



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent terminal evaluation of

**Market Transformation Programme on Energy Efficiency in Greenhouse Gas
Intensive Industries in the Russian Federation**

UNIDO Project ID: 103056

GEF Project ID: 3593

July 2017

Contents

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	3
1.	Project factsheet	3
2.	Project context.....	3
3.	Project objective	4
4.	Project implementation arrangements	5
5.	Budget information	6
II.	Scope and purpose of the evaluation	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.....	11
V.	Time schedule and deliverables.....	12
VI.	Evaluation team composition	12
VII.	Reporting.....	13
VIII.	Quality assurance	14
	Annex 1: Project Logical Framework.....	15
	Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria	19
	Annex 3: Job descriptions	25
	Annex 4- Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report.....	29
	Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality	32
	Annex 6: Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and Projects	33
	Table 1. Financing plan summary.....	6
	Table 2. Financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown	7
	Table 3. Co-Financing source breakdown	7
	Table 4. UNIDO budget execution (4000376 XP and 2000002517 GEF Grants)	8
	Table 5. Project evaluation criteria.....	10
	Table 6. Project rating criteria	11

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1. Project factsheet¹

Project title	Market Transformation Programme on Energy Efficiency in Greenhouse Gas Intensive Industries in the Russian Federation
UNIDO Project ID	103056
GEF Project ID	3593
Region	ECA
Country(ies)	Russian Federation
Project donor(s)	GEF
Project implementation start date	10/12/2010
Expected duration	36 months
Expected implementation end date	31 December 2017
GEF Focal Areas and Operational Project	Climate Change
Implementing agency(ies)	UNIDO and EBRD
Executing partners	45T
UNIDO RBM code	
Donor funding	8,078,625 (UNIDO component)
Project GEF CEO endorsement / approval date	7/22/2010
UNIDO input (cash and in kind, USD)	695,631
Co-financing at CEO Endorsement, as applicable	307,595,631
Total project cost (USD)	322,980,631
Mid-term review date	6/30/2013
Planned terminal evaluation date	8/31/2017

(Source: Project document)

2. Project context

The typical energy efficiency of Russian industry is significantly below the global average. There are a number of reasons for this disadvantage: an ageing capital equipment stock, traditionally low energy prices and abundant national energy resources, in combination with low government and management interest.

This situation has been changing rapidly. Government has set an ambitious target of a 40% improvement of the energy intensity by 2020. National gas prices are increasing steadily, to the level of

¹ Data to be validated by the Consultant

export prices and electricity sector reforms created a liberalized electricity market leading to market-based prices for electricity. This development raises the interest for energy efficiency significantly. In fact many options could be implemented that are cost-effective today.

However the uptake rate for these efficiency options is slow. There are still serious barriers that stand in the way of financing and implementing energy efficiency options. The knowledge in enterprises about the real energy efficiency opportunities needs improvement as well as the capacity in government to develop and implement effective energy efficiency policies.

Energy Management Systems (EMS) has proven to be an effective tool for enterprises in other countries. Typically they raise the annual efficiency improvement by 1-2 percentage points over a period of many years. This represents an increase by a factor two to three. Such improvements have been observed for large companies and small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs). However experience shows that the EMS requirements for SMEs cannot be as demanding and detailed as for large enterprises. Both groups of enterprises need a differentiated approach.

The Government has passed an ambitious new energy efficiency law, which poses a considerable burden on the policy-making capacity in particular of the Ministry of Energy. It is reorganizing its structure to raise the effectiveness of implementation of the law. For example, it is transforming one of its associated bodies that had some research tasks into a new Russian Energy Agency with a much broader set of responsibilities. Clearly a new range of skills and experts will be needed to further develop, implement and monitor policy measures. This new agency as well as other government bodies needs capacity building in order to adequately meet the demands set by the new energy efficiency law.

3. Project objective

The overall objective of the project is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the Russian Federation by transforming the market for industrial energy efficiency in GHG-intensive industries. The project aims to achieve this market transformation through activities that will:

- structurally improve industrial energy efficiency (EE) in heavy and light industries through increased energy efficiency investments,
- have a wider direct positive effect on rational energy use with related environmental benefits, and
- improve the capacity of the government to develop effective (industrial) energy efficiency policies.

The project includes four components:

- Component 1: “Enhancing knowledge assets” creating the training materials, information campaign and training trainers;
- Component 2 : “Capacity building for large industry”: targeting knowledge and financial market barriers aiming to facilitate investment in EE for large companies;
- Component 3 and “Capacity Building for SMEs” targeting knowledge and financial market barriers aiming to facilitate investment in EE for SMEs; and
- Component 4 “Policy support” targeting legislative and market barriers”.

The key performance indicators include:

- Total CO_{2eq} emission reductions as a result of the investments in industrial energy efficiency – target 3.8 million tonnes (over 10 year lifetimes) by 2015
- Volume of investment – target 300 USD by 2015
- Total energy saved (GWh/yr) – target 1.4 TWh per year by 2015

The full logical framework is included as annex 1.

4. Project implementation arrangements

During the course of the PPG and related project development work, UNIDO and EBRD have held numerous meetings with stakeholders dealing with industrial energy efficiency in the Russian Federation, including policy-makers, partner banks, utilities, project developers, investors, and companies that provide products and services related to energy efficiency. On the basis of these discussions and a thorough analysis of existing market barriers, the EBRD and UNIDO have ascertained that the most effective approach to developing the Industrial Energy Efficiency market is through a combination of technical assistance, which is incorporated into all project components, and investment.

The project has been executed by the EBRD and UNIDO through their local Russian offices and headquarters in London and Vienna.

Project Advisory committee

To secure a constructive stakeholder dialogue throughout the project an Advisory Committee will be formed consisting of the Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Economic Development and other representatives from relevant ministries, the Russian Energy Agency, and associations with interest in industrial energy efficiency, project development and finance. The main role of the Advisory Committee will be to provide advice and feedback on the project design and support implementation during operations with policy support and by facilitating key partnerships across the market. The Advisory Committee also provides a forum for the advancement of sustainable energy finance in industry. The Advisory Committee members typically play important roles in promoting and sustaining a favorable policy environment for investments.

UNIDO and the EBRD project implementation team will convene the Advisory Committee semiannually to advise the project on operational issues and promote coordination with other national initiatives and policies. The first Advisory Committee meeting will be organized after launching the project. The purpose of the first meeting will be to announce that the project has started operation, present strategies for the first year and discuss the implementation plan. Other potentially interested government, FI and other partners would be invited to the meeting as observers.

Project Management Unit (PMU)

The project will be coordinated by the EBRD and UNIDO through their local Russian offices and headquarters in London and Vienna. Local execution will take place through two Project Management Units to address project management needs.

All field staff are hired as per UNIDO recruitment rules. During the entire implementation period of the project, UNIDO provides the PMU with the necessary management and monitoring support.

The PMU is responsible for the overall operational and financial management in accordance with rules and regulations imposed by UNIDO/GEF for directly executed projects. It prepares progress reports, financial reports etc. which are submitted to UNIDO-HQ and the PSC. It produces annual progress reports, at least two weeks before the annual meetings. At the end of the project, the PMU will produce

the terminal report, which is to be submitted to the Project Steering Committee at least two weeks before the Terminal meeting.

Stakeholders

EBRD and UNIDO are engaging in extensive consultations with local stakeholders. Local stakeholder participation in the Program will be extensive in all components with representatives from government, developers, and financial institutions. This list is by no means exhaustive and simply serves to illustrate the profile of select interested parties.

The main government bodies involved in energy efficiency policy-making process who would be involved in the project include:

- Ministry of Energy;
- Russian Energy Agency;
- Ministry of Economic Development;
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment;
- Ministry of Industry and Trade;
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs;

Other public and private sector stakeholders to be involved in the project include:

- Analytical Centre of the Russian Government;
- OPORA RUSSIA (NGO for SMEs);
- Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs;
- Russian Association of Energy Service Companies;
- Regional/Oblast authorities and EE related institutions;
- Universities;
- Industrial enterprises;
- Energy efficiency consultants and service providers; and others.

5. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary

\$	<i>Project Preparation</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Total (\$)</i>
Financing (GEF / others)	225,000	15,385,000	15,610,000
Co-financing (Cash and In-kind)	600,000	307,595,631	308,195,631
Levered co-financing		40,000	40,000
Total (\$)	825,000	362,980,631	363,805,631

Source: CEO endorsement document

Table 2. Financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown²

Project outcomes	Donor (GEF/other) (\$)	Co-Financing (\$)	Total (\$)
1. Enhancing knowledge assets	2,174,050	2,300,000	4,474,050
2 Capacity building in large industries	6,114,750	150,600,000	156,714,750
3. Capacity building in SMEs	5,022,300	150,895,631	155,917,931
4. Policy support	1,329,850	500,000	1,829,850
Project management	744,050	3,300,000	4,044,050
Total (\$)	15,385,000	307,595,631	322,980,631

Source: CEO endorsement document

Table 3. Co-Financing source breakdown

Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Total Amount (\$)
EBRD	Implementing Agency	Cash and In Kind	6,900,000
UNIDO	Implementing Agency	Cash and In Kind	695,631
EBRD	Implementing Agency	Loan (credit lines)	300,000,000
Total Co-financing (\$)			307,595,631

Source : CEO endorsement document

Table 4 : GEF Resources by Agency

GEF Agency	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	Project	Agency Fee	Total
EBRD	CC	Russian Federation	7,306,375	730,638	8,037,013
UNIDO	CC	Russian Federation	8,078,625	807,863	8,886,488
Total GEF Resources			15,385,050	1,538,500	16,923,500

Source : CEO endorsement document

² Source: Project document.

Table 4. GEF Grant and XP funds (thousands US dollars)

	2011-2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
International Experts	300,489.26	438,225.13	549,217.93	298,392.95	258,743.13	83,683.32
Project Travel	33,642.47	67,067.33	110,240.97	173,528.30	173,578.57	23,037.61
Staff Travel	9,065.61	18,743.75	7,618.14	11,676.78	11,835.61	963.70
National Experts	712,539.43	991,954.18	625,935.90	303,048.07	308,257.68	87,702.16
Subcontracts	570,749.02	295,789.54	316,048.77	277,634.07	234,842.41	63,352.33
Trainings/ Study Tours	25,375.50	116,218.06	77,932.53	23,134.38	12,814.54	-
Equipment	645.42	93.81	29,841.45	113,101.07	29,758.26	643.52
Sundries	71,068.42	29,518.93	77443.18	81671.79	62498.17	8,011.44
TOTAL	1,723,575.13	1,957,610.73	1,794,278.87	1,282,187.41	1,092,328.37	267,394.08

Source: SAP database as of July 2017.

II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in 10/12/2010 to the estimated completion date in 31/12/2017. It will assess project performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact for the UNIDO component of the project.

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 the country 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 and 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 VI.

The key question of the TE is whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective, i.e. to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the Russian Federation by transforming the market for

Industrial Energy Efficiency in GHG-intensive industries. The project will lead to a transformation of the market for industrial energy efficiency through activities that will i) improve industrial energy efficiency in heavy industries, ii) have a direct positive effect on rational energy use with related environmental benefits, and iii) improve the commercial prospects of industrial borrowers. Financing of over 400 million USD will be facilitated through this project resulting in potential direct emission reductions of up to 3.8 million tonnes CO₂eq over 10-year equipment lifetimes.

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 Policy³ and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle⁴. 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.

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

The main instruments for data collection are the following:

- (a) **Desk and literature review** of documents related to the project, including but not limited to:

³ UNIDO. (2015). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (UNIDO/DGB/(M).98/Rev.1)

⁴ UNIDO. (2006). Director-General's Administrative Instruction No. 17/Rev.1: Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle (DGA1.17/Rev.1, 24 August 2006)

- 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 and counterparts.
- (c) **Field visit** to 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. The details questions to assess each evaluation criterion are in annex 2.

Table 5. Project evaluation criteria

#	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
A	Impact	Yes
B	Project design	Yes
1	• Overall design	Yes
2	• Logframe	Yes
C	Project performance	Yes
1	• Relevance	Yes
2	• Effectiveness	Yes
3	• Efficiency	Yes
4	• Sustainability of benefits	Yes
D	Cross-cutting performance criteria	

1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender mainstreaming 	Yes
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M&E: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ M&E design ✓ M&E implementation 	Yes
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results-based Management (RBM) 	Yes
E	Performance of partners	
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNIDO 	Yes
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National counterparts 	Yes
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donor 	Yes
F	Overall assessment	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 Table 6.

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 September to mid-November 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;
- ii. Desk review and data analysis;
- iii. Interviews, survey and literature review;

- iv. Country visit;
- v. Data analysis and report writing.

V. Time schedule and deliverables

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from 9/1/2017 to 11/10/2017. The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned for 10/2/2017 to 10/13/2017. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project in 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 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 Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EVQ/IEV) standards.

Timelines	Tasks
4-15 September 2017	Desk review and writing of inception report
18-19 September	Vienna: briefing with HQ
2 –12 October 2017	Field visit to project site
10-11 October 2017	Presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations
11 - 25 October 2017	Preparation of first draft evaluation report
1 – 3 November 2017	Mission to Moscow and debriefing to key stakeholders and project partners
6 November 2017	Internal peer review of the report by the Independent Evaluation Division / stakeholder comments to draft evaluation report
13 November 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 the use of EnMS. 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 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 (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 timetable⁵.

Evaluation report format and review procedures

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EVQ/IEV) (the suggested report outline is provided 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 Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EVQ/IEV) 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

⁵ The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation.

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

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's Office for Independent Evaluation 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 Office for Independent Evaluation, 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 (Logical) Framework

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
Impact			
<p><i>GEF Strategic Priorities:</i></p> <p>Strategic Program 2: Promoting energy efficiency in the industrial sector</p>	<p>Total CO_{2eq} emission reductions as a result of the investments in industrial energy efficiency – target 3.8 million tonnes (over 10 year lifetimes) by 2015</p> <p>Volume of investment – target 300 million USD by 2015</p> <p>Total energy saved (GWh/yr) – target 1.4 TWh annually by 2015</p> <p>See Annex G for details of how these targets have been estimated</p>	<p>For all three indicators: Reporting from project sites, data from feasibility studies, verification of savings for all or a representative sample of projects</p>	<p>Energy saving service providers find the line of business profitable, and companies choose to make energy efficiency investments</p> <p>Implementation of project activities will foster industrial energy efficiency investments and reduce CO_{2eq} emissions</p>
Outcomes			
<p>Local trainers have the knowledge resources and skills needed to enhance capacity</p> <p>Participating large industries make EE investments</p> <p>Participating SMEs make EE investments</p> <p>Government capacity enhanced</p>	<p>Average “trainers capacity score” increased⁶ – target x4 by project mid-term compared to start of project status</p> <p>Investment facilitated in large industries – target US\$ 100 million submitted to EBRD credit lines and/or local banks for financing by end of project</p> <p>Investments facilitated in SMEs – target US\$ 50 million by end of project</p> <p>Government capacity to design and implement an effective industrial EE policy enhanced⁷ - target x2</p>	<p>Survey of capacity of trainers at project start, mid-term and end</p> <p>Regular monitoring and reporting of support consultants</p> <p>Regular monitoring and reporting of support consultants</p>	<p>The Program overcomes existing energy efficiency energy market barriers and builds a sustainable market capacity</p> <p>The barriers we identified are indeed the principal constraints to growth in this area.</p> <p>There is no major deterioration in the macro economic and political climate, and Russia emerges from the current financial crisis within the next two-three years.</p>

⁶ The system for scoring trainers capacity, including weighting of factors, will be determined at project inception. Scores will be assigned based on results of the start of project survey, and compared to that in the mid-term and end-term survey. Indicators for enhanced capacity may include: knowledge of international best practice, appropriate staffing in terms of number and skills, presence of processes and procedures to facilitate industrial energy efficiency.

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
	by project mid-term and x4 by end of project compared to start of project	Review of institutional capacity of government at start, mid-term and end of project	
Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
Component 1: Enhancing knowledge assets	<p>Fully developed set of training materials for energy management system implementation and systems optimisation training, including build-up of systems optimisation library;</p> <p>Information campaign implemented</p> <p>Fully functional Russian-English language web site;</p> <p>Discussion forum and Peer-to-Peer network established and operational;</p> <p>Up to 140 national trainers fully trained in EMS and systems optimisation</p>	<p>Copies of training materials</p> <p>Copies of information assets, contact log</p> <p>Website and use statistics</p> <p>Discussion archive and membership list</p> <p>Participant logs and evaluation forms from trainers' events</p>	Local trainers are interested in the information and resources and this contributes to their capacity to train others
Component 2: Capacity building in large industries	<p>½-day introductory training sessions to 100 managers in 50 large enterprises delivered;</p> <p>Formal classroom training in energy management systems and systems optimisation to 100 managers in 20 large enterprises delivered that are additional to the core 10 enterprises;</p> <p>2-day training sessions to participating large enterprises staff delivered;</p> <p>Extensive on-site EMS training for 10 large</p>	<p>Participant logs and evaluation forms</p>	Macro-economic conditions are such that investment in efficiency continues to be attractive, and banks have capital for investment.

⁷ The system for scoring government institutional capacity, including weighting of factors, will be determined at project inception. Scores will be based on expert reviews at the beginning middle and end of the project.

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
	<p>enterprises;</p> <p>Implementation of EMS in 10 large enterprises;</p> <p>Full energy audits for the 10 large enterprises carried out</p> <p>40-60 enterprise staff trained in systems optimisation at the 10 core enterprises (a total of 30 three-day workshops)</p> <p>40 system assessments prepared at the 10 core enterprises</p> <p>40 system assessments prepared at the 20 additional enterprises;</p> <p>35 full case studies developed;</p> <p>Recognition programme established and participants registered in the peer-to-peer network;</p> <p>10 complete company energy efficiency investment plans developed;</p> <p>40 Russian equipment suppliers trained in optimisation of six types of systems (twelve three-day workshops)</p>	<p>Verification reviews of EMS status in enterprises</p> <p>Copies of audits</p> <p>Participant logs and evaluation forms</p> <p>Copies of assessments</p> <p>Copies of assessments</p> <p>Copies of case study reports</p> <p>Reports from annual events, Discussion archives</p> <p>Copies of plans</p> <p>Participant logs and evaluation forms</p>	
Component 3: Capacity building in SMEs	<p>100 SMEs trained in energy management systems</p> <p>25 large SMEs trained in systems optimisation;</p> <p>25 systems optimisation assessments completed in large SMEs;</p> <p>Russian benchmarking developed and introduced in 2-3 SME-sectors and 50 SMEs;</p> <p>50 quick audits carried out by national experts and audit companies;</p> <p>Data bank on energy efficiency technologies</p>	<p>Participant logs and evaluation forms</p> <p>Participant logs and evaluation forms</p> <p>Copies of assessments</p> <p>Reports from benchmarking</p> <p>Copies of audits</p>	Macro economic conditions are such that investment in efficiency continues to be attractive, and banks have capital for investment.

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification	Assumptions
	<p>developed;</p> <p>Voluntary certification scheme prepared;</p> <p>50 energy efficiency investment plans prepared</p>	<p>Web-based databank</p> <p>Documentation on possible scheme structure</p> <p>Copies of investment plans</p>	
4. Policy support	<p>80 government officials trained in industrial energy efficiency policy preparation;</p> <p>Proposals for selection and approval of projects submitted to the new federal target programme delivered;</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation procedures for the federal target programme developed;</p> <p>Experts of the energy agency trained in information campaigns and the use of the web site and its tools;</p> <p>Proposals delivered to REA on data collection and analysis structure;</p> <p>Proposals delivered for the introduction of a Russian Energy Management Standard and road map for long-term agreements with industry;</p> <p>Recommendations prepared for certification scheme of industrial energy efficiency equipment;</p>	<p>Participant logs and evaluation forms</p> <p>Copies of proposals</p> <p>Copies of procedures</p> <p>Participant logs and evaluation forms</p> <p>Copies of proposals</p> <p>Copies of proposals</p> <p>Copies of recommendations</p>	<p>Institutional and political barriers can effectively be overcome through analysis, information and co-ordination activities</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>Progress to impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <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? ✓ <u>Replication</u>: To what extent the project's specific results (e.g. methodology, technology, lessons, etc.) are reproduced or adopted ✓ <u>Scaling-up</u>: To what extent the project's initiatives and results are implemented at larger geographical scale? ✓ What difference has the project made to the beneficiaries? ✓ What is the change attributable to the project? To what extent? ✓ What are the social, economic, environmental and other effects, either short-, medium- or long-term, on a micro- or macro-level? ✓ What effects are intended or unintended, positive or negative? <p>The three UNIDO impact dimensions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Safeguarding environment</u>: To what extent the project contributes to changes in the status of environment. ✓ <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? ✓ <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?
B	<p>Project design</p>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Overall design</u> ✓ The project design was adequate to address the problems at hand? ✓ 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? ✓ 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? ✓ To what extent the project design (in terms of funding, institutional arrangement, implementation arrangements...) as foreseen in the project document still valid and relevant? ✓ Does the project document include a M&E plan? Does the M&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&E budget adequately allocated and consistent with the logframe (especially indicators and sources of verification)? ✓ Risk management: Are critical risks related to financial, social-political, institutional, environmental and implementation aspects identified with

#	Evaluation criteria
	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"> • <u>Logframe</u> ✓ 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? ✓ 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? ✓ 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?
C	Project performance
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Relevance</u> ✓ How does the project fulfil the urgent target group needs? ✓ To what extent is the project aligned with the development priorities of the country (national poverty reduction strategy, sector development strategy)? ✓ How does project reflect donor policies and priorities? ✓ Is the project a technically adequate solution to the development problem? Does it eliminate the cause of the problem? ✓ To what extent does the project correspond to UNIDO's comparative advantages? ✓ 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?
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Effectiveness</u> ✓ What are the main results (mainly outputs and outcomes) of the project? What have been the quantifiable results of the project? ✓ To what extent did the project achieve their objectives (outputs and outcomes), against the original/revised target(s)? ✓ What are the reasons for the achievement/non-achievement of the project objectives? ✓ 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? ✓ To what extent is the identified progress result of the project rather than external factors? ✓ What can be done to make the project more effective? ✓ Were the right target groups reached?

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Efficiency</u> ✓ How economically are the project resources/inputs (concerning funding, expertise, time...) being used to produce results? ✓ To what extent were expected results achieved within the original budget? If no, please explain why. ✓ Are the results being achieved at an acceptable cost? Would alternative approaches accomplish the same results at less cost? ✓ What measures have been taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used? Were the project expenditures in line with budgets? ✓ To what extent did the expected co-financing materialize, in cash or in-kind, grants or loan? Was co-financing administered by the project management or by some other organization? Did short fall in co-financing or materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results? ✓ Could more have been achieved with the same input? ✓ Could the same have been achieved with less input? ✓ How timely was the project in producing outputs and outcomes? Comment on the delay or acceleration of the project's implementation period. ✓ 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? ✓ Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet the requirements?
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Sustainability of benefits</u> ✓ Will the project results and benefits be sustained after the end of donor funding? ✓ Does the project have an exit strategy? <p><i>Financial risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the project ends? <p><i>Socio-political risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? ✓ What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? ✓ Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? ✓ Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives? <p><i>Institutional framework and governance risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 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? ✓ Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency and required technical know-how in place? <p><i>Environmental risks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? ✓ 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?

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Progress to impact</u> ✓ Is there any evidence of progress towards impact? ✓ To what extent do the key assumptions of the project's theory of change hold? ✓ Is there qualitative and quantitative evidence on environmental stress reduction (e.g. GHG emission reduction, reduction of waste discharge, etc.) and environmental status change? ✓ To what extent observed changes in capacities (awareness, knowledge, skills) or in infrastructure and legislation are attributable to the project?
D	Cross-cutting performance criteria
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Gender mainstreaming</u> ✓ Did the project design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? Was the gender marker assigned correctly at entry? ✓ Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)? Were there gender-related project indicators? ✓ Are women/gender-focused groups, associations or gender units in partner organizations consulted/ included in the project? ✓ How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries? ✓ Do the results affect women and men differently? If so, why and how? How are the results likely to affect gender relations (e.g., division of labour, decision-making authority)? ✓ To what extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M&E:</u> ✓ M&E design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Was the M&E plan at the point of project approval practical and sufficient? ○ Did it include baseline data and specify clear targets and appropriate indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio economic results? ○ Did it include a proper M&E methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of the M&E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection; ○ Did it include budget adequate funds for M&E activities? ✓ M&E implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How was the information from M&E system used during the project implementation? Was an M&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&E system and based on results achieved? ○ Are annual/progress project reports complete and accurate? ○ Was the information provided by the M&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? ○ 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?

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Were resources for M&E sufficient? ○ How has the logframe been used for Monitoring and Evaluation purposes (developing M&E plan, setting M&E system, determining baseline and targets, annual implementation review by the Project Steering Committee...) to monitor progress towards expected outputs and outcomes? ○ 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?
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Project management</u> ✓ 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. ✓ 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)? ✓ 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)?
E	Performance of partners
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>UNIDO</u> ✓ Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mobilization of adequate technical expertise for project design ○ Inclusiveness of project design (with national counterparts) ○ Previous evaluative evidence shaping project design ○ Planning for M&E and ensuring sufficient M&E budget ✓ Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Timely recruitment of project staff ○ Appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services ○ Project modifications following changes in context or after the Mid-Term Review ○ Follow-up to address implementation bottlenecks ○ Role of UNIDO country presence (if applicable) supporting the project ○ Engagement in policy dialogue to ensure up-scaling of innovations ○ Coordination function ○ Exit strategy, planned together with the government
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>National counterparts</u> ✓ Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Responsiveness to UNIDO's invitation for engagement in designing the project

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Implementation ○ Ownership of the project ○ Support to the project, based on actions and policies ○ Counterpart funding ○ Internal government coordination ○ Exit strategy, planned together with UNIDO, or arrangements for continued funding of certain activities ○ Facilitation of the participation of Non-Governmental Organizations(NGOs), civil society and the private sector where appropriate ○ Suitable procurement procedures for timely project implementation ○ Engagement with UNIDO in policy dialogue to promote the up-scaling or replication of innovations
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Donor</u> ✓ Timely disbursement of project funds ✓ Feedback to progress reports, including Mid-Term Evaluation ✓ Support by the donor's country presence (if applicable) supporting the project for example through engagement in policy dialogue
F	<p>Overall project achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 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.

Annex 3: Job descriptions

Post title: Senior International Evaluator (Team Leader)

Duration: 33 working days

Date required: 4 September - 10 November 2017

Duty station: Home-base with two briefings in Vienna and field mission to 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 on or before 29 September 2017
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 missions 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 on or before 15 October
Debriefing mission – presentation of preliminary evaluation findings and recommendations to the project stakeholders for factual validation	5 working days (Vienna and Moscow)	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 on or before 2 November 2017. 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 on or before 20 November 2017

Requirements

Relevant university degree; over 10 years' experience with environmental management projects as well as project evaluation experience; excellent oral and written communication skills in English; Knowledge of Russian is an asset.

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 the Office for Independent Evaluation.

Post title: National consultant

Duration: 22 working days

Date required: 4 September - 10 November 2017

Duty station: Home-base with two briefings in Vienna and a field mission in 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>Desk review</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 Vietnamese if deemed necessary (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>Coordinate and lead interviews in local language and assist the team leader with translation where necessary;</p> <p>Analyze and assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework, specifically in the context of the project's objectives and targets.</p>	<p>3 working days (home base)</p>	<p>Evaluation questions, questionnaires/interview guide, logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context;</p> <p>A stakeholder mapping;</p> <p>A brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework in the context of the project.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>Assist and provide detailed analysis and inputs to the team leader in the preparation of the inception report.</p>	<p>3 working days (home base)</p>	<p>Detailed evaluation schedule</p> <p>List of stakeholders to interview during the field missions.</p>
<p>Participation in interviews during field missions</p>	<p>10 working days</p>	<p>Interview notes.</p>
<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>	<p>3 working days</p>	<p>Draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager for review on or before 17 November 2017.</p>
<p>Finalize evaluation report, on basis of comments and suggestions received through the evaluation manager</p>	<p>3 working days (home base)</p>	<p>Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager on or before 20 November 2017</p>

Requirements

Relevant university degree; over 5 years' experience in planning, implementation, monitoring and/or evaluation of technical assistance projects; excellent oral and written communication skills in English and 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 the Office for Independent Evaluation.

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 project⁸ 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:

⁸ 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 vis-à-vis the country and project 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's 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 SAP ID:

Evaluation team:

Quality review done by:

Date:

Report quality criteria	UNIDO IEV assessment notes	Rating
a. Was the report well-structured and properly written? (Clear language, correct grammar, clear and logical structure)		
b. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?		
c. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?		
d. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?		
e. 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)		
f. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?		
g. Did the report include the actual project costs (total, per activity, per source)?		
h. 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?		
i. Quality of the lessons: were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
j. 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?		
k. Are the main cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights and environment, appropriately covered?		
l. 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?