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1. Introduction and background

An independent evaluation of the activities and involvement of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization’s (UNIDO) in the Republic of Indonesia was proposed and included in the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation (ODG/EVA) Work Programme 2014/2015.

The country evaluation will assess the efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the UNIDO interventions in Indonesia implemented since 2008 until now (2014). In addition to assessing country programme instruments, the country evaluation will include an assessment of the Field Office and how various management functions/tools contribute to efficient implementation, and achievements of regional programme interventions and national stand-alone projects as well as Montreal Protocol (MP) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) projects. The country evaluation is planned for the first quarter of 2015 and will be conducted by ODG/EVA staff and external independent evaluators.

Country context

Indonesia has a population of 242 million and with a total area covering 1,919,440 sq. km. Indonesia is the world's largest archipelago, with more than 17,500 islands, the world's fourth most populous democracy (since 1999) (behind China, India, and the United States).

The Human Development Index (HDI) for Indonesia was 0.68 in 2013, positioning the country in the medium human development category, at the 108th place out of 187 countries. The unemployment rate was estimated at 6.6% in 2012, showing a decreasing tendency and the poverty rate was estimated 16.2% in 2011 also showing improvement from 2010 (the poverty rate was 18% in 2010). Indonesia is ranked 38 on a total of 148 countries on the Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) for 2013-2014 ranking higher than in 2012-2013 (ranked 50) and has a
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Gender Inequality Index of 0.494, ranking 106 out of 148 countries in the 2012 index\(^5\), worse than other Asian countries like Philippines and China which are ranked at 77 and 35 respectively on this index.

**Economic aspects**

Indonesia is the 16\(^{th}\) largest economy in the world and the biggest economy in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and presented a steady economic growth over the last six years. As reported by Statistics Indonesia, the GDP Annual Growth Rate in Indonesia averaged 5.42% from 2000 until 2014, reaching an all-time high of 7.16% in the fourth quarter of 2004 and a record low of 1.56 % in the fourth quarter of 2001. Foreign Direct investment (FDI) represents only 2.1% of the GDP\(^6\). In 2012, Indonesia had a slight trade balance of $USD 4.076,9 million, exporting $US182.551,8 million and importing $US 186.628,7 million\(^7\).

According to 2000-2014 data, the services sector constitutes 38% of total GDP. Within services, the most important are: trade, hotel and restaurants (around 14% of GDP); transport and communication (7% of GDP); finance, real estate and business services (7% of GDP) and government services (6%). Agriculture accounts for the remaining 15%.\(^8\)

The industrial sector is the sector that currently contributes most to Indonesia's annual GDP growth. The two most important sub-sectors of industry are mining and manufacturing, both being major pillars of the nation's economy since the 1970s, thus being engines of economic change and development. Although manufacturing has lost its momentum after the Asian Crisis of the late 1990s, it still constitutes the most popular sub-sector of Indonesia in terms of foreign direct investment (FDI), followed by the mining sub-sector. Indonesia's main mining and manufacturing products are: coal, oil, gold, automobiles, electronics, footwear, textile products, paper products, furniture.\(^9\)

As far as energy is concerned, Indonesia produces oil, coal, natural and has a high renewable energy potential (solar, wind, hydro and geothermal energy). According to the International Energy Agency (IEA) Indonesia was the 10\(^{th}\) top natural gas producer in 2009. Indonesia is also blessed with huge renewable energy sources: Hydro, Geothermal, Mini/Micro-hydro and biomass. In addition solar energy and probably ocean/wave energy are available.


\(^{9}\) Indonesia investments http://www.indonesia-investments.com/culture/economy/general-economic-outline/industry/item379 (Retrieved 01.12.2014)
Challenges
Indonesia is a middle income country with manufacturing activities driven largely by the private sector and having a moderately sound export base. However, the manufacturing base needs to be modernized and industry and trade competitiveness needs to be strengthened.

With more than 25 large cities, with increasing urbanization and with some top ranked cities when it comes to population density, Indonesia faces some big challenges in the environment and infrastructure sectors. The greater metropolitan area of Jakarta has a population of about 27 million today and being one of the fastest-growing cities on earth, growing faster than Beijing and Bangkok, is expected to grow to over 40 million by 205010.

Pollution and the growing pressure of population demands together with inadequate environmental management is a problem for Indonesia that hurts the poor and the economy. Promoting employment and protecting the country’s vast natural resources from natural and man-made disasters is another major issue.

The Government became a signatory of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutant (POPs) in 2001. Today, Indonesia is one of the largest recipients of climate related development assistance through international funds, including the Global Environment Facility (GEF)11.

Government priorities
Giving high priority to nationwide economic and social development, the Government of Indonesia set a number of ambitious objectives that should be reached by the year 2025 and, accordingly, launched development plans listing its national development priorities. According to the “National Long Term Development Plan 2005 – 2025” the government’s priorities are:

1. Competitive economic development
2. Competitive manufacturing industry
3. Industrial sector as the locomotive of economic development
4. Development of industrial clusters
5. Improvement of efficiency, modernization and added value
6. Poverty alleviation
7. Trade and investment
8. Energy development
9. Environmental protection

The above priorities form the basis for Ministries and Government agencies when formulating or adjusting their respective strategic and regional plans. In brief, Indonesia aims to earn its place as one of the world’s developed countries by


2025 to be achieved by efforts aimed at increasing the quality of human resources, including the promotion of capacity building in science and technology and the strengthening of economic competitiveness.

**United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)**

**UNDAF 2006 - 2010**

The UNDAF 2006-2010 provided a collective, coherent and integrated United Nations System response to Indonesia’s national priorities and needs and was also in line with the commitments, goals and targets of the major international conferences, summits, conventions and human rights instruments of the UN system.

The focus areas and main outcomes of the UN System in Indonesia for UNDAF 2006-2010 were agreed to be:

- Strengthening human development to achieve the MDGs
- Promoting good governance
- Protecting the vulnerable and reducing vulnerabilities

UNIDO's work in Indonesia - as part of an interagency collaboration with International Labor Organization (ILO), United Nations Volunteers (UNV) and United Nations Treaty Collection (UNTC) - is in particular linked to the first and the third focus area of UNDAF 2006-2010.

**UNPDF 2011- 2015**

The United Nations Partnership for Development Framework UNPDF 2011 – 2015 was formulated over a period of two years in close coordination with the National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS) as the national Counterpart and with the engagement of several UN agencies, the Government, and civil society. The following 'actual' thematic focus areas for the UNPDF were identified:

1. Poverty and Vulnerability
2. Human and Social Impact of Crisis
3. Climate Change / Energy / Environment
4. HIV / Aids
5. Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management
6. Participation and Decentralization

It can be seen that the projects identified (and funded) under the Country Programme 2009 – 2013 had a direct link and were fully relevant to the identified thematic focus areas 1, 2 and 3 of the UNPAF 2011-2015.
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UNIDO’s presence in Indonesia

UNIDO has implemented more than 303 projects in Indonesia since 1969 with a total budget of more than US$ 77 million.\(^{13}\)


In the period 2003-2007 UNIDO’s activities in Indonesia were organised under two consecutive Country Service Frameworks (CSF). UNIDO’s Country Service Framework CSF I and CSF II covered the periods 2003 – 2004 and 2005 – 2007, respectively. Both the CSF I and II were not fully funded due largely to the aftermath of the Asian Financial Crisis of the late-1990s and the devastating tsunami and earthquake, which hit the country in 2004. During the CSF I and CSF II Indonesia were mostly engaged in structural adjustment programmes, and the top priority during CSF II was relief and humanitarian assistance to the victims of natural calamities.

CSF II comprised 14 programmatic themes structured under three components and had a budget of more than US$10 million. The CSF II was not very successful in raising funds. As a result of the funds mobilization efforts from both external and UNIDO sources, eight projects were ultimately funded and implemented under the Framework, with a total budget of $3.2 million. This funding level accounted for 30% of the original budget.

An independent evaluation of CSF II (May 2008) concluded that, although the framework and actual interventions proposed and implemented were broadly relevant, the overall effectiveness of the CSF II was limited and the efficiency mixed. Five of the projects covered different geographical areas, had different target groups, were not related types of project and were managed by different project managers, therefore there was a minimal synergy effect. At least three projects were designed as pilots, but replication features had not been built into the design and implementation and as a result, they were not readily replicable.

However, some significant outcomes were also produced. A comprehensive National Implementation Plan for the phase out of POPs in Indonesia had been endorsed by the government of Indonesia which was a key step for the government towards ratifying the Stockholm Convention. The livelihoods of the targeted beneficiaries, even though small in number, had increased and had become more stable. A technically sound small hydro power plant, which was put in place in Nias Island, would produce long-term impact if the local authorities or other development organizations replicate its model.

It was recommended, among others, that the upcoming UNIDO Indonesia Country Programme should follow up on and replicate the successful interventions under CSF II and include only projects with genuine government
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\(^{13}\) Source: UNIDO InfoBase, November 2014
support and firm funding prospects. Moreover, it was recommended to base programme/project design on proper needs assessments.

In May 2009, the discontinuation of the CSF Phase II was decided based on the understanding that whatever activities were still ongoing at that moment, should be included under the next Country Programme\textsuperscript{14}.

**The 2009-2013 Country Programme (CP)**

The Country Programme 2009 to 2013 was prepared with inputs received from Indonesia counterparts, in particular the Ministries of Industry, Trade, Environment, Energy and Mineral Resources. The formulation process took also into account the UNDAF 2006-2010, as well as the likely funding opportunities based on Indonesia’s state of economic development. The CP had an initial budget of USD 26,997,631\textsuperscript{15} (including support costs) and is structured along five components, covering 10 projects. The Country Programme was approved on May 2009 by the UNIDO Project Approval Committee (PAC).

Below there is a list with the projects planned in the Country Programme:

1. **Programme Component One**: Poverty Reduction through Productive Activities.
   - **Project 1**: Realizing minimum living standards for disadvantaged communities through peace building and village based economic development in Maluku province.
   - **Project 2**: Improving Human Development in Belu District, Nusa Tenggara Timur. Province (UN joint programme).

2. **Programme Component Two**: Trade Capacity Building.
   - **Project 3**: Increasing trade capacity of the fisheries sector in Indonesia.

   - **Project 4**: Promoting Energy Efficiency in the Industries through System Optimization and Energy Management Standards.
   - **Project 5**: Development of Nias Renewable Energy through Installation of Micro Hydro Power Plant.

4. **Programme Component Four**: Environment, MP - Stockholm Conventions (POPs).
   - **Project 6**: Introduction of an Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal System for PCBs Wastes and PCB Contaminated Equipment in Indonesia.
   - **Project 7**: Regional Plan for Introduction of BAT/BEP Strategies to Industrial Clusters of Annex C of Article 5 Sectors in East and South East

\textsuperscript{14} IOM 18.05.2009. Discontinuation of UNIDO Programmes
\textsuperscript{15} Source: Information provided by the FO in Indonesia (21/10/2014)
Asia (ESEA) Region: Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao, Mongolia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam.

- Project 8: Demonstration of BAT and BEP in Fossil Fuel fired Utility and Industrial Boilers in Response to the Stockholm Convention on POPs.
- Project 9: Phasing-out of HCFC-141b Under MP

5. Programme Component Five: Cross Cutting Programme – South - South Cooperation

At this stage, all projects (with exception Project 2: Improving Human Development in Belu District, Nusa Tenggara Timur Province, UN joint programme) of the Country Programme are being implemented or have been completed.

The Country Programme for Indonesia has an overall approved budget of USD 28,153,010 (including support costs) and is thus 104% funded. It is to be noted that the Programme’s major project portfolio concerns environment and energy related support with a portfolio of about 18 Million. The biggest donor is the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Other important donors are: the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO), of the Switzerland Government, the Montreal Protocol Multilateral and the Governments of Japan, Italy and New Zealand.

**Figure 1: Indonesia Country Programmed allotments per theme**

![Indonesia Country Programme allotments per theme](image)

A list of the current status of the projects (released budget and expenditures) included in the Indonesia Country Programme is presented below.
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17 Source: Information according to SAP, infobase and PM (21.11.2014)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project number</th>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Region of implementation</th>
<th>Budget Info (USD$)/(EURO€): Allotment November 2014</th>
<th>Budget Info (USD$)/(EURO€): Disbursement</th>
<th>Donor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US/INS/10/002</td>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>CP for the Republic of Indonesia 2009 – 2013</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>37,681</td>
<td>38,924</td>
<td>United Nations Trust Fund for Hu, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF/INS/08/004 - TF/INS/08/A04</td>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>REALIZING MINIMUM LIVING STANDARDS FOR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES THROUGH PEACE BUILDING AND VILLAGE BASED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>1,966,076</td>
<td>1,978,926</td>
<td>United Nations Trust Fund for Hu, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YY/INS/12/X01</td>
<td>TCB</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>INCREASING TRADE CAPACITY OF THE FISHERIES SECTOR IN INDONESIA</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>437,906</td>
<td>SECO, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP/INS/08/002</td>
<td>TCB</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>INCREASING TRADE CAPACITY OF THE FISHERIES SECTOR IN INDONESIA</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>123,221</td>
<td>123,221</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF/INS/12/001</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION OF AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL SYSTEM FOR PCB WASTES AND PCB CONTAMINATED EQUIPMENT IN INDONESIA - PREPARATORY ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>160,726</td>
<td>GEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP 130249,</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION OF AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL SYSTEM FOR PCB WASTES AND PCB CONTAMINATED EQUIPMENT IN INDONESIA</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>233,849.01</td>
<td>GEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project number</td>
<td>Thematic Area</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Region of implementation</td>
<td>Budget Info (USD$)/(EURO€): Allotment November 2014</td>
<td>Budget Info (USD$)/(EURO€): Disbursement</td>
<td>Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE/INS/09/004</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NATIONAL NETWORK FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOURCE EFFICIENT AND CLEANER PRODUCTION IN INDONESIA - PREPARATORY ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>Yogyakarta, Bandung, Surabaya, Makassar and Jakarta</td>
<td>54,671</td>
<td>55,910</td>
<td>SECO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US/INS/12/002, (SAP: 100224)</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NATIONAL RESOURCE EFFICIENT AND CLEANER PRODUCTION PROGRAMME IN INDONESIA</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>3,401,137</td>
<td>200,267</td>
<td>SECO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP/RAS/11/001</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>REGIONAL PLAN FOR INTRODUCTION OF BAT/BEP STRATEGIES TO INDUSTRIAL SOURCE CATEGORIES OF STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ANNEX C OF ARTICLE 5 IN ESEA REGION</td>
<td>RAS, CAMBODIA, CHINA, INDONESIA, LAO PEOPLES DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC, MONGOLIA, PHILIPPINES, THAILAND, VIETNAM</td>
<td>52,034.97</td>
<td>65,666.71</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF/RAS/10/006,XP/RAS/11/001</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>REGIONAL PLAN FOR INTRODUCTION OF BAT/BEP STRATEGIES TO INDUSTRIAL SOURCE CATEGORIES OF STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ANNEX C OF ARTICLE 5 IN ESEA REGION.</td>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>1,002,034.97</td>
<td>1,014,573.79</td>
<td>GEF, UNIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF/RAS/10/003, XP/RAS/11/002</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>DEMONSTRATION OF BAT AND BEP IN FOSSIL FUELED UTILITIES AND INDUSTRIAL BOILERS IN RESPONSE TO THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ON POPS</td>
<td>RAS, Indonesia, Cambodia, Lao, PDR, Mongolia, Philippines, Thailand</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>3,274,542</td>
<td>GEF and UNIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project number</td>
<td>Thematic Area</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Region of implementation</td>
<td>Budget Info (USD$)/(EURO€): Allotment November 2014</td>
<td>Budget Info (USD$)/(EURO€): Disbursement</td>
<td>Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF/INS/12/003</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>ENABLING ACTIVITY TO REVIEW AND UPDATE THE NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN IN INDONESIA</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>205,051</td>
<td>GEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE/INS/09/003</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROMOTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN THE INDUSTRIES THROUGH SYSTEM OPTIMIZATION AND ENERGY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS - GOVERNMENT OF ITALY CONTRIBUTION FOR PROJECT PREPARATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>EUR 94,500</td>
<td>EUR 92,728.89</td>
<td>GOVERNMENT OF ITALY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF/INS/09/001</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROMOTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN THE INDUSTRIES THROUGH SYSTEM OPTIMIZATION AND ENERGY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS - GEF CONTRIBUTION FOR PROJECT PREPARATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>79,515</td>
<td>GEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP/INS/08/003</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>SUSTAINING THE OPERATION OF THE MICRO HYDRO POWER PLANT IN NIAS ISLAND, NORTH SUMATRA PROVINCE, INDONESIA</td>
<td>Nias island, North Sumatra</td>
<td>36,416</td>
<td>36,591</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montreal Protocol</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP/INS/10/001</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>PREPARATION FOR HCFC PHASE-OUT INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES (SOLVENT SECTOR)</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>9,647</td>
<td>9,647</td>
<td>Montreal Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP/INS/11/003</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>HCFC PHASE-OUT MANAGEMENT PLAN (STAGE I, PHASE I) (UMBRELLA PROJECT TO PHASE OUT HCFC-141B FROM THE MANUFACTURING OF RIGID POLYURETHANE FOAM AT ISOTECH JAYA MAKMUR, AIRTEKINDO, SINAR LENTERA KENCANA AND MAYER JAYA)</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>777,395</td>
<td>732,194</td>
<td>Montreal Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project number</td>
<td>Thematic Area</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Region of implementation</td>
<td>Budget Info (USD$)/(EURO€): Allotment November 2014</td>
<td>Budget Info (USD$)/(EURO€): Disbursement</td>
<td>Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Regional projects

In addition to the Country Programme two regional projects will be included in the evaluation and will be assessed in terms of relevance to Indonesia and how the country has benefitted from them.

These regional projects are
1) TF/RAS/09/004/A04. "Regional Network on Pesticide for Asia and the Pacific" and “NEEM, Phase II - Coordination and technical support services provided by the Regional Network on Safe Pesticide Production and Information for Asia and the Pacific Team (RENPAP).”

The complete project list of project portfolio for Indonesia is available in Annex A.

Field Office Coordination, operations and management arrangements

The country programme falls under the responsibility of the UNIDO Field Office in Jakarta. The UNIDO Field Office in Indonesia, located in Jakarta and covers also Timor-Leste. It employs a UNIDO Representative and two staff members. The work of the Office is also supported by National and international experts.

2. Purpose of the country evaluation

The evaluation was included in the ODG/EVA Work Programme for 2015. It will be a forward-looking exercise and seek to identify good practices and areas for improvement in order to draw lessons to enhance the performance of UNIDO’s programme in Indonesia.

The country evaluation aims at assessing in a systematic and objective manner the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness (achievement of outputs and outcomes), impact and sustainability of UNIDO’s interventions. The evaluation will assess the achievements of the interventions against their key objectives, including ownership issues and re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and the appropriateness of the design. It will identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. Gender equality, procurement procedures, enterprise development and environmental sustainability will be mainstreamed in the evaluation.

The purpose of the evaluation is multifaceted, covering in particular the following features:

- To assess the relevance of UNIDO’s interventions in relation to national needs and national and international development priorities;
To assess the progress of Technical Cooperation (TC) interventions towards the expected outcomes outlined in the country programme (CP) and related project documents;

To assess the efficiency of UNIDO Technical Cooperation projects under the CP;

To assess contributions to the achievement of national development and UNDAF objectives;

To assess synergies within and between UNIDO projects as well as with related assistance of other donors/agencies;

To assess the adequacy of coordination and management systems and steering mechanisms;

To generate findings and draw lessons that can feed into future UNIDO projects and programmes in Indonesia and possibly elsewhere;

To serve as an input to the Thematic Evaluations to be conducted in 2015:
   - UNIDO interventions in the area of enterprise/job-creation and skills development, including for women and youth;
   - UNIDO procurement process.

3. Scope and focus

The evaluation will cover the full range of UNIDO’s activities in Indonesia since 2009. It will try to assess why projects/programmes have succeeded or failed and identify good practices and lessons learned. The evaluation will review all major projects within the ongoing Country Programme, as well as other (non-CP) UNIDO projects implemented in Indonesia since 2009. The evaluation will, furthermore, review coordination and management arrangements and functions.

In this respect, the evaluation will review the performance and impact of selected individual projects and, in a wider sense, the contribution of UNIDO to the development goals of Indonesia. It will focus on projects of a certain size or considered strategically important.

Based on the structure of the Country Programme the projects under this CP fall into the following thematic areas:

- Trade Capacity Building;
- Poverty reduction through productive activities;
- Energy;
- Environment;
Country specific projects that are proposed to be included in the country evaluation:
The following Country specific projects having an important budget allotment and state of expenditures – sufficient to measure the outputs -, or that are judged relevant for evaluation are in particular:

These are:

**Environment**
1) US/INS/12/002. “National Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production Programme in Indonesia”.

2) GF/INS/12/001. Introduction of an Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal System for PCBs Wastes and PCB contaminated equipment in Indonesia - Preparatory Assistance.

3) GF/INS/12/003. “Enabling activity to review and update the National Implementation Plan in Indonesia”.

**Montreal Protocol**
4) MP/INS/11/003. HCFC Phase-out management plan (STAGE I, PHASE I) (Umbrella Project to phase out HCFC-141B from the manufacturing of Rigid Polyurethane foam at Isotech Jaya Makmur, Airtekindo, Sinar Lentera Kencana and Mayer Jaya).

**Energy**
5) GF/INS/11/001, XP/INS/11/002. “Promoting energy efficiency in the industries through system optimization and energy management standards in Indonesia” and UNIDO Contribution for implementation phase of “Promoting Energy Efficiency in the Industries through System Optimization and Energy Management Standards”,

6) TE/RAS/12/005, UE/RAS/05/004. “Promotion and transfer of marine current exploitation technology in China and South East Asia (pilot plants)”

7) UE/INS/09/003. Promoting energy efficiency in the industries through system optimization and energy management standards - Government of Italy contribution for project preparation.

**Poverty reduction through productive activities**
8) TF/INS/08/004 - TF/INS/08/A04 and US/INS/10/002 “Realizing minimum living standards for disadvantaged communities through peace building and village based economic development.
Trade Capacity Building

9) YY/INS/12/X01 and XP/INS/08/002. Increasing trade capacity of the fisheries sector in Indonesia, financed by SECO and UNIDO.

Of the UNIDO projects included in the overall Indonesia project portfolio four projects have already been evaluated by UNIDO or by the donor, one project will be evaluated independently and a field validation mission was conducted. These evaluation findings will be reviewed and will feed into the country evaluation. These projects are:

- UNIDO Independent Terminal Evaluation - Promotion and Transfer of Marine Current Exploitation Technology in China and South East Asia (Pilot Plants)” (UE/RAS/05/004), 2014.
- Field validation mission carried out in Indonesia in connection to the internal UNIDO review of UNIDO Montreal Protocol projects, 29 June – 7 July 2009 (Solvent, Methyl Bromide and other Foams sector projects).

To be evaluated individually:

GFINS11001 “Promoting Industrial Energy Efficiency through System Optimization and Energy Management Standards.”

The country evaluation will also take into consideration the following UNIDO past evaluations covering Indonesia or which addressed issues relevant to the country:


Inter alia, the country evaluation will review to what extent recommendations of the prior CP evaluation have been implemented.

The exact scope of the country evaluation will be decided during the inception period. The evaluation will be participatory and involve stakeholders, including national counterparts, donors and beneficiaries as well as UNIDO project managers and project staff.
Regional projects

As already mentioned, the following regional projects are envisaged to be included in the country evaluation.

Regional projects
TF/RAS/09/004/A04. “Regional Network on Pesticide for Asia and the Pacific” and “NEEM, Phase II - Coordination and technical support services provided by the Regional Network on Safe Pesticide Production and Information for Asia and the Pacific Team (RENPAP)”

Pipeline projects and projects under development

Also pipeline projects and projects in early stage of development are expected to be included in the assessment (with focus on the assessment of their design and relevance. The four following projects were identified:

1) Promoting Energy Efficiency (EE) in Small and Medium Industries (SMIs) in Indonesia.
   Budget USD 3,000,000 and Co-financing: USD 14.775 million.
   Status: PIF is currently under development and discussions with counterparts are ongoing Potential Donor: GEF

2) The Global Cleantech Innovation Programme for SMEs in Indonesia.
   Budget: USD 2,000,000 and Co-financing: USD 6 million.
   Status: Consultations with potential project partners are ongoing Potential Donor: GEF

3) Introduction of BAT/BEP in the Thermal Processes of the Metallurgical Sector in Indonesia
   Status: To be formulated in 2016
   Budget: USD 4M
   Potential Donor: GEF

4) Maluku/NTT Seaweed Sector Development.
   Budget: USD 1,500,000.
   Potential Donor: New Zealand.
   Status: Prodoc prepared.
4. Evaluation issues and key evaluation questions

A. General evaluation and cross-cutting issues

The country evaluation will use the DAC criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact). In addition, South-South Cooperation, gender and environmental sustainability will be mainstreamed.

More specifically the evaluation will assess the CP and selected individual projects and aims at answering the questions below.

Relevance
The degree to which the design and objectives of UNIDO’s integrated and country programmes is consistent with the needs of the country and with development plans and priorities as well as with UNIDO’s strategic priorities.

The extent to which the country programme was relevant to:
- the development challenges facing the country;
- the UNDAF objectives\textsuperscript{18}
- Government strategies and priorities
- UNIDO’s strategic priorities (Programme and Budget, Medium Term Strategic Framework);
- UNIDO’s policy on Gender Equality (GE) and the Empowerment of Women;
- the Green Industry agenda;
- the different types of beneficiaries (varying per project).

Efficiency
The extent to which:

- UNIDO provided high quality services (expertise, training, equipment, methodologies, technologies, etc.) that led to the production of outputs;
- the resources and inputs were converted to results in a timely and cost-effective manner;
- coordination amongst and within components of the programme, synergies and coherence between different UNIDO projects and with related programmes and projects of other donors/agencies lead to collaboration and cooperation among stakeholders and to the production of outputs;
- the same results could have been achieved in another, more cost-effective manner;

\textsuperscript{18} UNDAF United Nations Development Assistance Framework, Indonesia 2006-2010
• women and men benefitted equally from the programme and its underlying projects;
• outputs were produced in a timely manner;
• procurement process/services were efficient (specific questions are provided as reference and guidance in the Annexe G: UNIDO Procurement Services - Generic Approach and Assessment Framework).

Effectiveness
The extent to which the programmes achieved their objectives and major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives.

The extent to which:
• objectives/results (outcomes and outputs) as formulated in programme/project documents were achieved and how the stakeholders perceive their quality and the beneficiaries use these;
• factors (to be identified) influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives.
• direct and ultimate beneficiaries were actually reached;

Sustainability
Sustainability is concerned with assessing whether the benefits of a project are likely to continue after the project has ended. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

The extent to which:
• a sustainability strategy was formulated
• there is continued commitment and ownership by the government and other national stakeholders to continue / replicate the project;
• the likelihood that changes or benefits can be maintained in the long term from technical, organizational and financial perspective

Impact
The positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

The extent to which the programme and projects contributed (directly or indirectly, in an intended or unintended manner):
• to the promotion of sustainable industrial development, employment generation and competitiveness, and laying the foundation for the graduation
of the country from a low-middle income count to becoming a newly industrialized country (Integrated programme objective);
- to the promotion of inclusive growth (including for youth and disadvantaged groups) through the enhancement of productive activities and introduction of environment-friendly technologies (Country programme objective);
- to developmental results (economic, environmental, social);
- to the achievement of the MDGs and national development goals;
- to Gender Equality (GE) and empowerment of women.

Country Programme management
The extent to which:

- efficient cooperation arrangements were established between the Headquarters and project staff and with the UNIDO Regional Office in Indonesia;
- UNIDO’s Field Office in Indonesia supported coordination, implementation and monitoring of the programmes;
- UNIDO HQ based management; coordination and monitoring have been efficient and effective;
- management and monitoring systems were adequate.

Partnership and coordination
The extent to which:

- effective coordination arrangements with other development partners were established;
- UNIDO contributed to and was part of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Indonesia 2006 – 2010 and 2011-2015;
- the UNIDO Country Programme adhered to the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (i.e., government ownership, alignment with government strategies, results orientation, program approaches, use of country systems, tracking results, and mutual accountability).

Cross-cutting issues
The extent to which the programme and its underlying projects addressed the cross-cutting issues of gender equality, environmental sustainability and South-South co-operation.

Project design
The extent to which:
- a participatory project identification process was followed in selecting problem areas and counterparts requiring technical cooperation support;
- the project has a clear thematically focused development objective, the attainment of which can be determined by a set of verifiable indicators;
- the project was formulated based on the logical framework approach;
- the project appropriately reflected the needs and priorities of women, youth and minorities in the design.

Relevance and ownership
The extent to which:

- the project/component was formulated with participation of the national counterpart(s) and/or target beneficiaries, in particular private enterprises and the industrial stakeholders.
- the counterpart(s) has (have) been appropriately involved and was (were) participating in the identification of the critical problem areas and in the development of technical cooperation strategies, and were actively supporting the implementation of the component.
- the project/component is relevant to the higher-level programme-wide objective.
- the project/component is relevant to national and international strategic priorities and the outputs as formulated in the project document are necessary and sufficient to achieve the objectives.

Efficiency
The extent to which:

- UNIDO and Government/counterpart inputs have been provided as planned and were adequate to meet requirements;
- UNIDO provided high quality services (expertise, training, equipment, methodologies, etc.) that led to the production of outputs;
- operationally completed projects are financially closed in a timely manner;
- resources and inputs were converted to results in a timely and cost-effective manner;
- procurement services have been provided as planned and were adequate in terms of timing, value, process issues, responsibilities;
- internal and external synergies with related interventions were sought and established.

Effectiveness
The extent to which:

- outputs and outcomes established in the project document were achieved;
- women and men benefitted equally.

Sustainability
Sustainability is concerned with assessing whether the benefits of a project are likely to continue after the project has ended. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

**Impact**
- Assessment of the developmental changes (economic, environmental, social) which have occurred or are likely to occur.

**Procurement**
- 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.

5. **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

These Terms of Reference (ToR) provide some information as regards the methodology but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. It is rather meant to guide the evaluation team in elaborating an appropriate evaluation methodology that should be proposed, explained and justified in an inception report.

In terms of data collection the evaluation team should use a variety of methods ranging from desk review (project and programme documents, progress reports, mission reports, Agresso search, SAP search, evaluation reports, etc.) to individual interviews, focus group discussions, direct observation at project sites and, where appropriate, statistical analysis, surveys.

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

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

Additional methodological components can be defined in the inception report.

6. TIME SCHEDULE

The country evaluation is scheduled to take place between January and March 2015. An evaluation mission 22 February 2015 to 3 March 2015 is planned. The overall times schedule is presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Estimated month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection of documentation by ODG/EVA</td>
<td>December, January, February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review by members of evaluation team</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews at HQ and development of inception report</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work in Indonesia (2 weeks)</td>
<td>February - March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings at HQ</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of report</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection and incorporation of comments into report</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuance of final report</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will include:

- One ODG/EVA staff member who will also act as evaluation manager.
- One Senior International Evaluation Consultant with experience in Environment and Energy related projects;
- One National Evaluation Consultant;
- One junior Consultant.

The international and national consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. In addition, a junior consultant will be hired for the preparation of relevant documents and coordination before the field mission. The tasks of the consultants are specified in their respective job descriptions, attached to this ToR as Annex B.

All members of the evaluation team must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of any intervention to be
assessed by the evaluation and/or have benefited from the programme/projects under evaluation.

One member of UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation will manage the evaluation and act as a focal point for the evaluation consultants. Additionally, the Field Office in Indonesia will support the evaluation team and assist in planning and coordinating the evaluation mission.

EVALUATION PROCESS AND REPORTING

The evaluation will use a participatory approach and involves various stakeholders in the different stages of the evaluation process. The responsibilities for the various evaluation stages and outputs are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection of consultants</th>
<th>ODG/EVA</th>
<th>PTC</th>
<th>UNIDO Field Office</th>
<th>Government of Indonesia and national counterparts</th>
<th>Evaluation team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of background documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews at UNIDO HQ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation mission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings in the field</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings at HQ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on draft report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation deliverables such as the Inception Report and the Evaluation Report will be approved by the Evaluation Manager.

The evaluation team will present its preliminary findings to the Government and other key national stakeholders at the end of the field mission as well as to programme and project staff and staff at UNIDO Headquarters and at the Field Office in Indonesia. A draft evaluation report will be circulated for comments and factual validation. The reporting language will be English.
The ToR and the draft report will be shared with the national counterparts, the main donors and relevant UNIDO staff members for comments and factual validation. This consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. The evaluators will take comments into consideration when preparing the final version of the report. The final evaluation report will be submitted 6-8 weeks after the field mission, at the latest, to the Government of Indonesia and other national stakeholders, to donors and to UNIDO.

8. DELIVERABLES

The following deliverables will be produced by the evaluation team:

- Inception report
- Draft report
- Final report

9. QUALITY ASSURANCE

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation. Quality control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on EVA methodology and process, review of inception report and evaluation report). The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality in Annex C.

10. ANNEXES

A. Job descriptions for team members
B. Checklist on evaluation report quality
C. Tentative evaluation report outline
D. Reference documents
E. List of UNIDO projects in Indonesia
F. Map with project locations
Annex A: Full list of projects to be reviewed for the Indonesia Country Evaluation

a) Projects proposed to be evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project number</th>
<th>Project m number</th>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Region of implementation</th>
<th>Budget Info (USD$)</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Counterparts</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YY/INS/12/X01</td>
<td>KAESER, Ralf</td>
<td>TCB</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>INCREASING TRADE CAPACITY OF THE FISHERIES SECTOR IN INDONESIA</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>SECO</td>
<td>Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, the Ministry of Trade and the Ministry of Industry and several Related Sector Associations</td>
<td>Implementation start 02/2014 - proposed end: 05/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP/INS/08/002</td>
<td>KAESER, Ralf</td>
<td>TCB</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>INCREASING TRADE CAPACITY OF THE FISHERIES SECTOR IN INDONESIA</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>123,221</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>Implementation start 2008 - implementation end 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,623,221</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Info:
- Allotment
- Disbursement

Donor:
- SECO
- UNIDO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project number</th>
<th>Project managers</th>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Region of implementation</th>
<th>Budget Info (USD$) Allotment</th>
<th>Budget Info (USD$) Disbursement</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Counterparts</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF/INS/12/001</td>
<td>CENTENO, Carmela</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION OF AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL SYSTEM FOR PCBs WASTES AND PCB CONTAMINATED EQUIPMENT IN INDONESIA - PREPARATORY ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>160,726</td>
<td>GEF</td>
<td></td>
<td>GFINS12001 GEF funded Grant for PPG: USD 150,000. FSP ongoing: SAP 130249, GEF grant: USD 6M: Start 10/2013 - proposed end 10/2018 - mid-term 01/2016 - )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US/INS/12/002, (SAP: 100224)</td>
<td>Cornelius VAN BERKEL</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NATIONAL RESOURCE EFFICIENT AND CLEANER PRODUCTION PROGRAMME IN INDONESIA</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>3,401,137</td>
<td>200,267</td>
<td>SECO</td>
<td>UNIDO, UNEP</td>
<td>Available funds:USD 3,200,869.00 Project start 2013- expected to finish 2016 .Related Projects: UEINS09004There have been delays due to changes in the government and the CTA hasn't been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP/RAS/11/001</td>
<td>CENTENO, Carmela</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>REGIONAL PLAN FOR INTRODUCTION OF BAT/BEP STRATEGIES TO INDUSTRIAL SOURCE CATEGORIES OF STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ANNEX C OF ARTICLE 5 IN ESEA REGION</td>
<td>RAS, CAMBODIA, CHINA, INDONESIA, LAO, PEOPLE'S</td>
<td>52,034.97</td>
<td>65,666.71</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines, Department of Environment, PDR Lao, Ministry of Environment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TF/RAS/09/004 & TF/RAS/09/A04 | GALVAN, Erlinda | Environment | O | REGIONAL NETWORK ON PESTICIDE FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC - NEEM, PHASE II - COORDINATION AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE RENPAP TEAM Note: A04 – Coordination and technical support services provided by the RENPAP team (October 2015) | RAS | 396,593 | 274,209 | Trust Fund from participating countries | Indonesia, Ministry of Environmental Protection, China, Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy, Cambodia Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Thailand Ministry of Nature and Environment, Mongolia

| XP/GLO/10/005 | LEUENBERGER, Heinz | Environment | C | FOLLOW-UP AND IMPLEMENTATION OF GREEN INDUSTRY INITIATIVE | GLO | 463,315 | 460,287 | UNIDO | Directorate of Base Chemical Industry, Ministry of Industry, Republic of Indonesia

Project since 2004

Closed 2012. Related Projects: TFRAS04001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF/RAS/10/003, XP/RAS/11/002</th>
<th>CENTENO, Carmela</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>DEMONSTRATION OF BAT AND BEP IN FOSSIL FUEL-FIRED UTILITIES AND INDUSTRIAL BOILERS IN RESPONSE TO THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ON POPS</th>
<th>RAS, Indonesia, Cambodia, Lao, PDR, Mongolia, Philippines, Thailand</th>
<th>4,000,000</th>
<th>3,274,542</th>
<th>GEF and UNIDO</th>
<th>Water Resources and Environment Administration (WREA), Lao PDR, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines, Ministry of Environment, Indonesia, Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy, Cambodia Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Thailand Ministry of Nature and Environment, Mongolia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF/INS/12/003</td>
<td>CENTENO, Carmela</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>ENABLING ACTIVITY TO REVIEW AND UPDATE THE NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN IN INDONESIA</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>205,051</td>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Available funds: ISD19,948 GFINS12003: ending December 2014, NIP endorsed: Grant: USD 225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,732,751</td>
<td>4,696,659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation start 20/05/2010 - Proposed end 30/04/2014 - Revised End 30/04/2015 - Mid - Term Eva: 12/2013 Term Eva: 01/04/2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project number</th>
<th>Project managers</th>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Stat us</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Region of implementation</th>
<th>Budget Info (USD$) Allotment</th>
<th>Budget Info (USD$) Disbursement</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Counterparts</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF/INS/09/001</td>
<td>SHRESTHA, Sanjaya Man</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROMOTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN THE INDUSTRIES THROUGH SYSTEM OPTIMIZATION AND ENERGY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS - GEF CONTRIBUTION FOR PROJECT PREPARATION</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>79,515</td>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (MEMR), Ministry of Industry (MOI), Badan Standardisasi Nasional (BSN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP/INS/08/003</td>
<td>SINGH, Rana Pratap</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>SUSTAINING THE OPERATION OF THE MICRO HYDRO POWER PLANT IN NIAS ISLAND, NORTH SUMATRA PROVINCE, INDONESIA</td>
<td>Nias island, North Sumatra</td>
<td>36,416</td>
<td>36,591</td>
<td>UNIDO, BRR</td>
<td>Agency for Rehabilitation and Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project number</td>
<td>Project managers</td>
<td>Thematic Area</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Region of implementation</td>
<td>Budget Info (USD$)</td>
<td>Budget Info (USD$) Disbursement</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Counterparts</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total | USD 2,296,796 and EUR 129,816 | USD 1,596,495 and EUR 118,225.61 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project number</th>
<th>Project managers</th>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Region of implementation</th>
<th>Budget Info (USD$) Allotment</th>
<th>Budget Info (USD$) Disbursement</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Counterparts</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP/INS/10/001</td>
<td>DEMKO, Milan</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>PREPARATION FOR HCFC PHASE-OUT INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES (SOLVENT SECTOR)</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>9,647</td>
<td>9,647</td>
<td>Montreal Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project started 2012 - ended 2012. All money was spent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP/INS/11/003</td>
<td>DEMKO, Milan</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>HCFC PHASE-OUT MANAGEMENT PLAN (STAGE I, PHASE I) (UMBRELLA PROJECT TO PHASE OUT HCFC-141B FROM THE MANUFACTURING OF RIGID POLYURETHANE FOAM AT ISOTECH JAYA MAKMUR, AIRTEKINDO, SINAR LENTERA KENCANA AND MAYER JAYA)</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>777,395</td>
<td>732,194</td>
<td>Montreal Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project started 2012 - Funds available: USD 48,451.41 MP Methyl Bromide and Solvent and other Foam were validated in 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | | | | | | **787,042** | **741,841** |
### Projects already evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project number</th>
<th>Project managers</th>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Region of implementation</th>
<th>Budget Info (USD$): Allotment</th>
<th>Budget Info (USD$): Disbursement</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Counterpart(s)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE/RAS/12/005, UE/RAS/05/004</td>
<td>VENTO, Emilio, SINGH, Rana</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>PROMOTION AND TRANSFER OF MARINE CURRENT EXPLOITATION TECHNOLOGY IN CHINA AND SOUTHEAST ASIA (PILOT PLANTS)</td>
<td>China, the Philippines and Indonesia</td>
<td>866,979</td>
<td>to be verified</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>GoI</td>
<td>evaluated 10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF/RAS/10/006, XP/RAS/11/001</td>
<td>CENTENO, Carmela</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>REGIONAL PLAN FOR INTRODUCTION OF BAT/BEP STRATEGIES TO INDUSTRIAL SOURCE CATEGORIES OF STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ANNEX C OF ARTICLE 5 IN ESEA REGION.</td>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>1,002,034.97</td>
<td>1,014,573.79</td>
<td>GEF, UNIDO, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Philippines, Department of Environment, PDR Lao, Ministry of Environment, Indonesia, Ministry of Environment Protection, China, Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy, Cambodia Ministry of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Evaluated 01/2014/ Implementation start 09/03/2010 - Proposed end: 31/07/2012 - Implementation end 31/03/2013 /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Project Leader</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Expected Output</td>
<td>Implementing Agency</td>
<td>Other Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF/INS/08/004 - TF/INS/08/A04</td>
<td>TAKAHASHI, Noriko</td>
<td>PRP C</td>
<td>$1,966,076</td>
<td>Realizing minimum living standards for disadvantaged communities through peace building and village based economic development</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>United Nations Trust Fund for Human Settlements (UNIDO)</td>
<td>Evaluated: 2012 Funds available: USD 7,149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Projects under development - Pipeline projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project managers</th>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Region of implementation</th>
<th>Budget Info tentative (USD$): Allotment</th>
<th>Potential Donor</th>
<th>Project Objective/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHRESTHA, Sanjaya Man</td>
<td>EAE</td>
<td>Hard pipeline</td>
<td>PROMOTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY (EE) IN SMALL AND MEDIUM INDUSTRIES (SMIs) IN INDONESIA</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>USD 3,000,000 and Co-financing: USD 14.775 million</td>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>To promote and stimulate adoption of energy efficient technologies and best practices in selected energy-intensive Small and Medium Industries (SMIs) in Indonesia for enhancement of their competitiveness and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. • Status: PIF is in the process for GEF Focal Point endorsement Discussions with GEF FP is ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRESTHA, Sanjaya Man</td>
<td>EAE</td>
<td>Soft pipeline</td>
<td>The Global Cleantech Innovation Programme for SMEs in Indonesia</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>USD 2,000,000 and Co-financing: USD 6 million</td>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>To promote clean energy technology innovations and entrepreneurship in Indonesia through the development of a cleantech innovation platform and accelerator programme. • Status: Consultations with potential project partners are ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAJARABI, Shadia</td>
<td>TCB</td>
<td>Prodoc prepared</td>
<td>Maluku/NTT Seaweed Sector Development</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>USD 1,500,000</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTENO, Carmela</td>
<td>EAE</td>
<td>To be formulated in 2016</td>
<td>Introduction of BAT/BEP in the Thermal Processes of the Metallurgical Sector in Indonesia</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>USD 4,000,000</td>
<td>GEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INDEPENDENT UNIDO COUNTRY EVALUATION – INDONESIA

Job description

Post title: Senior International Evaluation Consultant

Post number:

Duration of contract: 35 days spread over 4 months

Entry on duty date: 9 February 2015

Duty station: Home-based, Indonesia and Vienna HQ

Duties:

The senior international evaluation consultant will carry out the review of UNIDO’s Environment and Energy related interventions in Indonesia according to the terms of reference. In addition she/he will be contributing to the preparation of the evaluation report. The senior international evaluation consultant will perform the following tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparatory phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Study related programme and project</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Analytical overview of available documents and of UNIDO activities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documentation (including progress reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and documentary outputs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Study relevant background information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(national policies, international</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frameworks, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Study available evaluation reports and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-evaluation reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Briefing with Evaluation Group at HQ</strong></td>
<td>4 days Incl travel</td>
<td>Vienna, UNIDO</td>
<td>Key issues of evaluation identified; Scope of evaluation clarified;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Inputs to methodology and interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>HQ Vienna</td>
<td><strong>Inception report</strong>, including the proposed methodology, approach and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Interviews with project managers and key</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders at HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Inputs to the inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field mission to Indonesia</td>
<td>12 days (incl. travel)</td>
<td>Indonesia with in-country travel</td>
<td>Information gathered on issues specified in TOR Draft conclusions and recommendations Agreement on structure and content of evaluation report; distribution of writing tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing at UNIDO HQ, Vienna</td>
<td>3 days (incl. travel)</td>
<td>Vienna, UNIDO HQ</td>
<td>Feedback on preliminary findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of evaluation report</td>
<td>12 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Draft report Feedback on draft report Final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualifications**

- Advanced university degree in energy or environment, development studies or other fields related to industrial development;
- Experience in evaluation and coordination of evaluation teams;
- Knowledge in the field of Environmental projects;
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks (Paris Declaration, One UN, etc.) desirable;
- Knowledge of issues related to Sustainable Industrial Development, knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset;
- Working experience within the UN system an asset;
- Working experience in Indonesia an asset.

**Languages:** English

**Background information:** see the terms of reference

**Impartiality:** According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the preparation, implementation or supervision of any of the programmes/projects under evaluation.
INDEPENDENT UNIDO COUNTRY EVALUATION – INDONESIA

Job description

Post title: National evaluation consultant

Post number: 

Duration: 24 days spread over 3 months

Date required: 17 February 2015

Duty station: Home-based and various locations in Indonesia

Duties:
As a member of the evaluation team and under the supervision of the evaluation team leader, the consultant will participate in the independent country evaluation in Indonesia according to the terms of reference attached. He/she will participate in all evaluation activities and contribute to the assessments in particular with a view to assessing the UNIDO activities in the field of private sector development, micro enterprise and livelihood development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Study relevant programme and project documentation including progress reports and documentary outputs and TOR.</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Analytical overview of available documents; list of issues to be clarified; background data needed for evaluation collected at field level; inputs to inception report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Study relevant background information (national policies, international frameworks, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Assist in the preparation of the evaluation mission in close consultation with the UNIDO Focal Point in Indonesia.</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Briefing with Evaluation Group in Indonesia.</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Indonesia with in-country travel</td>
<td>Notes, tables; information gathered on issues specified in ToR; Draft conclusions and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conclusions and recommendations, and present them to stakeholders in accordance with the instructions of the team leader.</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Inputs to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Participate in the preparation/review of the report according to the instructions of the team leader, and providing country specific background information and national context inputs to the report. Draft inputs based on evaluation to the evaluation report. Incorporate comments received and assist with finalizing the evaluation report, including annexes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Inputs to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualifications:**
- University degree in a field relevant to economics, development;
- Knowledge of Indonesia’s industrial development situation, institutions and programmes;
- Knowledge of UNIDO;
- Evaluation experience.

**Languages:** Fluency in oral and written English and preferably good knowledge in Indonesian.

**Impartiality:** According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the preparation, implementation or supervision of the project subject to this evaluation.
INDEPENDENT UNIDO COUNTRY EVALUATION – INDONESIA

Post title: Junior Consultant

Duration: 1 w/m (1 w/m over period January/February/March 2015)

Date required: February 2015

Duty station: UNIDO HQ, Vienna

Duties of the consultant: The Junior Consultant will assist with the conduct of the Indonesia Country Evaluation; he/she will carry out the following duties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties</th>
<th>Duration (work days)</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participate in the preparation, including mission planning and background research</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Mission programme and desk review document, providing information according to the needs identified in the ToR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and statistical analyses needed for the preparation of the evaluation report</td>
<td>12 days</td>
<td>Statistical tables and analyses to be used in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of annexes of the evaluation report.</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Bibliography and list of person consulted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualifications:
- Qualification in evaluation, university degree in development, public administration, communications or other relevant degree.
- Knowledge of evaluation and UN/UNIDO projects and programmes.

Competencies: Proven conceptual analytical skills and ability to conduct independent research and analyse data.

Languages: Fluency in oral and written English.
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Checklist on evaluation report quality:

**Independent Terminal Evaluation of the UNIDO Project**

“title……………”

(Project Number: ………………………)

Evaluation team leader:

Quality review done by:

Date:

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

**Findings and conclusions**

The report is consistent and the evidence is complete (covering all aspects defined in the TOR) and convincing.

The report presents an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives.

The report presents an assessment of relevant external factors (assumptions, risks, impact drivers) and how they influenced the evaluation object and the achievement of results.

The report presents a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes or it explains why this is not (yet) possible.

The report analyses the budget and actual project costs.

Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report and are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report.

Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, are identified as much as possible.

Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.

Relevant cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights, and environment are appropriately covered.

**Recommendations and lessons learned**

The lessons and recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions presented in the report.

The recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations (‘who?’ ‘what?’ ‘where?’ ‘when?’).

Recommendations are implementable and take resource implications into account.

Lessons are readily applicable in other contexts and suggest prescriptive action.

**Rating system for quality of evaluation reports**

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.
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Acronyms and Abbreviations
Glossary of Terms
Executive Summary

MAIN REPORT:

I. BACKGROUND
   1. Background and introduction
      o evaluation objectives
      o methodology
      o evaluation process
      o limitations of evaluation
   2. Country context
      o historical context
      o brief overview of recent economic development
      o industrial situation and relevant sector specific information
      o development challenges facing the country
      o relevant Government policies, strategies and initiatives
      o initiatives of international cooperation partners
   3. Description of UNIDO activities in the country
      o major TC components, main objectives and problems they address
      o brief overview of other important activities

II. ASSESSMENT
   4. Performance of TC activities
      o Poverty Reduction through Productive Activities
      o Trade capacity building
      o Energy and Environment
   5. Performance in cross-cutting issues
      o gender
      o environment
      o South-South cooperation

III. MAIN CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

   o Main conclusions from section II will be used as a basis for recommendations.

IV. LESSONS LEARNED

V. ANNEXES
   o Annex A: Terms of Reference
o Annex B: List of persons met
o Annex C: Bibliography
o Annex D: Project Assessments and reviews
o Annex E: Country Map and project sites
o Annex F: .....
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Annex G: 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 etc..

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 occur between the Project Manager/Allotment Holder and his/her respective Line Manager. For Fast Track procurement, the segregation occurs between the Project Manager/Allotment Holder and Financial Services;
- Financial Services: For processing payments.

Figure 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, etc.).
- The absence of efficiency parameters (procurement KPIs).

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

- To what extent does the process provide adequate treatment to different types of procurement (e.g. by value, by category, by exception)?
- Was the procurement timely? How long did the procurement process take (e.g. by value, by category, by exception)?
- Did the good/item(s) arrive as planned or scheduled? If not, how long were the times gained or were the delays. If delay occurred, 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 not, please elaborate.
- Was the freight forwarding timely and within budget? If not, 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 long did it take?
- How long did it take to get approval from the government on import duty exemption?
- Which were the main bottlenecks / issues in the procurement process?
- What good practices have been identified?
- To what extent are roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the different procurement stages established, adequate and clear?
- To what extent is an adequate segregation of duties across the procurement process and between the different roles and stakeholders in place?

6. Evaluation Method and Tools

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

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

- **Desk Review**: Policy, Manuals and procedures related to the procurement process. Identification of new approaches being implemented in other UN or international organizations. Findings, recommendations and lessons from UNIDO Evaluation reports.
- **Interviews**: to analyze and discuss specific issues/topics with key process stakeholders
- **Survey to stakeholders**: To measure the satisfaction level and collect expectations, issues from process owners, user and clients
- **Process and Stakeholders Mapping**: To understand and identify the main phases the procurement process and sub-processes; and to identify the perspectives and expectations from the different stakeholders, as well as their respective roles and responsibilities
- **Historical Data analysis from IT procurement systems**: To collect empirical data and identify and measure to the extent possible different performance dimensions of the process, such as timeliness, re-works, complaints, etc.

An evaluation matrix is presented in below, 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.
### Evaluation Matrix for the Procurement Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators(^{19}) for country / project evaluations</th>
<th>Data Source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015</th>
<th>Additional data Source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Overall) Time to Procure (TTP)</td>
<td>Interviews with PMs, Government counterparts and beneficiaries</td>
<td>• Procurement related documents review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Was the procurement timely? How long the procurement process takes (e.g. by value, by category, by exception...)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SAP/Infobase (queries related to procurement volumes, categories, timing, issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interviews with Procurement officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Did the good/item(s) arrive as planned or scheduled? If not, how long were the times gained or delays. If delayed, what was the reason(s)?</td>
<td>Time to Delivery (TTD)</td>
<td>Interviews with PM, procurement officers and Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Was the freight forwarding timely and within budget? If not, please elaborate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Was the customs clearance timely? How many days did it take?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How long time did it take to get approval</td>
<td>Time to Government</td>
<td>Interviews with PMs, Government counterparts and beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{19}\) 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(^9) for country / project evaluations</th>
<th>Data Source(s) for thematic evaluation of procurement process in 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from the government on import duty exemption?</td>
<td>Clearance (TTGC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | Roles and Responsibilities | To what extent roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the different procurement stages are established, adequate and clear? | Level of clarity of roles and responsibilities | • Procurement Manual  
• Interview with PMs  |
|     |      | To what extent there is an adequate segregation of duties across the procurement process and between the different roles and stakeholders? | | • Procurement Manual  
• Interview with PMs  |
• Interview to PMs  
• Interviews with local partners  |
<p>|     |      | To what extent were suppliers delivering products/services as required? | Level of satisfaction with Suppliers | • Interviews with PMs  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators¹⁹</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>Costs</td>
<td>• Were the transportation costs reasonable and within budget. If no, pleased 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 different types of procurement (e.g. by value, by category, by exception...)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview with PMs</td>
<td>• Interviews with Procurement officers</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, Observation in project site</td>
<td></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, Evaluation Reports, Survey to PMs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Which are the main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Evaluation question</td>
<td>Indicators[^1]</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>bottlenecks / issues in the procurement process?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PMs, Government counterparts and beneficiaries</td>
<td>procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     |      | • Which part(s) of the procurement process can be streamlined or simplified? | • Interview with PMs |                                | • Procurement related documents review  
• Evaluation Reports  
• Survey to PMs, procurement officers, beneficiaries, field local partners.  
• Interviews with Procurement officers |

[^1]: Evaluation question indicator.