UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

Terms of Reference

Independent Final Evaluation of the UNIDO Project:

UNIDO Project Number: 106034

Market Access and Trade Facilitation Support for South Asian LDCS, through strengthening Institutional and National Capacities related to Standards, Metrology Testing and Quality (SMTQ) – Phase III

NORAD Funding: (excl. psc) EUR 836,000.00

Duration: July 2013 to December 2016

AND

UNIDO Project Number: 106078

Trade capacity-building in the Mekong Delta countries of Cambodia and Lao People's Democratic Republic through strengthening institutional and national capacities related to standards, metrology, testing and quality (SMTQ) phase III

NORAD Funding: (excl. psc) EUR 1,230,625.00

Duration: October 2011 to December 2016

September 2016

CONTENTS

I. Introduction and Project background and overview

1. Introduction

This evaluation will assess the performance and results of project number 106034, titled "Market Access and Trade Facilitation Support for South Asian LDCS, through strengthening Institutional and National Capacities related to Standards, Metrology Testing and Quality (SMTQ) – Phase III" (SAARC III) and project number 106078, titled "Trade capacity-building in the Mekong Delta countries of Cambodia and Lao People's Democratic Republic through strengthening institutional and national capacities related to standards, metrology, testing and quality (SMTQ) phase III" (Mekong III)

It is a final evaluation (with field visit expected to be conducted in November and December 2016) of both project phases III which were implemented during July 2013 to December 2016 (SAARC) and October 2011 to December 2016 (Mekong III).

2. Project factsheet

SAARC III

Project Title	Market Access and Trade Facilitation Support for South Asian LDCS, through strengthening Institutional and National Capacities related to Standards, Metrology Testing and Quality (SMTQ) – Phase III.
UNIDO project No. and/or SAP ID	Project No. SAP ID: 106034
Region	SAARC Region
Country(ies)	Nepal, Bhutan, Maldives
Implementing agency(ies)	UNIDO
Executing partner(s)	---
Project size (FSP, MSP, EA)	---
Project implementation start date (First PAD issuance date)	July 2013
Original implementation end date	July 2016
Revised expected implementation end date (if applicable)	Dec 2016
Donor(s):	NORAD
Actual implementation end date	Dec 2016
Project Budget	Euro 1,696,680 (NORAD inputs 836,000)
PA or PPG (if applicable)	
UNIDO co-financing	Cash: 0 In-kind: 0
Total co-financing at design (cash and in-kind)	Cash: 0 In-kind: 0
Materialized co-financing at project completion (cash and in -kind)	EUR 752,000
Mid-term review date	Not foreseen
Planned terminal evaluation date	Nov/Dec 2016

(Source: Project document)[1]

---

[1] Project information data throughout these TOR are to be verified during the inception phase.

Mekong III

Project Title	**Trade capacity-building in the Mekong Delta countries of Cambodia and Lao People's Democratic Republic through strengthening institutional and national capacities related to standards, metrology, testing and quality (SMTQ) phase III**
UNIDO project No. and/or SAP ID	**Project No.** **SAP ID: 106078**
Region	**Mekong Region**
Country(ies)	**Lao PDR, Cambodia**
Implementing agency(ies)	**UNIDO**
Executing partner(s)	
Project size (FSP, MSP, EA)	
Project implementation start date (First PAD issuance date)	**October 2011**
Original implementation end date	**Dec 2014**
Revised expected implementation end date (if applicable)	**Dec 2015**
Donor(s):	**NORAD**
Actual implementation end date	**Dec 2016**
Project Budget	**Euro 1,390,606**
PA or PPG (if applicable)	**---**
UNIDO co-financing	**Cash: 0** **In-kind: 0**
Total co-financing at design (cash and in-kind)	**Cash: 0** **In-kind: 0**
Materialized co-financing at project completion (cash and in -kind)	In kind contribution by Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy to provide offices, telephone and internet facilities. Private Sector and counterpart institutions were foreseen to contribute through partnering in implementation of activities (through human resources project offices). In-kind contribution was not defined in financial terms.
Mid-term review date	**Not foreseen**
Planned terminal evaluation date	**Nov/Dec 2016**

3. Project background and context

Background:

Every country needs to be able to produce tradable goods that are competitive in design, quality and price. Increasing international trade, in an era of liberalised economic context, largely depends on quality standards as well as on credible testing and calibration facilities, which ensure that products comply with the requirements of standards.

Hitherto, a number of duty free and quota free facilities were launched to support developing countries in accessing markets. In-spite of this, many developing countries are still unable to enjoy equitable participation in global trade due to challenges of inadequate supply capacity and the lack of quality infrastructure.

As a matter of fact, trade is identified as one of the principal instruments of poverty alleviation. Local and regional trade and export-led growth has resulted in increased household incomes and employment opportunities signifying a positive trade poverty-nexus in development process. Good quality is an essential element for products to integrate into international markets.

Context project 106034 - SAARC:

UNIDO, through funding from Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) is providing development assistance to the least developed nations of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) - Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives, and Nepal since 2003. The project(s) intended to improve Standards, Metrology, Testing, and Quality (SMTQ) through implementation of internationally accepted metrology institutes (both legal and commercial), standards development institutes, food safety testing facilities, and product certification primarily to assist exports certification to Management System Standards (MSS).

Implementation of these measures aims to:
- Ensure mutually accepted trade measurements;
- Provide standards that assist exports and facilitate imports while ensuring appropriate products for the domestic market;
- Enhance the capacity to assess safety of food imported, exported, and domestic, as well as identify food rejected elsewhere;
- Ensure the market (domestic and export) has verified acceptable products;
- Open access to export markets that have sophisticated requirements for safe quality products made with concern for the environment and labour practices;
- Facilitate the introduction of a quality culture in organizational endeavours;
- Position each country to be a strong participant in regional trade under the free trade initiatives in SAARC;

Phases 1 and 2 of the UNIDO SAARC SMTQ project have achieved much progress in having appropriate laws and regulations drafted with some already put into place for metrology and food safety, providing training to key staff, facilitating companies to achieve MSS certification, and acquiring appropriate laboratory equipment. The initiatives for Bangladesh are considered complete, with additional time needed for Bhutan, Maldives, and Nepal due to delays caused by organizational changes and uncertain political situations.
The overall objective of Phase 3 is to build on the achievements of Phase 2 and the lessons learned to establish the desired SMTQ infrastructure and ensure measures are in place to make the initiatives sustainable using local resources.

The current Phase 3 will contribute towards MDG goal 1 on poverty reduction, MDG goal 3 on gender equality and empowerment of women, and MDG goal 7 on ensuring environmental sustainability through increased export opportunities, economic growth, safe food and employment subsequent to completion of legislative reforms and improvement of the quality infrastructure. This project also corresponds to the aims set out in the MDG goal 8 on instigating a global partnership for development. Recognized transparency, inclusion of women,

international credibility, and quality systems are the backbone for the sustainability of the aforementioned goals. The intervention, mainly funded by NORAD was implemented in three phases starting in 2002. Phase I was designed as a regional project for the four countries of Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives and Nepal and mainly focussed on mapping of the national SMTQ infrastructures, training, consultancy and planning of further developments. It was evaluated by the UNIDO Evaluation Group in May 2007 with respect to its Relevance, Ownership, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability and Horizontal issues[2]. Findings concluded that the project was relevant and UNIDO's implementation has been efficient with outputs related to the National Quality Infrastructure (NQI) being achieved.

There was a general high degree of project ownership, however regional concord was weak based on different national needs. Although the project was seen likely to get a high impact and very good in sustainability aspects, it was stated that regional activities should be replaced by the EU project ESPEC.

Further Recommendations for project design and management included inter alia:

- The objective of the project should be extended to protect the domestic societies against substandard and hazardous products;
- For phase II to describe the roles and authorities of all UNIDO representatives and other stakeholders;
- Review and improve project management set-up and mobilise the national steering committees in the planning and follow-up phase II;

Phase II was consequently launched in September 2007 covering Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives and Nepal. It was evaluated by the UNIDO evaluation group in October 2012. Main finding stated that the project has been successfully implemented and delivered significant benefits to the stakeholders of the NQI in all participating countries, reaching about 90% of implementation outcomes in Bhutan and 70% in the Maldives and Nepal. The project was evaluated to have been well managed in an efficient manner and strictly in accordance with UNIDO's rules on financial management while complementing overlapping activities with the EU project in Bangladesh and Nepal.

Main recommendations included to adopt a sector or value chain approach in designing SMTQ support programs. While additional TA was recommended in all countries to strengthen the sustainability of the outcomes achieved, UNIDO was recommended to develop a structured and in-depth approach for SMTQ project preparation, including an assessment of demand and supply of SMTQ services and the identification of needs of SMTQ service users, while NORAD should allocate sufficient funds for detailed project formulation. [3]

The third and last phase with a total duration of three years will come to an end in December 2016.

Project implementation started in July 2013 and the project completion date was initially planned in July 2016 but was revised to December 2016.

The project document foresees regular monitoring (MTR) and an independent terminal evaluation (TE). Monitoring was conducted through steering committee meetings and telephone conferences (minimum once a year) to monitor and review progress, challenges faced and way forward. In parallel progress reporting on bi-annual basis was provided to the donor.

Context project 106078 - Mekong:

The liberalized global trade regime provides developing countries opportunities for export-driven growth, as well as challenges. In addition, the Mekong countries, i.e. Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Vietnam, have the potential to integrate and benefit from regional trade. NORAD has funded capacity-building interventions in these three countries since 2003. These interventions have been instrumental in setting up and strengthening the legal and regulatory framework relating to TBT/SPS compliance, in particular, national standards, metrology legal framework, product certification, testing and metrology laboratories.

---

[2] For the full report please visit: http://www.unido.org/fileadmin/import/70923_20070505_SAARC_TFRAS03001.pdf

[3] For the full report please visit: https://www.unido.org/fileadmin/user_media_upgrade/Resources/Evaluation/E-Book_SAARC_II-2012.pdf

Developing standards and compliance capabilities require significant funding and time. The overall objective of the project phase III is to consolidate the recent achievements in SMTQ infrastructure development, and address the remaining institutional and capacity building gaps. This phase of the NORAD-UNIDO intervention covers Cambodia and Lao PDR, and targets on the following key outputs:

- Enhancing capacity of National Specifications Laboratory (NSL) of Cambodia Rubber Research Institute and promoting CRRI's activities in partnership with the Association for Rubber Development of Cambodia (ARDC);
- Upgrading the chemical testing capacity at Industrial Laboratory Centre of Cambodia;
- Promoting concepts and benefits of National Quality Infrastructure (NQI) in collaboration with the Cambodia Chamber of Commerce;
- Establishment of a facility for testing coffee in collaboration with the Lao Coffee Association;
- Upgrading the Chemical Testing Laboratory at Food & Drug Quality Control Centre (FDQCC); and
- Improvement of testing facilities at the State Enterprise for Survey Design and Materials Testing (SDMT) in Lao PDR;

The intervention funded by NORAD was implemented in three phases starting in 2003.

Phase I, covering a period of 2 years from 2003 to 2005 and implemented in Lao PDR, Vietnam and Cambodia, aimed at (1) national capacity building related to market access requirements and TBT and identifying manufacturing sub-sectors and export market focus for remedial action in each country and (2) upgrade the required technical infrastructure. Most results (outputs and outcomes) were achieved as planned, except training in the quality area that did not achieve targets. UNIDO policy advice regarding legislation and institutional development has made an impact and is expected to result in new legislation, particularly in Lao PDR and Cambodia. The project was evaluated to address important needs being highly relevant and showing excellent national ownership. The regional approach was questioned whether similar benefits could be obtained by three parallel national projects. A continuation of phase II was recommended with national components to be defined for each of the three countries. [4]

Phase II of the project was consequently developed and implemented during 2006 and 2011 aiming at developing new and strengthening existing conformity infrastructure, developing national capabilities on different standards related to key export industries, ensuring regional and international credibility of the conformity infrastructure, and developing enquiry points for Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) and Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) in each of the three countries. The project management was flexibly adapting the content to changed needs but day-to-day implementation left room for improvement. The project was highly relevant in terms of international priorities, national policies and demand of beneficiaries. It significantly improved the capacities of most of the targeted laboratories with remarkable achievements such as the international accreditation of ILCC and CRII laboratories in Cambodia.[5]

The third and last phase with a total duration of five years will come to an end in December 2016.

Project implementation started in October 2011 and the project completion date was initially planned in December 2014 but was revised to December 2015 and then to December 2016.

The project document foresees regular monitoring (MTR) and a terminal evaluation (TE).

Monitoring was conducted through steering committee meetings and telephone conferences (bi-annually) to monitor and review progress, challenges faced and way forward. In parallel progress reporting on bi-annual basis was provided to the donor.

---

[4] For the full evaluation report please visit:
http://www.unido.org/fileadmin/import/39573_FINAL_EVAL_REPORT_2005_07_11_Mekong_Delta_Countries.pdf

[5] For the full report please visit:
http://www.unido.org/fileadmin/user_media/About_UNIDO/Evaluation/Project_reports/SMTQ%20Mekong%20final_TERAS06001_111123.pdf

4.   Project objective and structure

106034 – SAARC III

The Phase 3 objectives build on the achievements of Phase 2 and the lessons learned to establish the desired SMTQ infrastructure and ensure measures are in place to make the initiatives sustainable using local resources.

Specifically Phase 3 aims to:

Bhutan:
Achieve accreditation of the food-testing laboratory of the Bhutan Agriculture and Food Regulatory Authority (BAFRA) with a full scope of testing, strengthen the metrology and construction products certification schemes of the Bhutan Standards Bureau (BSB) and determine the best approach to encourage the national use of management systems.

Maldives:
Ensure safe food through enactment of laws and regulations verified by an accredited Maldives Food and Drug Authority (MFDA) food safety laboratory with a full range of testing parameters, strengthen the metrology scheme provided by the Polytechnic and the Atolls inspectors, and establish measures to assist the yellowfin tuna industry to retain required management system certifications for exports, and facilitate the dried fish industry to increase exports through effective use of management systems.

Nepal:
Strengthen the food safety system through improvements to the Department of Food Technology and Quality Control (DFTQC) Central Food Laboratory (CFL) operations and scope extension, strengthen the Pashmina industry through improved Nepal Bureau of Standards and Metrology (NBSM) textile testing and certification scheme, improve construction product quality through NBSM certification, and determine the best approach to encourage the national use of different management systems, as well as strengthening training for, and accreditation scope.

The following project components have been developed, in addition to project management, to achieve the project objectives:

Project Component 1: Enhancement of Food Safety system in Bhutan, Nepal and Maldives with respect to (in-country) processed products, domestically produced, imported and exported products. The food safely system will be enhanced by published regulations along with accredited testing capacity to detect residues, additives, pesticides and contaminants.

Project Component 2: Accurate trade quantities for consumers, industry, and exporters supported by a fully functioning internationally accepted metrology system to be supported by measuring instruments used in Bhutan and Maldives being calibrated with international acceptance of calibration certificates.

Project Component 3: Functional 3rd party Conformity Assessment Bodies operating to the benefit of society and facilitating continual improvement.

- Bhutan: An operational BSB Product Certification Body is established with Management systems supporting societal objectives.
- Maldives: Affordable MSS Certification Services for Fish and fish product exporters are available.
- Nepal: Additional product capacity for NBSM Testing Laboratory and accreditation of NBSM as a Product Certification Body to ISO/IEC 17065. NBSM Management Systems Certification Body is augmented in providing both certification and training for a variety of Management System Standards (MSS).

The following are, in brief, some of the expected results of the project/programme:

- Laws addressing SMTQ will be issued and detailed regulations will be in place and accessible through electronic means;
- The food safety system in each country will be comparable to others in the region and capable to identify foods rejected by other countries. Target markets will readily accept foods for export;
- Products in the region will be accepted across borders through agreements for mutual acceptance of product certifications;
- Standards will be based on regional and international needs to the fullest extent possible with national standards for specialty products;
- Organizations will be voluntarily implementing MSS to become more effective, continually improve, and to better access markets;
- Measures will be in place to ensure ongoing MSS certifications are affordable to all organizations;
- Commercial and industrial measuring instruments will be verified accurate, with their accuracy traceable to international prime standards;

Original Objective (2002):

For continuity and to put the Phase 3 objectives in context, the initial overall objective established in 2002, as well as the individual objectives indicated at the start of the project for Bhutan, Maldives, and Nepal were to:

- Facilitate industrial development and export capabilities (and consequently spurring economic growth and employment opportunities) of the assisted countries by reducing technical barriers to trade through the strengthening of standards, metrology, testing, quality and conformity assessment institutional structures and national capacities.
- Bhutan: Strengthen the standards cell in the Standards and Quality Control Authority (SQCA), (renamed the BSB), its metrology laboratory and the food-testing laboratory of BAFRA, and to develop a national capability for training in quality management with a view to developing the quality competence of the nascent industry.
- Maldives: Strengthen the Standards Cell and Legal and Industrial Metrology laboratory of the MSMC and to enhance the capability of the national food-testing laboratory of the MFDA, leading to its accreditation with a view to increasing its fishery exports.
- Nepal: Strengthen the product certification scheme and textile laboratory of the NBSM and the food-testing laboratory of the DFTQC and to develop a national capability for training in quality management with a view to developing the quality competence of industry.

106078 – Mekong III

The main objective of the proposed project is to facilitate the industrial development, consumer protection and enhancement of export capabilities through further strengthening of national quality infrastructure and human capacities related to standards, metrology, testing and quality.

The following **project components** have been developed, in addition to project management, to achieve the project objectives:

Cambodia
Project Component 1: Improvement of product quality products and protection of consumers in respect of safety and health by supporting the Institute of Standards Cambodia (ISC) to approve and publish 40 draft standards developed in Phase II and to attract at least 3 new products and expand accreditation.

Project Component 2: Improvement of measurement accuracy, international traceability and consumer protection by upgrading of the industrial and legal metrology sections of the National Metrology Center (NMC) and provincial legal metrology offices.

Project Component 3: Improved capability of Cambodian exporters to meet international requirement for trade by upgrading the National Specifications Laboratory (NSL) of the Cambodia Rubber Research Institute (CRRI) and non-food chemical testing laboratory of the Industrial Laboratory Center (ILCC).

Project Component 4: In collaboration with Cambodia Chamber of Commerce, awareness on quality among industrialists, consumers and the general population will be increased by creation of a quality award and organization of awareness building seminars.

Lao PDR
Project Component 1: Improvement of quality of products and protection of consumers in respect of safety and health services by: supporting the Division of Standards (DOS) in developing and disseminating standards for key export products; supporting the Quality Center in identifying new product categories and expanding accreditation; and supporting the Information and Training Center to develop a standards library.

Project Component 2: Improvement of measurement accuracy, international traceability and consumer protection by: upgrading the Lao Metrology Center and support for accreditation; support the division of Consumer Protection for legal metrology.

Project Component 3: Improved capability of Lao PDR exporters to meet international requirements for trade by: supporting the Lao Coffee Association (LCA) in the establishment of a coffee testing laboratory; upgrading the food chemistry section of the Food and Drug Control Center (FDQCC); and upgrade the testing capacities of the State Enterprise for Survey Design and Materials Testing (SDMT) for accreditation.

The following are, in brief, some of the expected **results** of the project/programme:

Cambodia
Overall the project will contribute towards strengthening the integration of Cambodia into the multilateral trading system, in particular regarding its capacity to comply with international market requirements in the areas of SPS and TBT issues. In addition, indirect intended outcomes are increased exports as well as strengthened consumer protection in the domestic market through the enhanced quality infrastructure recognizing issues of health, safety and environment whilst addressing issue of public and private sector development.

Lao PDR
Overall the project will contribute towards strengthening the integration of Lao PDR into the multilateral trading system, in particular regarding its capacity to comply with international market requirements in the areas of SPS and TBT issues. In addition, indirect intended outcomes are increased exports as well as strengthened consumer protection in the domestic market through the enhanced quality infrastructure recognizing issues of health, safety and environment whilst addressing issue of public and private sector development.

5.   Project implementation and execution arrangements

106034 – SAARC III

The project is implemented jointly by UNIDO and the involved organizations/ counterparts in each country through the project management unit. For Bhutan this is the Department of Trade, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Bhutan Standards Bureau (BSB), and Bhutan Agriculture and Food Regulatory Authority (BAFRA); for the Maldives, Ministry of Economic Development, Maldives Standards and Metrology Centre (MSMC), Maldives Food and Drug Authority (MFDA), Maldives Polytechnic, and the Atolls Council; and for Nepal, Ministry of Industry, Nepal Bureau of Standards and Metrology (NBSM), and Department of Food Technology and Quality Control (DFTQC). The National Project Coordinators (NPC), supported by the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) (homebased) are responsible for organizing and overseeing implementation. International experts are providing technical support for developing advanced testing methodologies and the verification of the same. National expertise is utilized as much as possible alongside the international experts, thereby providing the international experts with much needed local knowledge and at the same time transferring international knowledge to local experts.

Each country has a Steering Committee (SC) that provides for the oversight of project implementation by the ministries involved, the Private Sector and the implementation agency (UNIDO) to oversee the project. This Committee met at the start of the project and biannually. An inception report was tabled at the first biannual meeting of this committee and biannual reports were tabled at each SC meeting. In addition to the bi-annual SC

UNIDO:
The daily implementation of the project is managed by the UNIDO project manager from the UNIDO TCB unit in cooperation with the UNIDO New Delhi office (India), the CTA and the National Project Coordinator with administrative support and in very close collaboration with the project counterparts. The UNIDO project manager is monitoring the implementation progress with a results-based management approach. The implementation team for each country is responsible for reviewing and updating work plans and the implementation of the project in accordance with UNIDO rules and procedures.

106078 Mekong III

The Project Steering Committees in Cambodia and Lao PDR are responsible for monitoring and guiding the programme. The project is overseen by the Steering Committee (SC) that has been set up in each beneficiary country. The SC consists of senior officials of the standards body, metrology and testing laboratories, all relevant and counterpart ministries and the private sector. The SC is providing for the oversight of project implementation by the Governments of the beneficiary countries (Cambodia and Lao PDR) and the implementation agency (UNIDO). This Committee was meeting at the commencement of the project and biannually to agree upon work plans, resource allocations and reporting of progress. An inception report was tabled at the fist biannual meeting of this committee and biannual reports were tabled at each SC meeting thereafter.
In addition to the bi-annual SC meetings held in each project country, meetings between the donor (NORAD) and UNIDO were held bi-annually in order to report on progress, challenges, risks and mitigating measures based on which the subsequent six monthly work plans were prepared and tranches of funding approved.

The project counterparts in Cambodia are: Institute of Standards (ISC), Industrial Laboratory Center (ILCC), National Metrology Centre (NMC), Cambodia Rubber Research Institute (CRRI), and Cambodia Chamber of Commerce (CCC).

The project counterparts in Lao PDR are: Department of Standardization and Metrology, Food & Drugs Quality Control Center, Lao National Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Lao Coffee Association, State Enterprise for Survey Design and Materials Testing (SDMT).

The Government counterparts are responsible for working closely with UNIDO in assessing the issues raised at the SC, having a particular bearing on Government commitment, contribution and in particular ways and means to absorb the assistance rendered for national development and make the capacity developed sustainable. If there were any administrative and bureaucratic bottlenecks (modifying legal and institutional framework etc.) from the Government stakeholder side, which may affect the successful completion of the project, the Government in consultation with UNIDO would agree on a mutually acceptable and a feasible solution in order to ensure smooth project implementation and sustainability. The Government is responsible for implementing the relevant decisions and recommendations of the SC.

UNIDO:
The daily implementation of the project is managed by the UNIDO project managers, national technical advisors and the national project coordinators with administrative support and in very close collaboration with the project counterparts. The UNIDO project manager, national coordinators and international technical advisors are monitoring the implementation progress with a results based management approach. The implementation team is responsible for reviewing and updating of work plans and implementation of the project in accordance with UNIDO rules and procedures.

UNIDO activities are overseen and coordinated by a headquarters based Project Manager with guidance on technical activities by international experts in the fields the Project supports. The project team comprises of the

Project Manager, Heads of UNIDO Operations in Cambodia and Lao PDR, international experts, together with National Technical Advisors and National Project Coordinators in each country (Cambodia and Lao PDR).

6. Relevant project reports/documents

106034 SAARC

During the process of developing the inception report, performance indicators were finalized and project milestones clearly defined. Work plans were defined by the CTA in line with the project agreement and decisions of each country's project SC.

Progress reports were prepared on bi-annual basis relating to each main project objectives and targeted outputs; specifying the results achieved to date, as well as presenting the work plan for the next six month period and presented to the SC meetings and donor meetings. At each meeting UNIDO presented specific problems encountered and constraints faced in project implementation, and provided technical guidance on how best these challenges can be addressed.

Further details can be obtained from mission reports undertaken by international experts and project management throughout the implementation.

106078 – Mekong

During the process of developing the inception report, performance indicators were finalized and project milestones clearly defined. Work plans were defined by the project Manager in line with the project agreement and decisions of the project SC.

Progress reports were prepared on bi-annual basis relating to each main project objectives and targeted outputs; specifying the results achieved to date, as well as presenting the work plan for the next six month period and presented to the SC meetings and donor meetings. At each meeting UNIDO presented specific problems encountered and constraints faced in project implementation, and provided technical guidance on how best these challenges can be addressed.

Further details can be obtained from mission report undertaken by international experts and project management throughout the implementation.

7. Budget information

Some financial details are shown below:

106034 SAARC III:

Outputs	NORAD	Co-funding (In-kind)			TOTAL
		Govt.	**Para-statal**	**Private**	
		Euros (Thousands)			
Output 1 (Bhutan: BAFRA)	85	10	50	0	145
Output 2 (Bhutan: BSB)	138	45	150	10	343
Output 3 (Maldives: MFDA)	85	20	50	0	155
Output 4 (Maldives: Polytech & MSMA)	35	50	50	10	145
Output 5 (Nepal: DFTQC)	85	10	50	0	145
Output 6 (Nepal: NBSM)	88	0	90	10	188
SUBTOTAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	**516**	**135**	**440**	**30**	**1121**
Project management	**320**	**15**	**132**	**0**	**467**
PROJECT TOTAL BUDGET	**836**	**150**	**572**	**30**	**1588**
Support costs	**108.68**				
GRAND TOTAL	**944.68**	**150**	**572**	**30**	**1696.68**
Percentage	**55.7**	**8.8**	**33.7**	**1.8**	**100.0**

(Source: Project document)

106078 – Mekong III:

Budget line	Description	Details	w/m	NORAD
		EURO		
11-00	Experts	Standards and Metrology//NQI	8	120,000
		Chemicals/Coffee	4	60,000
		Rubber	4	60,000
		National quality scheme	2.5	37,500
			18.5	**277,500**
13-00	Support staff	Project secretary and drivers in Cambodia and Lao	144	**60,000**
15-00	Local travel			**4,000**
16-00	Mission costs			**30,000**
17-00	National staff	NPCs and Technical Advisers Cambodia and Lao PDR	108	**94,000**
	National experts		42	**25,125**
21-00	Sub contracts	Cambodia		115,000
		Lao PDR		100,000
				215,000
32-00	Study tours	Cambodia		15,000
		Lao PDR		30,000
				45,000
33-00	In service training			**15,000**
45-00	Equipment	Cambodia		115,000
		Lao PDR		300,000
				415,000
51-00	Miscellaneous			**10,000**
82-00	Evaluation			**40,000**
	Total			**1,230,625**
	Support cost (13%)			**159,981**
	Grand total			**1,390,606**
	Contingency			**43,394**
	Total incl contingency funds			**1,434.000**

106078 MEKONG III -Country budget by output

CAMBODIA

Outputs	Sub Total	BL11	w/m	BL13	BL15	BL16	BL17	BL21	BL32	BL33	BL45	BL51
C.5.1.1.1 Output 1	27723	7500	0.5	4286	286	2143	8509	0	0	0	0	5000
C.5.1.1.2 Output 2	55223	15000	1	4286	286	2143	8509	25000	0	0	0	0
C.5.1.2.1 Output 3	95223	15000	1	4286	286	2143	8509	35000	0	0	30000	0
C.5.1.2.2 Output 4	47723	7500	0.5	4286	286	2143	8509	0	0	0	25000	0
C.5.1.3.1 Output 5	140223	60000	4	4286	286	2143	8509	35000	0	0	30000	0
C.5.1.3.2 Output 6	77723	22500	1.5	4286	286	2143	8509	0	10000	0	30000	0
C.5.1.4.1 Output 7	83723	37500	2.5	4286	286	2143	8509	20000	5000	8000	0	0
Total	529563	165000	11	30000	2000	15000	59563	115000	15000	8000	115000	5000

C.5.1.1.1 Output 1	ISC is supported for approving and publishing 40 draft standards developed in the Phase II
C.5.1.1.2 Output 2	ISC is supported in attracting at least 3 new product categories and expanding accreditation
C.5.1.2.1 Output 3	Industrial metrology laboratory of National Metrology Center is upgraded
C.5.1.2.2 Output 4	Provincial legal metrology offices are upgraded
C.5.1.3.1 Output 5	National Specifications Laboratory (NSL) of the Cambodian Rubber Research Institute is upgraded
C.5.1.3.2 Output 6	ILCC non-food chemical testing laboratory is upgraded
C.5.1.4.1 Output 7	Assistance is provided for consultancy services for creation of quality awareness and development of quality award, as well as for organization of awareness building seminars

LAO PDR

Outputs		Sub Total	BL11	w/m	BL13	BL15	BL16	BL17	BL21	BL32	BL33	BL45	BL51
C.5.2.1.1 Output 1	31320	31320	15000	1	3750	250	1875	7445	0	0	0	0	3000
C.5.2.1.2 Output 2	55320	55320	12000	0.8	3750	250	1875	7445	30000	0	0	0	0
C.5.2.1.3 Output 3	28320	28320	3000	0.2	3750	250	1875	7445	0	10000	0	0	2000

C.5.2.2.1 Output 4	88320	88320	15000	1	3750	250	1875	7445	30000	0	0	30000	0
C.5.2.2.2 Output 5	118320	118320	15000	1	3750	250	1875	7445	0	0	0	90000	0
C.5.2.3.1 Output 6	72820	72820	22500	1.5	3750	250	1875	7445	0	0	7000	30000	0
C.5.2.3.2 Output 7	158320	158320	15000	1	3750	250	1875	7445	20000	10000	0	100000	0
C.5.2.3.3 Output 8	108320	108320	15000	1	3750	250	1875	7445	20000	10000	0	50000	0
		661063	112500	7.5	30000	2000	15000	59563	100000	30000	7000	300000	5000

C.5.2.1.1 Output 1	Division of Standards is supported in developing and disseminating standards for key export products	
C.5.2.1.2 Output 2	The Quality Center is supported in identifying new product categories and expanding accreditation	
C.5.2.1.3 Output 3	Information & Training Center is supported to develop standards library	
C.5.2.3.1 Output 4	Lao Metrology Centre is upgraded and supported for accreditation	
C.5.2.3.2 Output 5	Division of Consumer Protection (DCP) is supported	
C.5.2.4.1 Output 6	Lao Coffee Association (LCA) is supported to have a coffee testing laboratory	
C.5.2.4.2 Output 7	Food Chemistry Section of Food & Drug Quality Control Centre (FDQCC) is supported	
C.5.2.4.3 Output 8	Survey Design and Materials Testing (SDMT) is supported	

BL11	International consultants
BL13	Administrative support
BL15	Project travel
BL16	Mission cost
BL17	National consultants
BL21	Sub contracts
BL32	Study tour
BL33	In-service training
BL45	Equipment
BL51	Miscellaneous

II.   Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting (October 2011) to the estimated completion date in December 2016. It will assess project performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

The TE has an additional purpose of drawing lessons and developing recommendations for UNIDO and the project stakeholders and partners, that may help improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities in the country and on a global scale upon project completion. The terminal evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in the focal area, country, or region.

The terminal evaluation should provide an analysis of the attainment of the project objective(s) and the corresponding technical components or outputs. Through its assessments, the terminal evaluation should enable the Government, the national counterparts, the donors, UNIDO and other stakeholders and partners to verify prospects for development impact and promoting sustainability, providing an analysis of the attainment project objectives, delivery and completion of project outputs/activities, and outcomes/impacts based on indicators, and management of risks. The assessment includes re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and other elements of project design according to the project evaluation parameters defined in this ToR.

The key questions of the terminal evaluation is whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objectives and to what extent the net benefits of the project will likely continue beyond the project completion.

III.   Evaluation approach and methodology

The terminal evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy[6], the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle[7].

The evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluation team, and it will be carried out as an independent in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The evaluation team will liaise with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EVQ/IEV) on the conduct of the evaluation and methodological issues.

The evaluation team will be required to use different methods to ensure that data gathering and analysis deliver evidence-based qualitative and quantitative information, based on diverse sources, as necessary: desk studies and literature review, statistical analysis, individual interviews, focus group meetings, surveys and direct observation. This approach will not only enable the evaluation to assess causality through quantitative means but also to provide reasons for why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The specific mixed methodological approach will be described in the inception report.

The evaluation team will develop interview guidelines. Field interviews can take place either in the form of focus-group discussions or one-to-one consultations.

---

[6] UNIDO. (2015). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (UNIDO/DGB/(M).98/Rev.1)
[7] UNIDO. (2006). Director-General's Administrative Instruction No. 17/Rev.1: Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle (DGAI.17/Rev.1, 24 August 2006)

The methodology will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents, including, but not limited to:

   (a) The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNIDO and Donor(s)/Partners, annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)), progress reports, mid-term review (MTR) report, output reports (case studies, action plans, sub-regional strategies, etc.), back-to-office mission report(s), end-of-contract report(s) and relevant correspondence.

   (b) If applicable, notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project (e.g. approval and steering committees).

   (c) Other project-related material produced by the project.

2. The evaluation team will use available models of (or reconstruct if necessary) theory of change for the different types of intervention (enabling, capacity, investment, demonstration). The validity of the theory of change will be examined through specific questions in interviews and possibly through a survey of stakeholders.

3. Counterfactual information: In those cases where baseline information for relevant indicators is not available, the evaluation team will aim at establishing a proxy-baseline through recall and secondary information.

4. Interviews with project management and technical support including staff and management at UNIDO HQ and in the field and – if necessary - staff associated with the project's financial administration and procurement.

5. Interviews with project partners and stakeholders, including, among others, government counterparts, project stakeholders, and co-financing partners as shown in the corresponding sections of the project documents.

6. On-site observation of results achieved by demonstration projects, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies.

7. Interviews and telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved in the project. The evaluation team shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of any donor agency(ies) or other organizations.

8. Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Field Office(s) to the extent that it was involved in the project, and the project's management members and the various national and sub-regional authorities dealing with project activities as necessary.

9. Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluation team and/or UNIDO, ODG/EVQ/IEV for triangulation purposes.

10. The inception report will provide details on the methodology used by the evaluation team and include an evaluation matrix.

IV. Project evaluation parameters

The evaluation team will assess the project performance, achievement of outputs, outcome(s) and likelihood of attainment of results (long term outcomes, impact) guided by the parameters and evaluations questions provided in this section.

In addition to the qualitative assessment based on the evidence gathered in the evaluation, the evaluation team will rate the project on the basis of the **rating criteria for the parameters described in the following sub-chapters, A to C.**

Ratings will be presented in the form of tables with each of the criteria / aspects rated separately and with **brief justifications for the rating** based on the findings and the main analyses (see Table 1 to Table 3) in Annex 2.

Table 4 in Annex 2 presents the template for summarizing the overall ratings.

A. Project identification and design

Project identification assessment criteria derived from the logical framework approach (LFA) methodology, establishing the process and set up of steps and analyses required to design a project in a systematic and structured way, e.g. situation, stakeholder, problem and objective analyses. The aspects to be addressed by the evaluation include inter alia the extent to which:

a) The situation, problem, need / gap was clearly identified, analysed and documented (evidence, references). The project design was based on a needs assessment
b) Stakeholder analysis was adequate (e.g. clear identification of end-users, beneficiaries, sponsors, partners, and clearly defined roles and responsibilities in the project(s)).
c) The project took into account and reflects national and local priorities and strategies
d) ISID-related issues and priorities were considered when designing the project
e) Relevant country representatives (from government, industries, gender groups, custom officers and civil society - were appropriately involved and participated in the identification of critical problem areas and the development of technical cooperation strategies.
f) Risk management: Are critical risks related to financial, social-political, institutional, environmental and implementation aspects identified with specific risk ratings? Are their mitigation measures identified? Where possible, are the mitigation measures included in project activities/outputs and monitored under the M&E plan?

Project design quality assessment criteria derive from the logical framework approach (LFA) methodology, leading to the establishment of LogFrame Matrix (LFM) and the main elements of the project, i.e. overall objective, outcomes, outputs, to defining their causal relationship, as well as indicators, their means of verification and the assumptions. The evaluation will examine the extent to which:

g) The project's design were adequate to address the problems at hand;
a) The project had a clear thematically focused development objective;
b) The project outcome was clear, realistic, relevant, addressed the problem identified and provided a clear description of the benefit or improvement that will be achieved after project completion;
c) Outputs were clear, realistic, adequately leading to the achievement of the outcome;
d) The attainment of overall development objective, outcome and outputs can be determined by a set of SMART verifiable indicators;
e) The results hierarchy in the LFM, from activities to outputs, outcome and overall objective, is logical and consistent.
f) Verification and Assumptions were adequate, identifying important external factors and risks.

B. Implementation Performance

Implementation assessment criteria to be applied are shown below and correspond to DAC criteria, as well as to good programme/project management practices.

a) Relevance and ownership

The evaluation will examine the extent to which the project is relevant to the:

   i.   National development and environmental priorities and strategies of the Government and the population, and regional and international agreements. See possible evaluation questions under "Country ownership/drivenness" below.
   ii. Target groups: relevance of the project's objectives, outcomes and outputs to the different target groups of the interventions (e.g. private-sector companies, civil society, beneficiaries of capacity building and training, etc.). The evaluation would review the effects of the projects on the private sector stakeholders and beneficiaries in the survey and field work, as appropriate.
   iii. Focal areas/operational programme strategies: In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the Donor's programmes/strategies (e.g. focal area(s)/operational program strategies?) Ascertain the likely nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the specific Donor focal area/programme.
   iv. Does the project remain relevant taking into account the changing environment?
   v.   A participatory project identification process and broad consultation including all main stakeholder groups (e.g. the national counterpart and target beneficiaries) was instrumental in selecting problem areas and counterparts requiring technical cooperation support.

b) Effectiveness

The evaluation will assess to what extent results at various levels, including outcomes and outputs, have been achieved. The following issues will be assessed:

   i.   Delivery of outputs: How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of outputs? Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached?
   ii. Achievement of expected outcomes:
   - To what extent have the expected outcomes, outputs and long-term objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved?
   - Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions?
   - Have there been any unplanned effects?
   - Are the project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives?
   - If the original or modified expected results were described as merely outputs/inputs, were there any real outcomes of the project and, if so, were these commensurate with realistic expectations from the project?
   - If there was a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country and operational context, were such modifications properly documented?
   iii. Longer-term impact: What were the actual and/or potential longer-term impacts or at least indicate the steps taken to assess these (see also below "monitoring of long term changes")? Wherever possible, evaluators should indicate how findings on impacts will be reported in future.

iv.   Catalytic or replication effects: The evaluation will describe any catalytic or replication effect both within and outside the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the project's catalytic role.

c) Efficiency

The extent to which:

i.   The project cost was effective: Was the project using the most cost-efficient options? Is the project cost-effective compared to similar interventions? Could the project have produced more with the same resources, or the same with less money, or with less delay? Were there other means to achieve the same outcomes?

ii.   Outputs and outcomes: Has the project produced results within the expected time frame? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the costs incurred and the time taken to achieve outcomes with that for similar projects. Were the project's activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and annual work plans? Were the disbursements and project expenditures in line with budgets?

iii.   Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet the requirements? Was the quality of UNIDO inputs and services as planned and timely?

iv.   Was there coordination with other UNIDO and other donors' projects, and did possible synergy effects happen?

v.   Were there delays in project implementation and if so, what were their causes?

d) Assessment of risks to sustainability of project outcomes

Sustainability is understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. Assessment of sustainability of outcomes will be given special attention but also technical, financial and organization sustainability will be reviewed. This assessment should explain how the risks to project outcomes will affect continuation of benefits after the project ends. It will include both exogenous and endogenous risks. The following four dimensions or aspects of risks to sustainability will be addressed:

i.   **Financial risks**. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once assistance ends? (Such resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors or income-generating activities; these can also include trends that indicate the likelihood that, in future, there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project outcomes.) Was the project successful in identifying and leveraging co-financing?

ii.   **Sociopolitical risks**. Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?

iii.   **Institutional framework and governance risks.** Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency and required technical know-how in place?

iv.   **Environmental risks.** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? Are there any environmental factors, positive or negative, that can influence the future flow of project benefits? Are there any project outputs or higher level results that are likely to have adverse environmental impacts, which, in turn, might affect sustainability of project benefits? The evaluation should

assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

e) Assessment of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems

i. **M&E design.** Did the project have an M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for the application of the Project M&E plan (see **Error! Reference source not found.**).

ii. **M&E plan implementation.** The evaluation should verify that an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete and accurate, with well-justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve performance and to adapt to changing needs; and the project had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure. Was monitoring and self-evaluation carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and impacts? Are there any annual work plans? Was any steering or advisory mechanism put in place? Did reporting and performance reviews take place regularly? How well have risks outlined the project document and in the logframe been monitored and managed? How often have risks been reviewed and updated? Has a risk management mechanism been put in place?

iii. **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, the evaluators will determine whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted for at the project planning stage and whether M&E was adequately funded and in a timely manner during implementation.

f) Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results

Among other factors, when relevant, the evaluation will consider a number of issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. The assessment of these issues can be integrated into the analyses of project design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and management as the evaluators deem them appropriate (it is not necessary, however it is possible to have a separate chapter on these aspects in the evaluation report). The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected project implementation and achievement of project results:

i. **Preparation and readiness / Quality at entry.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable, and feasible within its time frame? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?

ii. **Country ownership / drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country—or of participating countries, in the case of multi-country projects? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government—or governments in the case of multi-country projects—approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives?

iii. **Stakeholder involvement and consultation.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through continuous information sharing and consultation? Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Were the relevant

vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes involved in a participatory and consultative manner? Which stakeholders were involved in the project (e.g., NGOs, private sector, other UN Agencies) and what were their immediate tasks? Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, nongovernmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions?

iv. **Financial planning.** Did the project have appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds? Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised co-financing materialize? Specifically, the evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing.

v. **UNIDO's supervision and backstopping.** Did UNIDO staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did UNIDO staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time, and restructure the project when needed? Did UNIDO provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the project?

vi. **Co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability.** Did the project manage to mobilize the co-financing amount expected at the time of design/formulation/approval? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and the co-financing actually mobilized, what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

vii. **Delays and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, what were the reasons? Did the delays affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

viii. **Implementation and execution approach.** Is the implementation and execution approach chosen different from other implementation approaches applied by UNIDO and other agencies? Does the approach comply with the principles of the Paris Declaration? Is the implementation and execution approach in line with the relevant UNIDO regulations (DGAI.20 and Procurement Manual)? Does the approach promote local ownership and capacity building? Does the approach involve significant risks? In cases where Execution was done by third parties, i.e. Executing Partners, based on a contractual arrangement with UNIDO was this done in accordance with the contractual arrangement concluded with UNIDO in an effective and efficient manner

g) Project coordination and management

The extent to which:

i. The national management and overall coordination mechanisms have been efficient and effective? Did each partner have assigned roles and responsibilities from the beginning? Did each partner fulfil its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions, managing risks)?

ii. The UNIDO HQ-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (e.g. problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)?

C. Assessment of gender mainstreaming

The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected gender mainstreaming in the project:

   i.   Did the project/programme design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? If so, was gender considered at the level of project outcome, output or activity?

   ii.   Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)? Were there gender-related project indicators?

   iii. How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?

   iv.   Have women and men benefited equally from the project's interventions? Do the results affect women and men differently? If so, why and how? How are the results likely to affect gender relations (e.g., division of labour, decision-making authority)?

   v.   Are women/gender-focused groups, associations or gender units in partner organizations consulted/ included in the project?

   vi.   To what extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?

Further guidance on integrating gender is included in Annex 3.

V.   Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international senior evaluation consultant acting as the team leader, one international junior consultant. The consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions in Annex 5 to these terms of reference.

The evaluation team might be required to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including terminal evaluation verification on request to donors/partners up to three years after completion of the terminal evaluation.

Members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the projects/programme under evaluation.

The UNIDO project manager and the project teams in the participating country/-ies, Nepal, Bhutan and Maldives for SAARC III, Cambodia and Lao PDR for Mekong III, will support the evaluation team.

VI.   Time schedule

The evaluation is scheduled to take place in the last Quarter 2016. An evaluation field mission to the participating countries will be arranged during the evaluation conduct.

At the beginning of the evaluation, the team leader would come to Vienna for briefing with the project manager and the Independent Evaluation Division. At the end of the evaluation field mission, a local debriefing should be conducted inviting local stakeholders (incl. government and parties involved in the evaluation). After the evaluation mission, the international evaluation consultant will come to UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of the preliminary findings of the terminal evaluation. The draft TE report will be submitted 2 to 4 weeks after the end of the mission.

The draft TE report is to be shared with stakeholders (e.g. the UNIDO PM, ODG/EVQ/IEV and other relevant stakeholders. The ET is expected to revise the draft TE report based on the comments received, edit the language and form and submit the final version of the TE report in accordance with UNIDO Evaluation standards.

VII.   Deliverables and Reporting

Inception report

These terms of reference (TOR) provide some information on the evaluation methodology, but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager, the evaluation team will prepare a short inception report that will operationalize the TOR relating to the evaluation questions and provide information on what type of and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). It will be discussed with and approved by the responsible in the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

The inception report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework ("evaluation matrix"); division of work between the international evaluation consultants; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable[8].

Evaluation report and review procedures

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (the suggested report outline is in Annex 1 and circulated to relevant UNIDO staff and national stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to the evaluation team (c.c. ODG/EVQ/IEV) for their consideration and any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

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

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in Annex 1.

Evaluation work plan and deliverables

The "Evaluation Work Plan" includes the following main phases and products/deliverables:

1. <u>Desk review, briefing by project manager and development of methodology:</u> Following the receipt of all relevant documents, and consultation with the Project Manager about the documentation, including reaching an agreement on the methodology, the desk review could be completed.

---

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

2. <u>Inception report:</u> At the time of departure to the field mission, all the received material has been reviewed and consolidated into the Inception report.

3. <u>Field mission:</u> The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNIDO. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field missions, coordinate with the Government. At the end of each country visit, there will be a presentation (preferably in Power Point slides) of preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to the key stakeholders in the country where the project was implemented.

4. <u>Preliminary findings from the field missions</u>: Following the field missions, the key findings, conclusions and recommendations would be prepared (preferably in PowerPoint slides) and presented at UNIDO Headquarters.

5. <u>A draft terminal evaluation report</u> will be submitted electronically to the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and circulated to main stakeholders. For feedback and factual validation.

6. <u>Final terminal evaluation report</u>: considering/incorporating comments/feedback received.

Evaluation phases	Deliverables
Desk review	Inception evaluation report, including: • Development/fine-tuning of methodology approach and evaluation tools • Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during field mission
Briefing with UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, Project Managers and other key stakeholders at HQ, and with representatives from NORAD through telephone or skype.	
Data analysis	
Field mission Present preliminary findings and recommendations to key stakeholders in the field	Presentation of key findings to key stakeholders in the field.
Debriefing at UNIDO HQ	Presentation of key preliminary findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ (Additional interviews and analysis as needed)
Further Analysis of the data collected and report drafting	Draft terminal evaluation report
Report finalization (on the basis of feedback/comment received from stakeholders, including the NORAD)	Final terminal evaluation report

VIII. Quality assurance

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on methodology and process by the UNIDO, ODG/EVQ/IEV, providing inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report and evaluation report by UNIDO, ODG/EVQ/IEV). The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality, attached as Annex 3. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO, ODG/EVQ/IEV should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of

organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO's evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation report are reviewed by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.

Annex 1 - Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report

Executive summary
- ➤ Must provide a synopsis of the storyline which includes the main evaluation findings and recommendations
- ➤ Must present strengths and weaknesses of the project
- ➤ Must be self-explanatory and should be maximum 3-4 pages in length

I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process
- ➤ Information on the evaluation: why, when, by whom, etc.
- ➤ Scope and objectives of the evaluation, main questions to be addressed
- ➤ Information sources and availability of information
- ➤ Methodological remarks, limitations encountered and validity of the findings

II. Country and project background
- ➤ Brief country context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- ➤ Sector-specific issues of concern to the project[9] and important developments during the project implementation period
- ➤ Project summary:
  - o Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
  - o Brief description including history and previous cooperation
  - o Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
  - o Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of Government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
  - o Counterpart organization(s)

III. Project assessment
This is the key chapter of the report and should address all evaluation criteria and questions outlined in the TOR (see section VI - Project evaluation parameters). Assessment must be based on factual evidence collected and analyzed from different sources. The evaluators' assessment can be broken into the following sections:

A. Project identification and formulation
B. Project design
C. Implementation performance
   a) Relevance and ownership (report on the relevance of project towards countries and beneficiaries, country ownership, stakeholder involvement)
   b) Effectiveness (the extent to which the development intervention's objectives and deliverables were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance)
   c) Efficiency (report on the overall cost-benefit of the project and partner countries' contribution to the achievement of project objectives)
   d) Likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes (report on the risks and vulnerability of the project, considering the likely effects of sociopolitical and institutional changes in partner countries, and its impact on continuation of benefits after the project ends, specifically the financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks)
   e) Project coordination and management (Report on the project management conditions and achievements, and partner countries' commitment)
   f) Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems (report on M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and budgeting and funding for M&E activities)
   g) Monitoring of long-term changes

---

[9] Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g., relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives)

h) Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results (report on preparation and readiness / quality at entry, country ownership, stakeholder involvement, financial planning, UNIDO support, co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability, delays of project outcomes and sustainability, and implementation approach)

D. Gender mainstreaming

At the end of this chapter, an overall project achievement rating should be developed as required in Annex 2. The overall rating table required should be presented here.

IV. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

A. Conclusions

This section should include a storyline of the main evaluation conclusions related to the project's achievements and shortfalls. It is important to avoid providing a summary based on each and every evaluation criterion. The main conclusions should be cross-referenced to relevant sections of the evaluation report.

B. Recommendations

This section should be succinct and contain few key recommendations. They should be:
➤ Based on evaluation findings
➤ Realistic and feasible within a project context
➤ Indicating institution(s) responsible for implementation (addressed to a specific officer, group or entity who can act on it) and have a proposed timeline for implementation if possible
➤ Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
➤ Taking resource requirements into account.

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:
o UNIDO
o Government and/or counterpart organizations
o Donor

C. Lessons learned

➤ Lessons learned must be of wider applicability beyond the evaluated project but must be based on findings and conclusions of the evaluation
➤ For each lesson, the context from which they are derived should be briefly stated

Annexes should include the evaluation TOR, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, a summary of project identification and financial data, including an updated table of expenditures to date, and other detailed quantitative information. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

Annex 2 – Rating tables

Ratings will be presented in the form of tables with each of the criteria / aspects rated separately and with **brief justifications for the rating** based on the findings and the main analyses (see Table 1 to Table 3) below. Table 4 presents the template for summarizing the overall ratings.

Table 1. Rating criteria for Quality of project identification and formulation process

Evaluation issue	Evaluator's comments	Ratings
1. Extent to which the situation, problem, need / gap is clearly identified, analysed and documented (evidence, references).		
2. Adequacy and clarity of the stakeholder analysis (clear identification of end-users, beneficiaries, sponsors, partners, and clearly defined roles and responsibilities in the project(s)).		
3. Adequacy of project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) design.		
4. Overall LFA design process.		

Table 2. Quality of project design

Evaluation issue	Evaluator's comments	Rating
1. Clarity and adequacy of **outcome** (clear, realistic, relevant, addressing the problem identified). Does it provide a clear description of the benefit or improvement that will be achieved after project completion?		
2. Clarity and adequacy of **outputs** (realistic, measurable, adequate for leading to the achievement of the **outcome**).		
3. Clarity, consistency and logic of the **objective tree**, and its reflexion in the LFM results hierarchy from **activities** to **outputs**, to **outcome** and to **overall objective**.		
4. **Indicators** are SMART for Outcome and Output levels.		
5. Adequacy of **Means of Verification and Assumptions** (including important external factors and risks).		
6. Overall LFM design quality.		

Table 3. Quality of project implementation performance

Evaluation criteria	Rating	
7. **Ownership and relevance**: to national development priorities and Government strategies; to target groups; to UNIDO's mandate and thematic priorities; to Donor's priorities; counterpart(s) were appropriately involved in the identification of critical problem areas and in the development of implementation strategies; supported actively project implementation including through in-kind and cash contributions; and the project(s) / programme are relevant to the ISID agenda).		
8. **Effectiveness**: objectives and final results at the end of the project (outputs were produced; outcome(s) were achieved or are likely to be achieved through the operation of outputs; and the project/programme contributed to inclusive and sustainable industrial development).		
9. **Efficiency** (UNIDO, Donors, implementing agencies and counterpart inputs have been provided as planned and were adequate to meet requirements; the quality of UNIDO, Donors, implementing agencies and counterpart inputs and services (expertise, training, methodologies, etc.) was as planned and led to the production of outputs; UNIDO procurement services were provided as planned and were adequate in terms of timing, value, process issues, responsibilities; the project used the most cost-efficient option and was cost-effective etc.).		
10. **Impact** (which long term developmental changes, e.g. economic, environmental, social and inclusiveness, have occurred or are likely to occur as a result of the intervention).		
11. **Likelihood of/ risks to sustainability** (results achieved so far are sustainable; the project was replicated/had a multiplying effect; a sustainability strategy was formulated; and what are the prospects/riks for technical, organizational, financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental sustainability).		
12. **Project management** (the national management and overall field coordination mechanisms of the project have been efficient and effective; the UNIDO management, coordination, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient and effective; changes in planning documents during implementation have been approved and documented; and synergy benefits can be found in relation to other UNIDO activities in the country or elsewhere).		
13. **M&E** (monitoring and self-evaluation was carried out based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and		

Evaluation criteria	Rating	
objectives; M&E activities were documented; and M&E information was used for project steering and adaptive management).		

Table 4. Overall ratings

Criterion	Evaluator's summary comments	Evaluator 's rating
Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating), sub criteria (below)		
Project implementation		
• Effectiveness		
• Relevance		
• Efficiency		
Sustainability of project outcomes (overall rating), sub criteria (below)		
• Financial risks		
• Sociopolitical risks		
• Institutional framework and governance risks		
• Environmental risks		
Monitoring and evaluation (overall rating), sub criteria (below)		
• M&E Design		
• M&E Plan implementation (use for adaptive management)		
• Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
Project Formulation		
• LFA (Situation, stakeholder, problem and objective analyses / Preparation and readiness)		
Project Design		
• Project Design (LFM, main elements of the project, i.e. overall objective, outcomes, outputs, their causal relationship, indicators, means of verification and assumptions)		
Project management - UNIDO specific ratings		
• Implementation approach		
• UNIDO Supervision and backstopping		
Overall Project rating		

RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

- Highly satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

- Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

- Moderately satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

- Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

- Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

- Highly unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Please note: Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits beyond project completion. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes.

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria
On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

- Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

- Moderately likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

- Moderately unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project M&E system will be rated on M&E design, M&E plan implementation and budgeting and funding for M&E activities as follows:

- Highly satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Highly unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

M&E plan implementation will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on M&E plan implementation.

All other ratings will be on the following six-point scale:

HS	= Highly satisfactory	Excellent
S	= Satisfactory	Well above average
MS	= Moderately satisfactory	Average
MU	= Moderately unsatisfactory	Below average
U	= Unsatisfactory	Poor
HU	= Highly unsatisfactory	Very poor (appalling)

Annex 3 – Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and programmes

A. Introduction

Gender equality is internationally recognized as a goal of development and is fundamental to sustainable growth and poverty reduction. The UNIDO Policy on gender equality and the empowerment of women and its addendum, issued respectively in April 2009 and May 2010 (UNIDO/DGB(M).110 and UNIDO/DGB(M).110/Add.1), provides the overall guidelines for establishing a gender mainstreaming strategy and action plans to guide the process of addressing gender issues in the Organization's industrial development interventions.

According to the UNIDO Policy on gender equality and the empowerment of women:

Gender equality refers to the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys. Equality does not suggest that women and men become 'the same' but that women's and men's rights, responsibilities and opportunities do not depend on whether they are born male or female. Gender equality implies that the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are taken into consideration, recognizing the diversity of different groups of women and men. It is therefore not a 'women's issues'. On the contrary, it concerns and should fully engage both men and women and is a precondition for, and an indicator of sustainable people-centered development.

Empowerment of women signifies women gaining power and control over their own lives. It involves awareness-raising, building of self-confidence, expansion of choices, increased access to and control over resources and actions to transform the structures and institutions which reinforce and perpetuate gender discriminations and inequality.

Gender parity signifies equal numbers of men and women at all levels of an institution or organization, particularly at senior and decision-making levels.

The UNIDO projects/programmes can be divided into two categories: 1) those where promotion of gender equality is one of the key aspects of the project/programme; and 2) those where there is limited or no attempted integration of gender. Evaluation managers/evaluators should select relevant questions depending on the type of interventions.

B. Gender responsive evaluation questions

The questions below will help evaluation managers/evaluators to mainstream gender issues in their evaluations.

B.1 Design

- Is the project/programme in line with the UNIDO and national policies on gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- Were gender issues identified at the design stage?
- Did the project/programme design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? If so, how?
- Were adequate resources (e.g., funds, staff time, methodology, experts) allocated to address gender concerns?
- To what extent were the needs and priorities of women, girls, boys and men reflected in the design?
- Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)?
- If the project/programme is people-centered, were target beneficiaries clearly identified and disaggregated by sex, age, race, ethnicity and socio-economic group?

- If the project/programme promotes gender equality and/or women's empowerment, was gender equality reflected in its objective/s? To what extent are output/outcome indicators gender disaggregated?

B.2 Implementation management

- Did project monitoring and self-evaluation collect and analyse gender disaggregated data?
- Were decisions and recommendations based on the analyses? If so, how?
- Were gender concerns reflected in the criteria to select beneficiaries? If so, how?
- How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?
- If the project/programme promotes gender equality and/or women's empowerment, did the project/programme monitor, assess and report on its gender related objective/s?

B.3 Results

- Have women and men benefited equally from the project's interventions? Do the results affect women and men differently? If so, why and how? How are the results likely to affect gender relations (e.g., division of labour, decision making authority)?
- In the case of a project/programme with gender related objective/s, to what extent has the project/programme achieved the objective/s? To what extent has the project/programme reduced gender disparities and enhanced women's empowerment?

Annex 4 – Checklist on terminal evaluation report quality

Independent terminal evaluation of UNIDO project:
Project Title:
UNIDO Project NO:
UNIDO SAP ID:

Evaluation team leader:
Quality review done by:
Date:

CHECKLIST ON EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
A. Was the report well-structured and properly written? (Clear language, correct grammar, clear and logical structure)		
B. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?		
C. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?		
D. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?		
E. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes or did it explain why this is not (yet) possible? (Including assessment of assumptions, risks and impact drivers)		
F. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?		
G. Did the report include the actual project costs (total, per activity, per source)?		
H. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of both the M&E plan at entry and the system used during the implementation? Was the M&E sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation?		
I. Quality of the lessons: were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
J. Quality of the recommendations: did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can these be immediately implemented with current resources?		
K. Are the main cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights and environment, appropriately covered?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner?		

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
(Observance of deadlines)		

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.

Annex 5 – Job descriptions

UNIDO

UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	International evaluation consultant, team leader
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Missions:	Missions to Vienna, Austria and Nepal, Bhutan, Maldives, Lao PDR, Cambodia
Start of Contract (EOD):	September 29, 2016
End of Contract (COB):	December 31, 2016
Number of Working Days:	70 working days spread over 3 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EVQ/IEV) 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. Evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of a programme, a project or a theme. Independent evaluations provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. ODG/EVQ/IEV is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

PROJECT CONTEXT

106034 – SAARC III

UNIDO, through funding from Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) is providing development assistance to the least developed nations of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) - Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives, and Nepal. The project is intended to improve Standards, Metrology, Testing, and Quality (SMTQ) through implementation of internationally accepted Metrology institutes, Standards development institutes, Food safety testing facilities, Product certification, Certification to Management System Standards (MSS).

Phase I and II of the UNIDO SAARC SMTQ project achieved much progress in having appropriate laws and regulations drafted with some already put into place for metrology and food safety, providing training to key staff, facilitating companies to achieve MSS certification, and acquiring appropriate laboratory equipment. The initiatives for Bangladesh are considered complete, with additional time needed for Bhutan, Maldives, and Nepal due to delays caused by organizational changes and uncertain political situations.

The ongoing Phase III has built on the achievements of Phase II and the lessons learned to establish the desired SMTQ infrastructure and ensure measures are in place to make the initiatives sustainable using local resources.

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

106078 – Mekong III

UNIDO is providing technical assistance to overcome market entry barriers by developing country capacities related to standards, metrology, testing, quality and conformity assessment. Based on a trust fund contribution from NORAD, a regional project in this area has been approved for Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam. Phase I of this intervention ($920,000) and Phase II (approx. US$ 1.5 MN) were completed in December 2005 and June 2011 respectively.

The Phases I and II of the UNIDO/NORAD initiative (Mekong Phase I and II) focused on establishing a National Quality Infrastructure (NQI) and the setting up of the required legal framework for policy and institutional building related to Standards, Metrology, Testing and Quality (SMTQ). The initiative also assisted the countries to a good extent in facing the key challenges of complying with the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) and Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) agreement requirements, which are now global trade embedded market requirements. A well-established NQI also became all the more important with the WTO accession of Cambodia in 2004 and Lao PDR in 2012. Both countries are fully committed to implement the TBT and SPS agreements.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
Review project documentation and relevant country background information (legislative and regulatory framework relevant to project's activities, national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key assessment instruments (questionnaires, logic models, surveys, samples…) to collect these data through surveys and interviews during and prior to the field mission.	• Adjust table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; • Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions;	8 days	Home-based
2. Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ. Preparation of the Inception Report.	• Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning; • Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant. • Inception Report.	3 days (2 days in Vienna, 1 day home-based)	Vienna, Austria and home-based
3. Conduct field mission to Nepal, Bhutan, Maldives, Lao PDR, Cambodia in **October 2016**[10].	• Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; • Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation	32 days	Nepal, Bhutan, Maldives, Lao PDR, Cambodia

---

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

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
	report and the distribution of writing tasks; • Evaluation presentation of the evaluation's initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country, at the end of the mission.		
4.Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.	After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed.	2 days	Vienna, Austria
5. Prepare the evaluation report, with inputs from the National Consultant, according to the TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the National Consultant and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report. Share the evaluation report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.	• Draft evaluation reports.	15 days	Home-based
6. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	• Final evaluation reports for SAARC III and Mekong III.	5 days	Home-based
1. Prepare, lead and conduct a learning workshop with PTC/TII: Maximizing project performance and results – Lessons and Good Practices from evaluations and reviews of UNIDO Quality Infrastructure projects (to be further defined). Hold a workshop for TII department on lessons learned and findings of several evaluations and reviews to maximize "performance and results of TII projects" through Results-Based Management.	• Concept and outline of the learning workshop is developed. • Evaluation findings are summarized into a presentation on lessons, good practices and practical guidance for project manager to improve future projects. The focus is on project design and results-based monitoring and evaluation during implementation.	5 days (4 days home-based, 1 day in Vienna to be combined with the de-briefing in 4).	Home-based and Vienna
	TOTAL	70 days	

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education:

Advanced degree in science, management, law, development studies or related areas.

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 10 years' experience in the evaluation of development projects
- Good practical understanding of technical assistance in quality infrastructure development
- Knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset
- Familiarity with multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks
- Working experience in developing countries

Languages:

Fluency in written and spoken English is required.

Reporting and deliverables

1) At the beginning of the assignment the Consultant will submit a concise Inception Report that will outline the general methodology and presents a concept Table of Contents;

2) The country assignment will have the following deliverables:
- Presentation of initial findings of the mission to key national stakeholders;
- Draft report;
- Final report, comprising of executive summary, findings regarding design, implementation and results, conclusions and recommendations.

3) Debriefing at UNIDO HQ:
- Presentation (slides) and discussion of findings;

All reports and related documents must be in English and presented in electronic format.

Absence of conflict of interest:

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

UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	International evaluation consultant
Main Duty Station and Location:	HQ and Home-based
Missions:	Missions to Nepal and Cambodia
Start of Contract (EOD):	September 15, 2016
End of Contract (COB):	December 31, 2016
Number of Working Days:	36 working days spread over 4 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EVQ/IEV) is responsible for the implementation of independent evaluations 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. Evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of a programme, a project or a theme. Independent evaluations provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. ODG/EVQ/IEV is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

PROJECT CONTEXT

106034 – SAARC III

UNIDO, through funding from Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) is providing development assistance to the least developed nations of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) - Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives, and Nepal. The project is intended to improve Standards, Metrology, Testing, and Quality (SMTQ) through implementation of internationally accepted Metrology institutes, Standards development institutes, Food safety testing facilities, Product certification, Certification to Management System Standards (MSS)

Phase I and II of the UNIDO SAARC SMTQ project achieved much progress in having appropriate laws and regulations drafted with some already put into place for metrology and food safety, providing training to key staff, facilitating companies to achieve MSS certification, and acquiring appropriate laboratory equipment. The initiatives for Bangladesh are considered complete, with additional time needed for Bhutan, Maldives, and Nepal due to delays caused by organizational changes and uncertain political situations.

The ongoing Phase III has built on the achievements of Phase II and the lessons learned to establish the desired SMTQ infrastructure and ensure measures are in place to make the initiatives sustainable using local resources.

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

106078 – Mekong III

UNIDO is providing technical assistance to overcome market entry barriers by developing country capacities related to standards, metrology, testing, quality and conformity assessment. Based on a trust fund contribution from NORAD, a regional project in this area has been approved for Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam. Phase I of this intervention ($920,000) and Phase II (approx. US$ 1.5 MN) were completed in December 2005 and June 2011 respectively.

The Phases I and II of the UNIDO/NORAD initiative (Mekong Phase I and II) focused on establishing a National Quality Infrastructure (NQI) and the setting up of the required legal framework for policy and institutional building related to Standards, Metrology, Testing and Quality (SMTQ). The initiative also assisted the countries to a good extent in facing the key challenges of complying with the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) and Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) agreement requirements, which are now global trade embedded market requirements. A well-established NQI also became all the more important with the WTO accession of Cambodia in 2004 and Lao PDR in 2012. Both countries are fully committed to implement the TBT and SPS agreements.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Under the supervision and coordination of the Senior International Evaluation Consultant and Team Leader (ETL):

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key assessment instruments (questionnaires, logic models, surveys, samples…) to collect these data through surveys and interviews during and prior to the field mission; Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project's activities and analyze other background info.	Inputs to the ETL on: • Adjust table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; • Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions; • Brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework.	8	Home-based
2. Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ. (This may be handled through email and skype conferences, depending on final costs) Preparation of the Inception Report, together with the team leader.	Inputs to the ETL on: • Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning; • Division of evaluation tasks with the team leader. • Inception Report	2	Home-based
3. Conduct field mission to Cambodia, Bhutan.	Together with the ETL: • Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; • Agreement with the team leader on the structure and	14	Nepal, Cambodia

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
	content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; • Evaluation presentation of the evaluation's initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country, at the end of the mission.		
5. Prepare the evaluation report, together with the team leader, according to the TOR; Share the evaluation report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.	Inputs to the ETL on: • Draft evaluation report.	10	Home-based
6. Revise the draft project evaluation report, together with the team leader, based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	Inputs to the ETL on: • Final evaluation report.	2	Home-based
	TOTAL	36	

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education:

Advanced degree on development studies or related areas

Technical and functional experience:

• Minimum of 5 years' experience in the field of industrial development and evaluation, including experience at the international level involving technical cooperation in developing countries
• Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks
• Working experience in developing countries

Languages:

Fluency in written and spoken English is required.

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

Annex 6 – Project results framework

106034 - SAARC III

Bhutan	Baseline	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Development goal/impact Improvement of SMTQ infrastructure to: enhance food safety system, support exports, assure fair trade quantities, improve products and operations, and foster a culture of continuous improvement	SMTQ infrastructure has been established and improved through UNIDO projects and other assistance, however, it is not complete and has not yet achieved a sustainable base	To assure safe food for the market To improve export opportunities To improve effectiveness of companies and organizations To support accurate measurements To achieve international credibility and acceptance of claims	Incidents related to food safety Increased exports Take-up of management system standards	Food department records Government reports Company/organization claims	

Bhutan	Baseline	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Outcome I **Bhutan will have food assessment facilities capable of identifying unsafe and unwanted foods, quantity statements acceptable to all purchasers, certified products freely traded, and a strategy to improve business and government through use of Management System Standards**	Basic food safety is assured through new laws, regulations, and an accredited food testing facility (BAFRA)	To ensure unsafe food is not dumped into the country, nor unknowingly produced.	Accreditation to a full set of parameters	Accreditation Body	It is assumed that other countries will continuously improve their assessment capacity of unfit food with the result that non-conforming shipments will be directed at countries with poor laws and inadequate testing ability
	Bhutan has limited metrology capacity in the capital that is recognized only in Bhutan	Ensure fair national trade and foreign acceptance of stated quantities	Inspections in remote regions Accreditation to ISO/IEC 17025	Certification certificates Accreditation Body Records	
	Bhutan operates a product listing service specific to Bhutan	Achieve free access to target markets (India) by replacing the product listing service with a product certification scheme backed by international accreditation and negotiate mutual acceptance of certifications by major trading partners	Exports of construction products to India accepted without restriction	Export Records	

Bhutan	Baseline	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
	Internationally recognized Management Systems have started to gain recognition in Bhutan with a few enterprises certified. Bhutan's quest for GNH has many overlaps with established MSS	MSS have the potential to assist enterprise (private and governmental) to become more efficient and effective, with internationally backstopped certification of MSS opening the doors to international trade of high value products.	Access to affordable training Access to affordable certification Use of MSS for private enterprise improvement Use of MSS for government operations and continual improvement	National Offerings Accreditation Body or Contract Industry claims Government requirements and records	It is assumed that industry associations will support promotion of MSS for both access to export markets and organizational improvement (continual) It is assumed that government will recognize the continuous improvement achieved through the plan-do-check-act cycle of MSS as supportive of their aims
Output 1 (BAFRA) **Published regulations along with accredited testing capacity to detect residues, additives, pesticides and contaminants**	Published regulations available on BAFRA website are dated 2007 Regulation requires BAFRA inspection of food handling facilities BAFRA has achieved (February, 2013) accreditation	Publish regulations based on Codex Alimentarius Commission requirements and Bhutanese law to provide clarity on requirements for all concerned. Regulations accepting 3rd party certification to HACCP or ISO 22000 as evidence of compliance to encourage (and reward) voluntary implementation of good food handling practices as an alternative to BAFRA site inspection Augment the food testing	Regulations based on CAC standards publicly available Scope of Accreditation	BAFRA website Accreditation Body	It is assumed the published regulations will be kept up to date on an ongoing basis and that affected parties (importers, producers, food establishments) are able to access BAFRA website It is assumed that 3rd party certification services will be available from BSB and overseas providers on a basis that is commercially viable for the certified facility; also, that BAFRA will gain confidence in BSB certifications through provision of experts for BSB audits

48

Bhutan	Baseline	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
	to ISO/IEC 17025 for basic food safety (25 parameters). Specialized testing equipment is idle for extended periods due to previously trained equipment operators finding new employment	capability to be comparable to that of trading partners (existing and potential) Implement policy to ensure continuous availability of trained laboratory equipment operators	Qualified equipment operators available 90% of working schedule for each parameter included in scope of accreditation	BAFRA records	It is assumed that export markets will require increasingly sophisticated verification of food products and that capacity at entry points to identify suspect shipments is also established It is assumed that equipment operators trained elsewhere will be able to train back-up operators
Output 2 (BSB) **Nation-wide, internationally based metrology system, construction products certification scheme for regional market, Use of Management System Standards to support organizational continual improvements of**	BSB Metrology Laboratory is subject to frequent vibration, affecting testing Calibration certificates are accepted in Nepal but not by trading partners Measuring instruments in remote regions have unknown accuracies (not calibrated)	Move the laboratory to an adjacent facility that does not house vibration inducing equipment Reduce the cost to export products through affordable calibration services that have international recognition Provide means for metrology inspectors to access remote regions	Vibration status of building Accreditation of BSB metrology laboratory to ISO/IEC 17025 Status of calibration of measuring instruments	BSB records Accreditation Body Calibration certificates (seals) attached to instruments BSB calibration records	It is assumed that vibrations from existing building will not transmit to the adjacent building It is assumed that the price for BSB calibration will be lower than foreign calibration service providers It is assumed that the ongoing cost associated with a mobile laboratory is less than the business cost to transport measuring equipment to and from a central laboratory along with associated waiting costs

Bhutan	Baseline	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Bhutanese organizations	Testing laboratory in support of product listing scheme has limited product testing capacity, and there is preliminary work on certification capacity	Construction products of defined quality providing assurance to the construction industry in Bhutan and trading partners	Certified products Accreditation to ISO/IEC 17065 Product acceptance in Bhutan and by trading partners	BSB records Accreditation Body BSB records Agreements with trading partners for mutual acceptance of Certifications	It is assumed the construction products industry understands the advantages of certification over a listing service
	BSB has staff familiar with MSS, but limited capacity The potential market for MSS training and certification and price/cost parameters are unknown The few companies certified to an MSS are satisfied with the results Limited awareness of value of Management System Standards to align organizations with strategic	An affordable Certification Body to provide independent credibility to claims of conformance to MSS. Determine the market opportunities for MSS training and certification along with establishing acceptable price levels and costs to operate Bhutan's quest for GNH has many overlaps with established MSS Importers, especially in developed countries prefer products from companies that implement MSS to organize their operations	Accreditation to ISO/IEC 17021 or contract with a Foreign CB Certified organizations, 5 per year Business case for national training organization Use of MSS for government procurement and operations 2 departments per year Use of MSS to support Brand Bhutan, Seal of Quality, and Seal of Excellence Promotional brochure based on success stories	Accreditation Body or Contract BSB website or contracted CB BSB documents Government requirements and records Requirement packages BSB Publications	

Bhutan	Baseline	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
	objectives and societal goals as well as ensuring continuous improvement				

Maldives	Baseline	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Outcome 2 **The Maldives will have food assessment facilities capable of identifying unsafe and unwanted foods, quantity statements acceptable to all purchasers, and a strategy to improve exports of fish through use of Management System Standards**	Basic food safety is assured through draft new laws, regulations, and an accredited food testing facility (MFDA)	To ensure unsafe food is not dumped into the country, nor unknowingly produced.	Accreditation to a full set of parameters	Accreditation Body	It is assumed that other countries will continuously improve their assessment capacity of unfit food with the result that non-conforming shipments will be directed at countries with poor laws and inadequate testing ability

	The Maldives have limited metrology capacity in the capital that is recognized only in Bhutan, and are implementing a system of trained inspectors in the regions	Ensure fair national trade and foreign acceptance of stated quantities	Inspections in remote regions Accreditation to ISO/IEC 17025	Certification certificates Accreditation Body Records	
	A lucrative export market of fresh and frozen tuna to Europe has been established; it relies on MSS Certifications The traditional fishery is transitioning to processing the catch in-country into fish products	Affordable MSS certification services will permit potential participants to enter markets and permit existing participants to continue exporting	Certification of Exporters	Certification Body records	It is assumed that opening the fishery to the 200 mile limit will increase the sustainable catch of yellowfin tuna It is assumed the harvest of small fish remains sustainable
Output 3 (MDFA) **Published laws and regulations along with accredited testing capacity to detect residues, additives, pesticides and contaminants**	A food safety law and accompanying regulations are drafted MFDA is accredited to address basic food safety	Publish laws and regulations based on relevant Codex Alimentarius Commission requirements to provide clarity for all concerned, Augment testing capacity to be comparable to that of trading partners	Law based on CAC standards Publicly available regulations Shipments (export and import) refused due to non-compliance Expanded scope of accreditation of MFDA	Ministry of Health records MFDA website MFDA records Accreditation Body	It is assumed that affected parties (importers, food handling establishments) are able to access the MFDA website

Output 4 (Polytechnic and MSMA) **Measuring Instruments used in the Maldives calibrated with international acceptance of calibration certificates**	Polytechnic assigned to provide metrology lab, most instruments are in place Calibrations of instruments In remote areas to be done by employees of Atolls Councils Calibrations are performed in Male; however are not traceable	Reduce the cost to export products through lower cost calibration services that have international acceptance Provide means for calibration of measuring instruments in remote areas through a policy to ensure continuous availability of metrology inspectors and a training program for them	Accreditation of Polytechnic metrology laboratory to ISO/IEC 17025 Status of calibration of measuring instruments	Accreditation Body Calibration records of MSMA and Atolls	It is assumed that trained metrology inspectors will have a continuous presence in each designated Atoll

Nepal	Baseline	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Outcome 3 **Nepal will have food assessment facilities capable of identifying unsafe and unwanted foods, products supported by test certificates, certified products freely traded, and training and certification capacity to improve business through use of Management System Standards**	Basic food safety is assured through laws, daft new regulations, and an accredited food testing facility (DFTQC)	To ensure unsafe food is not dumped into the country, nor unknowingly produced.	Accreditation to a full set of parameters	Accreditation Body	It is assumed that other countries will continuously improve their assessment capacity of unfit food with the result that non-conforming shipments will be directed at countries with poor laws and inadequate testing ability
	NBSM Testing Laboratory is well on the way to international recognition with specialty in Pashmina testing	To support development of Pashmina (and other) industry through testing in support of exports, product development, and certification	Accreditation	Accreditation Body	
	NBSM Product Certification Accreditation is in progress	Achieve free access to target markets (India) with a product certification scheme backed by international accreditation and a bilateral agreement Support nationally produced products for both export and	Exports of construction products to India accepted without restriction	Export Records	It is assumed that product certification will be affordable

		national use			
	NBSM now certifies to ISO 9001 (February 2013) and is considering other MSS The market potential is not clearly understood	MSS have the potential to assist enterprise to become more efficient and effective, with internationally backstopped certification of MSS opening the doors to international trade of high value products	Access to affordable training Access to affordable certification Use of MSS for private enterprise improvement	National Offerings Accreditation Body or Contract Industry claims	It is assumed that industry associations will support promotion of MSS for both access to export markets and organizational improvement (continual)
Output 5 (DFTQC) **Published regulations along with accredited testing capacity to detect residues, additives, pesticides and contaminants**	Draft regulations are in progress. Improvements have been made to food safety testing and assessment capacity to test for basic food safety parameters Excessive turnover of trained laboratory equipment operators	Publish regulations based on Codex Alimentarius Commission requirements to provide clarity for all concerned Regulations accepting 3rd party certification to HACCP or ISO 22000 as evidence of compliance to encourage (and reward) voluntary implementation of good food handling practices Augment testing capacity to be comparable to that of trading partners	Regulations based on CAC standards publicly available Food establishments certified to HACCP and ISO 22000 Scope of Accreditation	DFTQC website NBSM records Accreditation Body	It is assumed that affected parties (importers, producers, food establishments) are able to access the DFTQC website It is assumed that 3rd party certification services will be available from NBSM and foreign CBs on a basis that is commercially viable for the certified facilities

		Implement policy to ensure continuous availability of trained laboratory equipment operators	Equipment list indicating trained operators	DFTQC records	It is assumed that export markets will require increasingly sophisticated verification of food products It is assumed that laboratory equipment operators trained elsewhere will be able to train backup operators
Output 6 (NBSM) **Improved training and conformance capacity for:** **- product testing** **- product certification** **- Management Systems**	Laboratory is in process of acquiring ISO/IEC 17025 accreditation with scope for textile testing Improvements required in some areas	Internationally recognized laboratory (ISO/IEC 17025 accredited) to issue credible certificates in support of exports, to assist product development, and to assess products for certification To fully support Pashmina industry through testing services	Scope of Accreditation	Accreditation Body	It is assumed that the Pashmina industry will continue its good relationship with NBSM
	Accreditation for Product Certification is in process	Internationally recognized body (ISO/IEC 17065 accredited to certify nationally produced products for both export and national use To support exports of construction products and	Scope of Accreditation Pashmina exports (certified and non-certified) Value of exports supported by Nepalese issued certificates/certification	Accreditation Body Industry association records NBSM records Government export records	It is assumed that products for use in Nepal will be certified to requirements equivalent to those of its trading partners

56

		acceptance in national market through scope extension	Products certified	NBSM records	
	NBSM has achieved accreditation to ISO/IEC 17021 (Management Systems) to certify organizations to ISO 9001 (February 2013) and is looking to expand to other MSS Preparations have started through personnel training and research Market potential is not clearly understood	To improve operations of Nepalese companies/organizations through training for MSS and certification To support exports of food products through MSS certifications Training program to facilitate uptake of MSS to improve operational effectiveness and efficiency of Nepalese organizations	Use of MSS (certified and non-certified) Value of food exports (certified and non-certified) Scope of Accreditation	NBSM records Company Claims Government export records Accreditation Body	It is assumed that the price for certification will be affordable

106078 - Mekong III

Mekong Lao PDR

	Objective Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Indicators	Sources and Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
To facilitate the industrial development, consumer protection and enhancement of export capabilities through further strengthening of national quality infrastructure and human capacities related to standards, metrology, testing and quality	The increased number of internationally accredited laboratories The decreased number of export rejection in the targeted commodities under the project Number of national standards developed and published	Note: Baseline indicator data and the actual export figures will be defined at the start of the project.	Issued certificate of accreditation EU/USA Japan database on export rejection	
Outcome 1 **Improvement of quality of products and protection of consumers in respect of safety and health services.**	**5 new Lao standards formulated and 18 standards developed in Phase II approved** **Product certification scheme expanded by 3 product categories.** **20 ISO/IEC standards obtained**	**10 standards have been approved so far** **QC product certification scheme has not been accredited yet against ISO Guide 65.**	**Annual report of Dept. of Standards (DOS)** **Certificates of accreditation Project progress report**	**It is assumed that Dept. of Standards (DOS) and Quality Center (QC) are committed to take all the necessary actions in time to implement the planned project activities**

Output 1 Division of Standards (DOS) is supported in developing and disseminating standards for key export products	At least 10 standards supplied 10 products tested 5 new Lao standards formulated and 18 standards developed in the Phase II approved	20 standards have been formulated and 10 standards have been approved	Project progress report	Inadequate number of staff at DOS Non- availability of translators
Output 2 Quality Centre (QC) is supported in identifying new product categories and expanding accreditation	At least 3 product categories identified for product certification. Assessment for accreditation conducted	The product certification scheme of the Quality Centre has not been accredited against ISO Guide 65.	Project progress report Accreditation certificate	It is assumed that there is growing demand for product certification for the 3 product categories to be selected.
Output 3 Information and Training Centre (ITC) is supported to develop standards library	At least 20 documents supplied At least 3 ITC staff members trained.	The ITC standards library which belonged to the DSQ earlier consists of approximately 100 foreign national standards and sixty ISO standards	Project progress report Annual report of ITC	Availability of staff for training
Outcome 2 **Improvement of measurement accuracy, international traceability and consumer**	**Industrial metrology laboratory at Metrology Centre enhanced and accredited in mass and**	**Metrology Centre has not been accredited yet**	**Annual reports of Metrology Center and Dept. of Metrology.**	**It is assumed that the metrology center and DM are committed to implement the planned project activities in time**

protection	temperature fields. **Legal metrology services of the Division of Consumer Protection (DCP) strengthened with equipment and 20 staff trained**	**Metrology law has been promulgated.** **Provincial metrology offices do not have equipment and trained staff.**	**Certificate of accreditation** **Project progress report**	
Output 4 Metrology Centre is supported for accreditation	Equipment for electrical lab in place 5 MC staff members trained Assessment for accreditation conducted	Electrical lab possesses only minimal equipment. MC staff have been trained for electrical meter testing only. Metrology Centre has not been accredited yet	Project progress report NTA report	There is a risk that trained personnel may leave MC after receiving training. It is assumed that efforts will be made to retain the personnel by discussing possible incentive measures with the MC management.
Output 5 Division of Consumer Protection (DCP) is supported	Equipment for provincial metrology offices (at least 10) in place At least 20 DCP staff members trained.	Although the Metrology Law has been promulgated, the provincial metrology offices do not possess equipment and trained staff for its enforcement**.**	Project progress report NTA report	It is assumed that adequate personnel will be deployed for legal metrology services.

Outcome 4				
Improved capability of Lao PDR exporters to meet international requirements for trade	**Facility for testing of coffee developed.** **Chemical laboratory at Food & Drug Quality Control Centre (FDQCC) enhanced and accredited in 2 scopes of testing.** **SDMT upgraded with equipment and accredited in two scopes of testing.**	**At present, no facility for coffee testing is available.** **Chemical laboratory of FDQCC has not been accredited yet** **SDMT has not been accredited yet**	**Annual report of FDQCC** **Certificate of accreditation** **Project progress report**	**It is assumed that FDQCC and SDMT are committed to implement the planned project activities in time**
Output 6 Lao Coffee Association (LCA) is supported for establishment of a coffee testing laboratory	Consultancy service provided to set up a coffee testing laboratory Test equipments are installed and commissioned	Presently there is no testing facility for coffee testing in the main coffee growing areas (Pakse province)	Project progress report NTA report	Commitment of LCA to provide a building to house the test facility. Non-availability of suitably qualified personnel to manage and engage in testing

Output 7				
Food Chemistry Section of Food & Drug Quality Control Centre (FDQCC) is supported	Equipment for chemicals testing in place	Advanced chemical test equipment is not available at FDQCC.	Project progress report NTA report	There is a risk that trained personnel may leave the laboratory after receiving training. It is assumed that efforts will be made to retain the personnel by discussing possible incentive measures with the laboratory management.
	At least 5 staff members of FDQCC trained	Staff trained in advanced techniques not available.		
	Assessment of FDQCC for accreditation is conducted.	Chemical laboratory of FDQCC has not been accredited yet		
Output 8				
Survey Design and Materials Testing (SDMT) is supported for accreditation	At least 5 staff members of SDMT trained	Present SDMT staff have mainly received on the job training.	Project progress report Accreditation certificate NTA report	There is a risk that trained personnel may leave SDMT after receiving training. It is assumed that efforts will be made to retain the personnel by discussing possible incentive measures with the SDMT management.
	SDMT participated in an inter laboratory comparison program	SDMT has not participated in an international inter laboratory comparison program.		
	Assessment of SDMT for accreditation conducted.	SDMT has not been accredited against ISO/IEC 17025.		

Mekong Cambodia

Objective/ Impact	Objective Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Indicators	Sources and Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
To facilitate the industrial development, consumer protection and enhancement of export capabilities through further strengthening of national quality infrastructure and human capacities related to standards, metrology, testing and quality	The increased number of internationally accredited test parameters. The decreased number of export rejection in the targeted commodities under the project.	Note: Baseline indicator data and the actual export figures will be defined at the start of the project.	Issued certificates of accreditation EU/USA/Japan database on export rejection	
Outcome 1 **Improvement of quality of products and protection of consumers in respect of safety and health**	**40 standards published 3 product categories accredited against ISO/IEC Guide 65**	**Currently only 7 standards published and 3 product categories accredited against ISO/IEC Guide 65**	**Annual report of ISC Certificates of accreditation Project progress report**	**It is assumed that ISC is committed to take all the necessary actions in time to implement the planned project activities**
Output 1 ISC is supported for approving and publishing 40 draft standards developed in the Phase II	40 standards translated & printed	Currently only 7 standards published	Project progress report ISC record	Irregular organization of technical committee to review standards at the government level. The project can request ISC to organize ad hoc technical committee meetings to accelerate the process of standards approval.

Output 2				
ISC is supported in attracting at least 3 new product categories and expanding accreditation	Number of product categories increased at least 3 through a promotional campaign At least 3 ISC staff trained for product certification inspectors At least 5 awareness seminars conducted	Currently 3 product categories accredited No staff has been trained for the new product categories No awareness seminars conducted	Project progress report ISC record	It is assumed that there is a growing demand for product certification for the 3 product categories to be selected.
Outcome 2 **Improvement of measurement accuracy, international traceability and consumer protection**	**Industrial Metrology Laboratory of National Metrology Center (NMC) enhanced and accredited**	**NMC has not been accredited yet.**	**Annual report of NMC Certificate of accreditation Project progress report**	**It is assumed that the new building of NMC is to be completed as planned by the end of 2011**

Output 3 Industrial and legal metrology sections of National Metrology Centre (NMC) upgraded and 2 scopes accredited	Equipment for electrical and water meter testing labs in place 5 NMC staff members trained in electrical and water meter testing Quality system documentation developed to meet ISO/IEC 17025 standard requirements Assessment for accreditation conducted	No NMC staff has been trained for electrical and water meter testing. Quality system documentation has not been developed yet NMC has not been accredited yet	Project progress report NTA report Accreditation certificate	It is assumed that there are sufficient staff to be trained.
Output 4 Provincial legal metrology offices are upgraded	Equipment for mass and volume metrology in place at least 6 provincial legal metrology offices At least 100 staff members of the provincial legal metrology offices trained.	Mass and volume equipment were provided to 20 provincial legal metrology offices. Six more provincial offices have to be supplied with equipment. Considerable number of provincial staff have been trained during Phase 1 and II. However, further training is required,	Project progress report NTA report	It is assumed that the Government will provide full backing for enforcement of regulations and availability of qualified personnel for training in legal metrology

		due to staff turn over.		

Outcome 3 **Improved capability of Cambodian exporters to meet international requirement for trade**	**CRRI upgraded with additional equipment and its scope of accreditation expanded.** **ILCC chemical testing laboratory upgraded with equipment and accredited in the areas related to chemical testing (EU REACH or pesticide residues)**	**Currently the scope "Chemical Tests for Block Rubber" accredited** **ILCC chemical testing laboratory has not been accredited yet**	**Annual reports of CRRI and ILCC Certificates of accreditation Project progress report**	**It is assumed that CRRI and ILCC are committed to take all the necessary actions in time to implement the planned project activities**
Output 5 National Specification Laboratory of CRRI is upgraded	Equipment for block rubber testing in place Staff members (at least 5) of National Specifications Laboratory (NSL) trained Assessment for expanded accreditation conducted	Some of the equipment available for testing block rubber are old and needs replacement. No NSL staff has been trained for the planned expanded accreditation scope. "Chemical Tests for Block Rubber" accredited so far	Progress report NTA report CRRI record	There is a risk that trained personnel may leave the laboratory after receiving training. It is assumed that efforts will be made to retain the personnel by discussing possible incentive measures with the laboratory management.
Output 6 ILCC non-food chemical testing laboratory is upgraded	Equipment for chemicals and/or pesticide residue testing in place Staff members (at least 5) of ILCC trained Assessment for accreditation conducted	Equipment for chemicals and/or pesticide residue testing has not been procured No ILCC staff has been trained in non-food chemical testing field ILCC non-food	Progress report NTA report ILCC record	There is a risk that trained personnel may leave the laboratory after receiving training. It is assumed that efforts will be made to retain the personnel by discussing possible incentive measures with the laboratory management.

		chemical testing laboratory has not been accredited		

Outcome 4 **In collaboration with Cambodia Chamber of Commerce, awareness on quality among industrialists, consumers and the general population created**	**Concepts and benefits of NQI established and 50 people participated in the awareness seminars**	**No activity has been undertaken to promote concepts and benefits of NQI with private sector participation**	**Annual report of CCC Project progress report**	**There are concerns about the quality of products among population in Cambodia**
Output 7 Assistance is provided for consultancy services for creation of quality awareness and development of quality award, as well as for organization of awareness building seminars	Documentation of Quality Award scheme available for use At least 2 awareness building seminars held	"Quality Award" has not been introduced yet	Progress report NTA report	Cambodia Chamber of Commerce (CCC) continues support for promotion of concepts and benefits of NQI.