



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent mid-term review of the UNIDO project:

Towards a green economy in Uruguay: stimulating sustainable production practices and low-emission technologies in prioritized sectors.

UNIDO SAP ID: 120323 and 120250 (PPG)
GEF ID: 4890

JANUARY 2016

CONTENTS

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW	3
II.	SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW	12
III.	REVIEW APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	13
IV.	REVIEW TEAM COMPOSITION	14
V.	TIME SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES	15
VI.	PROJECT REVIEW PARAMETERS	15
VII.	REPORTING	22
VIII.	QUALITY ASSURANCE	23
	Annex 1 - Outline of an independent mid-term review report	24
	Annex 2 - GEF minimum requirements for M&E	27
	Annex 3 – Checklist on independent mid-term review report quality	28
	Annex 4 – Required project identification and financial data	29
	Annex 5 – Job descriptions	31
	Annex 6 – Project results framework	35

I. Project background and overview

1. Project factsheet

Project Title	Towards a green economy in Uruguay: stimulating sustainable production practices and low-emission technologies in prioritized sectors.
UNIDO project No. and/or SAP ID	120323
GEF project ID	4890
Region	LAC
Country(ies)	Uruguay
GEF focal area(s) and operational programme	CLIMATE CHANGE CCM-1 and CCM-3
GEF implementing agency(ies)	UNIDO
GEF executing partner(s)	Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining (MIEM), Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment (MVOTMA) and Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fishery (MGAP)
Project size (FSP, MSP, EA)	FSP
Project CEO endorsement / Approval date	19 November 2013
Project implementation start date (First PAD issuance date)	19 December 2013
Expected implementation end date (indicated in CEO endorsement /Approval document)	18 December 2017
Revised expected implementation end date (if applicable)	
Actual implementation end date	
GEF project grant (excluding PPG, in USD)	3,392,727 (excl. project agency fee)
GEF PPG (if applicable, in USD)	50,000 (excl. project agency fee)
UNIDO co-financing (in USD)	110,000 (excl. PPG)
Total co-financing at CEO endorsement (in USD)	32,410,000
Materialized co-financing at project completion (in USD)	
Total project cost (excluding PPG and agency support cost, in USD; i.e., GEF project grant + total co-financing at CEO endorsement)	35,802,727
Mid-term review date	19 th February 2016
Planned terminal evaluation date	31 st December 2017

(Source: Project document)

2. Project background and context

Uruguay is one of the smallest countries in South America in terms of land surface, with a solid economic, political, social and cultural background. Uruguay has experienced more than a decade of high economic performance, but that growth is projected to decelerate to 1.6 percent in 2015 (no official data available yet) due to a drop in domestic spending from recent highs and weak external conditions. During 2014 the Uruguayan economy expanded 3.5% of its GDP as opposed to 6.5% in previous years. That is, after years of very high growth, Uruguay's economy is "cooling off" as exports and domestic demand growth are both slowing down. The relatively high level of growth of recent years was underpinned by high levels of foreign direct investment and relatively high levels of productivity growth.

Though the country's prices for predominantly export products like livestock/beef, grains and dairy products have been in decline in the external markets during the past two years, agriculture has been and is a major contributor to the economy¹. The warm, humid climate and the abundance of grasslands and arable soils create adequate conditions for agriculture and silviculture, as they provide natural pastures for cattle and sheep breeding. With a population of approximately 3.3 million people and an area of 176,215 km² Uruguay produces large surpluses of meat, dairy products, agricultural products, wood, leather and wool. There are more than 32,000 cattle farms in the country with a total stock of over 11 million bovines and 7.4 million sheep. The large majority (near 80%) are family-run cattle farms.

In a sparsely populated country like Uruguay, waste and residues from traditional activities in the primary sector were not of major concern in the past decades. The often severe environmental impacts of processing industries were not recognized until late. Residues from agriculture and agribusiness facilities, such as sawdust, rice husk, and cow manure were commonly piled up or disposed of on the land. Bagasse is burned as a common practice. Non-appropriately treated liquid manure (wastewater) is in some cases discharged into streams and rivers. The government has established a National Action Plan for Environmentally Sustainable Production and Consumption (2010-2015), which also tackles the environmentally appropriate management of residues and waste flows including the dairy and meat sectors.

As a result of the insertion of Uruguay into the global markets and the inflow of foreign capital, the primary sector is undergoing a process of intensification, up-scaling and concentration of activities. Integrated cattle farms, dairy factories and milking yards may count thousands of animals bound to a small area. Manure is removed in liquid form and must be treated, which is usually done in open lagoons, causing methane emissions from natural anaerobic digestion. Regulation requires wastewater to be treated before discharge. Some agribusiness (the largest ones) follow a proactive approach, anticipating more stringent legislation in the future but also pursuing cleaner production practices as a business strategy. Other companies adhere to the mandatory requirements, since investments in environmental measures are considered financially unrewarding.

The large majority of small farm holders in Uruguay are not generally aware enough of the most important environmental issues related to their business. Given their limited investment capacity and the lack of readily available solutions for waste valorization, the government expects coercive regulation to have a limited effect.

¹ Agriculture accounted for 10.1% of GDP in 2011. Source: "Uruguay at a Glance", World Bank / Development Economics LDB Database, 17 March 2013. Available at: http://devdata.worldbank.org/AAG/ury_aag.pdf

Under the prevailing situation, it could be expected that GHG emissions continue to rise and the environmentally appropriate treatment of waste and wastewater lags behind.

The project thus pursues an economically, environmentally and socially sustainable agribusiness development by means of including and adopting a range of sustainable waste valorization and low-emission waste treatment technologies in the primary production sectors of Uruguay that would lead to a reduction in carbon emissions and to the transformation of different kinds of waste into energy and other by-products, all leading to the generation of a sustainable low-carbon production model. That is, GEF financing will provide the necessary catalytic support to create and sustain a market environment conducive to investments and adoption of appropriate waste valorization, waste-to-energy and waste management technologies that contribute to climate change mitigation and bring other associated environmental benefits. The proposed project and methodological approach will lay the grounds for a learning, know-how transfer and in-situ technological capabilities development, which ultimately will drive the replication of this kind of activities in the future towards one common objective: achieving a green low-carbon sustainable development model in Uruguay.

The envisaged Project fits into national strategies to promote cleaner production technologies, enhance sector productivity and competitiveness, preserve natural resources, protect the local and global environment and diversify the energy mix by increasing the share of renewable energies. The Project is expected to deliver tangible socioeconomic benefits for Uruguay in the targeted sectors as a whole and individually for men, women and their families.

The socioeconomic benefits at national level (country) are achieved as a result of the expected economic growth in the targeted sectors. With the inclusion of cleaner technologies and better waste management and treatment activities, environmental impacts derived from their activities would be reduced thus increasing their competitiveness in the international market, which may be translated into growth. Additionally the Project will contribute to reduce economic dependence on fossil fuel imports through strengthening the diversification strategy by increasing the use of renewable energy.

The Project will provide direct technical assistance to identified subsectors, including dairy farmers and factories, cattle farmers for meat production, meat packers, and specific enterprises that can contribute to the reduction of GHG emissions. These will benefit from the Project by acquiring technological know-how to increase the use of renewable energy sources, improve waste management procedures, reduce methane emissions and treat waste and effluents in a more environmentally-responsible way.

It is expected that social and economic benefits from the implementation of biogas-based energy supply and low carbon technologies will be shared equally by male and female workers in the respective sectors. Direct creation of jobs is an important opportunity that could benefit both men and women. Women often have a predominant role to sustain smallholder economies and therefore the project may benefit those women in this kind of situation.

The expected total direct GHG emissions avoided of the project are 126,341 tCO₂e p.a., amounting to a total over lifetime avoidance of 1,396,143 tCO₂e. The indirect GHG emissions avoided (using a bottom-up approach) are expected to amount to 3,790,269 tCO₂e p.a.

Project implementation started in December 2013 and the foreseen project end date is in December 2017.

Regular Monitoring is foreseen in the project document, as well as an independent mid-term review (MTR) and a terminal review (TE). The independent MTR will be carried out by an international evaluator as well as a national evaluator from February 2016 – April 2016 and include a field mission to Uruguay in March 2016. The TE is scheduled to take place in late 2017.

3. Project objective and structure

The overall objective of the project is to transform the different kinds of waste generated in the agriculture and agro-industry production chains in Uruguay into various types of energy and/or other by-products with the aim of reducing GHG emissions, while contributing to the development of a low carbon sustainable production model supported by an adequate technology development and transfer.

The project consists of 5 technical components, in addition to monitoring and evaluation and project management, as follows:

Project component 1 (PC-1): Policy and regulatory framework strengthening. The activities to be undertaken under PC-1 are intended to adjust the regulatory and policy frameworks in order to promote investments and allow the development of waste valorization projects to generate energy, by-products and reduce GHG emissions. These activities also involve the removal of financial barriers and the development and implementation of policies, provisions and guidelines for financial instrument(s) that will lead to the deployment of waste valorization projects in Uruguay.

Project component 2 (PC-2): Knowledge base (technological capacities) in the field of waste-to-energy, waste valorization and low-emission waste treatment technologies strengthened. This component builds upon the work undertaken during the PPG phase with regards to the identification and location of waste sources (mapping and characterization), the characterization of globally available (state-of-the-art) technologies, the identification of market and technology barriers as well as opportunities for waste-to-energy, low-emission waste treatment and waste valorization technologies, amongst others. As such the characterization of disaggregated (department level) physical and chemical characterization of at least the 16 identified waste streams with valorization potential is to be undertaken. Research and prefeasibility studies (including social, environmental and economic dimensions) in the targeted sectors to determine the most viable waste valorization processes and business models are also to be conducted.

Project component 3 (PC-3): Demonstration of waste valorization and renewable energy technologies' applications. With the goal of proving the applicability of low-emission waste treatment, waste-to-energy, by-products generation and waste valorization technologies in the Uruguayan context, this component aims to design, install, monitor and assess small- as well as large-scale demonstration projects in the targeted sectors. This component complements the previous component and it is intended for demonstrating the applicability of more technologically advanced waste treatment techniques, in comparison to the current "first generation" technologies that are employed in the country at the moment.

Project component 4 (PC-4): Capacity building, training and dissemination campaign for the adoption of low carbon waste valorization initiatives. This component aims to enhance the capacities of sector agents to deliver state-of-the-art sustainable production schemes through sustainable waste management and low-emission treatment technologies in prioritized sectors. Activities entail the setting-up of a

running web-based knowledge management platform, a dissemination campaign and the creation of training courses and toolkits, amongst others.

Project component 5 (PC-5): Monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring of project progress is essential for the adequate and timely delivery of results. This project component covers project monitoring and oversight by UNIDO in close coordination with MIEM (DNE), MVOTMA (DINAMA) and MGAP, as well as a mid-term and terminal evaluation of the project. Independent consultants will be contracted to perform the mid-term and final evaluation of the project in compliance with UNIDO and GEF requirements.

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

- The policy framework to promote sustainable production schemes and implement low-emission technologies in prioritised sectors (agricultural and farming sector, processing industries, small communities) has been strengthened.
- The design and implementation of waste-to-energy valorization alternatives and low-emission waste treatment technologies have been enhanced due to an improved knowledge base.
- Waste-to-energy and other feasible waste valorization applications have been adopted in the targeted sectors.
- The capacities of sector agents to deliver state-of-the-art sustainable production schemes through sustainable waste management and low-emission treatment technologies in prioritized sectors have been strengthened.
- A monitoring plan has been prepared and implemented.

4. Project implementation and execution arrangements

UNIDO: Implementing agency. Oversees the implementation of the project and is represented by a designated UNIDO staff member (UR Uruguay) in the Steering Committee. Moreover, UNIDO contracts all members of the Project Management Unit (PMU) including the Project Coordinator (PC).

Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining (MIEM) via the DNE (National Energy Directorate): Executing partner. Apart from being part of the Steering Committee (SC), it executes some of the activities. It will be responsible for keeping the project up to schedule and to develop specific initiatives in accordance to the project objectives. The Chairman of the SC will be provided by DNE. Moreover, the in-kind support from the Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining (MIEM), which is channelled through DNE, consist of hosting the project management unit (PMU), coordination with government partners, the provision of office space and technical inputs by DNE staff. A legal agreement has been signed with MIEM, AUCI and UNIDO covering the project.

Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment (MVOTMA) via the DINAMA (National Environment Directorate): Executing partner, which will coordinate project activities along with the DNE and the MGAP. It will be represented by a person in the Steering Committee. MVOTMA will provide in-kind support through DINAMA in the form of office facilities, technical input, human resources and information databases related to undertakings within the scope of this project. There is no separate legal agreement signed between MVOTMA and UNIDO.

Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fishery (MGAP): Executing partner, which will coordinate project activities along with the DNE and the DINAMA. It will be represented by a person in the Steering Committee. MGAP will provide in-kind support in the form of human resources, office facilities, information and databases related to undertakings within the scope of this project. There is no separate legal agreement signed between MGAP and UNIDO.

In order to ensure the efficient and effective management of the whole project the following activities are envisaged:

Main Activities to be conducted	Responsibility of / stakeholders involved
1) Convene the Steering Committee (SC) responsible for project coordination and execution	DNE (MIEM), DINAMA, MGAP, UNIDO
2) Selection of a Project Coordinator	Steering Committee
3) Establishment of a Project Management Unit (PMU) and selection of members	Steering Committee
4) Day to day coordination, management and monitoring of all project activities	PMU - Project Coordinator
5) Engagement of Strategic Partners when necessary	PMU – Project Coordinator

5. Relevant project reports/documents

PIRs

4890_2015_PIR_UNIDO_Uruguay_Bethke, 2015

PSC meeting minutes

REUNIÓN COMITÉ DIRECTIVO ACTA REUNIÓN – Nº 1, 2014
 REUNIÓN COMITÉ DIRECTIVO ACTA REUNIÓN – Nº 2, 2014
 REUNIÓN COMITÉ DIRECTIVO ACTA REUNIÓN – Nº 3, 2014
 REUNIÓN COMITÉ DIRECTIVO ACTA REUNIÓN – Nº 4, 2015
 REUNIÓN COMITÉ DIRECTIVO ACTA REUNIÓN – Nº 5, 2015
 REUNIÓN COMITÉ DIRECTIVO ACTA REUNIÓN – Nº 6, 2015
 REUNIÓN COMITÉ DIRECTIVO ACTA REUNIÓN – Nº 7, 2015

Monitoring reports

REPORTE PERIODO AGOSTO – DICIEMBRE 2014, 2014 plus attachments
 MONITORING REPORT_2015_ENE-MAR, 2015
 MONITORING REPORT_2015_ABRIL, 2015
 MONITORING REPORT_2015_MAYO_v2, 2015 plus attachments
 MONITORING REPORT_2015_JUNIO_v4, 2015 plus attachments
 MONITORING REPORT_2015_JULIO, 2015 plus attachment
 MONITORING REPORT_2015_AGOSTO, 2015 plus attachments
 MONITORING REPORT_2015_SETIEMBRE, 2015 plus attachments
 MONITORING REPORT_2015_OCTUBRE, 2015 plus attachments

MONITORING REPORT_2015_NOVIEMBRE_v2, 2015 plus attachments
 MONITORING REPORT_2015_Diciembre, 2015 with attachments
 150730_InformeSemestral_MJG, 2015 with attachments
 INFORME DE AVANCE, 2015

6. Budget information

As envisioned at the time of CEO endorsement/approval, the project is funded through a GEF grant, amounting to USD 3,392,727 (and PPG Grant of USD 50,000), a UNIDO co-financing contribution of USD 110,000 (in cash and in-kind, excluding the PPG phase); and other co-financing of USD 32,300,000), which amount to total project budget of USD 35,802,727.

Financing plan summary for the project (in USD):

Type of financing	Project preparation (in USD)	Project (in USD)	Total (in USD)
GEF financing	50,000	3,392,727	3,442,727
Co-financing	60,000	32,410,000	32,470,000
Total (in USD)	110,000	35,802,727	35,912,727

(Source: CEO endorsement document)

Project budget:

Project components	Project outcomes	GEF grant amount (excl. PPG) (in USD)	Co-financing (in USD)	Total (in USD)
1. Policy and regulatory framework strengthening	1. The policy framework to promote sustainable production schemes and implement low-emission technologies in prioritised sectors (agricultural and farming sector, processing industries, small communities) has been strengthened.	494,727	495,000	989,727

Project components	Project outcomes	GEF grant amount (excl. PPG) (in USD)	Co-financing (in USD)	Total (in USD)
2. Knowledge base (technological capacities) in the fields of waste-to-energy, waste valorization and low emission waste treatment technologies strengthened	2. The design and implementation of waste-to-energy valorization alternatives and low-emission waste treatment technologies have been enhanced due to an improved knowledge base.	395,000	415,000	810,000
3. Demonstration of waste valorization and renewable energy technologies' applications	3. Waste-to-energy and other feasible waste valorization applications have been adopted in the targeted sectors.	1,775,000	30,705,000	32,480,000
4. Capacity building, training and dissemination campaign for the adoption of low carbon waste valorization initiatives	4. The capacities of sector agents to deliver state-of-the-art sustainable production schemes through sustainable waste management and low-emission treatment technologies in prioritized sectors have been strengthened.	475,000	475,000	950,000

Project components	Project outcomes	GEF grant amount (excl. PPG) (in USD)	Co-financing (in USD)	Total (in USD)
M&E	M&E	90,000	70,000	160,000
Project management	Project management	163,000	250,000	413,000
Total (in USD)		3,392,727	32,410,000	35,802,727

(Source: CEO endorsement document)

Expected co-financing source breakdown is as follows:

Name of co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Total amount (in USD)
UNIDO	Implementing agency	In-kind	50,000
UNIDO	Implementing agency	Cash/grant	60,000
MIEM	National Government	In-kind	1,299,811
MVOTMA	National Government	In-kind	272,500
MGAP	National Government	In-kind	272,500
Instituto Nacional de Colonizacion	National Government	Cash/grant	13,055,189
Alcoholes del Uruguay S.A. (ALUR S.A.)	Private Sector	Cash/grant	7,400,000
Estancias del Lago	Private Sector	Investment	10,000,000
Total co-financing (in USD)			32,410,000

(Source: CEO endorsement document)

UNIDO GEF-grant disbursement breakdown:

Item	Disbursement (commitment + expenditure) in 2012	Disbursement in 2013	Disbursement in 2014	Disbursement in 2015	Disbursement in 2016	Total disbursement (in USD) (2012-present) (26 January 2016)
Sub-contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	236,690.05	-272.42	236,417.63
Equipment	0.00	0.00	1,459.70	366.32	0.00	1,826.02
International Experts	16,715.00	11,315.2	4,101.91	17,252.35	13,500.00	62,884.46
International Meetings	0.00	0.00	2,913.90	22,611.81	-6.54	25,519.17
Project travel	0.00	2,889.19	1,211.30	28,929.15	5,270.17	38,299.81
National Experts	19,461.26	11,065.55	32,248.80	169,008.36	145,883.44	377,667.41
Other direct costs	0.00	3,417.31	7,531.75	4,157.70	3,673.09	18,779.85
Staff travel	4,550.00	5,659.75	0.00	6,000.00	0.00	16,209.75
Training/ Fellowship/ Study Tour	0.00	0.00	0.00	11,829.22	0.00	11,829.22
Total (in USD)	40,726.26	34,347.00	49,467.36	496,844.96	168,047.74	789,433.32

Source: SAP database, 26 January 2016 (includes GEF and UNIDO funding, PPG & project)

II. Scope and purpose of the mid-term review

The independent mid-term review will cover the duration of the project from its starting date in December 2013 to the estimated mid-term review date March 2016. It will assess project performance and progress against the review criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

The nature of the mid-term review is largely a management tool to provide the project team and stakeholders with an account of results achieved at the time of reporting, and to guide for the remaining period of the project.

The review team should provide an analysis of the attainment of the main objective and specific objectives under the four core project components. Through its assessments, the review team should enable the Government, counterparts, the GEF, UNIDO and other stakeholders and donors to:

- (a) Verify prospects for development impact and sustainability, providing an analysis of the attainment of global environmental objectives, project objectives, delivery and completion of project outputs/activities, and outcomes/impacts based on indicators. The assessment includes re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and other elements of project design according to the project review parameters defined in chapter VI.
- (b) Enhance project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability by proposing a set of recommendations with a view to ongoing and future activities until the end of project implementation.

The key question of the mid-term review is to what extent the project is achieving the expected results at the time of the mid-term review, i.e. to what extent the project has achieved its main objective of transforming the different kinds of waste generated in the agriculture and the agro-industry production chains in Uruguay into various types of energy and/or other byproducts with the aim of reducing GHG emissions, while contributing to the development of a low carbon sustainable production model supported by an adequate technology development and transfer.

III. Review approach and methodology

The mid-term review will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects, the GEF's 2008 Guidelines for Implementing and Executing Agencies to Conduct Terminal Evaluations, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy from 2010 and the Recommended Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies.

It will be carried out as an independent mid-term review using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the review. The review team leader will liaise with the project manager on the conduct of the review and methodological issues.

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

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

The methodology will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNIDO and GEF annual project implementation review (PIR) reports), output reports (case studies, action plans, sub-regional strategies, etc.) and relevant correspondence.

- (b) Notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project (e.g. approval and steering committees).
 - (c) Other project-related material produced by the project.
2. The review team will use available models of (or reconstruct if necessary) theory of change for the different types of intervention (enabling, capacity, investment, demonstration). The validity of the theory of change will be examined through specific questions in interviews and possibly through a survey of stakeholders.
 3. Counterfactual information: In those cases where baseline information for relevant indicators is not available the review team will aim at establishing a proxy-baseline through recall and secondary information.
 4. Interviews with project management and technical support including staff and management at UNIDO HQ and in the field and – if necessary - staff associated with the project's financial administration and procurement.
 5. Interviews with project partners including Government counterparts, GEF focal points and partners that have been selected for co-financing as shown in the corresponding sections of the project documents.
 6. On-site observation of results achieved in demonstration projects, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies.
 7. Interviews and telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project. The evaluator shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of any donor agencies or other organizations.
 8. Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Country Office and the project's management and Project Steering Committee (PSC) members and the various national and sub-regional authorities dealing with project activities as necessary. If deemed necessary, the evaluator shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.
 9. Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluator and/or UNIDO, ODG/EVA.
 10. The inception report will provide details on the methodology used by the review team and include a review matrix.

IV. Review team composition

The review team will be composed of one international evaluation consultant.

The review team should be able to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including review verification on request to the GEF partnership up to two years after completion of the independent mid-term review.

Both consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions attached to these terms of reference.

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

The project manager at UNIDO and the Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining (MIEM), the Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment (MVOTMA) and the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fishery (MGAP) will support the review team. The UNIDO GEF Coordinator will be briefed on the mid-term review.

V. Time schedule and deliverables

The mid-term review is scheduled to take place in the period from 15 February 2016 to 14 April 2016. The field mission is planned for 07 March to 11 March 2016. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project in Uruguay.

At the end of the evaluation field mission, a debriefing should be conducted inviting local stakeholders (incl. government and parties involved in the evaluation). After the field mission, the review team leader will come to UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of preliminary findings of the mid-term review. The draft mid-term review report will be submitted 4-6 weeks after the end of the mission. The draft mid-term review report is to be shared with the UNIDO PM, ODG/EVA, the UNIDO GEF Coordinator and the GEF OFP and other relevant stakeholders for receipt of comments. The ET leader is expected to revise the draft mid-term review report based on the comments received, edit the language and form and submit the final version of the mid-term review report in accordance with UNIDO, ODG/EVA standards.

VI. Project review parameters

A. Project design

The review will examine the extent to which:

- ✓ The project's design is adequate to address the problems at hand;
- ✓ A participatory project identification process was instrumental in selecting problem areas and national counterparts;
- ✓ 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 (project results framework) approach;
- ✓ The project was formulated with the participation of national counterparts, stakeholders and/or target beneficiaries through a participatory and broad public consultation approach;
- ✓ Relevant country representatives (from government, industries, gender groups, and civil society), including the GEF OFP, have been appropriately involved and were participating in the identification of critical problem areas and the development of technical cooperation strategies;
- ✓ All GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects have incorporated relevant environmental and social risk considerations into the project design / all GEF-6 projects are following the provisions specified in UNIDO/DGAI.23: UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP) tracking the relevant environmental and social (E&S) risks and applying appropriate E&S safeguards, established at the time of project design;

- ✓ All GEF-6 projects have incorporated relevant knowledge management strategy, including plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share the knowledge, experiences and expertise generated by the project with the relevant stakeholders, UNIDO HQ, the GEF Sec and the broader GEF Network (i.e., GEF Agencies and other stakeholders);
- ✓ The project preparation/formulation process is timely and efficient, and which are the reasons in case of delays/issues (e.g., compliance with the 18 month CEO endorsement deadline; adequacy of communication among stakeholders).

B. Project relevance

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

- ✓ National development and environmental priorities and strategies of the Government and the population, and regional and international agreements. See possible review questions under Country ownership/drivenness below.
- ✓ Target groups: relevance of the project's objectives, outcomes and outputs to the different target groups of the interventions (e.g., companies, civil society, beneficiaries of capacity building and training).
- ✓ GEF's focal areas/operational programme strategies: In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the GEF focal area(s)/operational program strategies? Ascertain the likely nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the wider portfolio of GEF's Climate Change Focal area, specifically CCM-1 and CCM-3.
- ✓ UNIDO's thematic priorities: Were they in line with UNIDO's mandate, objectives and outcomes defined in the Programme & Budget and core competencies?
- ✓ Does the project remain relevant taking into account the changing environment? Was there a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country and operational context?

C. Effectiveness: objectives and planned final results at the end of the project

- The mid-term review will assess to what extent results at various levels, including outcomes, have been achieved. In detail, the following issues will be assessed: To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and long-term objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved? Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?
- Are the project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? If the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs, the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and, if there were, determine whether these are commensurate with realistic expectations from the project.
- How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of outputs? Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached?

- What outputs and outcomes has the project achieved so far (both qualitative and quantitative results)? Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?
- Identify actual and/or potential longer-term impacts or at least indicate the steps taken to assess these (see also below “monitoring of long term changes”). Wherever possible, evaluators should indicate how findings on impacts will be reported in future.
- Describe any catalytic or replication effects: the mid-term review will describe any catalytic or replication effect both within and outside the project. If no effects are identified, the mid-term review will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the project’s catalytic role.

D. Efficiency

The extent to which:

- The project cost was effective? Was the project using the least cost options?
- Has the project produced results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected time frame? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the costs incurred and the time taken to achieve outcomes with that for similar projects. Are the project’s activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and annual work plans? Are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with budgets?
- Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet requirements? Was the quality of UNIDO inputs and services as planned and timely?
- Was there coordination with other UNIDO and other donors’ projects, and did possible synergy effects happen?

E. Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes

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

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

- ✓ **Sociopolitical risks.** Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?
- ✓ **Institutional framework and governance risks.** Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?
- ✓ **Environmental risks.** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? Are there any environmental factors, positive or negative, that can influence the future flow of project benefits? Are there any project outputs or higher level results that are likely to have adverse environmental impacts, which, in turn, might affect sustainability of project benefits? The mid-term review should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

F. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems

- **M&E design.** Did the project have an M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The mid-term review will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for the application of the project M&E plan (see [annex 3](#)).
- **M&E plan implementation.** The mid-term review should verify that an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete and accurate, with well-justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve performance and to adapt to changing needs; and the project had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure. Where monitoring and self-evaluation carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and impacts? Are there any annual work plans? Was any steering or advisory mechanism put in place? Did reporting and performance reviews take place regularly?
- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, the evaluators will determine whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted for at the project planning stage and whether M&E was adequately funded and in a timely manner during implementation.

G. Monitoring of long-term changes

The monitoring and evaluation of long-term changes is often incorporated in GEF-supported projects as a separate component and may include determination of environmental baselines; specification of indicators; and provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis, and use. This section of the mid-

term review report will describe project actions and accomplishments toward establishing a long-term monitoring system. The review will address the following questions:

- a. Did this project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?
- b. What were the accomplishments and shortcomings in establishment of this system?
- c. Is the system sustainable—that is, is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and does it have financing? How likely is it that this system continues operating upon project completion?
- d. Is the information generated by this system being used as originally intended?

H. Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results

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

- a. **Preparation and readiness / Quality at entry.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable, and feasible within its time frame? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
- b. **Country ownership/drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country — or of participating countries, in the case of multi-country projects? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in the project? Was the GEF OFP involved in the project design and implementation? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government—or governments in the case of multi-country projects — approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives?
- c. **Stakeholder involvement and consultation.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through continuous information sharing and consultation? Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes involved in a participatory and consultative manner? Which stakeholders were involved in the project (i.e., NGOs, private sector, other UN Agencies, etc.) and what were their immediate tasks? Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, nongovernmental

organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and review of project activities? Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions?

- d. **Financial planning.** Did the project have appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds? Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised co-financing materialize? Specifically, the mid-term review should also include a breakdown of final actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing.
- e. **UNIDO's supervision and backstopping.** Did UNIDO staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did UNIDO staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time, and restructure the project when needed? Did UNIDO provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the project?
- f. **Co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability.** Did the project manage to mobilize the co-financing amount expected at the time of CEO Endorsement? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and the co-financing actually mobilized, what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?
- g. **Delays and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, what were the reasons? Did the delays affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?
- h. **Implementation and execution approach.** Is the implementation and execution approach chosen different from other implementation approaches applied by UNIDO and other agencies? Does the approach comply with the principles of the Paris Declaration? Is the implementation and execution approach in line with the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards: Separation of Implementation and Execution Functions in GEF Partner Agencies (GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01) and the relevant UNIDO Regulations (DGAI.20 and Procurement Manual)? Does the approach promote local ownership and capacity building? Does the approach involve significant risks? In cases where Execution was done by third parties, i.e. Executing Partners, based on a contractual arrangement with UNIDO was this done in accordance with the contractual arrangement concluded with UNIDO in an effective and efficient manner?
- i. **Environmental and Social Safeguards.** if a GEF-4 or GEF-5 project, has the project incorporated relevant environmental and social risk considerations into the project design? What impact did these risks have on the achievement of project results? If a GEF-6 project, have the provisions specified in UNIDO/DGAI.23: UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP) tracking the relevant environmental and social (E&S) risks and applying appropriate E&S safeguards, established at the time of

project design been followed? Have the identified E&S risks been appropriately mitigated?

- j. **Knowledge Management.** If a GEF-6 project, has the project incorporated a relevant knowledge management strategy, including plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share the knowledge, experiences and expertise generated by this project with the relevant stakeholders, UNIDO HQ, the GEF Sec and the broader GEF Network (i.e. GEF Agencies and other stakeholders)?

As per the GEF's requirements, the report should also provide information on project identification, time frame, actual expenditures, and co-financing in the format in annex 4, which is modeled after the GEF's project identification form (PIF).

I. Project coordination and management

The extent to which:

- The national management and overall coordination mechanisms have been efficient and effective? Did each partner have assigned roles and responsibilities from the beginning? Did each partner fulfil its role and responsibilities (e.g., providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions)?
- The UNIDO HQ and Field Office based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (e.g., problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)?
- The national management and overall coordination mechanisms were efficient and effective? Did each partner have specific roles and responsibilities from the beginning till the end? Did each partner fulfill its role and responsibilities (e.g., providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions)? Were the UNIDO HQ based management, coordination, quality control and technical inputs efficient, timely and effective (e.g., problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)?

J. Assessment of gender mainstreaming

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

- Did the project design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? If so, how?
- Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)?
- How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?

- Have women and men benefited equally from the project's interventions? So far, 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)?
- To what extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?

VII. Reporting

Inception report

These terms of reference provide some information on the review methodology but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager the international evaluation consultant will prepare, in collaboration with the national evaluation consultant, a short inception report that will operationalize the TOR relating to the review questions and provide information on what type of and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). The Inception Report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of review methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an review framework ("review matrix"); division of work between the international evaluation consultant and national evaluation consultant; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable².

Mid-term review report format and review procedures

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO, ODG/EVA (the suggested report outline is in annex 1) and circulated to UNIDO staff, the GEF OFP and national stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or responses, or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to the project manager for collation and onward transmission to the project review team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the review team will prepare the final version of the mid-term review report.

The review team will present its preliminary findings to the local stakeholders at the end of the field visit and take into account their feed-back in preparing the mid-term review report. A presentation of preliminary findings will also take place at HQ after the field mission.

The mid-term review report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the mid-term review, exactly what was evaluated, and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the mid-term review took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should

² The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an inception report (prepared by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation).

include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The mid-term review report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in annex 1.

Mid-term review: Work plan

The **mid-term review work plan** includes the following main products:

1. Desk review, briefing by project manager and development of methodology: Following the receipt of all relevant documents, and consultation with the Project Manager about the documentation, including reaching an agreement on the Methodology, the desk review could be completed.
2. Inception report: At the time for departure to the field mission, the complete gamete of received materials have been reviewed and consolidated into the Inception report.
3. Field mission: The principal responsibility for managing this mid-term review lies with UNIDO. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field missions, coordinate with the Government. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of preliminary findings to the key stakeholders in the country where the project was implemented.
4. Preliminary findings from the field mission: Following the field mission, the main findings, conclusions and recommendations would be prepared and presented in the field and at UNIDO Headquarters.
5. A draft Mid-term review report will be forwarded electronically to the Project Manager, who will forward the same to the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and circulated to main stakeholders.
6. A final mid-term review report will incorporate comments received.

VIII. Quality assurance

The project manager (PM) will be responsible for managing the mid-term review, preparing the terms of reference (TOR) and the job description (JD) of the review consultant(s) on the basis of guidance of the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation (ODG/EVA). The PM will forward drafts and final reports to ODG/EVA for review, distribute drafts and final reports to stakeholders (upon review by ODG/EVA), and organize presentations of preliminary review findings which serve to generate feedback on and discussion of mid-term review findings and recommendations at UNIDO HQ. Finally, the PM will be responsible for the submission of the final mid-term review report.

Annex 1 - Outline of an independent mid-term review report

Executive summary

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

I. Mid-term review objectives, methodology and process

- Information on the mid-term review: why, when, by whom, etc.
- Scope and objectives of the mid-term review, main questions to be addressed
- Information sources and availability of information
- Methodological remarks, limitations encountered and validity of the findings

II. Countries and project background

- Brief countries context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project³ and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
 - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
 - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
 - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
 - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
 - Counterpart organization(s)

III. Project assessment

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

- A. Design
- B. Relevance (report on the relevance of the project towards countries and beneficiaries)
- C. Effectiveness (the extent to which the development intervention's objectives and deliverables were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance)
- D. Efficiency (report on the overall cost-benefit of the project and partner Countries contribution to the achievement of project objectives)

³ Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g. relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives, etc.)

- E. Sustainability of Project Outcomes (report on the risks and vulnerability of the project, considering the likely effects of sociopolitical and institutional changes in partner countries, and its impact on continuation of benefits after the GEF project ends, specifically the financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks)
- F. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems (report on M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and Budgeting and funding for M&E activities)
- G. Monitoring of long-term changes
- H. Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results (report on preparation and readiness / quality at entry, country ownership, stakeholder involvement, financial planning, UNIDO support, co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability, delays of project outcomes and sustainability, and implementation approach)
- I. Project coordination and management (report project management conditions and achievements, and partner countries commitment)
- J. Gender mainstreaming

IV. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

A. Conclusions

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

B. Recommendations

This section should be succinct and contain few key recommendations. They should:

- be based on review findings
- realistic and feasible within a project context
- indicate institution(s) responsible for implementation (addressed to a specific officer, group or entity who can act on it) and have a proposed timeline for implementation if possible
- be commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
- take resource requirements into account.

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:

- UNIDO
- Government and/or Counterpart Organizations
- Donor

C. Lessons learned

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

Annexes should include the mid-term review TOR, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, a summary of project identification and financial data, and other detailed quantitative information. Dissident views or management responses to the review findings may later be appended in an annex.

Annex 2 - GEF minimum requirements for M&E⁴

Minimum requirement 1: Project design of M&E

All projects will include a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and review plan by the time of work program entry for full-sized projects and CEO approval for medium-sized projects. This monitoring and review plan will contain as a minimum:

- SMART indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management;
- SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, indicators identified at the corporate level;
- Baseline for the project, with a description of the problem to be addressed, with indicator data, or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation;
- Identification of evaluations and reviews that will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluation of activities; and
- Organizational set-up and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

Minimum requirement 2: Application of project M&E

Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&E plan, comprising:

- SMART indicators for implementation are actively used, or if not, a reasonable explanation is provided;
- SMART indicators for results are actively used, or if not, a reasonable explanation is provided;
- The baseline for the project is fully established and data compiled to review progress reviews, and reviews/evaluations are undertaken as planned; and
- The organizational set-up for M&E is operational and budgets are spent as planned.

⁴ http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf

Annex 3 – Checklist on independent mid-term review report quality

Independent mid-term review of UNIDO-GEF project:

PROJECT TITLE:

PROJECT NUMBER:

CHECKLIST ON INDEPENDENT MID-TERM REVIEW REPORT QUALITY

Report quality criteria	UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation: Assessment notes	Rating
A. The independent mid-term review report presented an assessment of all relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable.		
B. The independent mid-term review report was consistent, the evidence presented was complete and convincing, and the ratings were well substantiated.		
C. The independent mid-term review report presented a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes.		
D. The lessons and recommendations listed in the mid-term review report are supported by the evidence presented and are relevant to the GEF portfolio and future projects.		
E. The independent mid-term review report included the actual project costs (totals, per activity, and per source) and actual co-financing used.		
F. The independent mid-term review report included an assessment of the quality of the M&E plan at entry, the operation of the M&E system used during implementation, and the extent M&E was sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation.		

Rating system for quality of independent mid-term review 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 4 – Required project identification and financial data

The independent mid-term review report should provide information on project identification, time frame, actual expenditures, and co-financing in the following format, which is modeled after the project identification form (PIF).

I. Dates

Milestone	Expected date	Actual date
Project CEO endorsement/approval date		
Project implementation start date (PAD issuance date)		
Original expected implementation end date (indicated in CEO endorsement/approval document)		
Revised expected implementation end date (if any)		
Mid-term review completion		
Terminal evaluation		
Planned tracking tool date		

II. Project framework

Project component	Activity type	GEF financing (in USD)		Co-financing (in USD)	
		Approved	Actual	Promised	Actual
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6. Project management					
Total (in USD)					

Activity types are:

- a) Experts, researches hired;
- b) technical assistance, Workshop, Meetings or experts consultation scientific and technical analysis, experts researches hired;
- c) Promised co-financing refers to the amount indicated on endorsement/approval.

III. Co-financing

Source of co-financing (name of specific co-financiers)	Type of co-financier (e.g. government, GEF agency(ies), Bilateral and aid agency (ies), multilateral agency(ies), private sector, NGO/CSOs, other)	Type of co-financing	Project preparation – CEO endorsement/ approval stage (in USD)		Project implementation stage (in USD)		Total (in USD)	
			Expected	Actual	Expected	Actual	Expected	Actual
	...							
Total co-financing (in USD)								

Expected amounts are those submitted by the GEF agencies in the original project appraisal document. Co-financing types are grant, soft loan, hard loan, guarantee, in kind, or cash.

Annex 5 – Job descriptions



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	International evaluation consultant
Main duty station and location:	Home-based
Missions:	Missions to Vienna, Austria and Uruguay
Start of contract (EOD):	1 March 2016
End of contract (COB):	08 April 2016
Number of working days:	25 working days

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent review function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Review is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of a programme, a project or a theme. Independent reviews provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. The Office for Independent Evaluation is guided by the UNIDO Review Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for review in the UN system.

PROJECT CONTEXT

In November 2013, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) endorsed a full size project under its Climate Change Focal Area entitled "Towards a green economy in Uruguay: stimulating sustainable production practices and low-emission technologies in prioritized sectors" for which UNIDO will act as the implementation agency. The overall objective of the project is to transform the different kinds of waste generated in the agriculture and the agroindustry production chains in Uruguay into various types of energy and/or other byproducts, aiming at the development of a low carbon sustainable production model, supported by an adequate technology development and transfer.

The project has four substantive components:

- Policy and regulatory framework strengthening
- Knowledge base (technological capacities) in the fields of waste-to-energy, waste valorization and low emission waste treatment technologies strengthened
- Demonstration of waste valorization and renewable energy technologies' applications
- Capacity building, training and dissemination campaign for the adoption of low carbon waste valorization initiatives

The project counts on a total budget of US\$3,392,727 in GEF grant funding.

Detailed background information of the project can be found the terms of reference (TOR) for the independent mid-term review.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable outputs to be achieved	Working days	Location
<p>1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument of 3A accordingly (if needed);</p> <p>Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project's activities and analyze other background info.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjust table of review questions, depending on country specific context • Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions • Brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework 	4 days	Home-based
<p>2. Briefing with the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.</p> <p>Preparation of the inception report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed review schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning • Division of review tasks with the national evaluation consultant • Inception report 	1 day	Home-based
<p>3. Conduct field mission to Uruguay in March 2016⁵.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP), etc. for the collection of data and clarifications • Agreement with the national evaluation consultant on the structure and content of the review report and the distribution of writing tasks; • Review presentation of the review's initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country, including the GEF OFP, at the end of the mission 	7 days	Uruguay
<p>4. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed 	2 day	Vienna, Austria

⁵ The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the evaluation consultants, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable outputs to be achieved	Working days	Location
5. Prepare the mid-term review report according to the TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the national evaluation consultant and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft mid-term review report. Share the review report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.	• Draft review report	7 days	Home-based
6. Revise the draft project review report based on comments from UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	• Final mid-term review report	4 days	Home-based
TOTAL		25 days	

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education:

Advanced degree in environment, energy, engineering, development studies or related areas

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 10 years' experience in energy project management and/or review (of development projects)
- Knowledge about GEF operational programs and strategies and about relevant GEF policies such as those on project life cycle, M&E, incremental costs, and fiduciary standards
- Experience in the review of GEF projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks
- Working experience in developing countries

Languages:

Fluency in written and spoken English is required. Knowledge of Spanish would be an asset.

Reporting and deliverables

- 1) At the beginning of the assignment the consultant will submit a concise inception report that will outline the general methodology and presents a concept table of contents;
- 2) The country assignment will have the following deliverables:
 - Presentation of initial findings of the mission to key national stakeholders;
 - Draft review report;
 - Final review report, comprising of executive summary, findings regarding design, implementation and results, conclusions and recommendations.

0

3) Debriefing at UNIDO HQ:

- Presentation and discussion of findings;
- Concise summary and comparative analysis of the main results of the review report.

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

Absence of conflict of interest:

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

Annex 6 – Project results framework

Results	Indicators	Baseline and Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Objective				
Transform the different kinds of waste generated in the agriculture and the agro-industry production chains in Uruguay in various types of energy and/or other by-products with the aim of reducing GHG emissions, while contributing to the development of a low carbon sustainable production model supported by an adequate technology development and transfer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantified reduction and/or avoidance of GHG emissions (in tCO₂e) 	<p>Baseline: Lifetime tons of CO₂eq avoided (equals 0)</p> <p>Target: Lifetime tons of CO₂eq emissions avoided (1,396,143 tCO₂eq)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEF climate change mitigation tracking tool 	<p>A: Continued support and interest from public and private sector to implement advanced, low carbon emission waste valorization technologies</p> <p>A: Data to calculate CO₂eq emission reductions is available</p> <p>R: Economic, financial or political crisis threaten the sustainability of the Project and prevent the targeted sectors from adopting low-carbon technologies</p>
PC#1: Policy and regulatory framework strengthening				
Outcome 1: The policy framework to promote sustainable production schemes and implement low-emission technologies in prioritized sectors (agricultural and farming sector, processing industries, and small communities) has been strengthened.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of new or revised policies and/or regulations proposed Number of financial incentives designed 	<p>Baseline: Insufficient support for waste valorization in place</p> <p>Target: Improved policies, regulations and instruments that promote waste valorization.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official publications Final evaluation 	<p>A: Government of Uruguay's commitment to improving policy and legislation</p> <p>R: Policies and regulations are not strengthened</p>

Outputs:					
Output 1.1	Establishment of a Taskforce coordinated by DNE/DINAMA/MGAP responsible for preparing strategies in the targeted sectors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operating Taskforce Number of men and women participating in the Taskforce 	<p>Baseline: no dedicated taskforce exists.</p> <p>Target: establishment of an operative taskforce</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official documentation e.g. meeting minutes Members of the Taskforce 	<p>A: Commitment from DNE/DINAMA/MGAP to establish the Taskforce</p> <p>R: Lack of personnel to be part of the Taskforce</p>
Output 1.2	Studies have been carried out as inputs for enhancing policy instruments covering at least 10 fields; amongst others, these include: (i) biogas production and uses of biogas; ii) production of synthetic diesel from organic matter; iii) use of dry manure for combustion; iv) production and application of bio-fertilizers to the soil.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of studies carried out 	<p>Baseline: insufficient information on the mentioned areas on what issues need to be tackled to enhance the existing instruments.</p> <p>Target: Carry out studies covering the 10 areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documentation Appraisals by counterparts 	<p>A: Government of Uruguay's commitment to allow for the conduction of the studies</p> <p>R: Limited information to conclude the studies</p>
Output 1.3	Development and implementation of an action plan to remove financial barriers and provide applicable mechanisms and instruments to favor the inclusion and adoption of new low-carbon waste valorization technologies in the targeted sectors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of mechanisms and instruments to overcome financial barriers proposed 	<p>Baseline: no specific plans to remove financial barriers to favor the inclusion and adoption of new low-carbon waste valorization technologies</p> <p>Target: Develop an action plan to favor the inclusion and adoption of new low-carbon waste valorization technologies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action plan Project documentation 	<p>A: Commitment of the government to provide incentives and mechanisms that remove the financial burden</p> <p>R: Political and/or financial context forces the government to reduce the incentives or mechanisms</p>

Output 1.4	Identification and design of financial instrument(s) targeting low carbon technologies for waste valorization and identification of local financial institutions (e.g. banks) that will implement the scale up of the technologies after this project is completed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of financial instrument(s) proposed 	<p>Baseline: no specific financial instrument exists for waste valorization initiatives.</p> <p>Target: Design the structure of a financial instrument to be used in the promotion of waste valorization opportunities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documentation Appraisals by counterparts 	A: Local capabilities to operate the financial instrument are established
Output 1.5	Development of new policy / regulation draft or revision of existing policy / regulation based on the pre-identified areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of modified, updated and/or new policies and regulations 	<p>Baseline: Insufficient policy and regulatory framework to promote waste valorization initiatives in place.</p> <p>Target: Establish provisions and guidelines in order to improve the policy and regulatory framework and draft new documents as necessary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documentation Appraisals by counterparts 	<p>A: Taskforce and GoU commitment on collaborating with the drafting of new/revised documents</p> <p>R: Political issues affect the creation and drafting of new/revised regulations and policies.</p>
PC#2: Knowledge base (technological capacities) in the field of waste-to-energy, waste valorization and low-emission waste treatment technologies strengthened					
Outcome 2: The design and implementation of waste-to-energy valorization alternatives and low-emission waste treatment technologies have been enhanced due to an		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New knowledge resources made available to the public and 	<p>Baseline: Insufficient technological knowledge base in the country</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official publications Final evaluation 	A: Commitment of the Government to promote the use of waste-to-energy and waste

improved knowledge base.	stakeholders	Target: Improve the technological knowledge base in the country		valorization technologies R: Lack of data to improve the technological knowledge base	
Outputs					
Output 2.1	Disaggregated (department level) physical and chemical characterisation of at least the 16 identified waste streams with valorization potential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of waste streams characterized Number of characterized parameters and variables for each stream 	Baseline: basic characterization of waste streams, which is insufficient for statistics estimation Target: Full characterization of at least 16 waste streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documentation Laboratory reports 	A: State-of-the-art facilities to analyze residues are available to conduct the characterization R: Data is not available, insufficient or not monitored
Output 2.2	Research and prefeasibility studies (including social, environmental and economic dimensions) conducted in the targeted sectors to determine the most viable waste valorization processes and business models.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of prefeasibility studies conducted 	Baseline: Lack of comprehensive information on waste valorization processes and business models Target: Complete prefeasibility studies in the targeted sectors to fill information gaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-feasibility studies 	A: Continued cooperation with national universities R: Universities' support is removed
PC#3: Demonstration of waste valorization and renewable energy technologies' applications					
Outcome 3: Waste-to-energy and other feasible waste valorization applications have been adopted in the targeted sectors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of implemented projects in the targeted sectors 	Baseline: No implementation of novel waste valorization technologies in projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Surveys to project owners Visits to the plants 	A: the facilities' owners are committed to promoting and carrying out the demonstration projects	

			Target: conduction of at least 4 feasibility studies involving waste valorization		R: the projects cannot continue after project finalization due to lack of resources
Outputs					
Output 3.1	Four fully functional large-scale waste treatment plants have been commissioned (digestion of vinasse from bioethanol production, digestion of cow manure from dairy sector, co-digestion of combined waste feedstock in agro-industry and waste treatment and management projects in small size cattle breeding farms)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of fully functional large scale commissioned projects 	Baseline: No large-scale waste valorization plants are commissioned in the targeted industries. Target: 4 fully functional plants are commissioned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects' feasibility studies and technical design files Field visits; plant commissioning reports; bill of lading; appraisals by counterparts, final evaluation. 	A: Private companies willing to implement advanced, low-emission waste treatment technologies R: Lack of resources can put in danger the continuity of the full-scale projects
Output 3.2	Call for Proposals for and implementation of at least five small to medium scale projects, including (i) design of the call; (ii) feasibility and technical design studies for demonstrations in medium and small sized farms / industries in the targeted sectors; and (iii) implementation of at least five full-scale projects in medium and small sized agro-industries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of fully functional projects in small- and medium-sized agro-industries 	Baseline: No innovative waste valorization projects have been implemented in small- and medium-sized agro-industries. Target: Implementation of at least 5 waste valorization projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects' feasibility studies and technical design files Field visits; plant commissioning reports; bill of lading; appraisals by counterparts, final evaluation. 	A: Private companies willing to implement advanced, low-emission waste treatment technologies R: Delays in the commissioning R: No responses are received after the Call for Proposals.
Output 3.3	Identification of a portfolio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of 	Baseline: No waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project 	A: There will be

	of potential waste valorization projects.	projects included in the portfolio	valorization project portfolio exists Target: Development of one portfolio with potential projects	documentation • Appraisals by counterparts	continuous commitment to promote waste valorization R: Farmers are not interested in participating in the initiative
Output 3.4	Training of personnel on the operation of at least the four large-scale waste treatment undertakings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of personnel attending the training course, disaggregated by gender • Number of training courses undertaken 	Baseline: Limited possibilities for training on the operation of waste valorization plants. Target: Successful training of at least 1 (one) person per undertaking.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Appraisal by counterparts and beneficiaries 	A: Private companies willing to implement advanced, low-emission waste treatment technologies R: People unable to attend the courses R: Unsuccessful transfer of know-how to the attendees.
PC#4: Capacity building, training and dissemination campaign for the adoption of low carbon waste valorization initiatives					
Outcome 4: The capacities of sector agents to deliver state-of-the-art sustainable production schemes through sustainable waste management and low-emission treatment technologies in prioritized sectors have been strengthened.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of women/men attending training courses as sector agents • Number of users of the knowledge management platform • Number of people reached by the dissemination campaign 	Baseline: Insufficient capabilities of the sector agents exist. Target: Strengthening of at least 10 sector agents (between women and men) in the field of waste valorization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Publications • Training materials 	A: There is a critical amount of stakeholders and public in general committed to promote low-emission residues treatment technologies R: Lack of interest and/or willingness of stakeholders in knowing about these new technologies
Outputs					
Output 4.1	A running web-based knowledge management platform has been set up.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of online users that accessed the 	Baseline: No dedicated web-based tool for information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Web-based platform 	A: Access to internet R: Insufficient access to internet or slow

		knowledge management platform	sharing in place. Target: Have one on-line knowledge management platform running		connections or webpage unavailability
Output 4.2	Creation of at least (i) 2 toolkits and (ii) 2 training courses: (i) Toolkit on identification of waste valorization project opportunities and technological options, and toolkit on financing waste valorization opportunities and applying successful business models; and (ii) Training course on identification of waste valorization project opportunities and technological options, and training course on financing waste valorization opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of toolkits per knowledge area created • Number of training courses per knowledge area created • Number of users subscribing to the training courses, disaggregated by gender 	Baseline: No publicly available information exists on the waste valorization field and no training courses held on the waste valorization field Target: Have at least 2 toolkits on the waste valorization field available on the platform and design and delivery of at least two training courses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Web-based platform • Training course participants' list 	A: People are interested in several subjects that justify the creation of a toolkit and there will be enough people interested in the courses R: There are not enough people interested in attending the course, and/or the course is not held
Output 4.3	Establishment of a network between different productive sectors to ensure the sustainability of the knowledge management platform after the project is completed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of individual members of the network, disaggregated by gender • Number of member organizations (<i>no gender disaggregation applies here</i>) 	Baseline: No network involving productive sectors to ensure the sustainability of the knowledge management platform. Target: Establish one network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Appraisal by counterparts 	A: The knowledge management platform has been successfully established and is operational

Output 4.4	Dissemination campaign and a dissemination workshop to promote waste-to-energy, waste valorization and low-emission waste treatment activities to increase their adoption by farmers, industries and communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of dissemination products designed Type of audience reached (e.g. farmer, industry, other), disaggregated by gender (where feasible) 	<p>Baseline: No dissemination programme is established for the promotion of waste valorization.</p> <p>Target: One dissemination campaign and one dissemination workshop have been created.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation • Dissemination campaign plan • Publications • Workshop proceeding 	<p>A: Government is committed to supporting the dissemination campaign and workshop</p> <p>R: The campaign and workshop do not reach the desired stakeholders</p>
Output 4.5	Generation of knowledge about the waste valorization field through the collaboration with universities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of additional documents and research conducted with universities' support 	<p>Baseline: Initial interactions between UDELAR and one of the private companies have taken place.</p> <p>Target: Generate a systematic collaboration between private companies and universities to improve knowledge exchange in the field</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge Platform • Universities 	<p>A: Universities are willing to collaborate with the project</p> <p>R: Information is unavailable and/or there is a lack of resources to generate new information</p>