



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent terminal evaluation of UNIDO project:

Supporting small and medium-sized manufacturers in the automotive component industry in India: Deepening and widening the services provided within the framework of the UNIDO-ACMA-DHI partnership programme

UNIDO SAP ID: 100245

December 2017

Contents

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	3
1.	Project factsheet	3
	Project factsheet:	3
2.	Project context.....	3
	<i>RATIONALE</i>	3
	<i>ORIGIN OF THE PROJECT</i>	4
3.	Project objective:	4
4.	Project implementation arrangements	5
5.	Budget information:	6
II.	Evaluation purpose and scope.....	7
III.	Evaluation approach and methodology.....	8
1.	Data collection methods.....	8
2.	Evaluation key questions and criteria	8
3.	Rating system.....	10
IV.	Evaluation process	10
V.	Time schedule and deliverables.....	10
VI.	Evaluation team composition	11
VII.	Reporting.....	12
VIII.	Quality assurance	12
	Annex 1: Project Results Framework	13
	Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria	16
	Annex 3: Job descriptions	21
	Annex 4- Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report.....	27
	Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality	28

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT¹

1. Project factsheet

Project factsheet:

Project title	Supporting small and medium-sized manufacturers in the automotive component industry in India: Deepening and widening the services provided within the framework of the UNIDO-ACMA-DHI partnership programme
SAP ID	100245
Region	Asia and Pacific
Country	India
Project donor(s)	India
Project approval date	December 2013
Project implementation start date	1 July 2014
Expected duration at project approval	3 years
Expected implementation end date	31 March 2018
Executing partners	Automotive Component Manufacturers Association of India (ACMA)
Donor funding	2,193,647 funded by Indian Department of Heavy Industry (DHI) (including 13% of supporting cost)
UNIDO input (in kind, USD)	
Co-financing:	1,131,086 (from the industrial sector)
Total project cost (USD)	3,324,732
Planned terminal evaluation date	Jan 2017 – March 2018

(Source: Project document)

2. Project context

RATIONALE

The overall objective of the UNIDO project “*Supporting small and medium-sized manufacturers in the automotive component industry in India: Deepening and widening the services provided within the framework of the UNIDO-ACMA-DHI partnership programme*” is to broaden and deepen the scope and outreach of already established programme services (implemented in a predecessor project over the period 2005-2009), and to further strengthen Indian small and medium-sized automotive component suppliers to meet the requirements of vehicle and Tier-1 automotive component manufacturers.

The Indian automotive component-manufacturing sector encompasses more than 570 firms in the organized sector and around 31,000 enterprises in the unorganized sector, and provides direct employment to about 500,000 people, accounting for over 4.7% to India’s GDP and 19% to India’s indirect tax revenue. SMEs across India typically operate in the context of industrial clusters, or geographic concentrations of firms producing similar goods. Despite delivering a substantial share of industrial employment, output and exports, SME clusters are impeded in their development process by

¹ Data in this chapter is to be validated by the Consultant against the project document and any changes should be reflected in the evaluation report.

a number of constraints: access to factors (finance, technology, skills, and supporting management processes) and to markets (logistics, compliance with standards, access to quality certification services, product range, packaging, branding, marketing, etc.).

Due to its long-standing involvement in the automotive sector and other clusters in India, UNIDO has acquired an in-depth understanding of the Indian context and established a relevant network of technical experts and collaborating institutions. Consequently, UNIDO has both the mandate and the necessary expertise to establish linkages between foreign firms and domestic SMEs, and to support them in designing and implementing the necessary measures to overcome these constraints.

Within the context of the automotive sector, as national and international car manufacturers and Tier-1 suppliers are demanding increasingly high standards with regard to cost, quality, delivery, and engineering know-how, UNIDO seeks to support SMEs in their endeavor to follow this demand.

ORIGIN OF THE PROJECT

The project was approved at the end of 2013, started in the beginning of July 2014 and is expected to complete on 31st March 2018. It builds on the results and the achievements of the UNIDO-ACMA Partnership Programme; implemented in 3 different phases between 1999 and 2009. The Programme aimed at strengthening the capacity of Indian small and medium-sized automotive component manufacturers to meet the quality requirements of vehicle manufacturers, thus enhancing their productivity and performance levels to facilitate their inclusion into both the domestic and the global automotive supply chains.

During its different phases, the Programme provided training sessions on quality management, cost efficiency and delivery, along with visits from industry experts. Throughout a process of training of engineers and industrial experts, the Programme delivered technical assistance to help companies in the automotive component industry meet the challenges brought by current Indian market conditions and to increase sustainability.

The feedback received from participating companies, national experts and technical counsellors of the Programme was overwhelmingly positive, stressing the importance of continuity in support to lock in the gains already realized and of providing counseling services to a larger number of companies.

3. Project objective

Aiming at strengthening Indian small and medium-sized automotive component suppliers to meet the requirements of vehicle and Tier-1 automotive component manufacturers, the project pursues the following core objectives:

- a) Enhancing the performance of domestic SMEs in the automotive component industry to facilitate their inclusion into national, regional and global supply chains and meeting relevant supply chain requirements (quality, cost, and delivery, as well as OHS, energy efficiency and environmental management standards).
- b) Enhancing the sustainability of the Partnership Programme through the consolidation of the institutional set-up, expansion of the UNIDO-ACMA methodology and the extension of the pool of well-trained national experts and counselors.

- c) Expanding the outreach of the Partnership Programme to upgrade and enhance the competitiveness of an increasing number of target companies along the supply chain in India, including lower tier suppliers.

The project has the following outcomes:

- A broad range of Indian automotive component manufacturers in the target clusters/localities will apply state-of-the-art methodologies for process, productivity as well as environmental and social improvement, and become more resource efficient, productive, and competitive in the marketplace.
- Trained national experts and business support institutions (public and private) will provide high-quality, sustainable services to local automotive component suppliers in the fields of continuous improvement, quality issues, lean manufacturing tools, social and environmental sustainability and energy efficiency.

Six main outputs are expected to be produced, with 30 main activities:

- a) Output 1: The programme's progress and effectiveness is assessed on a continuous basis through a well-defined M&E framework.
Lead Responsibility: UNIDO
- b) Output 2: New target clusters have undergone a mapping/baseline assessment, including the determination of possible partner institutions for participation in the Programme.
Lead Responsibility: UNIDO
- c) Output 3: A revised and adapted UNIDO-ACMA methodology includes modules relating to new issues of particular relevance to the automotive component industry, including e.g. cleaner production, energy efficiency, occupational health and safety, and is available to the project team and counterparts.
Lead Responsibility: UNIDO
- d) Output 4: National experts and representatives of business support and educational and training institutions have the capacity to organize and facilitate trainings on the enhanced UNIDO-ACMA methodology (continuous improvement/lean manufacturing methodologies) as well as other methodologies of relevance.
Lead Responsibility: ACMA
- e) Output 5: Selected clusters/supplier companies receive continuous assistance over a 24-months period and apply the above-mentioned methodologies to their production and skills development processes.
Lead Responsibility: ACMA
- f) Output 6: The effectiveness of the Partnership Programme has been rigorously assessed against national/international practices, and related policy recommendations formulated.
Lead Responsibility: UNIDO

4. Project implementation arrangements

- The team of national staff recruited by ACMA is responsible for the organization of (a) all trainings and workshops for the junior counsellors related to the productivity upgrading, continuous improvement, as well as environmental, energy and labour/workplace-related issues in the automotive component industry, and (b) the monthly review meetings (MRMs) for selected supplier clusters.

ACMA also provides equipment and supplies to cover the costs for ICT (laptops, cameras, beamers, etc.) and transport of national experts.

The national expert team cost is supposed to be covered by the industry contribution to be generated and collected by ACMA, which influences the overall size and composition of the expert team as well as of the duration of the contracts.

- Under the responsibility of ACMA, it is foreseen to raise an industry contribution of an average of 35% over the entire duration of this project, which is mainly envisaged to cover national expert/counselor expenses and local travel costs. This contribution is generated on the basis of the existing payment system of the UNIDO-ACMA Partnership Programme, which charges 0.1% of the turnover of participating automotive component manufacturers.
- UNIDO is responsible for hiring a full-time international expert in charge of overall coordination, reporting, documentation, awareness raising and communication with other relevant international and industry-specific organizations globally to promote the approach, M&E and building of linkages/synergies (cross-fertilization and learning) to other UNIDO supported automotive component supplier development projects.

UNIDO's component also foresees the issuance of sub-contracts for the identification, development, and codification of additional training materials targeting Training of Trainers as well as company recipients (scans and self-learning materials) on the basis of the existing UNIDO methodology. The project also envisages subcontracts for the provision of technical assistance for the adaptation and expansion of the UNIDO-ACMA methodology/training material/roadmap.

UNIDO is also responsible for (a) the provision of training programmes to relevant support institutions related to the productivity upgrading, continuous improvement, as well as environmental, energy and labour/workplace-related issues in the automotive component industry and (b) organize awareness seminars for OEM representatives on this project.

At the same time, it is foreseen to undertake study tours for counselors, policy makers and selected experts of local support institutions to other clusters and companies assisted through similar UNIDO projects in other countries or particularly successful auto cluster examples to experience the application of the cluster development methodology in the field, exchange experiences with other experts and peers, and learn from best practice.

5. Budget information:

Table 1. Financing plan summary²

#	Items	UNIDO	ACMA	Industry (tentative)	TOTAL
11	International expertise	270,000	-	-	270,000
17	Support staff	20,700	78,840		99,540
15	Project travel	10,000	140,000	348,600	498,600
16	Mission costs	32,400	-		32,400
17	National expertise	235,200	692,800	728,800	1,656,800
21	Sub-contracts	190,000	-		190,000
30	Study tours, training & conference	62,000	49,140	53,686	164,826
43	Office Premises	-	39,132		39,132

² Source: Project document.

#	Items	UNIDO	ACMA	Industry (tentative)	TOTAL
45	Equipment	-	53,803		53,803
51	Miscellaneous	9,374	112,000	-	121,374
80	M&E	80,000	-	-	80,000
	Total	909,674	1,165,715	1,131,086	3,206,475

Table 2. Co-Financing source breakdown

Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Total Amount (\$)
Industry contribution	Private sector	Cash	1,131,086
Total Co-financing (\$)			1,131,086

Source: Project document

Table 3. UNIDO budget expenditure

Item	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total Expenditure (\$)
Contractual Services	109,805	67,518	751	27,125	205,199
Local travel	0	9,544	4,686	12,149	26,379
Nat.Consult./Staff	13,706	70,120	68,462	75,890	228,177
Evaluation (measured per Output, i.e. 100245-1-53-01)	4,498	3,638	9,991	62,494	80,620
Staff & Intern Consultants	28,002	48,681	77,546	57,770	211,999
Staff Travel	2,022	7,051	5,502	14,614	29,189
Train/Fellowship/Study	357	49,455	8,843	0	58,656
Miscellaneous	-30	-167	238	-142	-100
Premises	0	0	0	15,800	15,800
Equipment	0	0	0	2,164	2,164
Support Cost IDC	20,002	32,787	21,584	26,636	101,009
Grand Total	173,864	284,990	187,613	232,006	878,472

Source: Source: SAP, December, 2017 (as on 4 December 2017)

II. Evaluation purpose and scope

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

The evaluation has two specific objectives:

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

The independent terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in 1/7/2014 to the estimated completion date in 31/3/2018.

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.

The evaluation will be carried out as an independent 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.

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

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

1. Data collection methods

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

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

2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

The key evaluation questions are the following:

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 (DGAI.17/Rev.1, 24 August 2006)

- (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, if possible)? To what extent have the expected results been achieved or are likely to be achieved against the project design? 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 to feed in the next phase?

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 1 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 1. Project evaluation criteria

#	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
A	Impact (or progress toward 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	• Gender mainstreaming	Yes
2	• M&E: ✓ M&E design ✓ M&E implementation	Yes
3	• Results-based Management (RBM)	Yes
E	Performance of partners	
1	• UNIDO	Yes
2	• National counterparts	Yes
3	• 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 5.

Table 5. 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 implemented in four phases which are not strictly sequential, but in many cases iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping:

- i. Desk review and data analysis;
- ii. Interviews, survey and literature review;
- iii. Field visits;
- iv. Data analysis and report writing.

V. Time schedule and deliverables

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from January 2018 to March 2018. The evaluation field mission to the project sites in India is tentatively planned for 22 January – 2 February 2018. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project.

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 to UNIDO 3 weeks after the end of the mission. The draft TE report is to be shared with the UNIDO IEV, UNIDO Project Manager and other stakeholders for comments and verification of factual and interpretation errors. The TE leader is expected to revise the draft TE report based on the comments received, edit the language and form and submit the final version in accordance with UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV standards.

Table 6. Tentative schedule

Timelines	Tasks
2 January 2017 – 22 Jan 2018	Desk review and preparation of inception report
5-6 March 2018 (to be confirmed with the Evaluation Manager)	Briefing with UNIDO Project Manager and experts based in Vienna (through Skype)
22 January – 2 February 2018	Field visits in India (New Delhi, Pune and Chennai)
February 2018	Preparation of first draft evaluation report
5-6 March 2018 (the exact date to be agreed with the Evaluation Manager in mid-January 2018)	Debriefing in Vienna
March 2018	Internal peer review of the report by the UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV and other stakeholders comments to draft evaluation report Final evaluation report

VI. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one International Evaluation Expert acting as the Team Leader and one National Evaluator. The evaluation team will possess relevant strong experience and expertise on evaluation and on private sector development. 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.

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.

An evaluation manager from UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV will provide technical backstopping to the evaluation team and ensure the quality of the evaluation. The UNIDO Project Manager and national project teams will act as resourced persons and provide support to the evaluation team and the evaluation Team Leader. The UNIDO Project Manager and the project team in New Delhi and Pune will provide logistical and administrative support the evaluation team to prepare for the field visits. The project team will provide a proposed list of stakeholders (e.g. government officials, private sector representatives and other relevant individuals) to the evaluation team who will make the final decision on who to consult. The project team will prepare a field visit schedule and arrange the meetings for the evaluation team, in coordination with the evaluation team, prior to the field visit.

The evaluation team will maintain close liaison with the representatives of UNIDO, other UN agencies as well as with the concerned national agencies, and with national and international project staff. The evaluation team is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment. However, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Government, the donor or UNIDO.

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 Team Leader will prepare, in collaboration with the team member, 1) an evaluation framework 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, 2) and a draft theory of change for field work. It will be discussed with and approved by the responsible UNIDO Evaluation Manager.

Evaluation report format and review procedures

The draft report will be delivered to the Independent Evaluation Division (IEV) (the suggested report outline is in Annex 4) and circulated to UNIDO staff and national stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or responses, or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to 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 evaluation team will present its preliminary findings to the local stakeholders at the end of the field visit and take into account their feedback in preparing the evaluation report. A presentation of preliminary findings will take place at UNIDO HQ after the field mission.

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

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

VIII. Quality assurance

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

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

Annex 1: Project Results Framework

The detailed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, and Risk Assessment Plan, which were both developed and implemented for this project will be shared with the evaluation expert once recruited.

<i>Activities</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
Output 1	
Activity 1.1: Development of an M&E framework tailored to the specific programme context and definition of roles and responsibilities in terms of data collection	UNIDO
Activity 1.2: Regular monitoring and evaluation	IE, National Experts, UNIDO
Activity 1.3: Final programme evaluation report written for publication and distribution	IE, National Experts, UNIDO
Output 2	
Activity 2.1: Overall mapping of target clusters/localities for project implementation (participatory process involving all key counterpart institutions)	UNIDO, DHI
Activity 2.2: Undertake an in-depth assessment of each selected target cluster/locality including (a) a mapping of all stakeholders, (b) their respective strengths and weaknesses, (c) number of firms in the clusters, size of firms, their location, products / services, internal/export market, as well as supply chain linkages, (d) analysis of the respective production/distribution chains, and (e) past/ongoing/planned initiatives related to cluster, networks, business linkages development or any other upgrading activities targeted at productivity or quality issues.	NEs
Activity 2.3: Conduct a survey of OEM/Tier 1 requirements (ISO as well as private standards) in order to inform the upgrading methodology to be developed/revised.	NEs
Activity 2.4: Organization of focus group meetings hosting representatives of the identified core institutions with the objective to (a) discuss the findings and recommendations outlined in the assessments/mapping; (b) gather feedback and suggestions from the stakeholders; (c) define the concrete role/involvement of each participating institution in this project component; and (d) present the UNIDO-ACMA Programme approach.	NEs
Activity 2.5: Finalization and dissemination of assessments.	NEs, UNIDO
Output 3	
Activity 3.1: Gather expert inputs to codify the current methodology and expand it to cover additional modules on Organizational Health and Safety (OHS), social/workplace issues, environmental management and energy efficiency.	UNIDO, ACMA, NEs, IEs
Activity 3.2: Carry out consultation meetings with relevant educational and training institutions to (1) validate the codified and expanded methodology, and (2) identify available services and material on subjects related to the above mentioned issues to complement the toolkit.	UNIDO, ACMA, NEs, IEs, support institutions
Activity 3.3: In cooperation with interested and relevant institutions, complement and adapt available material to fit the automotive-SME context, and develop expanded modules on the above mentioned subjects to complement the UNIDO-ACMA methodology.	UNIDO, ACMA, NEs, IEs
Output 4	

Activity 4.1: Integration of lead experts/trainers (senior counsellors)	ACMA
Activity 4.2: Selection and recruitment of junior counsellors – minimum one per cluster/company sub-group	ACMA
Activity 4.3: Organization of training courses on the UNIDO/ACMA methodology	ACMA, lead trainers and experts
Activity 4.4: Organization of a study tour to other UNIDO supported clusters (in India and/or abroad)	UNIDO, cluster trainers
Activity 4.5: Organization of site visits to previously upgraded companies to learn from practical examples and the experiences company staff with the programme	Lead trainers, ACMA
Activity 4.6: Coaching and monitoring of junior counsellors by master engineers/lead trainers	Lead trainers, ACMA
Output 5	
Activity 5.1: Selection of pilot firms based on the results of the baseline assessment and the stakeholder consultations, the received applications, as well as on the basis of agreed criteria.	UNIDO, ACMA, national experts
Activity 5.1: The management of the SMEs is expected to commit to the project by signing a Memorandum of Understanding	
Activity 5.2: Development of an overall training and counselling work plan to coordinate the rollout and clearly set responsibilities and targets of individual experts/participating cluster firms.	ACMA, IEs, UNIDO
Activity 5.3: Inception site visits/needs assessment carried out at the level of participating companies and updating of the counselling roadmap for each individual target firm	ACMA, Junior counsellors, Master engineers
Activity 5.4: Appointment of continuous improvement teams in pilot SMEs	ACMA, Junior counsellors, Master engineers
Activity 5.4: A “continuous improvement team” will be identified in each company (number of members depending on firm size) and a team leader will be appointed. The team will consist of members of all kinds of hierarchical levels (from management to machine operator) and departments	
Activity 5.5: Experts will visit the firms and work with the teams. They will start with the collection of baseline data. Junior counsellors will be accompanied and supported by master engineers / trainers as deemed appropriate.	ACMA, Junior counsellors, Master engineers
Activity 5.5: Continuous review of problem areas identified, opportunities and priority issues to be targeted by the firms	
Activity 5.6: Implementation of the counselling roadmap as agreed, including counselling on new modules/topics, as appropriate. ACMA, Junior counsellors, Master engineers 17 The experts will keep on supporting the firms in the implementation of the productivity enhancement measures and will formally visit them to check progress on a regular basis. The master engineers will keep supporting the junior counsellors and accompany them to additional company visits as deemed necessary. Improvements and statistics will be tracked regularly, following the elaborated assessment and monitoring framework.	CMA, Junior counsellors, Master engineers
Activity 5.6: Final assessment of the pilot firms (track of improvements) together with counsellors	
Activity 5.7: Preparation of a final report and detailed case studies, outlining the results achieved in each pilot company and on cluster level.	ACMA, Junior counsellors, Master engineers
Activity 5.8: Development of a market-based external feedback system to help companies determine their progress and identify new areas for improvement. Findings	UNIDO, International Expert

integrated into future project activities.	
Output 6	
Activity 6.1: Development of benchmarking methodology and definition of approach	UNIDO, International Expert
Activity 6.2: Collection of baseline data on firm-level performance indicators (assisted/upgraded and unassisted firms)	National Expert
Activity 6.3: Collection of interim M&E data on performance indicators (assisted/upgraded firms only)	National Expert
Activity 6.4: Collection of post-programme data on firm-level performance indicators (assisted/upgraded and unassisted firms) following the rollout of the upgrading programme	National Expert
Activity 6.5: Preparation of an evaluation report and presentation to the Steering Committee and other stakeholders (including policy recommendations)	UNIDO, IE, National Expert

Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria

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

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>
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 and 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 (finances, income, costs saving, expenditure and etc) 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, including vulnerable groups, and hence generating employment and access to education and training?
B	<p>Project design</p>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Overall design</u> ✓ The problem, need or gap to be addressed by the project is clearly identified, with clear target beneficiaries? ✓ 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 it include M&E plan and adequate budget for M&E activities? ✓ Risk management: Are critical risks related to financial, social-political, institutional, environmental and implementation aspects identified with specific risk ratings? Are their mitigation measures identified? Where possible, are the mitigation measures included in project activities/outputs and monitored under the M&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 change or benefit to a society or community (not as a mean or process), do outcomes describe change in target group's behaviour/performance or system/institutional

	<p>performance, do outputs describe deliverables that project will produce to achieve outcomes? Are the expected results realistic, measurable and not a reformulation or summary of lower level results? Do outputs plus assumptions lead to outcomes, do outcomes plus assumptions lead to impact? Can all outputs be delivered by the project, are outcomes outside UNIDO's control but within its influence?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Indicators: Do indicators describe and specify expected results (impact, outcomes and outputs) in terms of quantity, quality and time? Do indicators change at each level of results and independent from indicators at higher and lower levels? Do indicators not restate expected results and not cause them? Are indicators necessary and sufficient and do they provide enough triangulation (cross-checking)? Are they indicators sex-diaggregated, if applicable? Are the indicator SMART? ✓ 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? ✓ Are key assumptions properly summarized and reflecting the proper level in the results chain in the logframe?
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 attributable to the intervention rather than to external factors? ✓ What can be done to make the project more effective? ✓ Were the right target groups reached?
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 and timeframe? 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? ✓ 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

	<p>Project Team and annual Work Plans?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 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? ✓ To what extent the outputs and results have been institutionalized? <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?
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 ○ Was the M&E plan included in the project document? Was it practical and sufficient at the point of project approval? ○ 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; ○ Does the M&E plan specify what, who and how frequent monitoring, review, evaluations and data collection will take place? Is the M&E plan consistent with the logframe (especially indicators and sources of verification)? ○ Does it allocate adequate budget for M&E activities?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ M&E implementation ○ 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, accurate and timely? ○ 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? ○ 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>Results-based management (RBM)</u> <p><i>Results-Based work planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved. ○ Are there any annual work plans? Are work-planning processes results-based? Has the logframe been used to determine the annual work plan (including key activities and milestone)? ○ Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. <p><i>Results-based monitoring and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Verify whether an M&E system is in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on selected indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; ○ Review the monitoring tool currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive? ○ Do project team and manager make decisions and corrective actions based on analysis from M&E system and based on results achieved? Is information on project performance and results achievement being presented to the Project Steering Committee to make decisions and corrective actions? Do the Project team and managers and PSC regularly ask for performance and results information? <p><i>Results-based reporting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the PSC. ○ Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil donor and UNIDO reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed delays or poor performance, if applicable?) ○ Assess how results and lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.
E	Performance of partners

1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>UNIDO</u> ○ 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 ○ Timely recruitment of project staff ○ 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 ○ 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. ○ To what extent the project has a proper and operational governance system (e.g. PSC with clear roles and responsibilities)? ○ 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)?
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>National counterparts</u> ✓ Design ○ Responsiveness to UNIDO's invitation for engagement in designing the project ✓ Implementation ○ Ownership of the project ○ Provide financial contribution as planned (cash or in-kind) ○ 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, if applicable ✓ Support by the donor's country presence (if applicable) supporting the project for example through engagement in policy dialogue
F	<p>Overall assessment</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



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	International Evaluation Expert – Team Leader
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	India and UNIDO HQ in Vienna, Austria
Start of Contract (EOD):	2 January 2018
End of Contract (COB):	30 March 2018
Number of Working Days:	30 working days

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes.

PROJECT CONTEXT (See evaluation terms of reference attached)

Duties: The International Evaluation Expert will act as a Team Leader in this project evaluation according to the Terms of Reference. She/he will be responsible for the preparation of the evaluation report, including the coordination of inputs from other team members. The Team Leader will perform the following tasks:

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument if needed; Prepare an evaluation framework and draft theory of change for the project intervention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation framework Draft Theory of Change 	5 days	Home-based
2. Briefing with the project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission 	1 day	Through Skype

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
	planning; • Division of evaluation tasks with the team member.		
3. Conduct field mission between 22 January -2 February 2018 ⁵ .	• Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; • Agreement with the team member on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; • Evaluation presentation of the evaluation's initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission.	12 days	India (New Delhi, Pune and Chennai)
4. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.	• After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed	2 days	Vienna, Austria
5. Prepare the evaluation report, with inputs from the team member, according to the TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the team member and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report; Share the evaluation report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.	• Draft evaluation report.	7 days	Home-based
6. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	• Final evaluation report.	3 days	Home-based
	TOTAL	30 days	

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

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Managerial competencies:

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

Core competencies:

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

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree preferably in economics, trade, development or related disciplines.

Technical and Functional Experience:

- At least 15 years of progressive and proven professional development experience in the field of evaluation and private sector development;
- A minimum of ten years practical experience in the field of development projects, including evaluation experience at the international level involving technical cooperation in developing countries;
- Adequate understanding of local social and cultural issues;
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English is required.

Absence of Conflict of Interest:

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



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	National Evaluator – Team Member
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	India (New Delhi, Pune and Chennai)
Start of Contract (EOD):	17 Jan 2018
End of Contract (COB):	30 March 2018
Number of Working Days:	17 working days

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Office for Independent Evaluation is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes.

PROJECT CONTEXT (See evaluation Terms of Reference attached.)

Duties: The National Evaluator will act as a Team Member in this project evaluation according to the Terms of Reference. She/he will be responsible for the preparation of the evaluation report, including the coordination of inputs from other team members. He/she will perform the following tasks:

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
Desk review Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information; in cooperation with the team leader, determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in English (questionnaires, logic models); If need be, recommend adjustments to the evaluation framework and Theory of Change in order to ensure their understanding in the local context.	Evaluation questions, questionnaires/interview guide, logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context; A stakeholder mapping, in coordination with the project team.	3 days	Home-based
Coordinate the evaluation mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed evaluation schedule. • List of stakeholders to interview during the field 	1 days	Home-based

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with project staff in the field.	missions.		
Coordinate and conduct the field mission with the team leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required; Consult with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks. Conduct the translation for the Team Leader, when needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission. • Agreement with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks. 	10 days (including travel days)	Delhi, Pune, Chennai
Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the Team Leader.	Draft evaluation report prepared.	3 days	Home-based
TOTAL		17 days	

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Managerial competencies:

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

Core competencies:

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

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree preferably in economics, private sector development, engineering, development or related disciplines.

Technical and Functional Experience:

- A minimum of 10 years practical experience in the field of industrial development or automotive industry;

- Experience with evaluation of development projects will be an asset;
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries in the region.

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

Absence of Conflict of Interest:

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

Annex 4: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report

Executive summary (maximum 5 pages)

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

1. Introduction

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

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

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

3. Project's quality and performance

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

4. Performance of Partners

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

5. Factors facilitating or limiting the achievement of results

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

6. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

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

Annexes (to be put online separately later)

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

Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Project Title:

UNIDO 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.