1. Context and background for the evaluation

The independent mid-term evaluation is part of the work plan of the project “Productive work for youth in Armenia – supporting young entrepreneurs”. The project started in March 2013 with the financial support of the Government of Austria and has a total duration of 44 months. The government coordinating agency is the Ministry of Economy.

The overall objective of this project is to support youth-led enterprise creation and expansion, thus promoting sound development of the local private sector. The project aims to demonstrate that young women and men are credit worthy and capable of turning loans into profitable businesses.

In March 2012, UNIDO received a request for assistance from the Government to develop youth employment schemes with special focus on the regions. The unemployment rate of youth (15-24 years old) in Armenia had risen to a percentage of 39.2% in 2011, and tackling youth unemployment was a serious challenge to Armenia’s socio-economic development. Taking into account the limited absorptive capacity of labor markets in the country, responding to government priorities, and taking into consideration the findings and recommendations of the MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF), the project focuses on youth entrepreneurship as a feasible option to create employment, particularly in the regions, which are affected by migration. The approach is holistic as it combines non-financial with financial services.

The target beneficiaries of the project are youth start-up entrepreneurs (individuals aged between 18 and 35 years with realistic business ideas, or with state registration up to 1 year) with special attention to young women and young families. The geographical area of coverage are the regions (marzes) of Lori and Shirak, and since June 2014 also Gegharqunik and Tavoush.

On the micro-level, the project provides non-financial and financial services to young start-up entrepreneurs with a focus on innovative, growth-oriented business ideas. Non-financial services are provided before, during and after business start-up and entail entrepreneurship training,
coaching and counselling, and technical assistance. While projects often try to facilitate access to
finance, this project directly provides the possibility to access finance through a revolving youth
business fund, which is a rather new practice in UNIDO. The revolving youth business fund has a
volume of EUR 400,000, to which the project and the Government of Armenia contributed
equally.

The executing counterpart is the SME Development National Center (SME DNC), which was
selected due to its mandate, track-record and capacity. SME DNC provides entrepreneurship
training, coaching and counselling and administers the revolving youth business fund, and is
expected to continue the revolving youth business fund after project closure.

The project now reached a critical stage, where a critical mass of beneficiaries has been served to
identify needs for technical assistance. The needs assessment is currently being carried out and
the technical assistance is being designed.

On the meso-level, the existing and potential executing counterparts are envisaged to receive
capacity building as and where necessary.

On the macro-level, the project promotes a more conducive business environment particularly for
youth-led enterprises. Initially, the project was designed to carry out a study and expert group
meeting (EGM) in order to advise political decision-makers on a conducive business
environment. However, in the meantime the World Bank carried out a study on the topic and
collaborates with the Government on the implementation of its recommendations. Therefore, the
project steering committee (PSC) decided to cancel the study and EGM foreseen in the project in
order not to duplicate efforts.

An additional element is outreach and awareness raising on youth entrepreneurship as a feasible
option to create employment and to address the apparent caution particularly amongst (young)
women towards risk-taking and profit-making.

The following results were achieved after 10 rounds of trainings and calls for proposals for
revolving youth business fund in January 2015: The milestones on outcome and output level have
been achieved over 100%: 363 young entrepreneurs (121% of milestone) participated in
trainings, 30 loans were approved (250% of milestone) and 26 jobs were created\(^1\). All young
entrepreneurs were able to repay loans fully on time except for one delay. The quarterly progress
reports undertaken contain details on the monitoring of ongoing implementation and output
achievement (see Annex 6).

The overall budget of the project is EUR 729,646, of which EUR 542,503 (74%) have been
implemented by 9 April 2015, which includes the contribution to the revolving fund of
EUR 200,000 to the revolving fund and the subcontract for SME DNC of EUR 97,500.

Further details and the logframe can be found in the annexed project document, progress reports
and preparatory assistance report, including detailed description of the approach, contextual
factors likely to influence project results, etc.

\(^1\) Figures from Progress Report (No. 6) covering Nov 2014 to Jan 2015
2. Purpose, objectives, rationale

As foreseen in the project work plan, this independent mid-term evaluation takes place after the first half of the project’s implementation phase, which started in October 2013. The first seven months of the project, March to September 2013, were the inception phase. Now, the execution of the project has proceeded to a considerable extent, so that there is a comprehensive basis for evaluation. Simultaneously, there remains sufficient time within the project duration to use the evaluation results to steer the project accordingly.

Consequently, and due to the point of time within the project life, the independent mid-term evaluation will be by its nature mainly formative, however, also with summative elements with the purpose to assist project steering through feedback of lessons learned.

The overriding objective is to create transparency and dialogue between project stakeholders to drive learning for the further development of the project as well as for its replicability and scaling-up of results. To reach this overriding objective, ancillary objectives are to gain insights on the functioning of the project structures and processes, as well as to control if project targets where achieved and to which degree, if targets and results and are likely to be achieved in future based on the project’s relevance and acceptance amongst stakeholders, effectiveness, efficiency, as well as potential impact and sustainability. In addition, the independent mid-term evaluation should also advise on the design of the M&E framework with a view to attribution of results to the project and an impact assessment at the end-of-project evaluation.

Therefore, direct users of the evaluation results (findings, lessons learnt, practical recommendations and conclusions) will be the project manager and project team, SME DNC (executing counterpart), the Ministry of Economy of Armenia (government coordinating agency), the Government of Austria (donor), as well as the Governorates of Gegharqunik, Lori, Shirak and Tavoush marzes.

In addition, lessons learnt will also be shared within UNIDO to further develop the approach and to feed into project design and formulation of similar projects. This independent mid-term evaluation is also expected to feed into the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Group’s “Thematic evaluation: UNIDO interventions in the area of enterprise/job-creation and skills development, including for women and youth”, foreseen in its work plan for 2015.

The independent mid-term evaluation should provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful for the mentioned purpose and objectives.

The independent mid-term evaluation should be completed before the next project steering committee (PSC), which is foreseen for June/July 2015, in order to discuss the results and identify ways and means to feed them into the project steering.

3. Scope and focus of the evaluation

Scope:

The evaluation concerns the first 26 months of the project, i.e. from March 2013 until end of April 2015. The evaluation covers all project areas of geographical coverage, i.e. Gegharqunik, Lori, Shirak and Tavoush marzes. It considers all activities that are part of the project. Given the point of time in the project life cycle and given the above mentioned purpose and objectives, the independent mid-term evaluation will focus
• within the results-chain on the links between inputs, activities, outputs and outcome;
• mainly on implementation and processes; and
• on the evaluation criteria relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, management and gender;

while assessing the potential impact and sustainability of the project.

Focus:

The focus of the evaluation is on the relevance of the project throughout its life cycle and on its effectiveness, i.e. is the project’s model of support to young entrepreneurs already leading to the desired changes based on outputs delivered and is it likely to do so in future or would a change in strategy lead to higher achievements of results on the outcome and impact level, as well as to higher sustainability in terms of business survival as well as institutionalization of the model.

In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that the project aims at demonstrating that young women and men – which are generally perceived as high-risk borrowers – are credit worthy and capable of turning loans into profitable businesses, which is intended to lead to a change in the behavior of (potential) young female and male entrepreneurs, local and national governments, banks, business service providers and other stakeholders as a result of the use, uptake and/or replication of the model set up by the project or its results.

In addition, the independent mid-term evaluation will focus on aspects of management such as observing processes and structures to identify and mitigate problems in implementation, including acceptance of the project amongst stakeholders, conflicts due to differing interests, sufficiency of qualified personnel, adequacy of communication and coordination amongst implementing partners and with target groups, and adequacy of project duration and funding.

4. Evaluation issues and key questions

The following questions indicate what is especially valuable for the project manager and project team as well as the other stakeholders to know. These should be answered within the budget and time of the evaluation. The list is not exhaustive. Clarifications shall be discussed with the project manager and project team after the inception of the evaluation process, as well as the feasibility of answering the questions within the time, budget and data constraints.

1. Relevance

   a) Were the appropriate groups targeted by the project, i.e. youth start-up entrepreneurs (individuals aged between 18 and 35 years with realistic business ideas, or with state registration up to 1 year) with special attention to young women and young families?

   b) Were innovative, growth-oriented business ideas targeted?

   c) Is this still the appropriate target group?

   d) Was the project relevant to the stakeholders, particularly the target beneficiaries, at project formulation?

   e) Is the project still relevant to the stakeholders, particularly the target beneficiaries, and meeting their needs - also with a view to the currently designed technical assistance?
f) To what extent was the project identification process participatory including all main stakeholder groups instrumental in selecting problem areas, counterparts and beneficiaries requiring technical support?

g) Is the level of flexibility of the project design and implementation adequate?

2. Effectiveness

   a) Does the project reach the target beneficiaries?
   b) To what extent are the outputs as formulated in the project document necessary and sufficient to achieve the expected outcomes and objectives?
   c) To what extent are outputs produced or likely to be produced?
   d) Is the project’s model of support to young entrepreneurs already leading to the desired changes based on outputs delivered and/or is it likely to do so in future by project end?
   e) Are there any unintended positive or negative effects, already observable or to be expected? What could be appropriate mitigation measures?
   f) Are there external factors, which could have a positive or negative impact, such as changes in basic policy environments, general economic and financial conditions, etc.?
   g) Would a change in strategy lead to higher achievements of results on the outcome and impact level?
   h) Does the project work at the macro-, meso- and micro-level? Were the choices made appropriate and are they still?

3. Management

   a) Project processes and structures
      i. Are there problems in implementation within the project processes and structures? If so, how could these be mitigated?
      ii. Is information resulting from monitoring used for project steering and adaptive management?
      iii. Are changes in planning documents during implementation being approved and documented?
      iv. Are synergy benefits being sought in relation to other UNIDO activities in the country (or elsewhere)? Do they materialize and why or why not?
      v. To what extent have the UNIDO HQ and field management, coordination, quality control and technical inputs been efficient and effective?
      vi. How effectively and efficiently implements the executing counterpart SME DNC?
      vii. Based on the needs assessment and design for the provision of technical assistance, what could be the best option to provide the assistance?

   b) M&E framework
      i. Is the design and implementation of the project M&E framework adequate for controlling target and results achievement, risk controlling and lesson learning, incl. quantitative baselines and systematic collection of monitoring data at output and outcome level? Could it be further improved?
ii. Is the design and implementation of the project M&E framework adequate for measuring and attributing results to the project and to carry out an impact assessment at the end-of-project evaluation? Could it be further improved, and if so, how?

iii. To what extent was the project formulated based on the logical framework approach and included appropriate output and outcome indicators within a realistic timeframe?

iv. To what extent does the project have a clear thematically focused development objective and outcome(s), the attainment of which can be determined by a set of verifiable indicators?

4. Efficiency

   a) To what extent have UNIDO inputs and inputs of SME DNC (executing counterpart), the Ministry of Economy of Armenia (government coordinating agency), the Government of Austria (donor) been provided as planned and were adequate to meet requirements?

   b) To what extent was the quality of UNIDO inputs and services as well as of procured services (expertise, training, methodologies, etc.) as planned and led to the production of outputs?

   c) Procurement:

      i. To what extent were UNIDO procurement services provided as planned and were adequate in terms of timing, value, process issues, responsibilities, etc.?

      ii. Were the procured services(s) acquired at a reasonable price?

      iii. Which were the main bottlenecks / issues in the procurement process?

      iv. Which good practices have been identified?

      v. Which procurement rule was particularly problematic to comply with?

      vi. To what extent roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the different procurement stages are established, adequate and clear?

      vii. To what extent the procurement process prima facie complied with the procurement rules?

5. Gender

   a) Are the targets regarding gender realistic and achievable?

   b) Are the project activities sufficient to reach gender targets?

   c) Is the gender-awareness of project staff and involved staff of the executing counterpart SME DNC adequate?

   d) Gender responsive evaluation questions: please see “Annex 4: Guideline on gender issues to be addressed in the evaluation” to mainstream gender issues in the evaluation.

6. Potential Sustainability & Impact

   a) Business survival: Does the support model lead to survival of youth business start-ups and growth beyond the start-up phase?

   b) Institutionalization of the model
i. Is the project model sustainable?
ii. Is the project model replicable?
iii. Is it likely that the support model of the project will be adopted, replicated and/or scaled up after project end?

c) Local expertise
   i. Did and does the project use available expertise from the target country at an adequate level?
   ii. Does the project build local expertise sufficiently and adequately, incl. of the executing counterpart SME DNC?

d) Can enterprise effects be expected to lead to socio-economic impact such as employment or income generation, gender equality and poverty reduction?

5. Evaluation approach and methodology

Based on the purpose and objectives of this independent mid-term evaluation, and given that the project is designed based on results based management (RBM) and logical framework approach (LFA) principles, two matching evaluation approaches appear feasible, i.e. the Theory-Based Approach to Evaluation (TBE) as well as the Utilization-focused approach, which in the evaluation design could also be reflected in a mixed methods approach.

As mentioned above, the independent mid-term evaluation will be by its nature mainly formative, however, also with summative elements. Formative evaluation often lends itself to qualitative methods of inquiry. The questions asked in formative evaluation are generally more open and lead to exploration of processes, both from the viewpoint of participants, but also from that of project staff and other stakeholders. The use of participatory evaluation is particularly relevant and appropriate to formative evaluation. Summative evaluation is often associated with more objective, quantitative methods of data collection. It is recommended to use a balance of both quantitative and qualitative methods in order to get a better understanding of what the project has achieved, and how or why this has occurred. Using qualitative methods of data collection can also provide a good insight into unintended consequences and lessons for improvement.

However, the evaluator shall propose an evaluation design and methodology in the inception phase of the evaluation process. Where feasible quantitative and qualitative data should be triangulated. Decisions to use primary, secondary or tertiary data should be well justified (internal/external validity, reliability, efficiency).

Since the evaluation results are relevant to all parties – beneficiaries, donor, implementing partners, Government at local and national level – participation of all of them appears commensurate and the independent mid-term evaluation should reflect their views of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and potential impact and sustainability of the project.

With a view to sampling amongst the target beneficiaries, it should be noted that the current target beneficiaries’ (approx. 70 young entrepreneurs) situations and their businesses are rather heterogeneous in terms of sector, development phase, etc. The independent mid-term evaluation should take into account the progress reviews, and the data collected thereunder, conducted as part of the project’s monitoring and reporting.
The evaluator must respect the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and ensure that sensitive data cannot be traced to their source. Evaluators must ensure that those involved in evaluations are given an opportunity to examine the statements attributed to them.

**Time schedule and deliverables**

In order to serve its purpose, the evaluation has to be completed within the second quarter of 2015 and before the next project steering committee (PSC), which is foreseen for June/July 2015, so that findings and recommendations can be implemented and used to steer the second half of the project’s activities.

At the end of evaluation, an evaluation report has to be delivered that presents in a complete and objective manner the evidence, findings, conclusions and practical recommendations. The report also explains the methodology followed and highlights the methodological limitations of the evaluation and key concerns, and includes an executive summary.

Formats for deliverables, including software, number of hard copies, translations needed and the structure of the evaluation report shall be specified during the inception of the evaluation, as well as quality refinements regarding language and style of presentations.

Below is a tentative time schedule, which is to be refined based on the proposed methodology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts signed with evaluators</td>
<td>By 15 May 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>PM HRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>18-20 May 2015</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of draft inception report</td>
<td>20 May 2015</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing of international evaluator through skype/video conference call</td>
<td>21 May 2015</td>
<td>HQ Vienna/FO Yerevan</td>
<td>PM EVA Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deskwork and interviews through Skype</td>
<td>22-26 May 2015</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised inception report</strong> containing work plan, key findings of desk review, methodology, evaluation tools such as questionnaires and interview guidelines, sampling technique(s), etc.</td>
<td>1 June 2015</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation mission:</strong> briefing of evaluators in the field, testing of evaluation tools, field visits, field research, interviews, observation, questionnaires, etc.</td>
<td>8-14 June 2015</td>
<td>Armenia: Lori, Shirak, Gegharqunik, Tavoush, Yerevan</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of preliminary findings, debriefing at HQ (national consultant to be connected via skype/video call)</td>
<td>15 June 2015</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and preparation of draft report</td>
<td>16-18 June</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery of draft report</strong></td>
<td>22 June 2015</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of comments and review of draft report</td>
<td>23-25 June 2015</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Evaluator PM EVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revised draft report</strong></td>
<td>26 June 2015</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of final report</td>
<td>30 June 2015</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>EVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination (Management Response Sheet, newsletter, articles)</td>
<td>30 June 2015</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>EVA PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PM: project manager, HRM: Human Resources Management, EVA: Office for Independent Evaluation

6. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will include:

One independent international evaluator with extensive experience and knowledge of evaluation methodologies. She/he shall be familiar with poverty reduction and Micro, Small and Medium-size Enterprise (MSME) development, particularly youth entrepreneurship and access to finance.

The evaluator should have the following competencies/skills:

- Appropriate language skills
- Process management skills, including facilitation skills
- Writing and communications skills
- Good interpersonal skills
- Ability to address relevant cross-cutting thematic issues, including gender
- Adequate understanding of local social and cultural issues
- Adequate mix of national and international expertise and of women and men

The evaluator must not have any previous or current or foreseen involvement with the project.

The evaluator must be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environments in which they work. In the light of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the evaluator must be sensitive to, and address issues of, discrimination and gender inequality.

Responsibilities:
The independent international evaluator shall have the responsibility to lead the evaluation. She/he shall (1) carry out a thorough desk review, (2) develop a suitable evaluation methodology and an evaluation work plan; share these with the project team and Office for Independent Evaluation (EVA) at UNIDO for their review and comments, develop interview guidelines and questionnaires for key informants and groups of stakeholders, (3) if appropriate, develop a beneficiary survey and conduct a pilot survey in close cooperation with the National Evaluator and respective UNIDO resource persons, (4) analyze the data, (5) be responsible for the drafting of the evaluation report and share it with the project team and EVA at UNIDO, (6) edit and finalize the evaluation report, (7) present the evaluation findings.

Detailed Job Description is attached in Annex 1.

During the implementation process, the evaluator will benefit from UNIDO operational capacities in Armenia; this includes internal transportation as well as office space and provision of the necessary material. The evaluator will be continuously and simultaneously supported by respective project staff members, the UNIDO field office and local counterparts – such as the SME DNC and the Ministry Economy. The evaluator will also link up with responsible staff members of the donor, the Government of Austria.

7. **Quality assurance**

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the UNIDO Evaluation Group. The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality, attached as Annex 3.

8. **Government and management process of the evaluation process**

The TOR were formulated by the project team members – Project Manager, International Expert on Youth Employment, National Team Leader, and Intern – as well as the former Project Manager, approved by the Project Manager, and cleared by Office for Independent Evaluation (EVA).

The inception report as well as the final report will be assessed by the Project Manager, the International Expert on Youth Employment and the National Team Leader, and cleared by EVA.

9. **Annexes**

These TOR comprise the following Annexes:

1) Job description for the Independent International Evaluator
2) Checklist on evaluation report quality
3) Guideline on gender issues to be addressed in the evaluation
4) Project Document including Logical Framework
5) Progress Reports
6) Project Steering Committee (PSC) TOR and meeting minutes
7) Preparatory Assistance (PA) report
Annex 1: Job description for the independent international evaluator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Independent International Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Duty Station and Location:</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/s to:</td>
<td>Vienna, Austria; Armenia: Lori, Shirak, Gegharqunik, Tavoush, Yerevan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Contract (EOD):</td>
<td>15 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Contract (COB):</td>
<td>30 June, duration: WAE 21 w/d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT**

The project “Productive work for youth in Armenia – supporting young entrepreneurs” is implemented by the Investment and Technology Unit (PTC/BIT/ITU), part of the Business, Investment & Technology Services Branch (PTC/BIT).

The Investment and Technology Unit is responsible for supporting developing countries and countries with economies in transition in improving their investment climate by assisting governments and institutions at the national and regional levels to analyse investment needs, assess the investment climate, and enhance the flow and impact of foreign and domestic investments.

The Office for Independent Evaluation (EVA) is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It manages, conducts and provides quality assurance to different kinds of independent evaluations within UNIDO and monitors the management response to such evaluations. EVA ensures also the effective dissemination throughout UNIDO and to external stakeholders of lessons learned. EVA lends methodological support amongst others to independent project evaluations and it performs an advisory and quality-assurance function in relation to independent project evaluations managed by project managers. EVA is part of the Office of the Director General (ODG). Its location is independent of any line management functions in the Divisions involved with project/programme development and implementation.

The incumbent will work under the direct supervision of and report to EVA.

**PROJECT AND EVALUATION CONTEXT**

The overall objective of the project “Productive work for youth in Armenia – supporting young entrepreneurs” is to support youth-led enterprise creation and expansion, thus promoting sound development of the local private sector. The project aims to demonstrate that youth are credit worthy and capable of turning loans into profitable businesses.
The unemployment rate of youth (15-24 years old) in Armenia had risen to a percentage of 39.2% in 2011, and tackling youth unemployment was a serious challenge to Armenia’s socio-economic development. Taking into account the limited absorptive capacity of labor markets in the country, responding to government priorities, and taking into consideration the findings and recommendations of the MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF), the project focuses on youth entrepreneurship as a feasible option to create employment, particularly in the regions, which are affected by migration.

Therefore the project follows a comprehensive approach providing non-financial and financial services and support beyond the start-up phase, and also promoting a more conducive environment particularly for youth-led businesses. In cooperation with the SME Development National Center (SME DNC), the project established a revolving youth business fund accompanied by a set of non-financial services such as entrepreneurship training, counselling and technical assistance.

As foreseen in the project work plan, the independent mid-term evaluation takes place after the first half of the project’s implementation phase. Consequently, the independent mid-term evaluation will be by its nature mainly formative, however, also with summative elements with the purpose to assist project steering through feedback of lessons learned.

The overriding objective is to create transparency and dialogue between project stakeholders to drive learning for the further development of the project as well as for its scaling-up and replicability. To reach this overriding objective, ancillary objectives are to gain insights on the functioning of the project structures and processes, as well as to control if project targets where achieved and to which degree if targets and results and are likely to be achieved in future based on the project’s relevance and acceptence amongst stakeholders, effectiveness, efficiency, as well as potential impact and sustainability. In addition, the independent mid-term evaluation should also advise on the design of the M&E framework with a view to attribution of results to the project and an impact assessment at the end-of-project evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DUTIES</th>
<th>Outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>Draft inception report</td>
<td>2 w/d</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of draft inception report</td>
<td>Draft inception report</td>
<td>1 w/d</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing of evaluator(s) through Skype with Project Manager and relevant project staff</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>1 w/d</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deskwork and if needed interviews through Skype with Project Manager, project staff</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>1 w/d</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised inception report containing work plan, key findings of desk review, methodology, evaluation tools such as questionnaires and interview guidelines, sampling technique(s), etc.</td>
<td>Revised inception report</td>
<td>1 w/d</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DUTIES

**Outputs to be achieved** | **Expected duration** | **Location**
--- | --- | ---
Evaluation mission: briefing of evaluator(s) in the field, possible testing of evaluation tools, field visits, field research, interviews, observation, questionnaires, etc. | Data collection | 7 w/d | Armenia: Lori, Shirak, Gegharqunik, Tavoush, Yerevan

Presentation of preliminary findings, debriefing at HQ | Presentation | 1 w/d | Vienna

Reporting, including:
1. Data analysis and preparation of draft report
2. Delivery of draft report
3. Collection of comments and review of draft report
4. Revising draft report | Output per activity:
1. Draft report
2. Draft report
3. Comments received and included
4. Revised draft report | 7 w/d | Home-based

Lead the independent mid-term evaluation of the project | Evaluation report delivered, including recommendations and lessons learned | continuous | Armenia / HQ Vienna

### 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. Ability to address relevant cross-cutting issues, especially gender and cultural issues
6. Organizational development and innovation

**Education:** Advanced university degree in Development Studies, Social Sciences, Economics, Business Administration or related field.

**Technical and Functional Experience:**

- At least 5 years of experience in in conducting and managing evaluations, preferably in the field of youth entrepreneurship and access to finance.
- Knowledge of poverty reduction and Micro, Small and Medium-size Enterprise (MSME) development, particularly youth entrepreneurship and access to finance.
- Sound qualitative and quantitative methodological skills incl. data collection, management and analysis skills.
- Very good communication, interpretation and writing skills, as well as interpersonal skills.
- Proven leadership capacity.
- Experience at the international level and in the UN system is an asset, as well as experience in working cross-culturally, ideally in Armenia or the region.

**Languages:** Fluency in written and spoken English is required. Knowledge of Armenian is an asset.

**Absence of conflict of interest:**

The members of the evaluation team must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the project under evaluation.
Annex 2: Checklist on evaluation report quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report quality criteria</th>
<th>UNIDO Evaluation Group Assessment notes</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Structure and quality of writing</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>Evaluation objective, scope and methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation objective is explained and the scope defined. The methods employed are explained and appropriate for answering the evaluation questions. The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder’s consultation process in the evaluation. The report describes the data sources and collection methods and their limitations. 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>Evaluation object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The logic model and/or the expected results chain (inputs, outputs and outcomes) of the object are clearly described. The key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the object are described. The key stakeholders involved in the object implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles are described. The report identifies the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings and conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations and lessons learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports
A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.
Annex 3: Guideline on gender issues to be addressed in the evaluation

1. Introduction

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

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

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

*Gender parity* signifies equal numbers of men and women at all levels of an institution or organization, particularly at senior and decision-making levels. The UNIDO projects/programmes can be divided into two categories: 1) those where promotion of gender equality is one of the key aspects of the project/programme; and 2) those where there is limited or no attempted integration of gender. Evaluation managers/evaluators should select relevant questions depending on the type of interventions.

2. Gender responsive evaluation questions

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

2.1 Design

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

2.2 Implementation management

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

2.3 Results

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