



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

DRAFT

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Independent terminal evaluation of project**

**Phase-out of CFC consumption in the manufacture of aerosol metered dose inhalers (MDIs) in the Russian Federation**

**UNIDO project ID: 100352**

**GEF Project ID: 4387**

January 2018

## 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.	Budget information .....	6
II.	Scope and purpose of the evaluation .....	7
III.	Evaluation approach and methodology.....	8
1.	Data collection methods.....	9
2.	Evaluation key questions and criteria .....	9
3.	Rating system.....	10
IV.	Evaluation process.....	10
V.	Time schedule and deliverables.....	11
VI.	Evaluation team composition .....	11
VII.	Reporting.....	12
VIII.	Quality assurance .....	13
	Annex 1: Project Results Framework .....	14
	Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria .....	20
	Annex 3: Job descriptions .....	26
	Annex 4- Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report.....	30
	Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality .....	33
	Annex 6: Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and Projects .....	34
	Table 1. Financing plan summary.....	6
	Table 2. Financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown .....	6
	Table 3. Co-Financing source breakdown .....	7
	Table 4. UNIDO budget execution .....	7
	Table 5. Project evaluation criteria.....	9
	Table 6. Project rating criteria .....	10
	Table 7. Major timelines .....	11

## I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

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

Project title	Phase-out of CFC consumption in the manufacture of aerosol metered dose inhalers (MDIs) in the Russian Federation
UNIDO project ID	100352
GEF Project ID	4387
Region	Europe and Central Asia (EUR)
Country(ies)	Russian Federation
Project donor(s)	GEF
Project implementation start date	3/1/2012
Expected duration	24 months
Expected implementation end date	31 March 2018
GEF Focal Areas and Operational Project	Ozone Depletion Substances
Implementing agency(ies)	UNIDO
Government coordinating agency	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) (through the Ozone Unit)
Executing Partners	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
UNIDO RBM code	GC33 (Implementation of MEA)
Donor funding	USD 2,550,000 (excluding PPG)
Project GEF CEO endorsement / approval date	12/15/2008
UNIDO input (in kind, USD)	In kind 50,000
Co-financing at CEO Endorsement, as applicable	Total expected: USD 5,600,000 MEP (cash & in-kind) MOF (cash) Local EPBS (cash & in-kind) Pesticides owners and other private sectors (cash & in-kind)
Planned terminal evaluation date	February – March 2018

(Source: Project document)

### 2. Project context

The Russian Federation, in its capacity as the legal successor to the former USSR in respect of the international obligations flowing from the Vienna Convention on Protection of the Ozone Layer (1985), the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (1987) and the London Amendment and adjustments to the Montreal Protocol (1990), was under an obligation to phase out the production of ozone-depleting substances (ODS) by 1 January 1996 and also to fulfill a number of other obligations associated with the phase-out of ODS in the consumption sector. In compliance with the decisions adopted by the Government of the Russian Federation in 1999 and 2000, the production of substances listed in Annexes A and B to the Montreal Protocol (including chlorofluorocarbons-11 (CFC-11) and CFC-

<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

12) was fully phased out on 20 December 2000. However, the Russian Federation has required CFCs for the production of metered-dose inhalers (MDIs) to meet patient demand. Technical assistance is still required to convert the production of CFC metered-dose inhalers (MDIs) to ozone-friendly hydrofluorocarbons (HFC) -134a at the two local MDI enterprises. According to the National Plan of Action to Phase-out of Ozone -Depleting Substances in the Manufacture of MDIs over the Period 2005-2007 (2004) the total phase-out of CFCs in the MDI sector in the Russian Federation as planned to be achieved in 2008. However, this task was not yet fulfilled because funds were not available at the time to assist in this conversion.

The CFC phase out programme in the Russian Federation had not included the technical assistance in phasing out CFCs in the production of Metered-dose Inhalers (MDIs) in the country. MDIs are being now produced by the two Russian enterprises, i.e. «Altayvitaminy Ltd. », Biysk, Altay region and Federal State Enterprise «MosChimPharmPreparaty», Moscow. These two MDI producers are still consuming annually about 212 MT of CFC-11 (solvent) and CFC-12 (propellant) (2010) needed for MDI production of the asthma rescue medicine Salbutamol. This project is consistent with the country's priorities and is designed to terminal phase out of CFCs in the Russian Federation by the end of 2012.

Decision XXI/4(8) of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP) requested the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) and its Medical Technical Options Committee (MTOC) to “organize and undertake a mission of experts to examine the technical, economic and administrative issues affecting the transition from CFC metered dose inhalers to CFC-free alternatives in the Russian Federation, and to report the results of this mission to the meeting of the thirtieth Open-ended Working Group. The recommendation of the TEAP was that financial support is the main priority and GEF funding should be investigated urgently as the first option since finance governs the success of the transition in the Russian Federation. Based on the TEAP/MTOC mission, the Parties could expect that 18-24 months would be the overall time for conversion of the two enterprises once funding is approved by the implementing agency.

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

The objectives of this project are (a) through appropriate technology transfer, to phase out the consumption of 212 ODP tones of CFC-11 and CFC-12 (2010) used in the manufacture of Aerosol Metered-Dose Inhalers (MDIs) in the Russian Federation (RF); and (b) to reduce future GHG emissions by approx. 1.7 MMT CO<sub>2</sub> t/equivalent, by introducing, through technology transfer, a lower GHG propellant.

The two MDI companies in the RF required technology transfer from one, or more, established multinational enterprises with experience in the development and manufacture of MDIs using CFC-free technologies, and with the right to transfer such technology to the Russian Federation (RF) without infringement of any intellectual property related to either the drug molecule, the method of formulation, the design of the metering valve or actuator or the filling process.

This project aimed at addressing the requirements for conversion of a manufacturing facility currently using CFCs to manufacture MDIs with CFC-free propellant.

The project includes four major components:

#### Component 1. Institutional and regulatory capacity building for ODS phase out

Expected outcomes include (i) Policies reviewed and CFC legislation improved, if necessary; (ii) ODS and CFC import/export legislation updated to reflect final phase out of CFCs in MDIs.

Component 2. Phase out of CFC consumption -212 MT (2010) in the Medical aerosol (MDI) sector at two Russian enterprises

Expected outcomes include (i) meeting Montreal Protocol phase out obligations(Phase out of 212ODP tonnes of CFC(CFC-11 and CFC12)); and (ii) Technical assessment of production capacity within the MDI sector,

Component 3. Technology transfer in developing a new HFA –based MDI

The expected outcome is that new MDI products meeting national and international standards are designed and developed.

Component 4. New developed MDIs registered at the Ministry of Health and Social Development.

The expected outcome is that the new MDI products are registered at the Ministry of Health for use.

Component 5. Project management, monitoring and evaluation.

These outcomes were planned to be achieved through the production of 17 outputs.

**4. Project implementation arrangements**

The Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment is responsible for the total CFC phase out in the RF and it has been involved in execution of the ODS Phase-out Programme of the RF. The Ministry of Health and Population is the on-line Ministry to which the two Russian MDI enterprises are subordinated. This Ministry is responsible for the final conversion of CFC-based MDI production to CFC-free MDI production at the two Russian enterprises, subject of this project, and for all necessary arrangements associated with control and monitoring of CFC-free MDI imports into the country.

The project management structure as designed is provided in Figure 1.



**Figure 1. Project Organogram**

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) was to be formed at the inception stage of the project, due to meet twice a year and be responsible for the overall strategic and policy guidance of the Project.

In order to use efficiently funds, the Project was to be monitored by the Project Monitoring Unit (PMU) established for the HCFC Phase out Project in the Russian Federation, especially in organizing annual PSC meetings.

The UNIDO office in Moscow was to be the coordinator of the whole GEF programme in the RF including the monitoring this project implementation.

## 5. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary

Description	Project Preparation	Project	Total (USD)
Financing (GEF / others)	Click here to enter text.	2,550,000	2,550,000
Co-financing (Cash and In-kind)	Click here to enter text.	5,600,000	5,600,000
<b>Total (USD)</b>	Click here to enter text.	<b>8,150,000</b>	<b>8,150,000</b>

Source: Project document

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

Project outcomes	Donor (GEF/other) (USD)	Co-Financing (USD)	Total (USD)
1.1 and 1.2. Policies reviewed and CFC legislation improved, if necessary; ODS and CFC import/export legislation updated to reflect final phase out of CFCs in MDIs.	50,000	100,000	<b>150,000</b>
2.1 and 2.2 To meet Montreal Protocol phase out obligations(Phase out of 212ODP tonnes of CFC(CFC-11 and CFC12)); Technical assessment of production capacity within the MDI sector	2,300,000	4,700,000	<b>7,000,000</b>
3.1. Design and development of new MDI products that meet national and international standards	100,000	500,000	<b>600,000</b>
4.1. New MDI products registered at the Ministry of Health for us	50,000	200,000	<b>250,000</b>
5. Project management	50,000	100,000	<b>150,000</b>
<b>Total (USD)</b>	<b>2,550,000</b>	<b>5,600,000</b>	<b>8,150,000</b>

Source: Project document

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

Table 3. Co-Financing source breakdown

Name of Co-financier (source)	In-kind	Cash	Total Amount (USD)
UNIDO	50,000	50,000	100,000
Private sector (Two pharmaceutical companies in the RF: MosChimPharmPreparaty, Moscow and Altayvitaminy Ltd., Biysk, Altay region)	5,500,000		5,500,000
<b>Total Co-financing (USD)</b>	5,550,000	50,000	5,600,000

Source : Project document

Table 4. UNIDO budget execution (Grant 200000310)

Item of expenditure	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total expend.
Contractual Services								
Equipment		252,140	2,269,256	0	0	0		2,521,395
Nat. Consult./Staff	17,392							17,392
Other Direct Costs				97	0			97
Staff & Intern Consultants			2,725	-399				2,326
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>17,392</b>	<b>252,140</b>	<b>2,271,981</b>	<b>-302</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>2,541,210</b>

Source: UNIDO. ERP database as of 26 January 2018

## II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in 3/1/2012 to the estimated completion date in 3/31/2018. **Error! Reference source not found.** It will assess project performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

The TE has an additional purpose of drawing lessons and developing recommendations for UNIDO and the GEF that may help for improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities in Russian Federation and on a global scale upon project completion. The TE report should include examples of good practices for other projects in the focal area, country, or region.

The TE should provide an analysis of the attainment of the project objective and the corresponding technical outputs and outcomes. Through its assessments, the Evaluation Team (ET) should enable the Government, counterparts, UNIDO, the GEF and other stakeholders and donors to verify prospects for development impact and sustainability, providing an analysis of the attainment of global environmental objectives, project objectives, delivery and completion of project outputs/activities, and

outcomes/impacts based on indicators. The assessment shall include re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and other elements of project design according to the project evaluation parameters defined in chapter III.

The key question of the TE is whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective, i.e. (a) through appropriate technology transfer, phase-out the consumption of 212 ODP tones of CFC-11 and CFC-12 (2010) used in the manufacture of Aerosol Metered-Dose Inhalers (MDIs) in the Russian Federation (RF); and (b) reduce future GHG emissions by approx. 1.7 MMT CO<sub>2</sub> t/equivalent, by introducing, through technology transfer, a lower GHG propellant. .

The evaluation has three specific objectives:

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

### 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 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.

---

<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)

## 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 the Russian Federation.

## 2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

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. Detailed questions to assess each evaluation criterion are provided 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

#	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Efficiency</li> </ul>	Yes
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability of benefits</li> </ul>	Yes
<b>D</b>	<b>Cross-cutting performance criteria</b>	
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender mainstreaming</li> </ul>	Yes
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M&amp;E: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ M&amp;E design</li> <li>✓ M&amp;E implementation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results-based Management (RBM)</li> </ul>	Yes
<b>E</b>	<b>Performance of partners</b>	
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNIDO</li> </ul>	Yes
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National counterparts</li> </ul>	Yes
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Donor</li> </ul>	Yes
<b>F</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	Yes

### 3. Rating system

In line with the practice adopted by many development agencies, the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division 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.	
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 **February to March 2018**. 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. Time schedule and deliverables**

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from February to April 2018. The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned during March 2018. 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 Russian Federation.

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 Independent Evaluation Division, 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 Independent Evaluation Division standards.

Table 7. Major timelines

Timelines	Tasks
February 2018	Desk review and writing of inception report
February 2018	Vienna: briefing with HQ
March 2018	Field visit
March/April 2018	Debriefing in Vienna Preparation of first draft evaluation report
April 2018	Internal peer review of the report by UNIDO’s Independent Evaluation Division and other stakeholder comments to draft evaluation report
April 2018	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 the Russian Federation 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 Independent Evaluation Division 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>6</sup>.

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

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO’s Independent Evaluation Division (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’s Independent Evaluation Division 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.

---

<sup>6</sup> The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV.

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 4.

### **VIII. Quality assurance**

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

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 5. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division 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 Independent Evaluation Division, which will submit the final report to the GEF Evaluation Office and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.

## Annex 1: Project Results Framework

Output	Interventions	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions	Risk
<b>Component 1: Institutional and regulatory capacity building for ODS phase out</b>					
1.1 Analysis of the level of the residual demand of CFC after 2010 by looking at the stock of ODS in the country made	Request from the Government for EUN quota for the RF without looking at the stock of ODS in the country. Policies reviewed and CFC legislation checked. CFCs consumption and import analysed.	To compare the level of MDI production in the last three years and conduct analysis of import of CFCs data from the customs	Customs data available. Production data from two MDI producers available. Rosstravnadzor data on MDI sales in the Russian Federation available.	The stock of CFCs at the two MDI producers could be available. Such stocks have to be taken into account in the EUN requests by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment.	Two Russian producers may be reluctant to divulge stock data. CFCs used for production of MDIs should be pharmaceutical grade and they can be not available in the stock.
1.2. Training of 50 customs officers done and procurement of ODS control equipment for customs made	Check with the customs, whether CFCs control equipment is available. Conduct training for custom officers on difference between HCFCs and CFCs.	A training workshop for custom officers has been conducted. Aide-memoire prepared.	Training report	Custom infrastructure exists to enable tests.	The level of custom staff qualification is low. It could be some organizational difficulties in checking CFC substances.
1.3. Two MDI producers and CFC supplier framework developed and commitments made	Further collection of MDI production and import data in the RF. Along with the two CFC-based MDI producers, at least one	Annual reports to be prepared by Rosstravnadzor reflecting the current status with MDI production and import	Verification reports prepared by local consultants for Rosstravnadzor  Official reporting data	Data is available from customs, Rosstravnadzor, international marketing reports	The interest of the Governmental authorities can be low to monitor the situation with import and production of

	additional HFA-based MDI company is known..				MDIs not allowing any more CFC-based MDIs.
1.4. Awareness, educational information and environmental management systems upgraded	Brief local public relations officers at the Ministries on the ban of CFC use in the RF Develop a plan for 2 years for communications purposes: preparation of leaflets, placates on the project which deals with complete CFC phase out in the country	Plan prepared and submitted to the Ministries involved. All project stakeholders are to be informed on this Plan.	Available public and private communications across all appropriate media		Public relation activities are required a lot of financial resources. Two MDI producers can be reluctant to participate in the awareness campaign, which is necessary for promotion of new HFA MDIs.
1.5 At least two centralized training symposia to train representatives from the Ministry of Health conducted	To develop a training course for doctors , pharmacists, lung specialists on the new HFA MDIs techniques including the details of new therapy	Training materials approved by UNIDO and Project Team. Aide-Memoire and work programme for two symposia prepared	Training certificates for participants, evaluation reports Aide-Memoirs, workshop reports	Without training it would be difficult to promote new MDIs due to specific issues. Already established pharmacy chain would allow to solve the problem	Local implementation difficulties, low-experienced lecturers, not prepared in advance training materials.
1.6. Policies reviewed, relevant laws and regulations in place	Domestic legislation is necessary to accommodate CFCs free MDIs	Laws and regulations adapted	Official documents available	This issue will be addressed through the Ministry of Health	Risk is low
<b>Component 2: Phase out of CFC consumption in the Medical Aerosol (MDI) Sector</b>					

2.1. Aerosol filling line/s with two dispensers in a double stage filling process at MosChimPharmPreparaty and line/s with two indexing machines in a single stage filling process at Altayvitaminy installed	Alternative technologies are to be selected for the two MDI producers TORs for equipment procurement are prepared by UNIDO	TOR for equipment available	Visits to the two companies by a team of supplier for equipment installation, conduction of SAP and FAP	UNIDO has accumulated a large experience on the machinery needed for production of HFA MDIs	Risk is low, although the project can expect the delay with equipment manufacture up to one year, due to delivery, customs, installations, etc.
2.2. Guidance of the Russian experts on the MVP - Installation Qualification (IQ), Operational Qualification (OQ), Performance Qualification (PQ) of new equipment carried out	Preparation of the Master Validity Plan, including GMP certification to conduct IQ, OQ and PQ tests	IQ, OQ, PQ qualifications tests conducted by the equipment supplier. MVP prepared by a team of local experts	International Consultant Project Report, Visits to the two companies, Installation Report of the equipment supplier	MVP can be drafted on the basis of the results from IQ, OQ, PQ qualifications tests by a Project Team to be proved by an international expert	Risk is low, since the Government of the RF demanded the conduction of GMP certification of all pharmaceutical companies till 2013
2.3. Overall project management incorporating both the elements of MDI design and development and supervision of equipment installation made	All engineering aspects of MDI production need to be verified and validated Engineering Plan need to be prepared	Engineering Plans at the two companies prepared, factory teams assigned to their implementation	International expert report	Engineering plans are to be prepared by project local teams to be proved by an international consultant.	Not included in the project scope of activities, assumed that this is a work to be done by the two companies
2.4. Assistance (new MDI-Salbutamol production, engineering services, equipment and instrumentation, etc.) for conduction of three pilot batches rendered by a technology provider	Engineering plan developed for production of three pilot batches of new MDIs by a technology provider Provision of all necessary	Three pilot batches of MDIs produced by each company Technical assistance will be given by a technology provider and an International	Report of a Technology provider, Report of International consultant	Assumed to be produced by a selected technology transfer company	Based on the results of development of a new MDI product to be done by a third party. It depends on the level of experience of

	materials on part of technology provider	consultant			this company, plus a risk of a copy of the marketed MDI
2.5. Three experimental batches of a new MDI (1500 pcs) together with a reference placebo batch (minimum placebo 500 MDIs) carried out at the two enterprises	Engineering plan developed for production of three experimental batches of a new MDI (1500 pcs) together with a reference placebo batch (minimum placebo 500 MDIs) Provision of all necessary materials on part of project counterparts	Three experimental batches of a new MDI (1500 pcs) together with a reference placebo batch (minimum placebo 500 MDIs) at the two enterprises	Report of a Technology provider, Report of International consultant	Assumed to be produced by two Russian MDI producers after new equipment installation  New equipment installed, Installation qualifications completed	Based on the results of development of a new MDI product to be done by a third party and to be produced by project counterparts If equipment is not properly installed there could be delay in project implementation
2.6. Pilot production of CFC free MDI Salbutamol 200 dose, 100 µg/ dose label claim of Salbutamol Base (equivalent) carried out and terminal phase out of CFC consumption in the MDI sector and reduction of GHG emissions achieved	Engineering Plan developed for pilot production of a final batch of new MDI. Provision of all necessary materials on part of project counterparts	Final experimental batch of new MDIs after the pilot and experimental batches for registration purposes produced	Cease of CFC consumption.  Certificates issued by the project counterparts confirming not-use of CFCs  Project report, International consultant's report	Assistance may be necessary here from an international consultant to make measurements of technical parameters of the final product	There might be a delay in production of this final batch since the results of two previous steps need to be very positive. Staff may not be ready to use a new equipment due to lack of sufficient experience
<b>Component 3: Technology Transfer for developing a new HFA-based MDI</b>					

<p>3.1. Design and development of a new HFA-based MDI- Salbutamol made by a technology provider including the drug formula, selection of MDI materials and components and transfer of all possible know-how needed to start manufacturing and testing of new MDIs</p>	<p>Drafting TOR for a technology provider, Job Description for an international consultant Preparation of tendering documents</p>	<p>Preparation of a pharma dossier for the new MDI including the drug formula, selection of MDI materials and components and transfer of all possible know-how needed to start manufacturing and testing of new MDIs</p>	<p>International Consultant report Pharma dossier prepared</p>	<p>The contract for technology transfer is issued and signed according to the agreed work plan. The contractor delivers the services according to the agreed work plan</p>	<p>The technology provider selected may not have sufficient experience in developing a new MDI. It may cause unnecessary delay in project implementation</p>
<p>3.2. All materials and primary packaging components (valve, canister and actuator), of the MDI product excluding the secondary packaging components (carton, package insert etc.) selected</p>	<p>Inclusion of all materials and packaging components in the TOR for technology provision</p>	<p>Interim report of a Contractor on All materials and packaging components selected Selection criteria adopted by the two Russian MDI producers</p>	<p>Interim report prepared</p>	<p>This part of the contract is fulfilled according to the agreed work plan</p>	<p>The new packaging components can be costly in comparison with CFC-based MDIs and it may cause disagreement of the two enterprises</p>
<p>3.3. Final conversion of CFC based MDI Salbutamol 200 dose, 100 µg/ dose label claim of Salbutamol Base (equivalent) (may be formulated using Salbutamol Sulphate and/ or specified in an acceptable manner as the Dose ex mouthpiece achieved</p>	<p>Conduction of 6 months stability tests proving that the new MDI Salbutamol 200 dose, 100 µg/ dose label claim meet the technical requirements of the Drug Regulations of the Ministry of Health</p>	<p>Inclusion of conduction of the 6 months stability tests in the TOR for technology provision</p>	<p>Test report prepared  Final Report on the Technology Transfer prepared</p>	<p>The contractor delivers services according to the agreed work plan</p>	<p>There could be negative results with 6 months stability tests. It may cause the delay with project implementation</p>

**Component 4: New developed MDI products registered at the Ministry of Health**

<p>4.1. 2 or 3 key events [pilot production, stability tests of new MDI] in the Working Plans of the companies included</p>	<p>Pilot production, stability tests of new MDI in the Working Plans of the two enterprises included</p>	<p>Conduction of 6 months stability tests after the production of three commercial batches at the two enterprises.</p>	<p>Evaluation Report on results of tests prepared by the two companies</p>	<p>The analytical methods for conduction of stability tests well known to the staff at the two enterprises</p>	<p>These tests are to be conducted by the two enterprises themselves. They may have not sufficient experience, the lack of measuring instruments may delay the project</p>
<p>4.2. 2 or 3 key events [testing results from the local labs, MDI registration] in the Working Plans Rosstravnadzor included</p>	<p>Testing results from the local labs submitted, MDI registration timing in the Working Plans of the Rosstravnadzor included</p>	<p>Assesment of the test results done</p>	<p>Evaluation Report prepared by Rosstravnadzor,</p>	<p>The staff is well prepared for assessment of testing data. The work to be done is included in the Work Plan of Rosstravnadzor.</p>	<p>Depend on timely completion of analyses</p>
<p>4.3. Clinical test and final registration of new MDI products achieved</p>	<p>A meeting and follow up with Rosstravnadzor on registration procedures of new MDIs conducted.</p>	<p>Complete set of requested documents required by Rosstravnadzor submitted.</p>	<p>Final Registration Certificate issued by Rosstravnadzor.</p>	<p>Registration procedures at Rosstravnadzor already established. This work should be included in the Work Plan of Rosstravnadzor.</p>	<p>Excessive time taken to go through all the procedures of registration.</p>

## Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria

The evaluation team will assess the project performance guided by the questions below.

#	Evaluation criteria
A	<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, 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 (e.g. finances, income, costs saving, expenditure) 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, such as employment, education, and training?</li> </ul>
B	<p><b>Project design</b></p>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Overall design</u></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 the project document include a M&amp;E plan? Does the M&amp;E plan specify what, who and how frequent monitoring, review, evaluations and data collection will take place? Does it allocate budget for each exercise? Is the M&amp;E budget adequately allocated and consistent with the logframe (especially indicators and sources of verification)?</li> <li>✓ Risk management: Are critical risks related to financial, social-political, institutional, environmental and implementation aspects identified with</li> </ul>

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>
	specific risk ratings? Are their mitigation measures identified? Where possible, are the mitigation measures included in project activities/outputs and monitored under the M&E plan?
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 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 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?</li> <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-disaggregated, if applicable?</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> </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 rather than external factors?</li> <li>✓ What can be done to make the project more effective?</li> <li>✓ Were the right target groups reached?</li> </ul>

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>
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? 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 Project Team and annual Work Plans?</li> <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> </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>

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Was the M&amp;E plan at the point of project approval practical and sufficient?</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>○ Did it include budget adequate funds for M&amp;E activities?</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ <b>M&amp;E implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 and accurate?</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> </li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Project management</u></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> </ul>

#	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>
<b>E</b>	<b>Performance of partners</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>UNIDO</u></li> <li>✓ <b>Design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> </ul> </li> <li>✓ <b>Implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> </ul> </li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>National counterparts</u></li> <li>✓ <b>Design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Responsiveness to UNIDO's invitation for engagement in designing the project</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ <b>Implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ownership of the project</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> </li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Donor</u></li> </ul>

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Timely disbursement of project funds</li> <li>✓ Feedback to progress reports, including Mid-Term Evaluation</li> <li>✓ Support by the donor's country presence (if applicable) supporting the project for example through engagement in policy dialogue</li> </ul>
<b>F</b>	<p><b>Overall project achievement</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

<b>Post title:</b>	Senior International Evaluator (Team Leader)
<b>Duration:</b>	30 working days
<b>Date required:</b>	February – April 2018
<b>Duty station:</b>	Home-base with two briefings in Vienna and field missions to project sites in the Russian Federation

Under the direct supervision of the UNIDO Evaluation Manager, in cooperation with the national consultant, and with the support of the Project Manager, the Senior International Evaluation Expert is responsible to carry out the following tasks:

Tasks	Expected Duration	Expected results
Undertake desk review of management, activity, output and related documents of the Project	5 working days (home base)	Key questions and notes to prepare the inception report and field visits
Prepare an inception report which streamlines the specific questions to address the 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.	3 working days (home base)	The inception report. Submitted to evaluation manager
Briefing mission in Vienna: consult with UNIDO relevant staff (project manager, Department and divisional managers), and other relevant stakeholders.	2 working days	Validated field work mission agenda
Undertake fact finding field mission 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.	10 working days	Completed data collection
Debriefing mission – presentation of preliminary evaluation findings and recommendations to the project stakeholders for factual validation	2 working days (Vienna)	Factual validation of evaluation report concluded, additional data obtained,
Prepare and submit draft report of evaluation, including evaluation findings and recommendations and lessons learned	6 working days	Draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager for review 2 pages summary of take-away message from the evaluation
Finalize evaluation report, on basis of comments and suggestions received through the evaluation manager	2 working days (home base)	Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager

**Requirements**

Relevant university degree; over 10 years' experience with projects dealing with environmentally sound management (ESM) and disposal of targeted PCB-containing oil and equipment as well as project evaluation experience; excellent oral and written communication skills in English.

**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 Independent Evaluation Division.

**Post title:** National consultant  
**Duration:** 24 working days  
**Date required:** February – April 2018  
**Duty station:** Home-base with two briefings in Vienna and field missions to the Russian Federation

Under the direct supervision of the UNIDO Headquarters Evaluation Manager, in consultation with and under the guidance of the Team Leader and with the support of the Project Managers, the national consultant is responsible to carry out the following tasks:

Tasks	Expected Duration	Expected results
<p><b>Desk review</b></p> <p>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);</p> <p>If need be, recommend adjustments to the tools in order to ensure their understanding in the local context;</p> <p>Analyze and assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework, specifically in the context of the project’s objectives and targets.</p>	3 working days (home base)	<p>Evaluation questions, questionnaires/interview guide, logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context;</p> <p>A stakeholder mapping.</p>
<p><b>Coordinate the evaluation mission</b> 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.</p> <p>Assist and provide detailed analysis and inputs to the team leader in the preparation of the inception report.</p>	4 working days (home base)	<p>Detailed evaluation schedule;</p> <p>List of stakeholders to interview during the field missions.</p>
<p><b>Participation in interviews during field missions</b></p>	10 working days	Interview notes.
<p>Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the team leader. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO IEV and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.</p>	4 working days	Draft evaluation report submitted to ET leader for review
<p>Finalize evaluation report, on basis of comments and suggestions received through the evaluation manager</p>	3 working days (home base)	Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation

**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; excellent oral and written communication skills in Russian; 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 Independent Evaluation Division.

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

### **Executive summary**

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

### **I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process**

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

### **II. Country and project background**

- Brief country context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project<sup>7</sup> and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
  - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
  - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
  - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
  - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
  - Counterpart organization(s)

### **III. Project assessment**

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

---

<sup>7</sup> Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g. relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives, etc.)

- A. Project design
- B. Implementation performance
  - Ownership and relevance (Report on the relevance of project towards the country and beneficiaries, country ownership, stakeholder involvement)
  - Effectiveness (The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives, outcomes and deliverables were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance)
  - Efficiency (Report on the overall cost-benefit of the project and partner country’s contribution to the achievement of project objectives)
  - Likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes (Report on the risks and vulnerability of the project, considering the likely effects of sociopolitical and institutional changes in the partner country, and its impact on continuation of benefits after the project ends, specifically the financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks)
  - Project coordination and management (Report project management conditions and achievements, and partner country commitment)
  - Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems (Report on M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and budgeting and funding for M&E activities)
  - Monitoring of long-term changes
  - Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results (Report on preparation and readiness / quality at entry, financial planning, UNIDO support, co-financing, delays of project outcomes/outputs, and implementation approach)
- C. Gender mainstreaming

At the end of this chapter, an overall project achievement rating should be developed as required in Annex 2. The overall rating table should be presented here.

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

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

##### **A. Conclusions**

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

##### **B. Recommendations**

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

- be based on evaluation findings

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

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:

- UNIDO
- Government and/or Counterpart Organizations
- Donor

### **C. Lessons learned**

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

**Annexes** should include the evaluation TOR, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, a summary of project identification and financial data, including an updated table of expenditures to date, and other detailed quantitative information. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

## 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?