HQ, Vienna</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Present preliminary findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ</td>
<td>Feedback on preliminary findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Carry out additional interviews if necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drafting of evaluation report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lead the preparation of the evaluation report, and drafting sections/chapters under his/her scope.</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Inputs to draft report and to final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Review/Adapt the evaluation report in light of additional evidence presented or factual corrections made; integrate comments from ODG/EVA and stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Integrate comments from ODG/EVA and stakeholders with regard to assessment, recommendations and lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation report as per tasks assigned by the team leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values and competencies

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity
4. Results orientation and accountability
5. Planning and organizing
6. Communication and trust
7. Team orientation
8. Judgement and decision making
9. Conflict resolution

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree in economics, development studies or other fields related to industrial development;

Technical and Functional Experience:

- Extensive experience in evaluation as part of an evaluation team;
- Extensive knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks (MDGs, Paris Declaration, One UN, etc.);
- Knowledge of issues related to sustainable industrial development and of UNIDO activities an asset;
- Experience in the evaluation of environmental projects will be an advantage;
- Working experience within the UN system an asset;
- Working experience in Uruguay an asset.

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

Absence of Conflict of Interest:
According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and management of and/or have been a stakeholder of the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultant will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the Office for Independent Evaluation.
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UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

INDEPENDENT UNIDO COUNTRY EVALUATION – URUGUAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Senior International Evaluation Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Duty Station and Location:</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ (Vienna, Austria), Uruguay, and home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/s to:</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ (Vienna, Austria), Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Contract (EOD):</td>
<td>1 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Contract (COB):</td>
<td>31 January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Working Days:</td>
<td>24 days spread over 3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation (ODG/EVA) is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes.

PROJECT CONTEXT

See evaluation terms of reference (attached).

Duties: The senior international evaluation consultant will participate in the country evaluation in Uruguay according to the evaluation terms of reference. She/he will participate in all evaluation activities and contribute, inter alia, to the assessments and to the preparation of the evaluation reports as per assigned tasks and under the direction of the team leader. He/she will perform the following tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory phase</td>
<td>Analytical overview of available documents and of UNIDO activities in Uruguay</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  o Study related programme and project documentation (including progress reports and documentary outputs) |
  o Study relevant background information (national policies, international frameworks, other) |
  o Study available evaluation reports |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefing with ODG/EVA at HQ</strong></td>
<td>Key issues of evaluation identified; Scope of evaluation clarified; Inception report, including the proposed methodology, approach and evaluation programme approved by ODG/EVA</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Inputs to methodology and interview guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Interviews with project managers and key stakeholders at HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Preparation of the inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field mission to Uruguay</strong></td>
<td>Information gathered on issues specified in TOR Draft conclusions and recommendations Agreement on structure and content of evaluation report; distribution of writing tasks</td>
<td>12 days (incl. travel)</td>
<td>Uruguay with in-country travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Carry out meetings, visits and interviews with stakeholders according to the evaluation programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Drafting the main conclusions and recommendations, and present them to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Draft evaluation report outline/structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debriefing at UNIDO HQ, Vienna</strong></td>
<td>Feedback on preliminary findings</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Present preliminary findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Carry out additional interviews if necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drafting of evaluation report</strong></td>
<td>Inputs to draft report and to final report</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lead the preparation of the evaluation report, and drafting sections/chapters under his/her scope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Review/Adapt the evaluation report in light of additional evidence presented or factual corrections made; integrate comments from ODG/EVA and stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Integrate comments from ODG/EVA and stakeholders with regard to assessment, recommendations and lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation report as per tasks assigned by the team leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

- **Core values:**
  1. Integrity
  2. Professionalism
  3. Respect for diversity

- **Core competencies:**
  1. Results orientation and accountability
  2. Planning and organizing
  3. Communication and trust
  4. Team orientation
  5. Client orientation
  6. Organizational development and innovation

- **Managerial competencies (as applicable):**
  1. Strategy and direction
  2. Managing people and performance
  3. Judgement and decision making
  4. Conflict resolution
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MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

**Education:** Advanced university degree in economics, development studies or other fields related to industrial development;

**Technical and Functional Experience:**
- Extensive experience in evaluation as part of an evaluation team;
- Extensive knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks (MDGs, Paris Declaration, One UN, etc.);
- Knowledge of issues related to sustainable industrial development and of UNIDO activities an asset;
- Experience in the evaluation of environmental projects will be an advantage;
- Working experience within the UN system an asset;
- Working experience in Uruguay an asset.

**Languages:** Fluency in written and spoken English and Spanish is required.

**Impartiality:** According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the preparation, implementation or supervision of any of the programmes/projects under evaluation.
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UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

INDEPENDENT UNIDO COUNTRY EVALUATION – URUGUAY

Title: International evaluation team member (to be filled by an ODG/EVA staff member)

Main Duty Station and Location: UNIDO HQ (Vienna, Austria)

Mission/s to: Uruguay

Start of Contract (EOD): not applicable

End of Contract (COB): not applicable

Number of Working Days: not applicable

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation (ODG/EVA) is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes.

PROJECT CONTEXT

See evaluation terms of reference (attached).

Duties: The team member will participate in the country evaluation in Uruguay according to the evaluation terms of reference. She/he will participate in all evaluation activities and contribute to the assessments under the direction of the team leader, in particular with a view to assessing UNIDO activities against UNIDO’s overall objectives, policies, competencies and capacities. The team member will perform the following tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/measurable Outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory phase</td>
<td>Analytical overview of available documents and of UNIDO activities in Uruguay</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Study related programme and project documentation (including progress reports and documentary outputs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Study relevant background information (national policies, international frameworks, other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Study available evaluation reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briefing with ODG/EVA at HQ</td>
<td>Key issues of evaluation identified; Scope of evaluation clarified; inputs to the Inception report, including the proposed methodology, approach and evaluation programme</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interviews with project managers and key stakeholders at HQ;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop methodology and interview guidelines;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inputs to the inception report for the country evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field mission to Uruguay</td>
<td>Information gathered on issues specified in TOR;</td>
<td>12 days (incl. travel)</td>
<td>Uruguay with in-country travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Carry out meetings, visits and interviews with stakeholders;</td>
<td>Draft conclusions and recommendations;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inputs to the drafting of the main conclusions and recommendations, and present them to stakeholders.</td>
<td>Agreement on structure and content of evaluation report; distribution of writing tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing at UNIDO HQ, Vienna</td>
<td>Feedback on preliminary findings</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Present preliminary findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Carry out additional interviews if necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of evaluation report</td>
<td>Inputs to draft report and Final report</td>
<td>8 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inputs to relevant parts of the draft country evaluation report; adapt the evaluation report in light of additional evidence presented or factual corrections made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 31 days

### REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

**Core values:**
1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

**Core competencies:**
1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Team orientation
5. Client orientation
6. Organizational development and innovation

**Managerial competencies (as applicable):**
1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution
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MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree in economics, development studies or other fields related to industrial development;

Technical and Functional Experience:
- Extensive experience in managing evaluations and in coordinating evaluation teams;
- Extensive knowledge of multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks (MDGs, Paris Declaration, One UN, etc.) desirable;
- Extensive experience in managing evaluation and evaluation teams;
- Knowledge of UNIDO activities;
- Working experience within the UN system an asset;
- Working experience in Uruguay an advantage.

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

Impartiality: According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the preparation, implementation or supervision of any of the programmes/projects under evaluation.
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UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

INDEPENDENT UNIDO COUNTRY EVALUATION – URUGUAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Senior National evaluation consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Duty Station and Location:</td>
<td>Home-based and various locations in Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/s to:</td>
<td>Various locations in Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Contract (EOD):</td>
<td>1 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Contract (COB):</td>
<td>31 January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Working Days:</td>
<td>30 days spread over 3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation (ODG/EVA) is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes.

PROJECT CONTEXT

See evaluation terms of reference (attached).

Duties: As a member of the evaluation team and under the supervision of the evaluation team leader, the consultant will participate in the independent country evaluation in Uruguay according to the terms of reference attached. He/she will participate in all evaluation activities and contribute to the assessments in particular with a view to assessing the UNIDO activities in the light of national objectives, strategies and policies, cooperation priorities and institutional capacities. In particular, he/she will be expected to:

- Study relevant programme and project documentation including progress reports and documentary outputs and TOR;
- Study relevant background information (national policies, international frameworks, other);
- Assist in the preparation of the evaluation mission in close

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical overview of available documents; list of issues to be clarified; background data needed for evaluation collected at field level; inputs to inception report</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/measurable Outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>consultation with UNIDO Field project staff in Uruguay and relevant government counterparts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation team field mission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participate actively in meetings, visits and interviews according to the evaluation programme;</td>
<td>Notes, tables; and information gathered on issues specified in ToR;</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>In-country travel (Uruguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participate in drafting the main conclusions and recommendations, and present them to stakeholders in accordance with the instructions of the team leader.</td>
<td>Draft conclusions and recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out additional interviews as required.</td>
<td>Interview protocols, findings incorporated in evaluation report</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>In-country travel (Uruguay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in the preparation/review of the report according to the instructions of the team leader, and providing country specific background information and national context inputs to the report.</td>
<td>Inputs to the report</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

**Core values:**
1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

**Core competencies:**
1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Team orientation
5. Client orientation
6. Organizational development and innovation

**Managerial competencies (as applicable):**
1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution

**MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**Education:** University degree (master level or equivalent) in Social sciences, business or a field relevant to industrial development;

**Technical and Functional Experience:**
- Knowledge of Uruguay’s industrial development situation, institutions and programmes;
- Working experience with international organizations and the UN system;
- More than 10 years of Evaluation experience.

**Languages:** Fluency in written and spoken English and Spanish is required.
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**Impartiality:** According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the preparation, implementation or supervision of any of the programmes/projects under evaluation.
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**ANNEX C: Checklist on evaluation report quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report quality criteria</th>
<th>UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation: Assessment notes</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Structure and quality of writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report is written in clear language, correct grammar and use of evaluation terminology. The report is logically structured with clarity and coherence. It contains a concise executive summary and all other necessary elements as per TOR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation objective, scope and methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation objective is explained and the scope defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methods employed are explained and appropriate for answering the evaluation questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder's consultation process in the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report describes the data sources and collection methods and their limitations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation report was delivered in a timely manner so that the evaluation objective (e.g. important deadlines for presentations) was not affected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation object</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The logic model and/or the expected results chain (inputs, outputs and outcomes) of the object is clearly described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object are described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The key stakeholders involved in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles are described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report identifies the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings and conclusions

| The report is consistent and the evidence is complete (covering all aspects defined in the TOR) and convincing. |
| The report presents an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives. |
| The report presents an assessment of relevant external factors (assumptions, risks, impact drivers) and how they influenced the evaluation object and the achievement of results. |
| The report presents a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes or it explains why this is not (yet) possible. |
| The report analyses the budget and actual project costs. |
| Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report and are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report. |
| Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, are identified as much as possible. |
| Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. |
| Relevant cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights, environment are appropriately covered. |

### Recommendations and lessons learned

| The lessons and recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions presented in the report. |
| The recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('Who?' 'What?' 'Where?' 'When?'). |
| Recommendations are implementable and take resource implications into account. |
| Lessons are readily applicable in other contexts and suggest prescriptive action. |

**Rating system for quality of evaluation reports**

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.
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ANNEX D: UNIDO Field Office Generic Assessment Framework

1. Introduction

1.1 This document outlines a generic framework for the evaluation of UNIDO field office performance in the context of comprehensive country evaluations that also cover technical cooperation (TC) projects/programmes and Global Forum activities. Adjusted to the requirements of a particular country evaluation, it can be incorporated with the TOR for that evaluation. A generic TOR for UNIDO country evaluations can be downloaded from the ODG/EVA intranet page.

1.2. Field office performance assessments are integral parts of country evaluations. Embedded in evaluations that also assess TC projects/programmes and Global Forum activities, they examine the role and contribution of the field office in a wider perspective but also more specifically in relation to TC delivery and management and Global Forum activities.

2. Background

2.1 UNIDO’s field representation has been progressively transformed and strengthened since UNIDO was first established in 1966. Originally integrated with the field representation of UNDP and in part financed by UNDP, it now, in 2010, consists of 10 regional offices, 19 country offices, 18 UNIDO desks in UNDP offices, five UNIDO focal points operating from a counterpart institution, and one centre for regional cooperation. Altogether, UNIDO is represented in more than 50 countries around the world. Since the late 1990’s, the field organization has been fully financed from UNIDO regular budgets, with some cost sharing and contributions by host governments.

The gradual expansion of UNIDO’s field organization reflects changes within the UN-system towards closer cooperation of agencies at country level as well as a more general shift of development cooperation management and decision-making towards the country level. Field offices/desks are intended to make UNIDO more accessible to partner country clients and stakeholders, while helping UNIDO itself to ensure that its services are well tailored to partner country needs and priorities. They are also intended to facilitate interaction with the UN country-level teams and bilateral and multilateral donors. Field presence is regarded as a precondition for efficient participation in joint UNCT planning and programming, and is normally required for leading a joint UN programme initiative. In some cases it is also required by donors.

However, the expected returns on investments in UNIDO’s field representation do not come by themselves. Some field offices turn out to be more useful to UNIDO and partner countries than others, and some field offices are more efficient in, for instance funds mobilization, than others. An assessment conducted by the Office of the Comptroller General of UNIDO in 2004 found that field offices generally spent relatively little time and effort on coordination with the local UN team, although UN country level integration was already at that time a UN priority issue. It also found that while field offices gave much importance to supporting TC activities, they were often more concerned with the administration and monitoring of ongoing TC activities.

than with the development of new ones. Since identification and formulation were activities for which field offices were considered particularly well positioned, this was not quite expected.

A more recent evaluation that deals with the performance of UNIDO desks confirms that it can be difficult for UNIDO’s field representation to live up to headquarter expectations.\textsuperscript{13} Although for the most part quite positive in its assessments, it notices that in some respects objectives are not fully achieved. With regard to facilitating access of stakeholders to UNIDO expertise, for example, the performance of the UNIDO desks is said to be uneven, and a similar assessment is made of desk contributions to the implementation of TC projects. According to the evaluation, these shortcomings in desk performance are to a large extent due to a mismatch between a very demanding set of responsibilities and the limited resources made available for their fulfillment.

What all this goes to show is that the performance of UNIDO field offices needs to be continuously monitored and periodically evaluated in greater depth. The performance assessments for which this document provides generic guidance are intended to fill this evaluation gap. Field office assessments are expected to be useful one by one, but will also serve as inputs to a thematic evaluation. A thematic evaluation of field office performance will be conducted in 2011.

3. Purpose

3.1. Field office assessments are assessment of the performance of field offices in conducting their mandated functions and achieving stated objectives. They are organizational or functional assessments as opposed to staff assessments focusing on individuals.

Like the comprehensive country evaluation of which it forms a part, a field office assessment serves purposes of both learning and accountability. It is intended to be useful to managers and staff at UNIDO headquarters who call on field offices for services or inputs as well as to the field offices themselves. It is also expected to be useful to UNIDO’s governing bodies and to external partners interested in UNIDO’s field organization.

4. Scope and focus

4.1. A field office assessment covers the main functions of a UNIDO field office.

In case the field office is a regional office serving several countries, the assessment will not include all the activities for which it is responsible, but cover only those pertaining to the country in focus for the country evaluation.

The list of field office responsibilities presented below is based on UNIDO/DGB/(0).95/Add 7, dated 26 February 2010, IDB. 37/6/Add.1, dated 20 April 2010, UNIDO’s TC Guidelines of 2006, and other documents describing the responsibilities of UNIDO’s field representation.

These are:

- Formally represent UNIDO among clients and stakeholders as appropriate.
- Help create/increase knowledge about UNIDO among potential clients and other interested groups in the country in order to stimulate demand for UNIDO services. This is an important marketing function. In UNIDO’s standardized format for field office (FO) work plans it is referred to as ‘enhancing the visibility’ of UNIDO and is one of five main field office outcome areas.
- Promote and facilitate Global Forum activities. The role of the field office can be that of a knowledge broker facilitating exchange of information and knowledge between national counterparts and stakeholders and transnational UNIDO networks. On the one side, the field office helps national stakeholders to get access to transnational knowledge networks. On the other side, the field office makes national expertise and experience accessible to transnational networks.
- Provide advice to national stakeholders in UNIDO’s areas of expertise as requested. To a large extent UNIDO advice flow through the channels of TC programmes/projects and specific Global Forum activities. However, advice can also be provided to national stakeholders, including the national government, through other types of contact and upon a direct request.
- Keep UNIDO headquarters informed of national developments in UNIDO’s areas of specialization through continuous liaising with national counterparts and stakeholders as well as representatives of international development organizations.
- Contribute to the identification and formulation of new UNIDO TC projects/programmes. In cooperation with the Regional Programme, the field office gathers information relevant to the identification and formulation of new country programmes as well as of national or regional projects. It paves the way for the formulation mission both substantively and logistically. It is expected to play an important role in ensuring that the programme to be proposed to the national government is aligned with national priorities and can be incorporated within the wider UN assistance frameworks.
- Help mobilize resources for TC interventions from the national government, international donors, and other interested actors. Conducted with support of UNIDO headquarters, the participation of field offices in resource mobilization is especially important in countries where there is a joint financing mechanism for the UN-system and/or donors have decentralized funding decisions to the country level.
- Contribute to ongoing UNIDO TC activities in the country/region through monitoring and support to implementation and evaluation. In the monitoring of programmes, field offices should regularly review implementation status with counterparts and stakeholders, brief and debrief experts and consultants, attend review meetings, and report back to the programme team on accomplishments and the possible need for remedial action. At project level, the main FO task is usually to provide administrative, technical and logistic support to project managers and experts based at UNIDO headquarters. In some cases, however, projects are directly managed by FO staff members who are then also allotment holders. Field offices also provide support to evaluation missions.
- Contribute to gender mainstreaming of TC activities at all stages.
- Support UN integration at country level through active participation in the United Nations Country Team (UNCT), and contribute as appropriate to joint UN country-level initiatives (Common Country Assessments (CCAs), United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs), Delivering as One
(DaO), etc.). Act as champion of UNIDO thematic interests and UNIDO itself in the UNCT.

4.2 Field office assessments do not replace the audits performed by UNIDO’s Office of Internal Oversight Services (IOS). While internal audits tend to focus on compliance with UNIDO rules and regulations, the quality of systems of internal control, etc., field office assessments are more directly concerned with the contributions of field offices to development cooperation or in fulfilling UNIDO’s mandate. Financial control, contracts, procurement, travel and general administration are matters that typically belong to auditing. Such matters may figure in field office assessments as variables influencing technical cooperation (TC) delivery (efficiency aspects) and results (effectiveness aspects), but would not be examined in their own right or in respect to adherence of rules and regulations.

4.3. Field office assessments are also not intended to replace the reporting by the field offices themselves on activities and results in accordance with their annual results-based management (RBM) work plans. While the RBM work plan and the monitoring of its implementation are integral elements of field office management, a field office assessment is an independent evaluation of field office functioning. In a field office assessment both the design and the implementation of the RBM work plan are assessed. The work plan’s standardized causal logic of outputs and outcomes is regarded as a hypothesis to be interpreted and validated rather than as an established fact.

In the standard RBM work plan framework for UNIDO field offices the following are currently (2010) the main outcomes:

1. UNIDO visibility enhanced at global, regional/sub-regional and country levels.
2. Responsiveness of UNIDO to national/regional priorities:
   - TC programme and project development
   - Fund raising
3. Effective participation in UN initiatives at country level, including UNDAF, PRSP, UNG, One UN, etc.
4. Promoting Global Forum activities with direct link to UNIDO priorities and to the potential increase of UNIDO portfolio in the region and worldwide.
5. Effective management of technical cooperation activities and the UNIDO office.

Field office assessments should review the appropriateness of this categorization of outcomes and the rest of the standard RBM work plan framework (outputs, indicators, etc.) for guiding the activities listed in section 4.1 above and reporting on their results. Questions regarding the appropriateness and actual and potential use of the work plan framework are included in the attached field office evaluation framework (Annex 1).

5. Criteria and issues

5.1 Field office performance is assessed in relation to three evaluation criteria:

- Relevance
- Effectiveness,
- Efficiency
The following paragraphs define these concepts and explain how they are intended to be applied in field office assessments. Standard evaluation questions relating to each of the criteria can be found in the field office evaluation matrix.

5.2. **Relevance** is defined in much the same way as in the OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management. The main difference is that while the OECD/DAC definition refers to the relevance of a specific development intervention, a field office assessment is concerned with the relevance of a subdivision of a larger organization. In both the cases, however, relevance is a criterion for assessing the extent to which the evaluated unit matches the needs and priorities of its clients or target groups. Most of the questions about relevance in the attached evaluation matrix concern the extent to which field office services are consistent with needs and priorities formulated in the partner country PRSP and other national policy documents and are considered useful by national counterparts and stakeholders. There is also a question about the consistency of the field office work programme with UNIDO strategic priorities. Is the field office doing what it should, given UNIDO priorities in relation to the country in question?

5.3. **Effectiveness** is a criterion for assessing the extent to which an entity has achieved, or is likely to achieve, its objectives or fulfill its mandate. OECD/DAC defines it as ‘the extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.’ In an assessment of field office performance, however, it is better understood as ‘the extent to which an organization, or organizational unit, has achieved, or is expected to achieve its objectives or fulfill its responsibilities, taking into account their relative importance.’ So defined, effectiveness refers to achievement of objectives and/or fulfillment of responsibilities in relation to most of the field office functions listed in section 4.1 above, including that of contributing to the effectiveness of TC projects/programmes.

Note that assessments of field office effectiveness should focus on the achievement of outcome-level results, rather than the performance of activities and the delivery of outputs. The key question is always the same: has delivered outputs been useful to clients or target groups as intended, and/or is it likely that they will achieve their intended effects in the future? In a field office assessment, the client or target group is in many cases another UNIDO functional unit for which the field office provides supportive services. In other cases, the client is a partner or stakeholder outside UNIDO.

In the attached evaluation matrix (Annex 1) the effectiveness criterion is applied to all the field office functions listed in section 4.1 above one by one. With regard to each of the functions there is a package of questions covering the following points:

- Activities and outputs: What has the field office actually done in relation to the function in question during the assessment period? What were the activities? What were the outputs? Who were the target groups or clients?
- Gender mainstreaming: How were gender equality issues taken into account by the field office in these activities?
- Performance monitoring: How has the field office monitored and measured the implementation and results of its own activities in relation to this function during the assessment period?
- Observed/inferred outcomes of field office outputs: What have been, or seem to have been, the outcomes of field office services for clients and target groups?
• Achievement of objectives/fulfillment of responsibilities: How do the observed/inferred outcomes for clients and target groups compare to intended outcomes? Are outcome-level results satisfactory in relation to field office mandates, plans and expectations?

• Capacity to respond to Government expectations: Is the Field Office able to cope with the country’s expectations and does it effectively and efficiently respond to Government priorities? What is the added value of UNIDO’s field office for the Government?

• In case intended outcomes for clients and target groups were not achieved or mandates not fulfilled: What is the explanation for the gap between intended and achieved results?

• Ways by which the field office could make its operations pertaining to this function more effective, if required.

• Ways by which UNIDO Headquarters could support field office efforts to make these operations more effective, if required.

An assessment of the overall effectiveness of a field office is a synthesis of function-by-function assessments that takes the relative importance of functions into account.

5.4. While effectiveness is about results, primarily outcomes, efficiency is about inputs and outputs and the relation between them. According to OECD/DAC, efficiency is ‘a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.’ As long as the word ‘results’ is taken to refer to outputs alone, this is an appropriate definition for field office assessments. Efficiency in this restricted sense is also known as input-output efficiency.

Since a field office provides a variety of services, most of which are non-standardized and difficult to measure, its efficiency in converting resources into outputs is not readily reduced to numbers and not easily compared to that of other field offices or other organizations. In large part, however, an assessment of field office efficiency is concerned with the quality of management systems and practices and the delivery of outputs according to plans, resources and budgets. It also covers efforts to achieve higher productivity, maintain or improve quality of outputs, and reduce the costs of resource inputs.

5.5. An assessment of field office performance must be grounded in an accurate appreciation of field office capacity in relation to its mandate and resource endowment and factors in the environment that may influence performance. The task of a field office assessment is not just to assess performance in relation to a set of standardized criteria, but to find explanations for differences in performance levels and constructively suggest remedies where performance seems to fall short of expectation and to identify good practices and benchmarks.

If a field office fails to achieve planned results, or does not achieve them well enough, it is perhaps because the objectives were unrealistic given the constraints of the local environment or the limitations of field office capacity. It may also be because the existing field office capacity is not well utilized, or it is perhaps due to a combination of all of these factors. Whatever the problem, it is the task of a field office assessment to come up with a useful and forward-looking diagnosis.

Similarly, when a field office is found to perform very well, a field office assessment should not be content with putting its achievements on record, but should try to identify factors explaining the good performance and draw conclusions that can be usefully applied elsewhere.
6. **Approach and methodology**

6.1. Field office assessments are part of country evaluations and should be planned and implemented accordingly. The evaluation team responsible for the country evaluation is usually also in charge of the field office assessment. Findings from assessments of TC project/programmes and activities pertaining to the Global Forum provide essential inputs to the field office assessment. Questions about field office contributions to TC interventions or Global Forum initiatives cannot be adequately answered without prior assessments of these activities themselves.

6.2. Field office assessments are conducted with the active participation of field office staff. They begin with a self-evaluation where field office staff members are asked to describe the functioning of the field office and make their own assessments of results in relation to the evaluation criteria explained above. In a second step the results from the self-evaluation are used as a platform for discussions between the FO staff and the evaluation team.

6.3. Data for field office assessments are also collected from actual and potential recipients of field office services inside and outside UNIDO. Since field offices are service organizations, opinions regarding the usefulness of their services to clients, as well as information on actual client satisfaction with services rendered, are essential for assessments of field office performance.

6.4. The selection of clients or target group representatives to be interviewed in connection with a field office performance assessment is made by the evaluation team in accordance with the requirements of the case at hand. The evaluation team is also responsible for other aspects of the evaluation methodology. A description of the proposed methodology should be included in the country evaluation inception report.
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ANNEX F: UNIDO Procurement Process -- Generic Approach and Assessment Framework

1. Introduction
This document outlines an approach and encompasses a framework for the assessment of UNIDO procurement processes, to be included as part of country evaluations as well as in technical cooperation (TC) projects/programmes evaluations.

The procurement process assessment will review in a systematic manner the various aspects and stages of the procurement process being a key aspect of the technical cooperation (TC) delivery. These reviews aim to diagnose and identify areas of strength as well as where there is a need for improvement and lessons learned.

The framework will also serve as the basis for the “thematic evaluation of the procurement process efficiency” to be conducted in 2015 as part of the ODG/EVA work programme for 2014-15.

2. Background
Procurement is defined as the overall process of acquiring goods, works, and services, and includes all related functions such as planning, forecasting, supply chain management, identification of needs, sourcing and solicitation of offers, preparation and award of contract, as well as contract administration until the final discharge of all obligations as defined in the relevant contract(s). The procurement process covers activities necessary for the purchase, rental, lease or sale of goods, services, and other requirements such as works and property. Past project and country evaluations commissioned by ODG/EVA raised several issues related to procurement and often efficiency related issues. It also became obvious that there is a shared responsibility in the different stages of the procurement process which includes UNIDO staff, such as project managers, and staff of the procurement unit, government counterparts, suppliers, local partner agencies (i.e. UNDP), customs and transport agencies.

In July 2013, a new “UNIDO Procurement Manual” was introduced. This Procurement Manual provides principles, guidance and procedures for the Organization to attain specified standards in the procurement process. The Procurement Manual also establishes that “The principles of fairness, transparency, integrity, economy, efficiency and effectiveness must be applied for all procurement transactions, to be delivered with a high level of professionalism thus justifying UNIDO’s involvement in and adding value to the implementation process”. To reduce the risk of error, waste or wrongful acts and the risk of not detecting such problems, no single individual or team shall control all key stages of a transaction. Duties and responsibilities shall be assigned systemically to a number of individuals to ensure that effective checks and balances are in place.

In UNIDO, authorities, responsibilities and duties are segregated where incompatible. Related duties shall be subject to regular review and monitoring. Discrepancies, deviations and exceptions are properly regulated in the Financial Regulations and Rules and the Staff Regulations and Rules. Clear segregation of duties is maintained between programme/project management, procurement and supply chain management, risk management, financial management and accounting as well as auditing and internal oversight. Therefore, segregation of duties is an important basic principle of internal control and must be observed throughout the procurement process.
The different stages of the procurement process should be carried out, to the extent possible, by separate officials with the relevant competencies. As a minimum, two officials shall be involved in carrying out the procurement process. The functions are segregated among the officials belonging to the following functions:

- **Procurement Services**: For carrying out centralized procurement, including review of technical specifications, terms of reference, and scope of works, market research/surveys, sourcing/solicitation, commercial evaluation of offers, contract award, contract management;
- **Substantive Office**: For initiating procurement requests on the basis of well formulated technical specifications, terms of reference, scope of works, ensuring availability of funds, technical evaluation of offers; award recommendation; receipt of goods/services; supplier performance evaluation. In respect of decentralized procurement, the segregation of roles occurs between the Project Manager/Allotment Holder and his/her respective Line Manager. For Fast Track procurement, the segregate on occurs between the Project Manager/Allotment Holder and Financial Services;
- **Financial Services**: For processing payments.

Figure 1 presents a preliminary “Procurement Process Map”, showing the main stages, stakeholders and their respective roles and responsibilities. During 2014/2015, in preparation for the thematic evaluation of the procurement process in 2015, this process map/workflow will be further refined and reviewed.
3. **Purpose**
The purpose of the procurement process assessments is to diagnose and identify areas for possible improvement and to increase UNIDO's learning about strengths and weaknesses in the procurement process. It will also include an assessment of the adequacy of the ‘Procurement Manual' as a guiding document.

The review is intended to be useful to managers and staff at UNIDO headquarters and in the field offices (project managers, procurement officers), who are directly involved in procurement and to UNIDO management.

4. **Scope and focus**
Procurement process assessments will focus on the efficiency aspects of the procurement process, and hence it will mainly fall under the efficiency evaluation criterion. However, other criteria such as effectiveness and/or compliance will also be considered as needed.

These assessments are expected to be mainstreamed in all UNIDO country and project evaluations to the extent of its applicability in terms of inclusion of relevant procurement related budgets and activities.

A generic evaluation matrix has been developed and is found in Annex B. However questions should be customized for individual projects when needed.

5. **Key Issues and Evaluation Questions**
Past evaluations and preliminary consultations have highlighted the following aspects or identified the following issues:

- Timeliness. Delays in the delivery of items to end-users.
- Bottlenecks. Points in the process where the process stops or considerably slows down.
- Procurement manual introduced, but still missing subsidiary templates and tools for its proper implementation and full use.
- Heavy workload of the procurement unit and limited resources and increasing “procurement demand”
- Lack of resources for initiating improvement and innovative approaches to procurement (such as Value for Money instead of lowest price only, Sustainable product lifecycle, environmental friendly procurement, etc.)
- The absence of efficiency parameters (procurement KPIs).

On this basis, the following evaluation questions have been developed and would be included as applicable in all project and country evaluations in 2014-2015:

- To what extent does the process provide adequate treatment to different types of procurement (e.g. by value, by category, by exception)?
- Was the procurement timely? How long the procurement process takes (e.g. by value, by category, by exception)?
- Did the good/item(s) arrive as planned or scheduled? If no, how long were the times gained or delays. If delay, what was the reason(s)?
- Were the procured good(s) acquired at a reasonable price?
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- To what extent were the procured goods of the expected/needed quality and quantity?
- Were the transportation costs reasonable and within budget. If no, please elaborate.
- Was the freight forwarding timely and within budget? If no, please elaborate.
- Who was responsible for the customs clearance? UNIDO FO? UNDP? Government? Other?
- Was the customs clearance handled professionally and in a timely manner? How many days did it take?
- How long did it take to get approval from the government on import duty exemption?
- Which were the main bottlenecks / issues in the procurement process?
- Which good practices have been identified?
- Which procurement rule was particularly problematic to comply with?
- To what extent roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the different procurement stages are established, adequate and clear?
- To what extent there is an adequate segregation of duties across the procurement process and between the different roles and stakeholders?
- To what extent the procurement process prima facie complied with the procurement rules?

6. Evaluation Method and Tools

These assessments will be based on a participatory approach, involving all relevant stakeholders (e.g. process owners, process users and clients).

The evaluation tools to be considered for use during the reviews are:

**Desk review:** Policy, Manuals and procedures related to the procurement process.

**Identification of new approaches** being implemented in other UN or international organizations. Findings, recommendations and lessons from UNIDO Evaluation reports;

**Interviews:** to analyze and discuss specific issues/topics with key process stakeholders;

**Survey to stakeholders:** To measure the satisfaction level and collect expectations, issues from process owners, user and clients;

**Process and Stakeholders Mapping:** To understand and identify the main phases the procurement process and sub-processes; and to identify the perspectives and expectations from the different stakeholders, as well as their respective roles and responsibilities;

**Historical data analysis from IT procurement systems:** To collect empirical data and identify and measure to the extent possible different performance dimensions of the process, such as timeliness, re-works, complaints);

An evaluation matrix is presented in Annex A, presenting the main questions and data sources to be used in the project and country evaluations, as well as the preliminary questions and data sources for the forthcoming thematic evaluation on Procurement process in 2015.
## ANNEX A: Evaluation Matrix for the Procurement Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators(^\text{14})</th>
<th>Data Source(s) for country / project evaluations</th>
<th>Additional data Source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>- Was the procurement timely? How long the procurement process takes (e.g. by value, by category, by exception...)?</td>
<td>(Overall) Time to Procure (TTP)</td>
<td>• Interviews with PMs, Government counterpart s and beneficiarie s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Did the good/item(s) arrive as planned or scheduled? If not, how long were the times gained or delays. If delayed, what was the reason(s)?</td>
<td>Time to Delivery (TTD)</td>
<td>• Interviews with PM, procurement officers and Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Was the freight forwarding timely and within budget? If not, please elaborate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Procurement related documents review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Was the customs clearance timely? How many days did it take?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• SAP/Infobase (queries related to procurement volumes, categories, timing, issues)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How long time did it take to get approval from the government on import duty exemption?</td>
<td>Time to Government Clearance (TTGC)</td>
<td>• Evaluation Reports</td>
<td>• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interviews with PMs, Government counterpart s and beneficiarie s</td>
<td>• Interviews with Procurement officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{14}\) These indicators are preliminary proposed here. They will be further defined and piloted during the Thematic Evaluation of UNIDO procurement process planned for 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Data Source(s) for country / project evaluations</th>
<th>Additional data Source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     |               | - To what extent roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the different procurement stages are established, adequate and clear? | Level of clarity of roles and responsibilities | • Procurement Manual  
• Interview with PMs | | |
|     | Roles and Responsibilities | - To what extent there is an adequate segregation of duties across the procurement process and between the different roles and stakeholders? |  | • Procurement Manual  
• Interview with PMs | • Procurement related documents review  
• Evaluation Reports  
• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.  
• Interviews with Procurement officers | |
• Interview to PMs  
• Interviews with local partners | | |
|     | Costs         | - To what extent were suppliers delivering products/services as required?               | Level of satisfaction with Suppliers                                                     | • Interviews with PMs                             | | |
|     |               | - Were the transportation costs reasonable and within budget. If no,                      |  | • Interviews with PMs                             | • Evaluation Reports  
• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators(^{14})</th>
<th>Data Source(s) for country / project evaluations</th>
<th>Additional data Source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pleased elaborate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>beneficiaries, field local partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Were the procured goods/services within the expected/planned costs? If no, please elaborate</td>
<td>Costs vs budget</td>
<td>• Interview with PMs</td>
<td>• Interviews with Procurement officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quality of Products</td>
<td>- To what extent the process provides adequate treatment to different types of procurement (e.g. by value, by category, by exception...)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview with PMs</td>
<td>• Evaluation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interviews with Procurement officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Process / workflow</td>
<td>- To what extent were the procured goods of the expected/needed quality and quantity?</td>
<td>Level of satisfaction with products/services</td>
<td>• Survey to PMs and beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Observations in project site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent the procurement process if fit for purpose?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Observations in project site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Which are the main bottlenecks / issues in the procurement process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Which part(s) of the procurement process can be streamlined or simplified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Evaluation question</td>
<td>Indicators&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Data Source(s) for country / project evaluations</td>
<td>Additional data Source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     |      |                     |                         |                                               | beneficiaries, field local partners.  
|     |      |                     |                         |                                               | • Interviews with Procurement officers |

<sup>14</sup> Indicators 14: Data Source(s) for country / project evaluations.