



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Independent terminal evaluation of**

**Capacity building for environmentally sound PCBs management and disposal**

**UNIDO Project ID: 104049**

**GEF Project ID: 3542**

**October 2017**

## Contents

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT .....	3
1.	Project factsheet .....	3
2.	Project context.....	3
3.	Project objective and expected outcomes .....	4
4.	Project implementation arrangements .....	5
5.	Main findings of the Mid-term review (MTR).....	6
6.	Budget information .....	7
II.	Evaluation purpose and scope.....	8
III.	Evaluation approach and methodology.....	9
1.	Data collection methods.....	9
2.	Evaluation key questions and criteria .....	10
3.	Rating system.....	11
IV.	Evaluation process.....	12
V.	Tentative time schedule and deliverables.....	12
VI.	Evaluation team composition .....	13
VII.	Reporting.....	13
VIII.	Quality assurance .....	14
	Annex 1: Project Logical Framework.....	16
	Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria.....	24
	Annex 3: Job descriptions .....	29
	Annex 4- Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report.....	36
	Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality .....	37
	Annex 6: Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and Projects .....	38
	Table 1. Financing plan summary.....	7
	Table 2. Financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown .....	7
	Table 3. Co-Financing source breakdown .....	7
	Table 4. UNIDO budget execution .....	8
	Table 5. Project evaluation criteria.....	10
	Table 6. Project rating criteria .....	11
	Table 7. Major timelines .....	12

## I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

### 1. Project factsheet<sup>12</sup>

Project title	Capacity building for environmentally sound PCBs management and disposal
UNIDO Project ID	104049
GEF Project ID	3542
Region	Asia and the Pacific
Country(ies)	Mongolia
Project donor(s)	GEF
Project implementation start date	10/26/2011
Expected duration	4 years
Expected implementation end date	31 December 2017
GEF Focal Areas and Operational Project	POPs focal area for GEF-4
Other executing Partners	Ministry of Nature and Environment of Mongolia (MNE); Ministry of Fuel and Energy of Mongolia (MFE)
Executing partners	UNIDO
UNIDO RBM code	GC33 (Implementation of MEA) or CE17 (Stockholm Convention)
Donor funding	2,650,000 (excluding PPG)
Project GEF CEO endorsement / approval date	3/23/2009
UNIDO input (in kind, USD)	In kind 100,000; Grant 278,000
Co-financing at CEO Endorsement, as applicable	MNE: USUSD 218,500 (cash) and USUSD 735,381 (in kind) MFE: USUSD 61,000 (cash) and USUSD 203,967 (in-kind) Stakeholder Participants: USUSD 4,239,470
Total project cost (USD), excluding support costs and PPG	8,208,318
Mid-term review date	12/3/2012
Planned terminal evaluation date	2 October – 21 December 2017

(Source: Project document)

### 2. Project context

The Stockholm Convention on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) recognizes that POPs including polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) “possess toxic properties, resist degradation, accumulate and are transported through air, water and migratory species, across international boundaries and deposited far from their places, where they accumulate in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems”. Exposure to PCBs, due to their bio magnifications, contaminates traditional foods, which are of a major public health concern, in particular for women and, through them, upon future generations.

Mongolia ratified the Stockholm Convention on POPs on 30 April 2004 and prepared the National Implementation Plan (NIP) that reviewed particular POPs issues, considered the provisions of relevant international commitments and developed detailed strategies and action plans, including timetables and

<sup>1</sup> Data to be validated by the Consultant

<sup>2</sup> Different data for implementation start date: July 2009 according to mid-term review and October 2011 according to UNIDO Open Data Platform as of August 2017

costing of their implementation. The NIP identified PCBs as one of the top priorities in managing POPs. The NIP also identified the need to conduct a thorough inventory on PCBs for gradual withdrawal and final disposal of the PCBs-containing equipment and wastes. The NIP also highlighted serious weaknesses of the current hazardous waste management practices and the need for institutional and regulatory development, capacity building, and public awareness in POPs management.

The institutional framework was initiated during the NIP development. However, there were no regulations specifically addressing PCBs and the management of PCB-containing electric equipment. There were no specific standards and guidelines that would provide a progressive phase-out and elimination of PCBs and PCB-containing electric equipment. The NIP also identified that public participation in management of POPs was lacking.

PCBs had never been produced in Mongolia. The period of the large-scale electrification of the country from 1960 to 1980 coincided with the peak of exporting PCB-containing equipment. According to the PCB inventory of May 2006, approximately 4,637 pieces of transformers, 3,847 circuit breakers, and 83 capacitors are available in the country, a large portion of which was imported from the former USSR before 1980. The NIP concluded that 96-98% of all transformers used in Mongolia might have PCB-containing oils. During the POPs preliminary inventory, over 500 pieces of equipment were analysed with Test Kit CHLOR-N-OIL, which revealed that 7.5 percent of the PCB-contaminated transformers contained above 50ppm of PCBs. Therefore, it was estimated that 350 transformers were contaminated with PCBs in the whole country, with the total weight of 2,300 tonnes. However, it should be noted that the test kit method used for the survey may underestimate the PCBs content in the oil, therefore these results were to be verified.

The GEF Full-Sized Project aimed to consolidate ongoing and planned activities in implementing Mongolia's obligations for reducing and eliminating PCBs to meet the country's obligations under the Stockholm Convention. The project was to focus PCBs in the electric sector through (a) developing appropriate legislation, (b) providing capacity building for key stakeholders, (c) developing an Environmentally Sound Management (ESM) system for electric equipment and incorporating it into a national policy framework, (d) gradual phase-out of PCB-containing equipment (transformers and capacitors), (e) eliminating PCBs cross-contamination, (f) disposal of all PCB-wastes, (g) strengthening environmental monitoring capacities and (h) identifying the most appropriate mitigation measures to reduce social costs of complying with the Stockholm Convention.

Project operations were also meant to create the required appropriate laboratory capacity, labelling system as part of the environmentally sound PCBs management and to complete the inventory for PCB-containing electric equipment. The PCB-containing equipment and wastes were to be collected in a maintenance workshop where they were to be separated for PCB-contaminated oil (approx.30-35% by weight, depending on the transformer's size), PCB-contaminated wastes (paper and wooden parts of transformers –approx.10% by weight) and other parts, which could be recycled (ferrous and non-ferrous metals– approx.55-60% by weight). The dismantling and phasing out of 1,000 tonnes of PCB-containing equipment and wastes were to eliminate a significant portion of PCBs from the electric network.

### **3. Project objective and expected outcomes**

The project's overall objective is to create capacity for environmentally sound management (ESM) of PCBs for preventing PCBs releases from the electric equipment, avoiding cross contamination of electric equipment and disposing of 1,000 tons of PCBs wastes. This objective was to be achieved through a combination of strategies, including legislative and regulatory development, capacity building, public education, technology transfer, training and technical support.

The immediate objectives of the project are to:

- Strengthen the legal and regulatory framework for environmentally sound management (ESM) and disposal of PCB-containing equipment and oil;
- Improve institutional capacity at all levels of PCBs waste management and disposal;
- Remove PCBs wastes from targeted contaminated sites and transport them to the disposal unit;
- Decontaminate PCB oils in in-service transformers and
- Dispose of wastes in an environmentally sound manner.

*Expected Outcomes:*

**Outcome 1: capacity building for implementing the PCBs related measures of Stockholm Convention.** Capacity building will be carried out in regulatory and institutional development, strengthening PCBs monitoring capabilities, enhancing public information, awareness and education, as well as by introducing socio-economic assessment and comprehensive data management.

**Outcome 2: environmentally sound management (ESM) of PCB-containing electrical equipment.** To achieve this outcome the PCBs inventory should be completed; ESM for PCB-containing equipment in use; and PCBs disposal as well as environmental monitoring system (EMS) for PCBs introduced and applied.

**Outcome 3: project management, monitoring, and evaluation,** including establishment of a Project Steering Committee (PSC) composed of national and local stakeholder agencies, establishment and staffing of the project management team at the national and local levels, recruitment of national and international consultants, execution of a management training program for project staff (particularly at the local level), and ongoing monitoring and reporting of project activities.

#### **4. Project implementation arrangements**

UNIDO is the GEF Implementing Agency (IA) for the project. A project focal point was to be established within UNIDO to assist with project execution. This focal point was meant to consist of dedicated core staff, supplemented by support from support staff colleagues on a part-time as required basis, supervised by a senior professional staff engaged in the management and coordination of UNIDO's POPs and chemical management program. UNIDO was to make these services available as part of its in-kind contribution to the project.

The project management structure was to be as follows:

The **Ministry of Nature and Environment (MNE)** is the lead agency of implementing the National Implementation Plan (NIP) of the Stockholm Convention in Mongolia, as well as coordinating activities and cooperation between relevant stakeholders of the plan.

**Ministry of Fuel and Energy (MFE)** is responsible for assisting in the implementation of the activities and measures for limitation, elimination and monitoring of import and use of PCB-containing equipment and reduction of unintentional production of POPs chemicals. In addition, the Ministry shall be in charge of making amendments and additions to relevant laws and regulation, as well as develop rules and procedures in relation to the above activities and measures.

**Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIT)** is responsible for the coordination of import and export of POPs-containing products, assistance in conducting inventory of POPs use and production and for the provision of policy and coordination in introducing and applying alternatives of POPs-containing products and equipment and environmentally sound technology.

**National Chemical Management Committee (NCMC)** operates at ministerial department level. It is located at the MNE, but reports directly to the Prime Minister's office. NCMC is staffed with four full time professionals and has its own independent budget. NCMC also includes representatives from each of the twenty-one agencies involved with all aspects of chemical management.

**Project Implementation Unit (PIU)** under the supervision of MNE, was to consist of two full-time professional staff and two support staff, with additional support provided by consultants on an as-needed basis. The PIU is meant to work closely with MFE and MIT, and report through MNE to UNIDO.

A **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** should consist of representatives of MNE, MFE, MIT, NCMC, the PIU, the NPC, the CTA, major stakeholder companies, and UNIDO.

A **Project Expert Team (PET)**, meant to assist the PIU, was to consist of an international Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), a National Project Coordinator (NPC), policy experts, PCBs management and disposal industry experts, chemists, monitoring & evaluation experts and other technical experts as required. The PET was to be recruited by the project.

## **5. Main findings of the Mid-term review (MTR)**

The assessment of project relevance to local and national priorities and policies, priorities related to relevant international conventions, and to the GEF's strategic priorities and objectives, overall project relevance was considered to be SATISFACTORY.

Project design was rated as MODERATELY SATISFACTORY, with strongest side being strong participation of local stakeholders in project identification, the Logical Framework and indicators are not developed adequately to allow for proper adaptive management and monitoring of project results.

It was not clear whether the project would be able to achieve the overall objectives, in spite of clear achievement of a number of the key outputs, mainly due to delays in startup of the PCB cleanup process. Thus, the progress towards achievement of the overall project objective and expected outcomes was rated as MODERATELY SATISFACTORY, but only under condition that the non-cost project extension was approved in order to allow the necessary time to perform actual decontamination of PCB-containing equipment under the project. Implementation of activities/inputs was rated as MODERATELY SATISFACTORY. There were no significant risks for cost-effectiveness noted at the time of the review.

Numerous deficiencies were found in the implementation of the M&E system, which were partly due to the shortcomings of the logical framework. Workplans and project monitoring were found quite basic, and there was no evidence that work plans were updated regularly. The semi-annual and annual project progress reports were submitted to MNET, but only in Mongolian language. The annual progress reports submitted in English provided details of the progress of activities, but not on the progress towards the expected outcomes.

Recommendations included:

- Focus on creating capacities for the enforcement of passed regulations on PCBs in Mongolia, mainly through providing practical tools to the inspection on how to enforce the legislation;
- Conduct well-targeted trainings and measure the level of capacity built;
- Complete accreditation of laboratories as soon as practicable, so that test results are according to international standards, to allow fulfillment of SC reporting requirements;
- Enhance health and safety for the workers in the electricity sector who handle directly the equipment;
- Enhance M&E design and implementation in order to implement corrective actions of the mid-term evaluation and improve the conditions for the final evaluation; and

- Review the logical framework indicators in order to apply SMART criteria.

## 6. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary

USD	<i>Project Preparation</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Total (USD)</i>
Financing (GEF / others)	130000	2650000	2780000.00
Co-financing (Cash and In-kind)	Click here to enter text.	5558318	5558318
<b>Total (USD)</b>	<b>130000</b>	<b>8208318.00</b>	<b>8338318.00</b>

Source: Project document / progress report

Table 2. Financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown<sup>3</sup>

Project outcomes	Donor (GEF/other) (USD)	Co-Financing (USD)	Total (USD)
1. Capacity building for implementing the PCBs related measures of SC	300430	571200	<b>871630.00</b>
2. Environmentally sound management of PCB-containing electrical equipment	2219570	4842518	<b>7062088.00</b>
3. Project management and monitoring and evaluation	130000	144600	<b>274600.00</b>
<b>Total (USD)</b>	<b>2650000.00</b>	<b>5558318.00</b>	<b>8208318</b>

Source: Project document / progress report

Table 3. Co-Financing source breakdown

Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Total Amount (USD)
MNE	Counterpart	Cash	218500
		In kind	735381
MFE	Counterpart	Cash	61000
		In kind	203967
Stakeholders	Participants	In kind	4239470

<sup>3</sup> Source: Project document.

Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Total Amount (USD)
UNIDO	Implementing Agency	In kind	100000
<b>Total Co-financing (USD)</b>			<b>5,558,318</b>

Source : Project document / progress report

Table 4. UNIDO budget execution (under Grants 200000273, 2000003219 and 4000196)

Item	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total Expenditure (USD)
<b>Contractual Services</b>	1214706	33086	-33064	-739	154798	0	13687888
<b>Equipment</b>	193623	83289	1560	0	0	0	278473
<b>International Meetings</b>	36211	3398		46	0	0	39655
<b>Local travel</b>	107964	11552	25671	7355	11608	3472	167622
<b>Nat. Consult./Staff</b>	356849	82270	118708		4991	31166	593984
<b>Other Direct Costs</b>	15096	35407	10798	-628	2895	9748	73318
<b>Premises</b>	0				0	2440	2440
<b>Staff &amp; Intern Consultants</b>	129477	8314	13626		0	0	151417
<b>Staff Travel</b>	0		3800		0	0	3800
<b>Train/Fellowship/Study</b>	64249	-57	0		0	0	64192
<b>Total</b>	<b>2120186</b>	<b>259274</b>	<b>143113</b>	<b>8049</b>	<b>176309</b>	<b>48844</b>	<b>2743688</b>

Source: SAP database

## II. Evaluation purpose and scope

The purpose of the evaluation is to independently assess the project to help UNIDO improve performance and results of future programmes and projects.

The evaluation has two specific objectives:

- (i) Assess the project performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and progress to impact;
- (ii) Develop a series of findings, lessons and recommendations for enhancing the design of new and implementation of ongoing projects by UNIDO.

The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in 10/26/2011 to the estimated completion date in 12/15/2017. **Error! Reference source not found..**

### III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The TE will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy<sup>4</sup> and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle<sup>5</sup>. In addition, the GEF Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies will be applied.

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

In line with its objectives, the evaluation will have two main components. The first component focuses on an overall **assessment of performance** of the project, whereas the second one focuses on the **learning** from the successful and unsuccessful practices in project design and implementation.

The evaluation will use a theory of change approach and mixed methods to collect data and information from a range of sources and informants. It will pay attention to triangulating the data and information collected before forming its assessment. This is essential to ensure an evidence-based and credible evaluation, with robust analytical underpinning.

The theory of change will identify causal and transformational pathways from the project outputs to outcomes and longer-term impacts, and drivers as well as barriers to achieve them. The learning from this analysis will be useful to feed into the design of the future projects so that the management team can effectively manage them based on results.

#### 1. Data collection methods

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

- (a) **Desk and literature review** of documents related to the project, including but not limited to:
  - The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports, mid-term review report, output reports, back-to-office mission report(s), end-of-contract report(s) and relevant correspondence.
  - Notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project.
- (b) **Stakeholder consultations** will be conducted through structured and semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion. Key stakeholders to be interviewed include:
  - UNIDO Management and staff involved in the project; and
  - Representatives of donors, counterparts and stakeholders.
- (c) **Field visit** to project sites in Mongolia.

---

<sup>4</sup> UNIDO. (2015). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (UNIDO/DGB/(M).98/Rev.1)

<sup>5</sup> UNIDO. (2006). Director-General's Administrative Instruction No. 17/Rev.1: Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle (DGAI.17/Rev.1, 24 August 2006)

## 2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

The key question of the TE is whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective, i.e. to create capacity for environmentally sound management (ESM) of PCBs for preventing PCBs releases from the electric equipment, avoiding cross contamination of electric equipment and disposing of 1,000 tons of PCBs wastes.

The key evaluation questions are the following:

- (a) What are the key drivers and barriers to achieve the long term objectives? To what extent has the project helped put in place the conditions likely to address the drivers, overcome barriers and contribute to the long term objectives?
- (b) How well has the project performed? Has the project done the right things? Has the project done things right, with good value for money?
- (c) What have been the project's key results (outputs, outcome and impact)? To what extent have the expected results been achieved or are likely to be achieved? To what extent the achieved results will sustain after the completion of the project?
- (d) What lessons can be drawn from the successful and unsuccessful practices in designing, implementing and managing the project?

The evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of the project results after the project completion. The assessment will identify key risks (e.g. in terms of financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental risks) and explain how these risks may affect the continuation of results after the project ends. Table 5 below provides the key evaluation criteria to be assessed by the evaluation. The details questions to assess each evaluation criterion are in annex 2.

Table 5. Project evaluation criteria

#	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
<b>A</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Project design</b>	<b>Yes</b>
1	• Overall design	Yes
2	• Logframe	Yes
<b>C</b>	<b>Project performance</b>	<b>Yes</b>
1	• Relevance	Yes
2	• Effectiveness	Yes
3	• Efficiency	Yes
4	• Sustainability of benefits	Yes
<b>D</b>	<b>Cross-cutting performance criteria</b>	
1	• Gender mainstreaming	Yes
2	• M&E: ✓ M&E design ✓ M&E implementation	Yes
3	• Results-based Management (RBM)	Yes
<b>E</b>	<b>Performance of partners</b>	
1	• UNIDO	Yes
2	• National counterparts	Yes

3	• Donor	Yes
<b>F</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	Yes

### **Performance of partners**

The assessment of performance of partners will **include** the quality of implementation and execution of the GEF Agencies and project executing entities (EAs) in discharging their expected roles and responsibilities. The assessment will take into account the following:

- Quality of Implementation, e.g. the extent to which the agency delivered effectively, with focus on elements that were controllable from the given GEF Agency's perspective and how well risks were identified and managed.
- Quality of Execution, e.g. the appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services.

### **Other Assessments required by the GEF for GEF-funded projects:**

The terminal evaluation will assess the following topics, for which **ratings are not required:**

- Need for follow-up:** e.g. in instances financial mismanagement, unintended negative impacts or risks.
- Materialization of co-financing:** e.g. the extent to which the expected co-financing materialized, whether co-financing was administered by the project management or by some other organization; whether and how shortfall or excess in co-financing affected project results.
- Environmental and Social Safeguards<sup>6</sup>:** appropriate environmental and social safeguards were addressed in the project's design and implementation, e.g. preventive or mitigation measures for any foreseeable adverse effects and/or harm to environment or to any stakeholder.

### **3. Rating system**

In line with the practice adopted by many development agencies, the UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV uses a six-point rating system, where 6 is the highest score (highly satisfactory) and 1 is the lowest (highly unsatisfactory) as per **Error! Reference source not found.**

Table 6. Project rating criteria

Score		Definition	Category
6	Highly satisfactory	Level of achievement clearly exceeds expectations and there is no shortcoming.	SATISFACTORY
5	Satisfactory	Level of achievement meets expectations (indicatively, over 80-95 per cent) and there is no or minor shortcoming.	
4	Moderately satisfactory	Level of achievement more or less meets expectations (indicatively, 60 to 80 per cent) and there are some shortcomings.	

<sup>6</sup> Refer to GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1 available at: [http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meetingdocuments/C.41.10.Rev\\_1.Policy\\_on\\_Environmental\\_and\\_Social\\_Safeguards.Final%20of%20Nov%2018.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meetingdocuments/C.41.10.Rev_1.Policy_on_Environmental_and_Social_Safeguards.Final%20of%20Nov%2018.pdf)

Score		Definition	Category
3	Moderately unsatisfactory	Level of achievement is somewhat lower than expected (indicatively, less than 60 per cent) and there are significant shortcomings.	UNSATISFACTORY
2	Unsatisfactory	Level of achievement is substantially lower than expected and there are major shortcomings.	
1	Highly unsatisfactory	Level of achievement is negligible and there are severe shortcomings.	

#### IV. Evaluation process

The evaluation will be conducted from October to December 2017. The evaluation will be implemented in five phases which are not strictly sequential, but in many cases iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping:

- i. Inception phase: The evaluation team will prepare the inception report providing details on the methodology for the evaluation and include an evaluation matrix with specific issues for the evaluation; the specific site visits will be determined during the inception phase, taking into consideration the findings and recommendations of the mid-term review.
- ii. Desk review and data analysis;
- iii. Interviews, survey and literature review;
- iv. Country visits;
- v. Data analysis and report writing.

#### V. Tentative time schedule and deliverables

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from October to 31 December 2017. The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned for week 13 November or 20 November 2017. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project in the country visited among the participating countries, i.e. Mongolia.

After the evaluation field mission, the evaluation team leader will visit UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of the preliminary findings of the terminal evaluation. The draft TE report will be submitted 4 to 6 weeks after the end of the mission. The draft TE report is to be shared with the UNIDO PM, UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV, the UNIDO GEF Coordinator and GEF OFP and other stakeholders for receipt of comments. The ET leader is expected to revise the draft TE report based on the comments received, edit the language and form and submit the final version of the TE report in accordance with UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV standards.

Table 7. Tentative major timelines

Timelines	Tasks
18 October -10 November 2017	Desk review
2-3 November	Briefing with UNIDO project manager through skype

<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Tasks</b>
13 November 2017	Field visit
Week 20 November (exact date to be confirmed by the project manager) 22 November – 15 December 2017	Debriefing in Vienna  Preparation of first draft evaluation report
15 December 2017	Internal peer review of the report by the UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV and other stakeholder comments to draft evaluation report
31 December 2017	Final evaluation report

## **VI. Evaluation team composition**

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluation consultant acting as the team leader and one national evaluation consultant. The evaluation team members will possess relevant strong experience and skills on evaluation management and conduct together with expertise and experience in innovative clean energy technologies. Both consultants will be contracted by UNIDO.

The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions annexed to these terms of reference. The ET is required to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including terminal evaluation verification on request to the GEF partnership up to three years after completion of the terminal evaluation.

According to UNIDO Evaluation Policy, members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the project under evaluation.

The UNIDO Project Manager and the project team in Mongolia will support the evaluation team. The UNIDO GEF Coordinator and GEF OFP(s) will be briefed on the evaluation and provide support to its conduct. GEF OFP(s) will, where applicable and feasible, also be briefed and debriefed at the start and end of the evaluation mission.

An evaluation manager from UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV will provide technical backstopping to the evaluation team and ensure the quality of the evaluation. The UNIDO Project Manager and national project teams will act as resourced persons and provide support to the evaluation team and the evaluation manager.

## **VII. Reporting**

### **Inception report**

This Terms of Reference (ToR) provides some information on the evaluation methodology, but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager, the International Evaluation Consultant will prepare, in collaboration with the national consultant, a short inception report that will operationalize the ToR relating to the evaluation questions and provide information on what type of and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). It will be discussed with and approved by the responsible UNIDO Evaluation Manager.

The Inception Report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework (“evaluation matrix”); division of work between the International Evaluation Consultant and national consultant; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable<sup>7</sup>.

### **Evaluation report format and review procedures**

The draft report will be delivered to ODG/EVQ/IEV (the suggested report outline is in Annex 4) and circulated to UNIDO staff 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 UNIDO ODG/EVA for collation and onward transmission to the project evaluation team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

The ET 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 evaluation report. A presentation of preliminary findings will take place at UNIDO HQ after the field mission.

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

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

### **VIII. Quality assurance**

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on methodology and process of UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV, providing inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report and evaluation report by UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV).

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality, attached as Annex 4. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO’s evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation report are reviewed by UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV, which will submit the final report to the GEF Evaluation Office and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet

---

<sup>7</sup> The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV.



## Annex 1: Project Logical Framework

Interventions	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p align="center"><b>Project Goal</b></p>	<p>To create capacity for Environmentally Sound Management (ESM) of PCBs, eliminate PCB releases from the electrical equipment, avoid cross-contamination of electrical equipment, and dispose of a minimum of 1,000 tons of PCB containing oil and discarded equipment according to Stockholm and Basel convention guidelines</p>	<p>Progress reports, activity implementation reports, lists of PCB containing oil and equipment maintained or disposed of in environmentally sound manner, copies of guidelines or regulations developed</p>	<p>Project inputs will be adequate to accomplish stated objectives; project activities will be adequate to allow identified barriers to be overcome.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1: Capacity building for implementing the PCBs related measures of SC</b></p>	<p>Capacity created for ESM of PCBs</p>		
<p><i>Output 1.1: Regulatory standards developed</i>            Activity 1.1.1: Develop national standards regulating PCB content in equipment and oil            Activity 1.1.2: Legislate national standards regulating PCB content in equipment and oil            Activity 1.1.3: Implement national standards regulating PCB content in equipment and oil            Activity 1.1.4: Develop and implement regulations for PCB content in imported equipment and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Number of new PCB related regulations adopted; Number enforcement measures undertaken</li> <li>➤ National standards drafted</li> <li>➤ National standards adopted</li> <li>➤ Number of enforcement measures</li> <li>➤ Regulations developed and implemented</li> <li>➤ PCBs added to occupational hazards list</li> <li>➤ Implementing regulations developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Report on number and content of new PCB related regulations adopted; progress report on # enforcement measures taken</li> <li>➤ Copy of standards developed</li> <li>➤ Report on national standards adopted</li> <li>➤ Implementation report</li> <li>➤ Implementation report</li> <li>➤ Copy of occupational hazards list including PCBs</li> <li>➤ Copy/report of regulations developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Delays in adoption of legal framework and specific policy and technical guidance may hamper implementation</li> <li>➤ Laws and regulations not fully and consistently enforced</li> </ul>

Interventions	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>products</p> <p>Activity 1.1.5: Add PCBs to occupational hazards list</p> <p>Activity 1.1.6: Support development of implementing regulations under Chemical Management Law to ensure PCB management compatibility with Stockholm Convention</p>			
<p><i>Output 1.2: Institutional capacity to implement PCBs related issues developed</i></p> <p>Activity 1.2.1: Develop system and capacity to determine PCB content in imported equipment and products</p> <p>Activity 1.2.2: Establish and train special unit to address PCB issues under National Chemical Management Committee</p> <p>Activity 1.2.3: Establish training programs for new and existing MNE staff on PCB issues</p> <p>Activity 1.2.4: Policy workshops and awareness raising program</p> <p>Activity 1.2.5: Develop and introduce PCB materials for professional training institutes</p> <p>Activity 1.2.6: Targeted public awareness raising</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ New technical guidelines; number of people trained (environmental inspectorates, specialists, NGOs)</li> <li>➤ Regulations developed; training program held; testing equipment provided</li> <li>➤ Special unit established</li> <li>➤ Training program developed and held</li> <li>➤ Workshops held</li> <li>➤ Information materials developed and introduced</li> <li>➤ Awareness levels increased</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Copies of new guidelines; workshop reports</li> <li>➤ Activity implementation report</li> <li>➤ Activity implementation report</li> <li>➤ Activity implementation report; copy of training materials</li> <li>➤ Activity implementation report; copy of training materials</li> <li>➤ Activity implementation report; copy of training materials</li> <li>➤ Survey of targeted audiences to determine increased awareness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Lack of human resources, delayed human resource allocations, or personnel changes at key stakeholder agencies could cause delays in project implementation</li> <li>➤ Awareness raising activities fail to significantly increase awareness levels</li> </ul>

Interventions	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p><i>Output 1.3: Strengthened laboratory capacity for PCBs monitoring</i></p> <p>Activity 1.3.1: Upgrade laboratory facilities to monitor PCBs</p> <p>Activity 1.3.2: Adopt standard methodology for PCB monitoring</p> <p>Activity 1.3.3: Technical training in PCB monitoring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Laboratory capacity strengthened, Number of staff trained</li> <li>➤ New equipment items purchased and installed</li> <li>➤ Standard methodology adopted</li> <li>➤ Number of individuals trained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Activity implementation report</li> <li>➤ List of equipment purchased and installed</li> <li>➤ Copy of methodology</li> <li>➤ Copy of training materials; training report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Laboratory capacity building resources are inadequate to accomplish project monitoring tasks</li> </ul>
<p><i>Output 1.4: Increased stakeholder capacity for PCB management</i></p> <p>Activity 1.4.1: Targeted technical training</p> <p>Activity 1.4.2: Develop and establish technical certification program</p> <p>Activity 1.4.3: Stakeholder awareness raising</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Number of training workshops, Number of on-site training programs, Number of individuals trained</li> <li>➤ certification program established; Number of individuals tested, Number of individuals certified</li> <li>➤ Stakeholder awareness levels increased</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Copy of training materials; training report</li> <li>➤ Activity implementation report</li> <li>➤ Stakeholder interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Possible reluctance by stakeholders to participate in awareness raising and other activities that would increase costs (e.g., company owners fear that employees will want higher salaries to deal with dangerous goods, along with other liabilities and costs).</li> </ul>
<p><i>Output 1.5: Socio-economic and mitigation measures assessed</i></p> <p>Activity 1.5.1: Public health and economic impact assessment report</p> <p>Activity 1.5.2: Worker health and safety assessment report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reports prepared</li> <li>➤ Report prepared analyzing public health impacts</li> <li>➤ Report prepared analyzing worker safety impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Copy of assessment reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Lack of political and popular support for PCB management measures compromises their chance for success</li> </ul>
<p><i>Output 1.6: Comprehensive data management in operation</i></p> <p>Activity 1.6.1: Procurement of data management software to meet Convention reporting requirements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Data management system created and implemented</li> <li>➤ Data management software procured</li> <li>➤ Training program developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Copy of software specifications</li> <li>➤ Activity implementation report; copy of training materials</li> <li>➤ Activity implementation report; copies of database formats and</li> </ul>	

Interventions	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Activity 1.6.2: Training in use of data management software Activity 1.6.3: Ongoing data entry and management in support of Convention reporting requirements	and held ➤ Number of items in database	data items	
<b>Outcome 2: Environmentally sound management of PCB-containing electrical equipment</b>	ESM of PCBs is implemented		Coordination of project activities with on-going and future investment projects will not be achieved
<i>Output 2.1: Detailed inventory developed</i> Activity 2.1.1: Stakeholder workshop to introduce PCB reporting requirements Activity 2.1.2: Stakeholder capacity building to identify and label PCB-containing equipment Activity 2.1.3: Provide inventory monitoring kits and other monitoring supplies Activity 2.1.4: Inventory survey of PCB use in energy sector Activity 2.1.5: Inventory survey of PCB use in non-energy sectors Activity 2.1.6: Initial inventory completion	➤ Detailed inventory developed ➤ Stakeholder workshop held; Number of attendees ➤ Information materials developed and provided to stakeholders; Number of stakeholders contacted and provided with information and technical support ➤ Amount of monitoring kits and other monitoring equipment/supplies provided ➤ Completed energy sector inventory list; Number items listed ➤ Completed non-energy sector inventory list; Number items listed ➤ Completed inventory list; Number items listed	➤ Inventory report ➤ Activity implementation report; copies of training materials, list of attendees ➤ Activity implementation report ➤ Activity implementation report; list of monitoring equipment/supplies provided ➤ Activity implementation report ➤ Activity implementation report ➤ Inventory report	➤ Stakeholders unwilling to share information

Interventions	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p><i>Output 2.2: Environmentally sound management of PCB-containing equipment in use, including handling, maintenance, and repair in place</i></p> <p>Activity 2.2.1: Develop and introduce guidelines for environmentally sound management of PCB-containing equipment</p> <p>Activity 2.2.2: Create and equip dedicated environmentally sound maintenance capacity for PCB containing transformers</p> <p>Activity 2.2.3: Decontamination of oil for transformers to remain in use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ESM system, operational guidelines, work instructions for all stakeholders in place; leaking equipment repaired or replaced and safely disposed of</li> <li>➤ Guidelines developed</li> <li>➤ Maintenance facility created; Number of pieces of equipment maintained in environmentally sound manner</li> <li>➤ Amount of PCB oil decontaminated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ List and specifications of equipment maintained or disposed of in environmentally sound manner; copy of guidelines</li> <li>➤ Copy of guidelines</li> <li>➤ List and specifications of equipment maintained in environmentally sound manner</li> <li>➤ Activity implementation report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Higher cost of ESM for PCB containing equipment causes stakeholders to abandon ESM practices</li> </ul>
<p><i>Output 2.3: Disposal of PCB containing equipment and waste using BAT/BEP implemented</i></p> <p>Activity 2.3.1: Develop and introduce guidelines for environmentally sound disposal of PCB-containing equipment and oil</p> <p>Activity 2.3.2: Retire targeted PCB containing equipment in electricity sector</p> <p>Activity 2.3.3: Introduce mobile technology to decontaminate PCB containing equipment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Minimum of 1000 tons of PCB-containing oil, equipment, and other PCB contaminated wastes disposed of</li> <li>➤ Guidelines developed</li> <li>➤ Amount of PCB containing equipment retired</li> <li>➤ Mobile decontamination technology introduced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ List of PCB containing materials disposed of</li> <li>➤ Copy of guidelines</li> <li>➤ List of retired equipment</li> <li>➤ Activity implementation report; technology specifications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Excessive contamination of the environment during transportation/handling of the PCB-contaminated equipment.</li> <li>➤ Technical staff, participating in the project implementation, and, in particular, contacting with PCB-contaminated equipment will be excessively exposed to PCB harmful influence.</li> <li>➤ Increase in equipment prices may reduce stakeholder incentive and ability to replace PCB containing equipment before mandatory deadlines</li> <li>➤ Increased transportation and disposal costs</li> </ul>

Interventions	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>Activity 2.3.4: Strengthen capacity created to collect, package, transport, and/or store PCB contaminated wastes</p> <p>Activity 2.3.5: Evaluate soil contamination risks and recommend leakage treatment approaches</p> <p>Activity 2.3.6: Incentive program</p> <p>Activity 2.3.7: Treat PCB contaminated wastes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Amount of PCB containing wastes collected</li> <li>➤ Evaluation report</li> <li>➤ Incentive program implemented including variety of measures to encourage ESM of POPs containing materials</li> <li>➤ Amount of PCB contaminated wastes created</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Activity implementation report</li> <li>➤ Copy of evaluation report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ PCB contaminated equipment and wastes are illegally diverted and reused or disposed of illegally, thus increasing the pollution of the environment and creating new "hot spot".</li> <li>➤ Volume of contaminated oils less than initially estimated may decrease the economic viability of dedicated treatment facility</li> </ul>
<p><i>Output 2.4: Environmental monitoring system for PCBs established</i></p> <p>Activity 2.4.1: Review of stakeholder PCB management systems</p> <p>Activity 2.4.2: Workplace safety monitoring</p> <p>Activity 2.4.3: Environmental site monitoring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Number of inspections</li> <li>➤ Stakeholder PCB management system plans submitted and reviewed</li> <li>➤ Number of inspections of PCB owner/user sites</li> <li>➤ Number of inspections of potentially at-risk sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Inspection reports</li> <li>➤ Copies of stakeholder materials submitted and evaluations thereof</li> <li>➤</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Outcome 3: Project management and monitoring and evaluation</b></p>			<p>Changes in project input prices and exchange rates may increase project costs</p>
<p><i>Output 3.1: Project management structure established</i></p> <p>Activity 3.1.1: Establish Project Implementation Unit (PIU) and appoint project leadership staff at MNE</p>	<p>Project Implementation Unit established; Project Steering Committee established with representatives from national and local stakeholder agencies; Project expert team established; Training workshop held on project management; MIS established</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Progress reports; TORs for project experts; Training materials</li> <li>➤ List of PIU staff</li> </ul>	

Interventions	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>Activity 3.1.2: Establish Project Steering Committee (PSC)</p> <p>Activity 3.1.3: Recruit Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), National Project Coordinator (NPC), policy and technical experts in POPs waste management, evaluation, and program development</p> <p>Activity 3.1.4: Hold project management training for project management staff</p> <p>Activity 3.1.5: Work with stakeholder project participants to establish PIUs within organization and sign project participation contracts</p> <p>Activity 3.1.6: Establish project management information system (MIS), including a project website to disseminate information to stakeholders</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ PIU established and staffed</li> <li>➤ PSC established</li> <li>➤ CTA recruited</li> <li>➤ Project management training held</li> <li>➤ Stakeholder PIUs established and staffed</li> <li>➤ MIS established</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ List of PSC members</li> <li>➤ CTA TOR and CV; copy of appointment notice</li> <li>➤ Copy of training materials; training report</li> <li>➤ Contact list for stakeholder PIUs</li> <li>➤ MIS specifications and user instructions</li> </ul>	
<p><i>Output 3.2: Project results monitored and reported</i></p> <p>Activity 3.2.1: Prepare and hold Inception Workshop</p> <p>Activity 3.2.2: Measure impact indicator</p> <p>Activity 3.2.3: Carry out annual project financial audits</p> <p>Activity 3.2.4: Prepare Annual Project Reports and Project Implementation Reviews</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Detailed work plans prepared; Data and information collected for MIS; Technical and political guidance received from Steering Committee; Problems identified and corrected as result of progress reports and field visits; MIS established; Project information, experience and lessons disseminated through website</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Monitoring reports</li> <li>➤ Inception report</li> <li>➤ Progress reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Delays in project implementation and low quality performance</li> </ul>

Interventions	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<p>Activity 3.2.5: Hold annual tripartite review meetings</p> <p>Activity 3.2.6: Carry out mid-term external evaluation</p> <p>Activity 3.2.7: Carry out final external evaluation</p> <p>Activity 3.2.8: Complete Project Terminal Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Inception Workshop held</li> <li>➤ Updated impact indicators</li> <li>➤ Financial audit completed</li> <li>➤ Annual reports and PIRs completed</li> <li>➤ Annual TPR meetings held</li> <li>➤ Mid-term evaluation completed</li> <li>➤ Final external evaluation held</li> <li>➤ Project Terminal Report completed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Copy of audit reports</li> <li>➤ Copies of annual reports and PIRs</li> <li>➤ TPR meeting notes</li> <li>➤ Copy of mid-term evaluation report</li> <li>➤ Copy of final external evaluation report</li> <li>➤ Copy of Project terminal report</li> </ul>	

## Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria

The evaluation team will assess the project performance guided by the questions below. It should be noted that these are the guiding questions. In the inception report, the evaluator will specify key issues and key questions for the evaluation to focus on.

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>
<b>A</b>	<p><b>Progress to impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <u>Mainstreaming</u>: To what extent information, lessons or specific results of the project are incorporated into broader stakeholder mandates and initiatives such as laws, policies, regulations and project?</li> <li>✓ <u>Replication</u>: To what extent the project's specific results (e.g. methodology, technology, lessons and etc) are reproduced or adopted</li> <li>✓ <u>Scaling-up</u>: To what extent the project's initiatives and results are implemented at larger geographical scale?</li> <li>✓ What difference has the project made to the beneficiaries?</li> <li>✓ What is the change attributable to the project? To what extent?</li> <li>✓ What are the social, economic, environmental and other effects, either short-, medium- or long-term, on a micro- or macro-level?</li> <li>✓ What effects are intended or unintended, positive or negative?</li> </ul> <p>The three UNIDO impact dimensions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <u>Safeguarding environment</u>: To what extent the project contributes to changes in the status of environment?</li> <li>✓ <u>Economic performance</u>: To what extent the project contributes to changes in the economic performance (finances, income, costs saving, expenditure and etc) of individuals, groups and entities?</li> <li>✓ <u>Social inclusiveness</u>: To what extent the project contributes to changes in capacity and capability of individuals, groups and entities in society, including vulnerable groups, and hence generating employment and access to education and training?</li> </ul>
<b>B</b>	<p><b>Project design</b></p>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Overall design</u></li> <li>✓ The problem, need or gap to be addressed by the project is clearly identified, with clear target beneficiaries?</li> <li>✓ The project design was adequate to address the problems at hand?</li> <li>✓ Is the project consistent with the Country's priorities, in the work plan of the lead national counterpart? Does it meet the needs of the target group? Is it consistent with UNIDO's Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development? Does it adequately reflect lessons learnt from past projects? Is it in line with the donor's priorities and policies?</li> <li>✓ Is the applied project approach sound and appropriate? Is the design technically feasible and based on best practices? Does UNIDO have in-house technical expertise and experience for this type of intervention?</li> <li>✓ To what extent the project design (in terms of funding, institutional arrangement, implementation arrangements...) as foreseen in the project document still valid and relevant?</li> <li>✓ Does it include M&amp;E plan and adequate budget for M&amp;E activities?</li> <li>✓ Risk management: Are critical risks related to financial, social-political, institutional, environmental and implementation aspects identified with specific risk ratings? Are their mitigation measures identified? Where possible, are the mitigation measures included in project activities/outputs and monitored under the M&amp;E plan?</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Logframe</u></li> <li>✓ Expected results: Is the expected result-chain (impact, outcomes and outputs) clear and logical? Does impact describe a desired long-term change or benefit to a society or community (not as a mean or process), do outcomes describe change in target group's behaviour/performance or system/institutional</li> </ul>

	<p>performance, do outputs describe deliverables that project will produce to achieve outcomes? Are the expected results realistic, measurable and not a reformulation or summary of lower level results? Do outputs plus assumptions lead to outcomes, do outcomes plus assumptions lead to impact? Can all outputs be delivered by the project, are outcomes outside UNIDO's control but within its influence?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Indicators: Do indicators describe and specify expected results (impact, outcomes and outputs) in terms of quantity, quality and time? Do indicators change at each level of results and independent from indicators at higher and lower levels? Do indicators not restate expected results and not cause them? Are indicators necessary and sufficient and do they provide enough triangulation (cross-checking)? Are they indicators sex-diaggregated, if applicable? Are the indicator SMART?</li> <li>✓ Sources of verification: Are the sources of verification/data able to verify status of indicators, are they cost-effective and reliable? Are the sources of verification/data able to verify status of output and outcome indicators before project completion?</li> <li>✓ Are key assumptions properly summarized and reflecting the proper level in the results chain in the logframe?</li> </ul>
<b>C</b>	<b>Project performance</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Relevance</u></li> <li>✓ How does the project fulfil the urgent target group needs?</li> <li>✓ To what extent is the project aligned with the development priorities of the country (national poverty reduction strategy, sector development strategy)?</li> <li>✓ How does project reflect donor policies and priorities?</li> <li>✓ Is the project a technically adequate solution to the development problem? Does it eliminate the cause of the problem?</li> <li>✓ To what extent does the project correspond to UNIDO's comparative advantages?</li> <li>✓ Are the original project objectives (expected results) still valid and pertinent to the target groups? If not, have they been revised? Are the revised objectives still valid in today's context?</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Effectiveness</u></li> <li>✓ What are the main results (mainly outputs and outcomes) of the project? What have been the quantifiable results of the project?</li> <li>✓ To what extent did the project achieve their objectives (outputs and outcomes), against the original/revised target(s)?</li> <li>✓ What are the reasons for the achievement/non-achievement of the project objectives?</li> <li>✓ What is the quality of the results? How do the stakeholders perceive them? What is the feedback of the beneficiaries and the stakeholders on the project effectiveness?</li> <li>✓ To what extent is the identified progress result of the project attributable to the intervention rather than to external factors?</li> <li>✓ What can be done to make the project more effective?</li> <li>✓ Were the right target groups reached?</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Efficiency</u></li> <li>✓ How economically are the project resources/inputs (concerning funding, expertise, time...) being used to produce results?</li> <li>✓ To what extent were expected results achieved within the original budget and timeframe? If no, please explain why.</li> <li>✓ Are the results being achieved at an acceptable cost? Would alternative approaches accomplish the same results at less cost?</li> <li>✓ What measures have been taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used? Were the project expenditures in line with budgets?</li> <li>✓ Could more have been achieved with the same input?</li> <li>✓ Could the same have been achieved with less input?</li> <li>✓ How timely was the project in producing outputs and outcomes? Comment on the delay or acceleration of the project's implementation period.</li> <li>✓ To what extent were the project's activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the</li> </ul>

	<p>Project Team and annual Work Plans?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet the requirements?</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Sustainability of benefits</u></li> <li>✓ Will the project results and benefits be sustained after the end of donor funding?</li> <li>✓ Does the project have an exit strategy?</li> <li>✓ To what extent the outputs and results have been institutionalized?</li> </ul> <p><i>Financial risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the project ends?</li> </ul> <p><i>Socio-political risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> <li>✓ 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?</li> <li>✓ Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow?</li> <li>✓ Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?</li> </ul> <p><i>Institutional framework and governance risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits?</li> <li>✓ Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency and required technical know-how in place?</li> </ul> <p><i>Environmental risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> <li>✓ Are there any project outputs or higher level results that are likely to have adverse environmental impacts, which, in turn, might affect the sustainability of project benefits?</li> </ul>
<b>D</b>	<b>Cross-cutting performance criteria</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Gender mainstreaming</u></li> <li>✓ Did the project design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? Was the gender marker assigned correctly at entry?</li> <li>✓ Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)? Were there gender-related project indicators?</li> <li>✓ Are women/gender-focused groups, associations or gender units in partner organizations consulted/ included in the project?</li> <li>✓ How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?</li> <li>✓ 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)?</li> <li>✓ To what extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>M&amp;E:</u></li> <li>○ <b>M&amp;E design</b></li> <li>○ Was the M&amp;E plan included in the project document? Was it practical and sufficient at the point of project approval?</li> <li>○ Did it include baseline data and specify clear targets and appropriate indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio economic results?</li> <li>○ Did it include a proper M&amp;E methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of the M&amp;E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection;</li> <li>○ Does the M&amp;E plan specify what, who and how frequent monitoring, review, evaluations and data collection will take place? Is the M&amp;E plan consistent with the logframe (especially indicators and sources of verification)?</li> <li>○ Does it allocate adequate budget for M&amp;E activities?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>M&amp;E implementation</b></li> <li>○ How was the information from M&amp;E system used during the project implementation? Was an M&amp;E system in place and did it facilitate timely tracking of progress toward project results by collecting information on selected indicators continually throughout the project implementation period? Did project team and manager make decisions and corrective actions based on analysis from M&amp;E system and based on results achieved?</li> <li>○ Are annual/progress project reports complete, accurate and timely?</li> <li>○ Was the information provided by the M&amp;E system used to improve performance and adapt to changing needs? Was information on project performance and results achievement being presented to the Project Steering Committee to make decisions and corrective actions? Do the Project team and managers and PSC regularly ask for performance and results information?</li> <li>○ Are monitoring and self-evaluation carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and impact in the logframe? Do performance monitoring and reviews take place regularly?</li> <li>○ Were resources for M&amp;E sufficient?</li> <li>○ How has the logframe been used for Monitoring and Evaluation purposes (developing M&amp;E plan, setting M&amp;E system, determining baseline and targets, annual implementation review by the Project Steering Committee...) to monitor progress towards expected outputs and outcomes?</li> <li>○ How well have risks outlined the project document and in the logframe been monitored and managed? How often have risks been reviewed and updated? Has a risk management mechanism been put in place?</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Results-based management (RBM)</u></li> </ul> <p><i>Results-Based work planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.</li> <li>○ Are there any annual work plans? Are work-planning processes results-based? Has the logframe been used to determine the annual work plan (including key activities and milestone)?</li> <li>○ Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.</li> </ul> <p><i>Results-based monitoring and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Verify whether an M&amp;E system is in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on selected indicators continually throughout the project implementation period;</li> <li>○ Review the monitoring tool currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?</li> <li>○ Do project team and manager make decisions and corrective actions based on analysis from M&amp;E system and based on results achieved? Is information on project performance and results achievement being presented to the Project Steering Committee to make decisions and corrective actions? Do the Project team and managers and PSC regularly ask for performance and results information?</li> </ul> <p><i>Results-based reporting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the PSC.</li> <li>○ Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil donor and UNIDO reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed delays or poor performance, if applicable?)</li> <li>○ Assess how results and lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.</li> </ul>
E	<b>Performance of partners</b>

1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>UNIDO</u></li> <li>○ Mobilization of adequate technical expertise for project design</li> <li>○ Inclusiveness of project design (with national counterparts)</li> <li>○ Previous evaluative evidence shaping project design</li> <li>○ Planning for M&amp;E and ensuring sufficient M&amp;E budget</li> <li>○ Timely recruitment of project staff</li> <li>○ Project modifications following changes in context or after the Mid-Term Review</li> <li>○ Follow-up to address implementation bottlenecks</li> <li>○ Role of UNIDO country presence (if applicable) supporting the project</li> <li>○ Engagement in policy dialogue to ensure up-scaling of innovations</li> <li>○ Coordination function</li> <li>○ Exit strategy, planned together with the government</li> <li>○ Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.</li> <li>○ To what extent the project has a proper and operational governance system (e.g. PSC with clear roles and responsibilities)?</li> <li>○ Review whether 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)?</li> <li>○ The UNIDO HQ-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (e.g. problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)?</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>National counterparts</u></li> <li>✓ <b>Design</b></li> <li>○ Responsiveness to UNIDO's invitation for engagement in designing the project</li> <li>✓ <b>Implementation</b></li> <li>○ Ownership of the project</li> <li>○ Provide financial contribution as planned (cash or in-kind)</li> <li>○ Support to the project, based on actions and policies</li> <li>○ Counterpart funding</li> <li>○ Internal government coordination</li> <li>○ Exit strategy, planned together with UNIDO, or arrangements for continued funding of certain activities</li> <li>○ Facilitation of the participation of Non-Governmental Organizations(NGOs), civil society and the private sector where appropriate</li> <li>○ Suitable procurement procedures for timely project implementation</li> <li>○ Engagement with UNIDO in policy dialogue to promote the up-scaling or replication of innovations</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Donor</u></li> <li>✓ Timely disbursement of project funds</li> <li>✓ Feedback to progress reports, including Mid-Term Evaluation, if applicable</li> <li>✓ Support by the donor's country presence (if applicable) supporting the project for example through engagement in policy dialogue</li> </ul>
F	<p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the analysis made under Project performance and Progress to Impact criteria above but not an average of ratings.</li> </ul>

## Annex 3: Job descriptions



### UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

<b>Title:</b>	International evaluation consultant, team leader
<b>Main Duty Station and Location:</b>	Home-based
<b>Missions:</b>	Missions to Vienna, Austria and Mongolia
<b>Start of Contract (EOD):</b>	October 18, 2017
<b>End of Contract (COB):</b>	December 31, 2017
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	25 working days (WAE)

#### 1. ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

#### 2. PROJECT CONTEXT

See details in the evaluation Terms of Reference

#### 3. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument if	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adjust table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context;</li><li>• Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions;</li></ul>	5 days	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
<p>needed;</p> <p>Streamlines specific questions to address key issues in the TOR, specific methods that will be used and data to collect in the field visits, detailed evaluation methodology confirmed, draft theory of change, and tentative agenda for field work.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft theory of change and Evaluation framework to submit to the Evaluation Manager for clearance</li> </ul>		
<p>2. Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning;</li> <li>• Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant.</li> </ul>	1 day	Through skype
<p>3. Conduct field mission in 2017<sup>8</sup> to consult field project partners and beneficiaries to verify and complete preliminary evaluation findings from desk review and assess the institutional capacities of the recipient country. Present the evaluation preliminary findings and recommendations to national stakeholders and project staff at the end of the mission</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP), etc. for the collection of data and clarifications;</li> <li>• Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks;</li> <li>• Evaluation presentation of the evaluation's initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country, including the GEF OFP, at the end of the mission.</li> </ul>	6 days	Mongolia
<p>4. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed</li> </ul>	2 days	Vienna, Austria
<p>5. Prepare the evaluation report, with inputs from the National Consultant, according to the TOR;</p> <p>Coordinate the inputs from the National Consultant and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report;</p> <p>Share the evaluation report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft evaluation report.</li> </ul>	7 days	Home-based

<sup>8</sup> The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
6. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final evaluation report.</li> </ul>	3 days	Home-based
7. Contingencies		1 day	Home-based
<b>TOTAL</b>		25 days	

## REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

### **Core values:**

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

### **Managerial competencies:**

1. Strategy and direction
2. Judgement and decision making
3. Conflict resolution

### **Core competencies:**

1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Client orientation
5. Organizational development and innovation

## 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 environmental/energy projects dealing with environmentally sound management (ESM) and disposal of targeted PCB-containing oil and equipment as well as project evaluation experience
- 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 evaluation 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.

## Reporting and deliverables

1) The country assignment will have the following deliverables:

- Presentation of initial findings of the mission to key national stakeholders;
- Draft report;

- Final report, comprising of executive summary, findings regarding design, implementation and results, conclusions and recommendations.

2) Debriefing at UNIDO HQ:

- Presentation and discussion of findings;
- Concise summary and comparative analysis of the main results of the evaluation 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 evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.



## UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

<b>Title:</b>	National evaluation consultant
<b>Main Duty Station and Location:</b>	Home-based
<b>Mission/s to:</b>	Travel to potential sites within Mongolia
<b>Start of Contract:</b>	October 18 2017
<b>End of Contract:</b>	December 31 2017
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	15 working days (WAE)

#### 1. ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EVQ/IEV) is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. ODG/EVQ/IEV is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

#### 2. PROJECT CONTEXT

See details in the evaluation Terms of Reference

#### 3. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

<b><u>MAIN DUTIES</u></b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>
Desk review Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information; in cooperation with the team leader, determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in English (questionnaires, logic models); If need be, recommend adjustments to the tools in order to ensure their understanding in the local context.	Evaluation questions, questionnaires/interview guide, logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context; A stakeholder mapping.	3 days	Home-based

<b><u>MAIN DUTIES</u></b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>
With the support of the project staff in Mongolia, coordinate the evaluation mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with project staff in the field.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed evaluation schedule</li> <li>• List of stakeholders to interview during the field missions.</li> </ul>	2 days	Home-based
<p>Coordinate and conduct the field mission with the team leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit and translate for the team leader, as required;</p> <p>Consult with the team leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission.</li> <li>• Agreement with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks.</li> </ul>	6 days (including travel days)	Mongolia
Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the Team Leader.	Draft evaluation report prepared.	3 days	Home-based
Contribute to the revision of the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	Final evaluation report prepared.	1 days	Home-based
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>15 days</b>	

## **REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

### ***Core values:***

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

### ***Managerial competencies:***

1. Strategy and direction
2. Judgement and decision making
3. Conflict resolution

### ***Core competencies:***

1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Client orientation
5. Organizational development and innovation

## **MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**Education:** Advanced university degree in environmental science, chemistry, engineering or other relevant discipline like developmental studies with a specialization in environment management.

**Technical and functional experience:**

- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.
- Experience in the field of environment and energy, including evaluation of development cooperation in developing countries is an asset

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

**Requirements**

Relevant university degree; over 5 years' experience in planning, implementation, monitoring and/or evaluation of projects in developing countries; excellent oral and written communication skills in English; demonstrated familiarity with procedures and practices of international technical cooperation.

**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 project/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before or shortly after the completion of her/his contract with UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV.

## **Annex 4- Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report**

### **Executive summary (maximum 5 pages)**

Evaluation purpose and methodology  
Key findings  
Conclusions and recommendations  
Project ratings  
Tabular overview of key findings – conclusions – recommendations

#### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1. Evaluation objectives and scope
- 1.2. Overview of the Project Context
- 1.3. Overview of the Project
- 1.4. Theory of Change
- 1.5. Evaluation Methodology
- 1.6. Limitations of the Evaluation

#### **2. Project's contribution to Development Results - Effectiveness and Impact**

- 2.1. Project's achieved results and overall effectiveness
- 2.2. Progress towards impact
  - 2.2.1. Behavioral change
    - 2.2.1.1. Economically competitive - Advancing economic competitiveness
    - 2.2.1.2. Environmentally sound – Safeguarding environment
    - 2.2.1.3. Socially inclusive – Creating shared prosperity
  - 2.2.2. Broader adoption
    - 2.2.2.1. Mainstreaming
    - 2.2.2.2. Replication
    - 2.2.2.3. Scaling-up

#### **3. Project's quality and performance**

- 3.1. Design
- 3.2. Relevance
- 3.3. Efficiency
- 3.4. Sustainability
- 3.5. Gender mainstreaming

#### **4. Performance of Partners**

- 4.1. UNIDO
- 4.2. National counterparts
- 4.3. Donor

#### **5. Factors facilitating or limiting the achievement of results**

- 5.1. Monitoring & evaluation
- 5.2. Results-Based Management
- 5.3. Other factors
- 5.4. Overarching assessment and rating table

#### **6. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned**

- 6.1. Conclusions
- 6.2. Recommendations
- 6.3. Lessons learned
- 6.4. Good practices

#### **Annexes (to be put online separately later)**

- Evaluation Terms of Reference
- Evaluation framework
- List of documentation reviewed
- List of stakeholders consulted
- Project logframe/Theory of Change
- Primary data collection instruments: evaluation survey/questionnaire
- Statistical data from evaluation survey/questionnaire analysis

## Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Project Title:

UNIDO PROJECT ID:

Evaluation team:

Quality review done by:

Date:

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

### Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

A rating scale of 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 6: Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and Projects**

### **A. Introduction**

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **B. Gender responsive evaluation questions**

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

### **B.1. Design**

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

### **B.2. Implementation management**

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

### **B.3. Results**

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