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I. Introduction and project background

1. UNIDO’s POPs portfolio

In mid-2001 UNIDO started its first Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) project and has since then implemented/on-going/PIF approved around 157 projects, almost all of which were funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) directly or indirectly. At UNIDO, the POPs portfolio is managed by the Stockholm Convention Unit (SCU) of the Environmental Management Branch.

POPs projects in UNIDO can be divided into two large categories: a) National Implementation Plans (NIPs) as foreseen in the Stockholm Convention (SC) as a first step towards POPs reduction and phase out, and b) Stockholm Convention Implementation Projects, which are assisting countries in implementing the NIPs in the different POPs areas. In May 2014, 157 out of 179 parties to the SC have submitted their first NIPs to the SC Secretariat and for 22 countries the transmission of their first NIP is still pending. Regarding the second NIP, 17 out of the 162 parties (which have so far ratified the amendments) have submitted the reviewed and updated to the Stockholm Convention Secretariat.

In 2001, UNIDO started the enabling activities acting as an Implementing Agency for the GEF for the first round of the NIPs projects: “Enabling Activities to Facilitate Early Action on the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)”, which will be designated as first NIP in these Terms of Reference (ToR). The second round of NIPs: “Enabling Activities to review and update the National Implementation Plans for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)” started their implementation in 2012, and in this ToR the terminology for them will be the second NIP.

Until 2014, UNIDO has supported 43 countries to prepare their first NIPs, which are frameworks to develop and implement, in a systematic and participatory way, priority policy and regulatory reform, capacity building, and investment programmes to reduce and/or phase-out POPs. The first NIP projects are funded under the GEF mechanism of Enabling Activities (EA) and have an average size of up to USD 500,000 each one, except those in China and India where the Governments opted for the GEF full-size projects with the funding of USD 4 million and USD 3.2 million respectively.

Stockholm Convention Implementation Projects are in line with the GEF Strategic Programmes of GEF 4 and GEF 5 under the POPs Focal Area:
1) strengthening capacities for NIP implementation;
2) partnering in investments for NIP implementation, and
3) partnering in the demonstrations of feasible, innovative technologies and best practices for POPs reduction.

So far, UNIDO has supported 52 single countries to prepare their second NIPs, which are frameworks to develop and implement, in a systematic and participatory way, priority policy and regulatory reform, capacity building, and investment programmes to reduce and/or phase-out the newly added ten POPs to the SC. The second NIP

1 Maldives, and Bosnia and Herzegovina have only a first NIP containing all the POPs listed in the Stockholm Convention (SC) done with the second round of NIP, due to the fact that these two countries did not participate in the first round of NIP project, they have received a greater funding for the only NIP to contain all the POPs.
2 Both first and second NIP projects were all funded by GEF.
projects are as well funded under the GEF mechanism of Enabling Activities (EA) and have an average size of up to USD225,000 (excluding support costs) each one, except those in China where the Governments opted for the GEF medium-size project of USD2 million.

Table 1. UNIDO’s POPs projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of projects</th>
<th>No. of projects</th>
<th>Total allotment (USD)</th>
<th>% of POPs portfolio (July 2014)</th>
<th>Average size (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Preparatory</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5,865,356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) First NIP</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25,943,212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Project Identification Form (PIF) approved or ongoing Medium-Size Project (MSP) and Full-Size Project (FSP)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94,600,000 (without PPG)</td>
<td>61 %</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) NIP review and update</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12,254,714</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>210,000 (EAs); 2,000,000 (China NIP update)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) PIF approved or on-going global and regional POPs projects (without Project Preparation Grant (PPG))</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48,000,000</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of 3-6</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td><strong>154,854,714</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also eight global and regional projects with main focus on:
- demonstrating the viability and removal of barriers impeding adoption and implementation of available non-combustion technologies for destroying POPs; and
- promoting strategies to reduce unintentional production of POPs or identifying contaminated sites.

The current project GEF-5 portfolio from 2014 of the SC Unit comprises 36 approved projects and totals around USD 143 million.


The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) was adopted in May 2001 with the objective of protecting human health and the environment from
toxic and hazardous POPs. It entered into force on 17 May 2004 initially listing twelve chemicals as POPs. At its 4th meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP) in May 2009, the Stockholm Convention was amended to include nine new POPs (listed in SC annexes A, B and C)\(^3\). The amendments entered into force for most of the Stockholm Convention Parties on 26 August 2010.

According to Article 7 of the Convention, Parties are required to develop a National Implementation Plan (NIP) to demonstrate how the country will implement the obligations under the Stockholm Convention. The Party should transmit the NIP to the COP within two years of the date on which the Convention entered into force for the country. In compliance to the above all the Counterpart Governments ratified the Stockholm Convention, and prepared the NIPs under the diverse responsible Ministries for the NIP update and review with UNIDO’s support and endorsed the NIPs.

Furthermore, Parties are required to review and update their NIPs in a manner specified by a decision of the COP. At the fourth meeting of the COP held from 4 to 8 May 2009, the COP considered and decided on the listing of nine new POPs to Annexes A, B and C of the convention, as per recommendation of the POPs Review Committee (POPRC). Thus, according to the initial planning, most Parties to the Convention will have to review, update and submit their NIPs within two years of the date of entry into force of the amendments to the COP (August 2012). The Stockholm Convention was amended in April 2011 at the 5th meeting of the COP to include Endosulfan in SC’s Annex A, with specific exemptions.

The second NIP projects are expected to enable the Government Counterparts to establish inventories of products and articles containing the ten newly listed POPs and identify industrial processes where new POPs are employed or unintentionally produced.

The Government Counterparts already have experience in conducting inventories and drafting action plans for elimination of pesticides, PCBs, DDT, and unintentionally produced POPs, thus the new POPs pesticides may to a large extent be managed similar to original POPs pesticides. However, new approaches are required to manage the industrial POPs chemicals such as brominated diphenyl ethers (BDE), PFOS, and others, due to their global use in industrial processes, products (especially electronic appliances) and recycling streams. For such chemicals, new inventory analyses such as supply chain, material flow and stakeholder analyses would be required to cope with the challenges of new POPs chemical risks posed by consumer products in use and in the market. Based on the inventory results, the identification and prioritization of new POPs will lead to new action plans and national policy proposals needed for implementing the updated second NIPs.

The second NIP update projects also built, whenever possible, on the capacity created/enhanced and the information dissemination/awareness raising mechanism that have already been put in place in the relevant country, where the second NIP update and review took place through various POPs projects.

For the first NIP, five phases were entailed for project implementation:

\(^3\) Alpha hexachlorocyclohexane, Beta hexachlorocyclohexane, Chloredecone, Hexabromobiphenyl, Hexabromodiphenyl ether and heptabromodiphenyl ether, Lindane, Pentachlorobenzene, Tetrabromodiphenyl ether and pentabromodiphenyl ether, Perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS), its salts and perfluorooctane sulfonyle fluoride
1. Coordination mechanism and inception phase,
2. Inventory phase,
3. Prioritization phase,
4. Drafting of the action plans and formulation of the NIP, and
5. Endorsement phase.

For the second NIP, four phases were entailed for project implementation:
1. Coordination mechanism, inception and awareness raising phase
2. Inventory review and update phase
3. Assessment of national capacities and prioritization phase
4. NIP formulation, endorsement and submission phase

For conducting new POPs inventories, the Stockholm Convention Secretariat “Step-by-step companion guide to the review and updating of the National Implementation Plans”, the inventory guidance developed under the GEF/UNIDO project "Development of the Guidelines for updating of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention", including the “Guidance for Developing a National Implementation for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants-updated in 2012)” as well as the GEF NIP update guidance “Guidelines for reviewing and updating the NIP under the Stockholm Convention on POPs” will be used as reference.

Table 2: Second NIP projects being implemented by UNIDO from 2012 to date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>30-May-13</td>
<td>205,000.00</td>
<td>154,000.00</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>9-May-13</td>
<td>190,000.00</td>
<td>144,000.00</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>18-Feb-13</td>
<td>205,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>14/04/2014</td>
<td>170,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>21-Feb-14</td>
<td>225,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>20-Nov-13</td>
<td>175,000.00</td>
<td>128,000.00</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>15-May-13</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>112,000.00</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>22-Apr-13</td>
<td>225,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>14-Mar-13</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
<td>129,101.52</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>13-Nov-13</td>
<td>185,000.00</td>
<td>135,000.00</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>12-Sep-13</td>
<td>225,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>18-Feb-13</td>
<td>170,000.00</td>
<td>119,000.00</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>4-Jun-13</td>
<td>225,000.00</td>
<td>182,433.40</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>20-Nov-13</td>
<td>170,000.00</td>
<td>129,000.00</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>01-March-14</td>
<td>225,000.00</td>
<td>181,000.00</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>21-Aug-13</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
<td>128,646.00</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>31-Aug-12</td>
<td>181,592.00</td>
<td>163,857.82</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>18-Feb-13</td>
<td>169,340.00</td>
<td>135,092.69</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China⁴</td>
<td>17/12/2013</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,756,010.99</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>8-Mar-13</td>
<td>194,260.00</td>
<td>96,293.17</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire</td>
<td>2-Sep-13</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>152,000.00</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>5-Mar-13</td>
<td>199,870.00</td>
<td>189,303.81</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>21-Mar-13</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
<td>114,307.99</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>18-Feb-13</td>
<td>189,420.00</td>
<td>147,191.97</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>4-Mar-13</td>
<td>159,700.00</td>
<td>136,088.47</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos PDR</td>
<td>22-Apr-13</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
<td>133,890.80</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>16-May-13</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td>145,356.55</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>5-Mar-13</td>
<td>430,000.00</td>
<td>248,374.00</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>11-Apr-13</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>263,948.22</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>28-Jan-14</td>
<td>190,000.00</td>
<td>145,000.00</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>8-Mar-13</td>
<td>225,000.00</td>
<td>203,983.07</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>10-May-13</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
<td>148,331.56</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>6-Sep-13</td>
<td>170,000.00</td>
<td>127,470.50</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>31-Aug-12</td>
<td>179,476.00</td>
<td>119,257.41</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>22-Apr-13</td>
<td>140,000.00</td>
<td>119,257.41</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>17-Dec-12</td>
<td>210,000.00</td>
<td>187,692.50</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>1-Oct-12</td>
<td>179,290.00</td>
<td>135,568.73</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>10-May-13</td>
<td>220,000.00</td>
<td>13,280.44</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>23-Jan-14</td>
<td>185,000.00</td>
<td>142,000.00</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>16-May-13</td>
<td>170,000.00</td>
<td>163,738.56</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>8-Mar-13</td>
<td>227,000.00</td>
<td>173,797.58</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>28-Sep-12</td>
<td>129,200.00</td>
<td>122,602.02</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Congo</td>
<td>2-Sep-13</td>
<td>170,000.00</td>
<td>130,168.40</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>8-Mar-13</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>182,974.11</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>14-Mar-13</td>
<td>181,850.00</td>
<td>165,137.67</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia Herzegovina</td>
<td>16-Aug-12</td>
<td>258,020.00</td>
<td>229,004.00</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>18-Oct-12</td>
<td>225,000.00</td>
<td>192,171.30</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>3-Oct-12</td>
<td>164,696.02</td>
<td>121,704.96</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>9-Oct-12</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>165,232</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>20-Jul-12</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>214,326.53</td>
<td>Phase 4 completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>19-Jul-12</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>218,707.98</td>
<td>Phase 4 completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>23-May-12</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>150,422.03</td>
<td>Phase 4 completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ China will not be part of this Cluster Evaluation, as the Enabling Activities are done in a form of a Medium-Size Project, for which there will be a separate independent evaluation according to GEF Evaluation Policy
4. Second NIP project objectives

**Enabling Activity (EA) Objective**

The overall objective of the proposed Enabling Activities (EA) is to review and update the National Implementation Plan (NIP), and have it endorsed and submitted by the Government to the Conference of Parties of the Stockholm Convention (COP). Participating stakeholders will be able to manage the additional POPs with newly developed technical skills, expertise and awareness.

**Enabling Activity goals, objectives and activities**

The overall goal of the Enabling Activities (EA) project is to fulfill the country’s obligation under Article 7 of the Stockholm Convention, which is to review and update the NIP and submit it to the COP within two years the amendments enter into force.

The tasks of the proposed EA will fill the gaps required to review and update the NIP. This will include strengthening the national coordination mechanism by involving additional stakeholders on new POPs, establishing working groups with expertise on new POPs issues, updating and reviewing the inventories of the original twelve POPs, conducting a basic inventory of new POPs, assessing the regulatory and policy framework and institutional capacities to manage new POPs, prioritizing and drafting relevant objectives and action plans for reducing and phasing out new POPs. Relevant stakeholders will be consulted and involved throughout the project implementation process. The updated, endorsed and submitted NIP will provide a basis to implement Stockholm Convention Implementation Projects in accordance with the requirements of the Stockholm Convention.

The EA project will focus on the attainment of the following outcomes:

- Reviewed and updated National Implementation Plan (NIP) endorsed and submitted by the Government to the Conference of Parties (COP) to the Stockholm Convention (SC); and
- Participating stakeholders able to manage the additional POPs with newly developed technical skills, expertise and awareness.

**Enabling Activity Project Components are:**

1. Coordination mechanism and awareness raising,
2. Inventories of new POPs and NIP Review,
3. National capacities assessment and priority setting for management of new POPs, and
4. NIP formulation, endorsement and submission.

**Enabling Activity Project Outcomes are:**

1. Coordination mechanism in place with stakeholders aware of the risk of new POPs,
2. Validation of inventories of new POPs (and updating of initial 12 POPs) by relevant stakeholders,
3. Identification of national capacities for new POPs management and priority setting of new POPs risk reduction options,
4. Government endorsement and submission of updated NIP to Conference of Parties to the SC, and
5. Periodic Monitoring and terminal evaluation of project implementation.
5. Project implementation arrangements

UNIDO has acted as the GEF implementing agency for these second NIP projects. The second NIP update and reviews have built on existing national coordination mechanism and capacities established during the development of the first NIP.

UNIDO did mainly engage the Ministries of Environment of each Government Counterpart to review and update the second NIP as a national executing organization to provide services and perform the work in the form of a subcontract where detailed Terms of References (ToR) was prepared after project approval. Subcontracts were signed by an authorized official from the Ministry and UNIDO. In the case that the Ministries of Environment decided that project activities should be carried out by another national organization (e.g. University, Cleaner Production Centre, Private Company etc.) an official endorsement letter needed to be signed by the Ministry of Environment and submitted to UNIDO for approval. A subcontract was then issued between UNIDO and the endorsed organization. UNIDO performed project implementation oversight through an assigned project manager (PM). The Ministry of Environment had to nominate a high-level official as a National Project Director (NPD) to chair the National Steering Committee (NSC), and appointed a National Project Manager (NPM) and Assistant Project Manager (APM)/Project Technical Specialist (PTS) to facilitate the coordination of the project. The NPD had to ensure political support for the project, ensure institutional coordination, supervise the project national coordination and provided support to the Technical and Steering Committees for strategic project issues. The fees for the NPD were covered by the Ministries of Environment.

II. Rationale and purpose of the evaluation

Given the number of second NIP projects and their different stages of implementation, it will not be feasible to assess all projects individually with the same level of details. For this reason, a cluster evaluation approach will be used. The cluster will be composed of ten projects selected from Table 2, considering regional representation and different stages of implementation. These selected projects will be reviewed to a deeper extent as established in this ToR.

One of the main purposes of this Cluster evaluation is to examine to which extent the Reviewing and Updating the NIP under the Stockholm Convention on POPs by the Government Counterparts has been followed and implemented, i.e. if the second NIPs updates and reviews in the countries included in the cluster have been leaned to the requirements of the “Guidelines for Reviewing and Updating the NIP under the Stockholm Convention on POPs”.

The Cluster evaluation will review the extent to which, each party of the cluster group (Government Counterpart) has done the following:

(a) Developed and endeavor to implement a plan for the implementation of its obligations under the Stockholm Convention;
(b) Transmit its implementation plan to the Conference of the Parties within two years of the date on which this Convention enters into force for it; and
(c) Review and update, as appropriate, its implementation plans on a periodic basis and in a manner to be specific by a decision of the Conference of the Parties.
(d) Lessons implemented from the process of the first NIP.
III. Scope and focus of the evaluation

The cluster of ten projects will be decided upon in the Inception Report, after the desk review and the preliminary research were done, and the choice will be based on the following criteria: 1. Regional presence (2-3 countries chosen for the five regions: Latin American and Caribbean Countries (LAC), Africa, Asia, Europe and Arab Countries), 2. Stage of Implementation (for instance one country should be in the middle phase of implementation and one should be at the end stage – the second NIP is either finalized or at drafting stage), 3. Level of complexity of the second NIP, and the issues treated in the NIPs, and 4. Size of the Project of the NIP review and update.

Furthermore this evaluation is expected to contribute to organizational learning, by UNIDO and its Counterparts, and will be forward looking, thus also guiding the development of new similar projects. This cluster evaluation will also be used as a platform for South-South Cooperation.

The evaluation is linked to other evaluations performed in 2012 – the Independent Thematic Evaluation: “UNIDO’s work in the area of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)”, and in 2013 – Independent Terminal Evaluation: “Development of the Guidelines for updating of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention”.

IV. Key evaluation questions

The key questions are to what extent:

1. Have the second NIP update projects performed effectively and efficiently, and have achieved or will achieve the expected results in providing the inventory of new POPs and identifying priorities and action plans related to reduction/disposal of the ten new POPs; and
2. What lessons and recommendations can be extracted from the different experiences in the different contexts where the projects in the cluster were/are being implemented.

The evaluation team will rate the ten projects that are part of the cluster. The ratings for the parameters described in the following sub-chapters A to H will be presented in the form of a table with each of the categories rated separately and with brief justifications for the rating based on the findings of the main analysis for each of the countries within the cluster. The rating system to be applied is specified in Annex 5.

To guide the reflection process, the evaluation team will use OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and be guided by the following evaluation questions:

A. Relevance

- To what extent project is relevant to the:

national development and environmental priorities and strategies of the Government and population of each country from the cluster, and regional and international agreements.

- target groups: relevance of the project’s objectives, outcomes and outputs to the different target groups of the interventions (e.g., companies, civil society, beneficiaries of capacity building and training).
- UNIDO’s thematic priorities: Were they in line with UNIDO’s mandate, objectives and outcomes defined in the Programme and Budget and core competencies?

- Do the projects remain relevant taking into account the changing environment?
- To what extent the approach(es) being used are still relevant? Is there a need to reformulate the project and the project results framework given changes in the country and operational context?
- How relevant/aligned have these projects been to the environmental strategies of the supported countries and the GEF and to the thematic priorities of UNIDO?

B. Effectiveness

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

- To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes been achieved or are likely to be achieved?
- How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of outputs? Were the targeted beneficiary groups (e.g., country, government, ministries, POPs producers, people living in the areas by POPs polluted) actually reached?
- What outputs and outcomes has the project achieved so far (both qualitative and quantitative results)? Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?
- To what extent do UNIDO POPs projects contribute to other UNIDO objectives, such as improved environmental performance of industry, competitiveness of industry, pro-poor growth?
- To what extent have the desired benefits of UNIDO’s POPs projects been sustained after project completion for the first round of NIPs? In the context of the initial NIP?
- What are the key project-internal factors (e.g. implementation approach, internal competencies, type and quality of expertise used, etc.) that determine the performance of the projects, results and sustainability?
- What are the key project-external factors (e.g. existing environmental legislation, budgetary provisions in the country, degree and form of private sector involvement (forward coming of providing data, actions), etc) that determine the performance of the projects, results and sustainability?
- Were the follow-up projects that derived from the initial NIP according to the Action Plans defined in the initial NIP?
- Have follow-up projects already been developed as a result of the initial first NIP projects? How many and what kind of projects exactly did come out as a result of the initial first NIP? How were they financed? Were all of these projects implemented by now? In which stage are they at the moment? Why were some projects implemented for some countries, and for others not? Please state the reasons behind with a sound explanation.
- Are appropriate legislative and regulatory frameworks in place for the initial first NIPs? How did the initial NIP and the NIP update and review projects contribute to an appropriate legislative and regulatory framework in place for the management of POPs (and other chemicals) in the country?
• Has enforcement capacity been strengthened and sustainable after the implementation in the first NIP?

C. Efficiency
To what extent:
• Were the projects costs effective? Were the projects using the least cost options?
• Have the projects produced the expected results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected time frame? Were the project implementations delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results?
• Are the projects activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and annual work plans?
• Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet requirements? Was the quality of UNIDO inputs and services as planned and timely?
• How adequate was the coordination/linkage with other UNIDO and other donors’ projects? If yes, did this produce any synergy effects?
• What are the lessons learned from the past NIP projects and how can they be turned into Best practices for the future project implementations?
• Taking into account the whole project cycle and the contributions made by different project stakeholders (e.g., GEF, Ministries, NGOs, enterprises, other donors and agencies); what was UNIDO’s value added to the efforts to reduce the production, use and release of POPs?
• What are the key advantages and disadvantages of the different implementation approaches? Are project management and implementation modalities adequate?

D. Sustainability
• How will the changes in the framework of GEF project funding (GEF 6; "broadening of the GEF partnership) affect UNIDO’s potential to implement POP related projects? How are the different roles of different types of agencies going to evolve?
• Are there any other trends - either external (e.g., increased cooperation of chemicals conventions, SAICM, changes in other GEF agencies approaches and capacities) or internal (e.g., UNIDO’s Resource Efficiency and Cleaner Production (RECP) and Green Industry strategies) that affect the UNIDO POPs work?

E. Project coordination and management
To what extent:
• 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)?
• The UNIDO HQ and Field Office 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)?

- Have clear responsibilities and roles (administrative and enforcement) in NIP implementation been assigned and is there appropriate institutional capacity to manage implementation? In the outsourcing of the Implementation modalities, was it clear who does what? Is there a clearly set framework and structure behind the implementation arrangements per country?

- Based on the past experience and future outlook, what are the main challenges that UNIDO will have to tackle in order to meet its POPs-related objectives?

- What are the common Agenda of UNIDO and GEF for future projects? How is UNIDO going to adapt to this common Agenda if there is any? What will be the approach?

- How will recent and planned changes within UNIDO affect the future POPs portfolio? Can UNIDO handle the large pipeline portfolio? Are the screening and approval procedures for projects appropriate and efficient?

- To what extent is UNIDO (in its present structure and capacity) prepared to answer the calls for projects that are coming out of the NIP update and review, and their implementation?

- How can UNIDO's internal project implementation (capacity, structure and efficiency) be changed in order to answer that call?

- What is the approach of UNIDO to adapt to the possibility of being able to implement increased number of projects coming out of the Action Plans set in the NIP updates and Reviews, as well as from the possibly higher mobilized funding (financial resources)?

- Is UNIDO's project managers' structure for POPs fit for purpose of implementing the projects and to what extent is it fit for this purpose?

- To what extent exist synergies between the Units and Branches within UNIDO (for instance Cleaner Production ad Stockholm Convention Unit - GEF 6), and to what extents can the synergies be built in the future? What is needed to be done in order to improve the concept of using the synergies within UNIDO?

- Is UNIDO set up in the best way to use the best of the opportunities, and what would be the best structure to implement these projects?

F. Cross-cutting issues (socio-economic aspects etc.)
To what extent:

- Were socio-economics aspects included in the first NIP and the second NIP?

G. Integrating of gender into the Enabling Activities for NIP Updates and Review
For the project design: To what extent:

- Was a gender component included in the first and the second NIP?
• Is the project/programme in line with the UNIDO\(^6\) 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?
• 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)?
• Is the project/programme is people-centered, were target beneficiaries clearly
identified and disaggregated by sex, age, race, ethnicity and socio-economic
group?
• Is 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?

**Implementation management:** To what extent:

• 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?
• Is 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?

**Project results:** To what extent:

• 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?

\(^6\) Once the gender mainstreaming strategy and action plans to guide the process of addressing
gender issues in industrial development interventions are developed, the project/programme
should align to the strategy or action plans.
H. Procurement issues

The following evaluation questions that will feed in the Thematic Evaluation on Procurement have been developed and would be included as applicable in all projects (for reference, please see Annex 6 of the ToR: UNIDO Procurement Process):

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

V. Evaluation approach and methodology

The Cluster evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the in line with the principles laid down in the “UN Norms and Standards for Evaluation”, UNIDO Evaluation Policy, the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects, the GEF’s 2008 Guidelines for Implementing and Executing Agencies to Conduct Terminal Evaluations, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy from 2010 and the Recommended Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies, and apply the standard DAC evaluation criteria to address, as systematically and objectively as possible the evaluation questions listed above. Achievements will be assessed against the objectives and indicators set out in programme and project documents and in logical frameworks of the individual projects (for the cluster evaluation). Special attention should be paid to conduct the terminal evaluation in a process and manner consistent with the “Guidelines for Reviewing and Updating the NIP under the Stockholm Convention on POPs” (GEF/C.39/Inf.5 of October 19 2010).

The evaluation is a forward looking exercise as it will provide analyses and recommendations to guide the future direction of UNIDO’s POPs interventions after the second NIPs, taking into account UNIDO’s mandate and comparative advantage, the work of other development agencies active in this field and needs and priorities of developing countries. The following will be done:
Review of past performance: an analysis of performance of all UNIDO first and second NIPs activities carried out so far; the depth of analysis will differ from fully fledged evaluations of selected projects to light document reviews of enabling activities.

Portfolio analysis: an analysis of UNIDO’s first and second NIP update and review portfolio along a list of criteria (e.g., type of projects, substance areas covered/not covered, regional focus), including a comparison with other GEF agencies and an analysis of how it has and likely will evolve in the future.

Future outlook: an analysis of trends and developments within the POPs area (coming out of the first and the second NIPs update and review) with a view to detecting future demands and requirements of UNIDO as executing and implementing agency (sustainability).

UNIDO capacity review: an analysis of UNIDO capacities at HQ and in the field, as well as the capacity of the Government Counterparts with regard to the identification, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects.

The review of past performance needs to be based on comparable assessment of individual cluster countries from the first NIPs. These questions are to be asked per country for the whole cluster of ten countries, resulting with a summary sheet per country from the cluster evaluation from the first NIPs, and the second NIPs. Thus, when comparing the performance of different interventions, the following framework, which has taken into account the questions/indicators of the three different strategic programmes of GEF focal area strategy for POPs, will be applied.

It will be carried out as Cluster 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 Office for Independent Evaluation and the Project Managers on the conduct of the evaluation and methodological issues.

The evaluation will use a triangulate approach, by combining different sources or types of information for the NIPs updates and reviews. The information sources will be the Project Manager at UNIDO, the National Project Coordinator, the beneficiaries in the countries, and representatives from the Government.

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: desk studies and literature review, statistical analysis, individual interviews, focus group meetings, and surveys. This approach will not only enable the evaluation to assess causality through quantitative means but also to provide reasons why certain results were achieved or not achieved and to double-check information for higher reliability of findings. The concrete mixed methodological approach will be described in the inception report.

The methodology will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project related documents including, but not limited to:
   (b) The original project document, the initial NIP of the country, the NIP update and review per country, monitoring reports, GEF tracking tool, progress and financial conciliatory reports of UNIDO training workshops and capacity building activities, Reports from the Inception Workshop, the Inventory Workshop, the Prioritization Workshop, and the Endorsement Workshop for each of the ten cluster countries, legal documents (PCBs
and POPs regulations, standards and guidelines) and relevant correspondence. Other related materials prepared by the project.

(c) Final Financial audit report
(d) Other project-related material produced by the project.

2. Surveys / questionnaires will be prepared, and sent in advance to the concerned countries to be answered. The survey will be conducted in all the 52 countries where the NIPs updates and reviews took place in order to assess all the necessary criteria set in this ToR, and additionally answer the concrete questions of possible project implementation from the action plans set for the ten pilot countries chosen. The questionnaires should be done regarding mainly the outcomes of the NIPs Update and Review and the possible projects that are coming out of it. Special attention in the survey should be paid on the fact if these projects will become real projects or they will stay project proposals, or, even more, if they are already in a pipeline or are they going to become real projects. The surveys will be piloted in three example countries in August/September, 2014, and afterwards sent to the rest concerned countries in September/October, 2014. The surveys will be analyzed and evaluated during October, 2014. Additional questionnaires with a deeper analysis and an evaluation matrix will be prepared for the ten countries that will be part of the cluster evaluation.

3. Field missions to four countries out of the ten cluster countries will be done in October-November 2014.

4. Since the project document contains an EA framework (included in Annex 4 of the ToR), the evaluation consultant will assess performance against this framework.

5. Interviews with UNIDO headquarters’ personnel – Project Managers and where possible UNIDO Field Offices personnel involved in the project.

6. Interviews with the National Steering Committee (NSC), personnel associated with project management, partner country focal points, project beneficiaries, and other surveys, reviews of documents deemed necessary by the evaluation team and/or UNIDO.

7. A Global UNIDO Meeting (a Learning Platform or a Platform for sharing knowledge and therewith especially strengthening the South-South Cooperation) will be organized by UNIDO’s SCU where all the National Project Coordinators and the Evaluation Team will be present, with the main purpose being to identify the burning issues of the country, and that the countries learn from each other’s experiences, and especially to establish a kind of mechanism with improvement proposals for the NIPs that are just starting, in order to simplify the process of preparing the NIP Updates and Reviews, and to share some Best Practices out of it. Interviews with the Government Counterparts from the Cluster Group of countries will be done during the Global UNIDO Meeting.

8. The inception report will provide details on the methodology used by the evaluation team and include an evaluation matrix for all of the cluster countries.

VI. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluation consultant as a team leader and one senior international evaluation consultant.
The evaluation team should be able to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including evaluation verification on request to the GEF partnership up to two years after completion of the evaluation.

The consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of the evaluation consultants are specified in the job description attached to these terms of reference.

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

The Projects’ staff and the UNIDO Field Offices in the corresponding countries where the EAs were done will support the international evaluation consultants. The UNIDO GEF Coordinator, GEF focal points in the country and the main Government counterparts of UNIDO will be briefed on the evaluation and equally provide support to its conduct.

VII. Time schedule and deliverables/outputs

The evaluation is scheduled to take place within the period of July to December 2014. The table below shows a tentative schedule of the evaluation activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Tentative schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Desk review</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys, questionnaires, interviews at HQ</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report (in English) with determination of the countries to be included in the cluster evaluation</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Study for the first and the second survey</td>
<td>September/October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending the surveys to all Counterparts</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation work including document reviews, evaluation of the surveys, interviews</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with business partners and other associated actors</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio analysis</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visits to selected countries – probably four (to be determined)</td>
<td>October/November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting and validation of evaluation report (in English)</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global UNIDO Meeting on National Implementation Plans and future POPs cooperation; Presentation and discussion of preliminary findings</td>
<td>November, 18-20, 2014 (in Vienna, Austria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Evaluation report</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the four field missions, the evaluation team will come to UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of the preliminary findings of the Terminal Evaluation during the Global UNIDO Meeting on National Implementation Plans and future POPs cooperation that is scheduled for 18 to 20 November 2014. The final cluster evaluation
report will be submitted end of December 2014 after the debriefing of the preliminary findings at the Headquarters.

**Evaluation process.** While underscoring the need for independence, the Office for Independent Evaluation recognizes the importance of engaging the main stakeholders in an active dialogue throughout the evaluation process. The UNIDO Evaluation Policy states that: “Transparency and consultation with the major stakeholders are essential at all stages of the evaluation process. Involvement of and consultation with stakeholders facilitates consensus building and ownership of the findings, conclusions and recommendations; it also heightens the credibility and quality of the evaluation”. This is fundamental to ensure the evaluators’ full understanding of the opportunities and constraints faced by the SC Unit, to engage the stakeholders in a fruitful collaboration and to facilitate the discussion of the recommendations and their adoption.

In order to do so, colleagues from the SC Unit will be invited to review and comment on the proposed evaluation methodology and process as set out in this terms of reference, participate in key discussions of the preliminary findings, as well as review and comment on the draft evaluation report.

The SC Unit will provide information and support to the evaluation as required.

**VIII. Quality assurance**

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on methodology and process of UNIDO’s Office for Independent Evaluation, providing inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report and evaluation report by the Office for Independent Evaluation). 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 4. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO’s Office for Independent Evaluation 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 UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation, which will submit the final report to the GEF Evaluation Office and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.
Annex 1 – Outline of the cluster 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 2-3 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. Countries and project background
- Brief countries 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 and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
  - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
  - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
  - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
  - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
  - Counterpart organization(s)

III. Programme level assessment of the second NIPs of all of the 52 countries
This is the key chapter of the report and should address all the evaluation criteria and questions outlined in the ToR. Assessment must be based on factual evidence collected and analyzed from different sources.

IV. Cluster assessment of the ten countries (projects)
This is the key chapter of the report and should address all evaluation criteria and questions outlined in the ToR (see section IV Key Evaluation Questions). The assessment for all the ten projects within the cluster must be based on factual evidence collected and analyzed from different sources. The evaluators' assessment can be broken into the following sections:

A. Relevance
B. Effectiveness
C. Efficiency
D. Sustainability
E. Project coordination and management
F. Cross-cutting issues (socio-economic aspects etc.)

7 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, etc.)
G. Integrating of gender into the Enabling Activities for NIP Updates and Review

H. Procurement issues

At the end of this chapter, an overall project achievement rating should be developed. This chapter should include an assessment summary per country for all the ten countries that are part of the cluster with all the key evaluation questions.

V. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt

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
- indicate 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
- be commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
- take resource requirements into account.

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:
- UNIDO
- Government and/or Counterpart Organizations
- Donor

C. Lessons Learnt

- Lessons learnt 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, and other detailed quantitative information. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.
ANNEX 2 – JOB DESCRIPTIONS

UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title: Senior International Evaluation Consultant (Team Leader)

Main Duty Station and Location: Home-based with 3 travels to Vienna, and 1 field missions (the field mission will be authorized separately)

Mission/s to: Field missions to be authorized separately

Start of contract (EOD): 01 August 2014

End of contract (COB): 31 December 2014

Number of working days: 45 working days

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation 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. The Office for Independent Evaluation is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

PROJECT CONTEXT

The overall objective of the Enabling Activities is to update and review the National Implementation Plan (NIP), and have it endorsed and submitted by the Government to the Stockholm Convention Conference of Parties (COP). Participating stakeholders will be able to manage the additional POPs with newly developed technical skills, expertise and awareness.

The EA project will focus on the attainment of the following outcomes:
• The updated National Implementation Plan (NIP) endorsed and submitted by the Government to the Stockholm Convention Conference of Parties (COP);
• Participating stakeholders able to manage the additional POPs with newly developed technical skills, expertise and awareness.

The senior international consultant will be the lead international consultant to carry out the thematic evaluation according to the evaluation Terms of Reference. S/he will be
main responsible person for preparing the thematic evaluation report, according to the standards of the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation. The evaluation results will monitor global trends and best practices of the UNIDO POPs programme and will evaluate and guide new initiative or changes to ensure that programmes reflects state-of-art approaches.

S/he will perform the following tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st phase of assignment: Preparation, document review, preparing two surveys (questionnaires), interviews with the Project Managers at UNIDO HQs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lead and review of UNIDO and GEF methodological documents, tools and training kits, reference documents and guidelines. Review of scientific literature and publications relevant to initial NIPs, NIPs update and review, and POPs.</td>
<td>Understanding of UNIDO operations and initial NIPs and NIPs updates and reviews, and strategies &amp; methods</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lead and review of project documents, initial NIPs, NIPs updates and reviews, reports, analyse intervention logic and design;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lead and review of portfolio information on “Enabling Activities to review and update the National Implementation Plans for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Review and agreement of the survey instruments for the two surveys for the initial NIPs and the NIPs update and review (lead by another international consultant)</td>
<td>Draft survey instruments for the two surveys</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inception report: lead the development of the detailed evaluation work plan including the choice of the ten cluster countries based on the given criteria in this ToR, draft survey instruments and preliminary analysis of the initial NIP and the NIP update and review intervention logic</td>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meeting at UNIDO HQ: discussions</td>
<td>Key issues of evaluations</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN DUTIES</td>
<td>Concrete/ measurable outputs to be achieved</td>
<td>Expected duration</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and interviews with SCU Project Managers</td>
<td>discussed with all concerned UNIDO stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd phase of assignment: Roll-out of the two pilot surveys to two or three pilot countries from the cluster and then to all the countries where the projects are implemented</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lead and coordinate the roll-out of the surveys to two to three pilot countries that will be defined in the Inception Report</td>
<td>Roll-out of the two surveys to concerning counterparts, beneficiaries, and UNIDO staff</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lead and coordinate the roll-out of the surveys to all the 52 countries from the cluster evaluation during September / October 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Interviews with external experts and review of trends of projects from the initial NIPs and NIPs updates and reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd phase of assignment: Review of evidence and assessment of results from two surveys and evaluations; field missions to two countries from the cluster group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Evaluation and assessment of the two surveys, review of evidence, discussion with the project managers at UNIDO HQs</td>
<td>Evaluation, assessment survey and discussions held and reported</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Participate in two field missions to evaluate the NIPs updates and reviews in the countries that will be defined in the Inception Report</td>
<td>Field mission conducted and mission report prepared</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Two countries defined in the inception report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Draft the evaluation report of the project visited in the two field mission with the other member of the evaluation team and prepare short case studies on evaluation issues in the countries where the field mission took place</td>
<td>Evaluation report conducted</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th phase of assignment: Synthesis of findings and evaluation report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Present preliminary findings to UNIDO EVA, SCU at the Global UNIDO Meeting on National Implementation Plans and future POPs cooperation; Presentation and discussion of preliminary</td>
<td>Feedback on preliminary findings, information gaps identified</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 MAIN DUTIES | Concrete/ measurable outputs to be achieved | Expected duration | Location |
--- | --- | --- | --- |
findings | Draft evaluation report | 6 days | Home-based |
14. Compilation of draft evaluation report | Revised draft report | 1 day | Home-based |
15. Send out draft report to ODG/EVA for comments and prepare revised draft report based on ODG/EVA comments and send out for comments to UNIDO SCU, and external reviewer for comments | Final cluster evaluation report | 2 days | Home-based |
16. Prepare final report, incorporating comments received |  |  |  |
**TOTAL:** |  | **45 days** |  |

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

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

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

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

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

**Education:** Advanced degree in environmental science, environmental law, or environmental chemistry

**Technical and functional experience:**
- Excellent analytical and writing skills
- At least 10 years experiences with international organizations is required
- Experience in the field of evaluation
- Knowledge of the Stockholm Convention is an advantage
- Knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset

**Languages:** Fluency in written and spoken English is required.
Absence of conflict of interest: According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have any preconceived notion, opinion or bias with regard to the issues, projects or programmes subject to the evaluation and 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 Office for Independent Evaluation.
UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title: Senior International Evaluation Consultant

Main Duty Station and Location: Home-based, UNIDO HQ, Field Mission to 1 – 2 countries

Mission/s to: Field missions to be authorized separately

Start of contract (EOD): 1 August 2014

End of contract (COB): 30 December 2014

Number of working days: 30 working days over a period of 6 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation 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. The Office for Independent Evaluation is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

PROJECT CONTEXT

The overall objective of the Enabling Activities is to update and review the National Implementation Plan (NIP), and have it endorsed and submitted by the Government to the Stockholm Convention Conference of Parties (COP). Participating stakeholders will be able to manage the additional POPs with newly developed technical skills, expertise and awareness.

The EA project will focus on the attainment of the following outcomes:

- The updated National Implementation Plan (NIP) endorsed and submitted by the Government to the Stockholm Convention Conference of Parties (COP);
- Participating stakeholders able to manage the additional POPs with newly developed technical skills, expertise and awareness.
The senior international evaluation consultant will support the international team leader in his/her substantive functions, in particular in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/ measurable outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lead the development of survey instruments, and agreement on it with UNIDO evaluation and international expert</td>
<td>Survey instruments developed</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participate in two field missions to evaluate the NIPs updates and reviews in the countries that will be defined in the Inception Report</td>
<td>Field mission conducted and mission report prepared</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Field missions (to be decided upon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lead in the evaluation and assessment of the two surveys, review of evidence (and discussion with the other international expert)</td>
<td>Evidence from evaluation reports analyzed</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meeting at UNIDO HQ: discussions and interviews with SCU Project Managers</td>
<td>Evidence collected from UNIDO staff</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>UNIDO HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Draft parts of the evaluation report in consultation with UNIDO evaluation and the other international expert</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUARED COMPETENCIES

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

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

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

**Education:** First degree in environmental science, environmental law, environmental chemistry

**Technical and functional experience:**
- Extensive knowledge of the Stockholm Convention
- Extensive knowledge and experience in the field of evaluation
- Knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset
- Excellent analytical and writing skills

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

**Absence of conflict of interest:** According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have any preconceived notion, opinion or bias with regard to the issues, projects or programmes subject to the evaluation and 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 Office for Independent Evaluation.
Annex 3 - Reference documents

1. “Guidelines for Reviewing and Updating the NIP under the Stockholm Convention on POPs” from October 19, 2010
2. All Project Documents for the first NIPs
3. All Project Documents for second NIPs: “Enabling Activities to review and update the National Implementation Plans for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)”
4. First NIPs in all the countries where they were enabled
5. Second NIPs in all the countries where they were enabled and for which they are available
6. Reports from the Inception Workshop for each of the ten cluster countries
7. Reports from the Inventory Workshop for each of the ten cluster countries
8. Reports from the Prioritization Workshop for each of the ten cluster countries
9. Reports from the Endorsement Workshop for each of the ten cluster countries
### Annex 4 – Enabling Activity (EA) framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EA component</th>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
<th>Expected outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Coordination mechanism and awareness raising** | Coordination mechanism in place with stakeholders aware of the risk of new POPs | 1.1. Project coordination mechanism reestablished and working groups formed and contracted (co-financing and PMC)  
*Activity 1.1.1. Strengthen national coordination mechanism (to be covered under project management costs and co-financing)*  
*Activity 1.1.2. Re-establish the National Steering Committee (NSC) (to be covered by PMC and co-financing)*  
*Activity 1.1.3. Draw up overall work plan, select working groups, national and international experts and assign responsibilities*  
1.2. Stakeholders and public informed, consulted and aware of new POPs risks and policy implications (inception workshop and awareness raising held)  
*Activity 1.2.1. Stakeholder consultation (to be covered by PMC and co-financing)*  
*Activity 1.2.2. Public participation and awareness of the new POPs and EA project development*  
*Activity 1.2.3. Hold inception workshop for high-level commitment* |
| **2. Inventories of new POPs and NIP review** | Validation of inventories of new POPs (and updating of initial 12 POPs) by relevant stakeholders | 2.1. Inventories of initial 12 POPs updated and validated by stakeholders  
*Activity 2.1.1. Update and validate initial 12 POPs inventories*  
*Activity 2.1.2. Hold meeting for the validation of initial POPs inventories*  
2.2. Inventories of new POPs conducted and validated by stakeholders  
*Activity 2.2.1. Train working groups in charge of inventories*  
*Activity 2.2.2. Conduct new POPS inventories*  
*Activity 2.2.3. Hold workshop on inventory validation* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EA component</th>
<th>Expected outcomes</th>
<th>Expected outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. National capacities assessment and priority setting for management of new POPs | Identification of national capacities for new POPs management and priority setting of new POPs risk reduction options | 3.1. National regulatory and policy framework and institutional capacities to manage new POPs assessed  
*Activity 3.1.1. Review the legislative and regulatory framework pertaining to new POPs management*  
*Activity 3.1.2. Assess monitoring, analytical and enforcement capacities for new POPs*  
*Activity 3.1.3. Assess socio-economic implications on new POPs use and reduction*  
3.2. Prioritization of new POPs risk reduction options based on criteria, cost and benefit, and inventory results completed  
*Activity 3.2.1. Develop criteria for prioritization and national objective setting*  
*Activity 3.2.2. Hold national priority validation workshop* |
| 4. NIP formulation, endorsement and submission | Government endorsement and submission of updated NIP to the Conference of Parties to the SC | 4.1. Updated and reviewed NIP drafted  
*Activity 4.1.1. Formulate specific action plans on new POPs management*  
*Activity 4.1.2. Draft the updated NIP*  
4.2. NIP endorsed by the Government and submitted to the Conference of Parties to the SC  
*Activity 4.2.1. Hold endorsement workshop for the updated NIP*  
*Activity 4.2.2. Endorse and submit the updated NIP to the SC Conference of Parties* |
| 5. Impact monitoring and evaluation | Periodic monitoring and terminal evaluation of project implementation | 5.1. Periodic monitoring report  
5.2. Terminal Evaluation report |
Annex 5 – Rating system to be applied for the key evaluation questions under chapter IV

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 GEF 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 monitoring and evaluation 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 GEF six point scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very poor (Appalling)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6 – UNIDO procurement process

UNIDO Procurement Process
-- Generic Approach and Assessment Framework –

1. Introduction

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

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

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

2. Background

Procurement is defined as the overall process of acquiring goods, works, and services, and includes all related functions such as planning, forecasting, supply chain management, identification of needs, sourcing and solicitation of offers, preparation and award of contract, as well as contract administration until the final discharge of all obligations as defined in the relevant contract(s). The procurement process covers activities necessary for the purchase, rental, lease or sale of goods, services, and other requirements such as works and property.

Past project and country evaluations commissioned by ODG/EVA raised several issues related to procurement and often efficiency related issues. It also became obvious that there is a shared responsibility in the different stages of the procurement process which includes UNIDO staff, such as project managers, and staff of the procurement unit, government counterparts, suppliers, local partner agencies (i.e. UNDP), customs’ and transport agencies.

In July 2013, a new “UNIDO Procurement Manual” was introduced. This Procurement Manual provides principles, guidance and procedures for the Organization to attain specified standards in the procurement process. The Procurement Manual also establishes that “The principles of fairness, transparency, integrity, economy, efficiency and effectiveness must be applied for all procurement transactions, to be delivered with a high level of professionalism thus justifying UNIDO’s involvement in and adding value to the implementation process”.

To reduce the risk of error, waste or wrongful acts and the risk of not detecting such problems, no single individual or team controls shall control all key stages of a transaction. Duties and responsibilities shall be assigned systemically to a number of individuals to ensure that effective checks and balances are in place.

In UNIDO, authorities, responsibilities and duties are segregated where incompatible. Related duties shall be subject to regular review and monitoring. Discrepancies, deviations and exceptions are properly regulated in the Financial Regulations and Rules and the Staff
Regulations and Rules. Clear segregation of duties is maintained between programme/project management, procurement and supply chain management, risk management, financial management and accounting as well as auditing and internal oversight. Therefore, segregation of duties is an important basic principle of internal control and must be observed throughout the procurement process.

The different stages of the procurement process should be carried out, to the extent possible, by separate officials with the relevant competencies. As a minimum, two officials shall be involved in carrying out the procurement process. The functions are segregated among the officials belonging to the following functions:

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

Figure 1 presents a preliminary “Procurement Process Map”, showing the main stages, stakeholders and their respective roles and responsibilities. During 2014/2015, in preparation for the thematic evaluation of the procurement process in 2015, this process map/ workflow will be further refined and reviewed.
3. **Purpose**

The purpose of the procurement process assessments is to diagnose and identify areas for possible improvement and to increase UNIDO’s learning about strengths and weaknesses in the procurement process. It will also include an assessment of the adequacy of the ‘Procurement Manual’ as a guiding document. The review is intended to be useful to managers and staff at UNIDO headquarters and in the field offices (project managers, procurement officers), who are the direct involved in procurement and to UNIDO management.

4. **Scope and focus**

Procurement process assessments will focus on the efficiency aspects of the procurement process, and hence it will mainly fall under the efficiency evaluation criterion. However, other criteria such as effectiveness will also be considered as needed. These assessments are expected to be mainstreamed in all UNIDO country and project evaluations to the extent of its applicability in terms of inclusion of relevant procurement related budgets and activities. A generic evaluation matrix has been developed and is found in Annex B. However questions should be customized for individual projects when needed.

5. **Key issues and evaluation questions**

Past evaluations and preliminary consultations have highlighted the following aspects or identified the following issues:

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

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

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

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

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

- **Desk review**: Policy, Manuals and procedures related to the procurement process. Identification of new approaches being implemented in other UN or international organizations. Findings, recommendations and lessons from UNIDO Evaluation reports.

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

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

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

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

An evaluation matrix is presented in Annex A, presenting the main questions and data sources to be used in the project and country evaluations, as well as the preliminary questions and data sources for the forthcoming thematic evaluation on Procurement process in 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators(^8)</th>
<th>Data source(s) for country/project evaluations</th>
<th>Additional data source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | Timeliness            | - Was the procurement timely? How long the procurement process takes (e.g. by value, by category, by exception) | (Overall) Time to Procure (TTP)                                       | • Interviews with PMs, Government counterparts and beneficiaries                                                                 | • Procurement related documents review  
• SAP/Infobase (queries related to procurement volumes, categories, timing, issues)  
• Evaluation reports  
• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.  
• Interviews with Procurement officers                                                                 |
|     |                       | - Did the good/item(s) arrive as planned or scheduled? If no, how long were the times gained or delays. If delay, what was the reason(s)? | Time to Delivery (TTD)                                               | • Interviews with PM, procurement officers and Beneficiaries                                                                                                                                         |
|     |                       | - Was the freight forwarding timely and within budget? If no, please elaborate.     |                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|     |                       | - Was the customs clearance timely? How many days did it take?                     |                                                                         | • Interviews with PMs, Government counterparts and beneficiaries                                                                                                                                     |
|     |                       | - How long time did it take to get approval from the government on import duty exemption | Time to Government Clearance (TTGC)                                   | • Interviews with beneficiaries                                                                                                                                                                        |
|     | Roles and Responsibilities | - To what extent roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the different | Level of clarity of roles and                                        | • Procurement Manual  
• Interview with PMs                                                                                                                                                                                |
|     |                       |                                                                                     |                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

\(^8\) These indicators are preliminary proposed here. They will be further defined and piloted during the Thematic Evaluation of UNIDO procurement process planned for 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data source(s) for country / project evaluations</th>
<th>Additional data source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>procurement stages are established, adequate and clear?</td>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent there is an adequate segregation of duties across the procurement process and between the different roles and stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Procurement Manual</td>
<td>Interviews with Procurement officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How was responsibility for the customs clearance arranged? UNIDO FO? UNDP? Government? Other?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview to PMs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent were suppliers delivering products/services as required?</td>
<td>Level of satisfaction with suppliers</td>
<td>• Interviews with PMs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>- Were the transportation costs reasonable and within budget. If no, please elaborate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interviews with PMs</td>
<td>Evaluation reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Were the procured goods/services within the expected/planned costs? If no, please elaborate</td>
<td>Costs vs. budget</td>
<td>• Interview with PMs</td>
<td>Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Products</td>
<td>- To what extent the process provides adequate treatment to</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview with PMs</td>
<td>Interviews with Procurement officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Evaluation question</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data source(s) for country / project evaluations</td>
<td>Additional data source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>different types of procurement (e.g., by value, by category, by exception)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent were the procured goods of the expected/needed quality and quantity?</td>
<td>Level of satisfaction with products/services</td>
<td>• Survey to PMs and beneficiaries&lt;br&gt;• Observation in project site</td>
<td>• Interviews with Procurement officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process / workflow</td>
<td>- To what extent the procurement process if fit for purpose?</td>
<td>Level of satisfaction with the procurement process</td>
<td>• Interviews with PMs, Government counterparts and beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Procurement related documents review&lt;br&gt;• Evaluation reports&lt;br&gt;• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.&lt;br&gt;• Procurement related documents review&lt;br&gt;• Evaluation reports&lt;br&gt;• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.&lt;br&gt;• Interviews with Procurement officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Which are the main bottlenecks / issues in the procurement process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Which part(s) of the procurement process can be streamlined or simplified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>