



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

DRAFT

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent evaluation

Cosmetic Sector Quality Programme

UNIDO Project No.: 120354

MARCH 2018

Contents

I. Project background and overview.....	3
1. Project factsheet.....	3
2. Project context.....	4
3. Project objective	5
4. Project implementation arrangements.....	7
5. Main findings on project progress	8
6. Budget information.....	9
II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation	11
III. Evaluation approach and methodology.....	11
1. Data collection methods	12
2. Evaluation key questions and criteria	13
IV. Evaluation process.....	15
V. Evaluation team composition	15
VI. Time schedule.....	16
VII. Evaluation Deliverables	16
VIII. Quality assurance.....	17
Annex 1: Project results framework	18
Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria	22
Annex 3: Job descriptions	28
Annex 4: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report	35
Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality	38
Annex 6. Guidance and checklist on lessons learned quality criteria	39
Annex 7. GEF Minimum requirements for M&E	42
Annex 8. Rating tables	43

I. Project background and overview

1. Project factsheet

Project title	Cosmetic Sector Quality Programme for Colombia
UNIDO project No. and/or ID	Project No. 120354
Region	The Americas
Country	Colombia
Planned implementation start date	October 2014
Planned implementation end date	October 2018
Actual implementation start date	12 January 2015
Actual implementation end date	31 December 2018
Implementing agency	UNIDO
Executing partner(s)/entity(ies)	-
Donor(s):	(1) State Secretariat for Economic Affairs of Switzerland (SECO) (2) Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Tourism (MINCIT) - Programme for Productive Transformation (PTP)
Total project allotment	USD 2,700,700 (incl. 13% support costs) SECO → USD 2,100,700 MINCIT/PTP → USD 600,000
Total co-financing at design (in cash and in-kind)	Cash: EUR 115,000 (UNIDO: 90,0000/SECO: 25,000)
Materialized co-financing at project completion (in cash and in-kind)	Cash: PA: EUR 115,000 UNIDO → EUR 90,000 SECO → EUR 25,000 Project: USD 2,391,425.57 SECO → USD 1,860,452.12 MINCIT/PTP → USD 530,973.45
Independent Evaluation date	April-June 2018

(Source: Project document)¹

¹ Project information data throughout these TOR are to be verified during the inception phase.

2. Project context

Since the beginning of the 90's, Colombia has pursued a strategy of economic liberalization, seeking integration into world markets and an active participation in the multilateral trading system. In recent years, Colombia has concluded a substantive number of Free Trade Agreements (FTA), including with the EFTA countries. While these agreements enhance trade opportunities for Colombian products by facilitating access to new markets, the country is still not able to fully exploit its export potential for the generation of much needed employment. A key limiting factor for the Colombian Export Sector is the national quality system – NQS (which covers Metrology, Accreditation, Standards and Conformity Assessment Services).

The National Development Plan 2010-2014 (PND in Spanish) aiming at the international recognition of Colombia's economy as an emerging economy, which is attractive for investment and tourism since is one of the economies with high growth expectations for the next decades, recognized the above described need for an adequate QI. Overall, the PND constitutes the guideline that public entities, private sector and civil society must follow to address the most crucial needs of the population. The Plan identifies the following main pillars as follows: Convergence and regional development; sustainable growth and competitiveness; equal opportunities; peace building; environmental sustainability and risk prevention; governance, citizen participation and fighting corruption; and international relevance.

In order to ensure that these targets are met, the ministry of Trade, Industry and Tourism (MCIT) established a public-private partnership named "the Programme for Productive Transformation (PTP)" in 2008. One of its main pillars is the promotion of productivity and competitiveness of sectors with high export potential as well as sustainable growth. At the same, the PTP constitutes one of the key elements of the sectoral component of the Industrial Policy also known as the Entrepreneurial Development Policy of 2011. PTP has acknowledged the National Quality Subsystem – NQS (which covers standardization, metrology, accreditation and conformity assessment) to be an important element, which requires attention and support in order to foster the growth of the Colombian export sector.

Although the Colombian NQS had recently received support through an EU funded technical cooperation programme (ALA/2007/019-005) and was able to achieve a variety of positive results, the NQS finds itself at an early stage, presenting various challenges, such as:

(a) Institutional level: consolidations of the government strategy to obtain international recognition of its quality infrastructure and conformity assessment services (e.g. calibration, testing, inspection, accreditation, certification);

(b) Supply side: potential for value addition of export products is by far not realized. Lack of appropriate technology and skills for compliance with international quality, private and sustainability standards.

Origin of Project Proposal

The Vice-minister of Commerce, Industry and Tourism of Colombia visited UNIDO HQ on 09 March 2012, where he highlighted Colombia's industrial policy towards free market and open competition mentioned in Colombia's National Plan for Development 2010-2014. On 18 May 2012 the Chief of Economic Cooperation of SECO met with staff members of PTC/TCB/QSC (now PTC/TII/SQI) and PTC/ECC/IEE to discuss potential cooperation

opportunities on trade-related issues and energy efficiency-related matters. On 20 June 2012 the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) contacted UNIDO Office in Colombia (PTC/FLD/LAC/COL) for a preparatory assistance in the area of metrology to be field latest **mid-September 2012**.

The purpose of the Preparatory Assistance (PA) was to assess and define with SECO and national stakeholders the technical nature/scope of UNIDO's potential future intervention(s). In the course of the PA a situation analysis was conducted, the Colombia's National Quality Infrastructure key institutions were assessed (stakeholder mapping) and their absorption capacity evaluated. Furthermore, by applying a risk assessment matrix possible challenges for future UNIDO TII-related interventions were broadly evaluated. Based on the results, a rational and strategic approach was defined, which allowed the development of a full-fledged project document, which was submitted to the counterpart and to SECO for their respective approval and funding. Project implementation started in January 2015 and the projected end date is 31 December 2018.

The project document had foreseen regular monitoring and a terminal evaluation (TE). However, due to the high probability of an extension of the project (second phase), it was agreed at the Steering Committee Meeting in 2017 to conduct an independent mid-term review (MTR) in year four (4) before the second phase will be initiated. The results and recommendations of this mid-term evaluation are to contribute to the formulation of the subsequent phase, which is planned to commence in January 2019.

3. Project objective

The overall objective of the project is to foster Colombia's integration into the regional and multilateral trading systems by enhancing its trade capacities and performance. This will be achieved partly through the strengthening of the National Quality Infrastructure and a first pilot support programme aimed at enhancing and improving the cosmetic sector's capacity, in particular products derived from natural ingredients, to comply with international quality, private and sustainability standards in order to generate employment and foster Colombia's socio-economic development. The project consists of three complementary components have been developed, in addition to project management, to be implemented over a period of four years.

Project Component 1: The technical capacity of the National Metrology Institute (NMI), the National Accreditation Board (ONAC), and the National Institute of Food and Drugs Surveillance (INVIMA) are strengthened to serve the cosmetic sector.

Project Component 2: The national quality infrastructure is strengthened to provide internationally recognized services to the cosmetic sector, in particular key functions providing conformity assessment.

Project Component 3: Compliance with international quality, private and sustainability standards, technical regulations and market requirements is enhanced along the natural ingredients Value Chain (VC) for cosmetic production.

The following are, in brief, some of the expected outputs of the project/programme, for each component

- **Output 1.1** An in-depth assessment of the country cosmetic sector's requirements /needs on proficiency testing (PT) – *sector driven*

- **Output 1.2** ONAC technical capacity is strengthened to provide internationally recognized accreditation services to Inspection Bodies (ISO 17020) and Conformity Assessment Bodies (ISO 17011) – *sector driven*
- **Output 1.3** ONAC technical staff resources (auditors, assessors, trainers and technical experts) are trained and qualified to support the accreditation of IBs and CABs following internationally-recognized curricula and international best practices – *sector driven*
- **Output 1.4** NMI technical staff resources are trained and qualified in chemical metrology following internationally-recognized curricula and international best practices – *sector driven*
- **Output 1.5** INVIMA technical staff trained and qualified in conformity assessment, in accordance with international best practices.
- **Output 1.6** Support the NMI in the identification and development of selected reference materials (RM) in chemical metrology – *sector driven*
- **Output 2.1** A market survey of the NQI servicing the cosmetic sector (VC approach) – *sector driven*
- **Output 2.2** An in-depth assessment on the country's laboratories (mainly for testing and calibration and inspection purposes) – *sector driven*
- **Output 2.3** At least three (3) conformity assessment service providers are ready to obtain accreditation by ONAC with international recognition following the implementation of a technical support programme (based on the results of output 2.1 & 2.2) – *sector driven*
- **Output 2.4** A roadmap for acceptance of Colombia into OECD Mutual Acceptance of Data (MAD) system is prepared
- **Output 2.5** ONAC and INVIMA are supported to obtain international recognition on GLP in order to develop accreditation services locally
- **Output 2.6** At least one (1) laboratory is supported to obtain internationally recognized GLP accreditation following the implementation of a technical support programme (idem output 2.3) – *sector driven*
- **Output 2.7** An awareness campaign promotes the role, mandate, benefits, and services offered by the NQS to the cosmetic sector
- **Output 3.1** ICONTEC, in coordination with the cosmetic sector, actively participates at standards-related regional and international for a
- **Output 3.2** An in-depth assessment carried out jointly with ICONTEC to identify relevant international quality, private, sustainability standards (e.g. Organic, BioTrade/UEBT) applicable to the natural ingredients VC
- **Output 3.3** Trade and market competitiveness analysis for the cosmetic sector and key natural ingredients products are conducted jointly with the PTP Intelligence Unit
- **Output 3.4** A pool of local resources trained and qualified for the provision of business advisory services and capacity building to the VC members (based on the results of output 3.2 & 3.3)
- **Output 3.5** A number of key VC members (e.g. growers, producers, exporters, etc.) are trained on standards compliance (ref. output 3.2), technical regulations, best practices, production, handling techniques, etc., through the implementation of a technical support programme
- **Output 3.6** PROEXPORT know-how and service provision on the importance of complying with market requirements and international quality and sustainability standards is strengthened
- **Output 3.7** A number new ingredients based on BioTrade principles are identified in collaboration with SENA La Salada through the implementation of a pilot programme with a number of selected SMEs

4. Project implementation arrangements

UNIDO:

UNIDO is responsible for the overall management and coordination of the project. The Standards and Quality Infrastructure Division (former Quality, Standards and Compliance Unit) has the overall responsibility on behalf of UNIDO. SQI assigns the task of project implementation to the **UNIDO Representative in Colombia (UR)** with regard to overall coordination and to a **SQI Project Manager** based in Vienna with regard to the technical components of the project (both positions are not funded by the project). In line with the UN administrative rules and regulations, UNIDO: (i) takes all decisions regarding staff recruitment, contractual arrangements/agreements, technical assistance, backstopping, and project supervision, monitoring and reporting; and (ii) considers both local and international procurement sources taking into account specification, quality and price (best value for money).

Project Management: The overall coordination of project implementation is ensured by the **UNIDO Representative for Colombia (UR)**, in close collaboration with UNIDO's TII Branch (former TCB); he acts as Team Leader for the coordination, supervising the PMU, and working closely with the focal point appointed by the MINCIT for the best planning and implementation of the project. Additionally, he provides strategic guidance and maintains close relationship with donor and counterparts. The management of the technical project components is ensured by the **TII/SQI Project Manager (PMTII)**.

The project manager is assisted by a project associate for the project and based at the UNIDO HQs. Both, the UR and the TII Project Manager represent UNIDO in the Steering Committee (SC) of the project and work together as a team, ensuring the results orientation and efficiency of delivery. The UR will be the main focal point for coordination with SECO and other SC members.

Operational level: a Project Management Unit (PMU) has been established in Bogota and is headed by a **National Project Coordinator (PC)**, who is in charge of operations and coordination, administration and monitoring under the supervision of the UR. She is supported by a national project assistant, and a national communication specialist. Day-to-day operations are led by the PC in close consultation with the UR and the TII project manager. Technical input is provided through long/short-term national and international experts in the area of SMTQ and for the respective value chain. The UNIDO regional office in Bogota provides strategic and administrative support (including local disbursements and recruitments). A **Steering Committee (SC)** comprising UNIDO, SECO, the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Tourism (MINCIT) as main Government counterpart, the National Business Association of Colombia (ANDI) and the PTP has been established. Close collaboration with the PTP is sought to be able to benefit from their outreach and coordination function between key public and private sector players in the targeted value chain.

The SC's main role is strategic guidance and monitoring of progress towards established objective and outcomes. To this end the SC may invite experts as reference persons and/or observers as deemed appropriate (i.e. beneficiaries, implementing agencies). It will be responsible to take all strategic decisions, which may include approval of the inception report as the basis for the project

implementation, monitoring and evaluation; significant changes to programme objectives and budget re-allocation; significant amendments to timeline (implementation of activities); changes of key beneficiaries; approval of implementation reports, including detailed financial reports, etc. In case of any dispute, a decision is taken by the following core members: SECO, MINCIT and UNIDO. The SC meets at least twice a year in Bogota. In

addition, ad-hoc sub-committees to the steering committee can be formed to assess thematic/output results and take adequate corrective actions. Such sub-committees will report to the SC.

The relationship with other agencies, institutions, and associations benefiting from the Project are formally arranged by UNIDO.

Counterpart roles and responsibilities

The MINCIT acts as the official Government counterpart for the project. The PTP acts as the operational counterpart for UNIDO. In this manner the project implementation is aligned with the initiatives and work plan pursued by the PTP aimed at supporting the cosmetic sector. Additionally, the PTP and the Ministry have appointed a focal point person at no cost to the project, who is responsible of representing the Government and ensuring coordination with other government stakeholders.

Furthermore, the counterparts are responsible for

- Appointing focal points in each of the respective beneficiary institutions to coordinate the activities/facilitate the implementation of project activities;
- Effective participation in the different activities especially those involving the developing and implementation/adoption of the policies, processes, and regulations;
- Expediting the process of any legislation or executive order (decree), which may be required for the smooth execution of the project;
- Resolving any institutional difficulty(ies) or obstacle(s) that may hinder the implementation of project-related activities and/or has direct impact on project objectives;
- Nominate and select appropriate technical personnel for training and study tours (internal & external).
- Support the organization and preparation of meetings, workshops, and other training-related activities/programmes in accordance with the project;

5. Main findings on project progress

The project started in January 2015 and by 30 November 2017 it was reported to the Steering Committee that fourteen (14) out of twenty (20) outputs had been finalized. Within a period of 35 months, the project reached 91.7% of its target, thereby executing USD \$ 1,716,857 corresponding to 71.8% of the total budget planned for the four year programme. It should be noted that the remaining 8.3% until project closure will be used mainly for activities related to the Programmes for Technical Assistance targeted at Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and Conformity Assessment Bodies (CABs). A total of twenty-six (26) beneficiary companies (SMEs) and sixteen (16) CABs have so far been supported by the programme, but are facing complex challenges and greater investment needs, which are being addressed in year four of project implementation.

Further details on the progress can be obtained from the Project Progress Report (dated 30 November 2017).

6. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary

Description	Project Preparation (in EUR)	Project (in USD)	Total (in USD)
Financing	25,000 (SECO)	2,100,700 (SECO) 600,000 (PTP)	2,728,355
Co-financing ² (in cash and/or in-kind)	90,000 (UNIDO)		99,558
Total (\$)	115,000 incl 13% support cost	2,700,700 incl. 13% support cost	2,827,913

Source: SSS/Project document, exchange rate as at 05/2015 when PA was subject to closure (1 EUR=1.1062 USD)

Table 2. Financing plan summary – project component breakdown

Project outcomes	Donor 1 (in USD) excl. support cost	Donor 2 (in USD) excl. support cost	Total (in USD)
1. The technical capacity of the National Metrology Institute (NMI), the National Accreditation Board (ONAC), and the National Institute of Food and Drugs Surveillance (INVIMA) are strengthened to serve the cosmetic sector.	SECO: 429,651.00	MINCIT/PTP: 40,000.00	469,651.00
2. The national quality infrastructure is strengthened to provide internationally recognized services to the cosmetic sector, in particular key functions providing conformity assessment.	SECO: 488,870.00	MINCIT/PTP: 299,231.45	788,101.45
3. Compliance with international quality, private and sustainability standards, technical regulations and market requirements is enhanced along the natural ingredients Value Chain (VC) for cosmetic production.	SECO: 453,257.00	MINCIT/PTP 191,742.00	644,999.00
4. Monitoring and Evaluation	SECO: 80,000.00	-	80,000.00
5. Project Management	SECO: 354,486.00	-	354,486.00
6. contribution (3%) for further development of the programme & effective and efficient management and administration = 3/13 th of Programme Support Cost ³	SECO: 54,188.12	-	54,188.12
Total (in USD)	1,860,452.12	530,973.45	2,391,425.57

Source: SAP Reporting Function

² Co-financing types are grant, soft loan, hard loan, guarantee, in kind, or cash.

³ See Letter of Agreement between the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) and UNIDO, dated 29 September 2014.

Table 4. UNIDO budget execution⁴ (Grant No.: 2000002856 & 2000002908) as of 10 March 2018

Items of Expenditure	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total Exp.
Contractual Services	80,129.03	124,296.69	105,227.38	109,637.08	419,290.18
Equipment	22,690.13	12,015.49	222,624.01	15,752.90	273,082.53
International Meetings		7,034.59	-46.63		6,987.96
Local travel	15,429.29	36,723.13	32,193.11	2,981.79	87,327.32
Natl. Consult./Staff	126,658.69	141,706.63	261,331.04	118,832.14	648,528.50
Intl. Consult./Staff	52,905.20	70,011.70	116,226.24	44,337.58	283,480.72
Other Direct Costs	24,862.56	29,143.71	34,966.13	4,485.86	93,458.26
Premises	650.04	0	0	0	650.04
Staff and Intern	-	-	-	-	-
Staff Travel	13,397.17	13,818.58	9,771.23	35.59	37,022.57
Train/Fellowship/Study	16,095.78	80,107.16	88,868.73	914.96	185,986.63
Grand Total	352,817.89	514,857.68	871,161.24	296,977.90	2,035,814.71

Source: UNIDO. ERP database as of [10 March 2018]

⁴ Disbursement: Expenditure, incl. commitment

II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The independent evaluation will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date up to the date of the evaluation. It will assess project performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

The evaluation has an additional purpose of drawing lessons and developing recommendations for UNIDO, the Government, Donors, and the project stakeholders and partners that may help improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of subsequent phase(s), similar future projects and activities in the country and on a global scale upon project completion. The evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in the focal area, country, or region.

The evaluation should provide an analysis of the attainment of the project objective and the corresponding outputs and outcomes. Through its assessments, the Evaluation Team (ET) should enable the Government, counterparts, UNIDO 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 reexamination of the relevance of the objectives and other elements of project design according to the project evaluation parameters defined in chapter III below.

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective, i.e. the strengthening of the national quality infrastructure through enhancing and improving the cosmetic sector's capacity to comply with international quality, private and sustainability standards in order to generate employment and foster Colombia's socio-economic development, and to what extent the project has also considered sustainability and scaling-up factors for increasing contribution to sustainable results and further impact.

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 evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy⁵ UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle⁶.

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

⁵ UNIDO. (2015). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (UNIDO/DGB/(M).98/Rev.1)

⁶ 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)

UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division on the conduct of the evaluation and methodological issues.

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

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

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

In those cases where baseline information for relevant indicators is not available, the evaluation team will aim at establishing a proxy-baseline through recall and secondary information.

1. Data collection methods

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

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), output reports, back-to-office mission report(s), end-of-contract report(s) and relevant correspondence
 - Notes from 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 Colombia**
 - On-site observation of results achieved by the project, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies
 - Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Country Office(s) representative to the extent that he/she was involved in the project, and the project's management members and the various national [and sub-regional] authorities dealing with project activities as necessary

- (d) Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluation team and/or by the Independent Evaluation Division for triangulation purposes

2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

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

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 detailed questions to assess each evaluation criterion are in annex 2. The **rating criteria** and table to be used is presented in annex 8.

Table 5. Summary of Project evaluation criteria

Index	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
A	Progress to 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	• Environment and socio-economic aspects	

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E: (focus on Monitoring) ✓ 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

IV. Evaluation process

The evaluation will be implemented in phases which are not strictly sequential, but in many cases iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping:

- UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (IED) identifies and selects the Evaluation Team members, in consultation with project manager
- Inception phase
 - ✓ Desk review and data analysis: The evaluation team will review project-related documentation and literature and carry out a data analysis
 - ✓ Briefing of consultant(s) at UNIDO Headquarters (HQ)
 - ✓ Preparation of inception report: The evaluation team will prepare the inception report providing details on the methodology for the evaluation and include an evaluation matrix with specific issues for the evaluation; the specific site visits will be determined during the inception phase, taking into consideration the findings and recommendations of project progress reports or mid-term reviews.
 - ✓ Interviews, survey
- Field phase
 - ✓ Country field visit(s)
 - ✓ ET Debriefing in the field to project stakeholders
- Reporting phase
 - ✓ After field mission, HQ debriefing with preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations by the ET leader
 - ✓ Data analysis and draft report writing
 - ✓ Draft report submission
 - ✓ Sharing and factual validation of draft report with stakeholders
 - ✓ Final evaluation report Submission and QA/clearance by IED, and
 - ✓ Two pages summary take-away message
- IED Final report issuance and distribution with the respective management response sheet and further follow-up, and publication of evaluation report in UNIDO intra/internet sites

V. Evaluation team composition

A staff from the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division will be assigned as Evaluation Manager and will coordinate and provide evaluation 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 IED evaluation manager.

The evaluation team will be composed of at least one international evaluation consultant acting as the team leader and one national consultant. The evaluation team members will possess relevant strong experience and skills on evaluation and evaluation management, including gender. Expertise and experience in the related technical subject of the project is desirable. The evaluation consultants will be contracted by UNIDO.

In some specific cases (e.g. complex projects, regional projects, projects at risk), an IED evaluation officer could be also assigned to be part of the evaluation team and hence participate in the whole conduct as such.

The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions in annex 3 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.

VI. Time schedule

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from April to June 2018.

The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned for April 2018.

The Draft Evaluation report will be submitted 2 to 4 weeks after the end of the mission.

The Final Evaluation report will be submitted 2 weeks after comments received.

VII. Evaluation Deliverables

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 the national consultant; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable⁷.

Evaluation report and review procedures

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (the suggested report outline is in annex 4) and circulated to UNIDO staff and national stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or responses, or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division for collation and onward transmission to the project evaluation team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

⁷ The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report and a Guide on how to formulate lessons learned (including quality checklist) prepared by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

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 evaluation 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 Spanish (with the executive summary also in English) and follow the outline given in annex 4. The ET should submit the final version of the TE report in accordance with UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division standards.

VIII. Quality assurance

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

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. UNIDO's Independent Evaluation Division should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO's evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation report are reviewed by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, which will issue and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet, as well as submit to relevant stakeholders as required.

Annex 1: Project results framework

Strengthening Colombia's national quality infrastructure through the Cosmetic sector's enhanced compliance capacity to meet international quality, private and sustainability standards			
Strategy of Intervention	Key Performance Indicators	Means of Verification	External Factors (assumptions / risks)
Development objective: Colombia's trade capacity and performance are improved in the cosmetics sector to enhance employment generation and socio-economic development.	% increase in exports per sector (proxy) % increase in sector employment (by gender) # jobs created and retained (by gender)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country trade/export reports and statistics MINCIT and PTP annual reports Project monitoring and evaluation reports Sector's competitiveness analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall stability both at government and at country level High degree of coordination and consensus between all relevant stakeholders Effective participation of national and regional institutions
Outcome 1. The technical capacity of the National Metrology Institute (NMI), the National Accreditation Board (ONAC), and the National Institute of Food and Drugs Surveillance (INVIMA) are strengthened to serve the cosmetic sector.	ONAC nationally, regionally and internationally recognized # of accreditation services available NMI measurements internationally traceable and recognized # calibration services available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project progress reports Evaluation reports. CMCs signed with BIPM ILAC MRA / IAF MLA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MINCIT and NMI/ONAC/INVIMA commitment in providing necessary resources (human and financial) for achieving objectives. NMI/ONAC/INVIMA commitment towards the operation and introduction of best practices.
Output 1.1 An in-depth assessment of the country cosmetic sector's requirements /needs on proficiency testing (PT) – <i>sector driven</i>	Identification of country's requirements # of PT conducted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PT results Internal audit results Laboratory reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective participation by the target beneficiaries in the planned project activities and in accordance to the set timeline. Government commitment in providing necessary resources (human and financial) for achieving objectives and sustainability of the beneficiary institutions. Government commitment towards the operation, introduction of best practices and recognition of mandate and service delivered. Government stability with regard to policy and institutional support.
Output 1.2 ONAC technical capacity is strengthened to provide internationally recognized accreditation services to Inspection Bodies (ISO 17020) and Conformity Assessment Bodies (ISO 17011) – <i>sector driven</i>	# laboratories and/or bodies accredited by ONAC # internal audits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accreditation certificates. Internal audit results ONAC annual reports Monitoring and progress reports. 	
Output 1.3 ONAC technical staff resources (auditors, assessors, trainers and technical experts) are trained and qualified to support the accreditation of IBs and CABs following internationally-recognized curricula and international best practices – <i>sector driven</i>	# trained staff resources # training courses conducted # training of trainers conducted # study tours conducted Training material prepared	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curricula. List of participants and certificates awarded. ONAC annual reports Monitoring and progress reports. 	

<p>Output 1.4 NMI technical staff resources are trained and qualified in chemical metrology following internationally-recognized curricula and international best practices – <i>sector driven</i></p>	<p># trained staff resources # training courses conducted # training of trainers conducted # study tours conducted Training material prepared</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curricula. • List of participants and certificates awarded. • NMI annual reports • Monitoring and progress reports. 	
<p>Output 1.5 INVIMA technical staff trained and qualified in conformity assessment, in accordance with international best practices- <i>sector driven</i></p>	<p># trained staff resources # training courses conducted # training of trainers conducted # study tours conducted Training material prepared</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curricula. • List of participants and certificates awarded. • INVIMA annual reports • Monitoring and progress reports. 	
<p>Output 1.6 Support the NMI in the identification and development of selected reference materials (RM) in chemical metrology – <i>sector driven</i></p>	<p>Identification of RM needs # RMs developed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NMI annual reports • Reference materials • Certificates 	
<p>Outcome 2. The national quality infrastructure is strengthened to provide internationally recognized services to the cosmetic sector, in particular key functions providing conformity assessment.</p>	<p># internationally-recognized conformity assessment services # accredit-ready conformity assessment service providers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports produced by the conformity service providers / institutions • Project progress reports • Evaluation reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective participation by the target beneficiaries in the planned project activities and in accordance to the set timeline. • Government commitment in providing necessary resources (human and financial) for achieving objectives and sustainability of the beneficiary institutions.
<p>Output 2.1 A market survey of the NQI servicing the cosmetic sector (VC approach) – <i>sector driven</i></p>	<p># of service providers identified by sector # of customers making use of these services Technical capabilities identified</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring and progress reports. • In-depth evaluation report. 	
<p>Output 2.2 An in-depth assessment on the country's laboratories (mainly for testing and calibration and inspection purposes) – <i>sector driven</i></p>	<p># of laboratories assessed by sector Technical capabilities identified</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring and progress reports. • In-depth evaluation report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective participation by the target beneficiaries in the planned project activities and in accordance to the set timeline. • Government commitment in providing necessary resources (human and financial) for achieving objectives and sustainability of the beneficiary institutions.
<p>Output 2.3 At least three (3) conformity assessment service providers are ready to obtain accreditation by ONAC with international recognition following the implementation of a technical support programme (based on the results of output 2.1 & 2.2) – <i>sector driven</i></p>	<p># trained staff resources # training courses conducted # training courses for trainers conducted # study tours conducted Training material prepared # of staff competences developed # tests services provided # of successful participation in PT # laboratories and/or bodies accredited by ONAC # internal audits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curricula • List of participants and certificates awarded. • PT results • Internal audit results • Laboratory reports • Conformity assessment service-providers' reports • Test/calibration/inspection reports • Accreditation certificates internationally recognized • ONAC annual reports • Monitoring and progress reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government commitment towards the operation, introduction of best practices and recognition of mandate and service delivered. • Government stability with regard to policy and institutional support. • Conformity service providers are ready and have resources to seek accreditation.

Output 2.4 A roadmap for acceptance of Colombia into OECD Mutual Acceptance of Data (MAD) system is prepared	Roadmap exists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and progress reports. Roadmap 	
Output 2.5 ONAC and INVIMA are supported to obtain international recognition on GLP in order to develop accreditation services locally	Support strategy for obtaining GLP recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and progress reports. Implementation strategy Minutes of coordination meetings held by key stakeholders. 	
Output 2.6 At least one (1) laboratory is supported to obtain internationally recognized GLP accreditation following the implementation of a technical support programme (idem output 2.3) – <i>sector driven</i>	# trained staff resources # training courses conducted # training courses for trainers conducted # tests conducted / services offered # of successful participation in PT # internal audits Laboratory GLP accredited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of participants and certificates awarded. PT results Laboratory reports Internal audit results Accreditation certificates internationally recognized Monitoring and progress reports. 	
Output 2.7 An awareness campaign promotes the role, mandate, benefits, and services offered by the NQS to the cosmetic sector	# of awareness activities successfully implemented # of documentation and/or visibility distributed (incl. in electronic format)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Media reports. Newspapers articles. Visibility material (e.g. banners, brochures, publications, etc.) 	
Outcome 3. Compliance with international quality, private and sustainability standards, technical regulations and market requirements is enhanced along the natural ingredients VC for cosmetic production	% increase in sector trade performance (proxy) # products/SMEs that access new (international/national) to markets # reduced rejections due to non-conformities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country trade/export reports and statistics MINCIT and PTP annual reports Project monitoring and evaluation reports Sector's competitiveness analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Producers and exporters from targeted value chain are keen to adopt quality and sustainability standards in order to show compliance, enhance quality and productivity.
Output 3.1 ICONTEC, in coordination with the cosmetic sector, actively participates at standards-related regional and international fora	# participants in technical committees # study tours conducted # meetings attended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and progress reports. ICONTEC annual reports Reports from international technical organizations (ISO) Technical documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective participation by the target beneficiaries in the planned project activities and in accordance to the set timeline. Producers and exporters from targeted value chain are keen to adopt quality and sustainability standards in order to show compliance, enhance quality and productivity. Exporters have market demand and require internationally-recognized conformity assessment services. Government and PTP sectors' support,
Output 3.2 An in-depth assessment carried out jointly with ICONTEC to identify relevant international quality, private, sustainability standards (e.g. Organic, BioTrade/UEBT) applicable to the natural ingredients VC	Identification of applicable sector-specific standards Strategy to introduce and implement compliance to international quality and sustainability standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of coordination meetings with all stakeholders. Implementation strategy. Monitoring and progress reports. PTP progress reports by sector 	

<p>Output 3.3 Trade and market competitiveness analysis for the cosmetic sector and key natural ingredients products are conducted jointly with the PTP Intelligence Unit</p>	<p># sector(s) performance indicator # product(s) performance indicator Identification of key quality constrains Strategy to overcome gaps through the enhancement of the NQS and compliance to international quality and sustainability standards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value chain and competitiveness reports. • Minutes of coordination meetings with all stakeholders. • Implementation strategy. 	<p>including the undertaking of other complementary initiatives, which fall beyond the project's mandate.</p>
<p>Output 3.4 A pool of local resources trained and qualified for the provision of business advisory services and capacity building to the VC members (based on the results of output 3.2 & 3.3)</p>	<p># advisory service provided # of customers making use of these services # trained staff resources # training courses conducted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer satisfaction survey(s) and/or questionnaire(s) • Material prepared for provision of advisory services • Monitoring and progress reports. 	
<p>Output 3.5 A number of key VC members (e.g. growers, producers, exporters, etc.) are trained on standards compliance (ref. output 3.2), technical regulations, best practices, production, handling techniques, etc., through the implementation of a technical support programme</p>	<p># trained VC members # training courses conducted Training material prepared # of documentation and/or visibility distributed (incl. in electronic format) # sector performance indicator # product performance indicator</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of participants and certificates awarded. • Monitoring and progress reports. • Material distributed (e.g. banners, brochures, publications, etc.) • Sector's competitiveness analysis reports 	
<p>Output 3.6 PROEXPORT know-how and service provision on the importance of complying with market requirements and international quality and sustainability standards is strengthened</p>	<p># trained staff resources # training courses conducted # advisory service provided # of customers making use of these services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PROEXPORT activity reports • List of participants • PTP progress reports by sector • Monitoring and progress reports. 	
<p>Output 3.7 A number new ingredients based on BioTrade principles are identified in collaboration with SENA La Salada through the implementation of a pilot programme with a number of selected SMEs</p>	<p># new ingredients identified # technical dossiers properly completed # SMEs participating in the pilot programme</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research reports from SENA La Salada • Technical dossiers • PTP progress reports by sector • Monitoring and progress reports. 	

Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria

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

No.	Evaluation criteria
A	Progress to impact
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ <u>Likelihood</u> to contribute to the expected impact ✓ Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, including redirecting trajectories of transformational process and the extent to which conditions for trajectory change are being put into place. ✓ <u>Replication</u>: To what extent the project's specific results (e.g. methodology, technology, lessons, etc.) are reproduced or adopted ✓ <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>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	Project design
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)? ✓ Were there any changes in project design and/or expected results after start of implementation.

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Did the project establish a baseline (initial conditions)? Was the evaluation able to estimate the baseline conditions so that results can be determined? ✓ 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 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?

No.	Evaluation criteria
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? <i>Financial risks:</i> ✓ What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the project ends? <i>Socio-political risks:</i> ✓ 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? <i>Institutional framework and governance risks:</i> ✓ 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? <i>Environmental risks:</i> ✓ 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>

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 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	✓ Environment and socio-economic aspects ⁸
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>M&E: (focus on Monitoring)</u> ✓ <i>M&E design</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Was the Monitoring 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? ✓ <i>M&E implementation</i> <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? ○ 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?
4	• <u>Project management</u>

⁸ All GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects have incorporated relevant environmental and social considerations into the project design / GEF-6 projects have followed the provisions specified in UNIDO/DGAI.23: UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP)

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 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)? ✓ The project implemented outreach and public awareness campaigns. Outreach and public awareness materials produced are in line with the relevant UNIDO and donor advocacy guidelines?"
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 ✓ Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ownership of the project ○ Support to the project, based on actions and policies ○ Counterpart funding

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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"> ✓ Donor ✓ 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

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

Title:	International evaluation consultant, team leader
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Missions:	Missions to Vienna, Austria and Colombia
Start of Contract (EOD):	[02/04/2018]
End of Contract (COB):	[15/06/2018]
Number of Working Days:	30 working days spread over 2.5 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

PROJECT CONTEXT

Detailed background information of the project can be found the terms of reference (TOR) for the terminal evaluation.

The international evaluation consultant/team leader will evaluate the project in accordance with the evaluation-related terms of reference (TOR). He/she will perform, inter alia, the following main tasks:

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
Undertake a desk review of 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 instruments accordingly (if needed); Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project's activities and analyze other background info.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant• An adjusted table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context• A draft list of stakeholders to be interviewed during the evaluation field mission• A brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework	4 days	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
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	Inception report submitted to the evaluation manager	3 days	Home-based
Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to be interviewed and planned site visits) submitted to evaluation and project manager 	2 days	Vienna, Austria
3. Undertake evaluation field mission ⁹ to consult field project stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries to verify and complete preliminary evaluation findings from desk review and assess the institutional capacities of the recipient country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field mission conducted • Evaluation/debriefing presentation of the evaluation's preliminary findings prepared, draft conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt to stakeholders in the country, at the end of the mission • Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks 	8 days	Colombia
4. Debriefing mission: Present preliminary findings, recommendations and lessons learnt to project stakeholders at UNIDO HQ for factual validation and comments Hold additional meetings with and obtain additional data from evaluation/project manager and other stakeholders as required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power point presentation • Feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed • Additional meetings held as required 	2 days	Vienna, Austria
5. Prepare the draft evaluation report, with inputs from the National Consultant, and in accordance with the evaluation TOR Submit draft evaluation report to the evaluation manager for feedback and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager for review and comments 	7 days	Home-based

⁹ The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
6. Revise the draft evaluation report based on comments and suggestions received through the evaluation manager and edit the language and finalize the evaluation report according to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division standards	Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager	3 days	Home-based
Prepare a two pages summary of a take-away message from the evaluation	Two pages summary take-away message from the evaluation submitted to the evaluation manager		
	TOTAL	30 days	

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced degree in science, business administration, economics, , project management,

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 10 years' experience in science, business administration, economics, project management and evaluation. Other relevant discipline such a specialization in trade, SME development, including gender is an asset.
- Experience in evaluation of UNIDO projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks
- Working experience in developing countries

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English is required. Fluency and/or working knowledge of another official UN language, particularly Spanish is required.

Reporting and deliverables

- 1) At the beginning of the assignment the Consultant will submit a concise Inception Report that will outline the general methodology and presents a concept Table of Contents
- 2) The country assignment will have the following deliverables:
 - Presentation of initial findings of the mission to key national stakeholders
 - Draft report
 - Final report, comprising of executive summary, findings regarding design, implementation and results, conclusions and recommendations
- 3) Debriefing at UNIDO HQ:
 - Presentation and discussion of findings
 - Concise summary and comparative analysis of the main results of the evaluation report

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

Absence of conflict of interest:

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

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

Title:	National evaluation consultant
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	Travel to potential sites within Colombia
Start of Contract:	[02/04/2018]
End of Contract:	[15/06/2018]
Number of Working Days:	27 days spread over 2.5 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

PROJECT CONTEXT

Detailed background information of the project can be found the terms of reference (TOR) for the terminal evaluation.

As evaluation team member, the national evaluation consultant will evaluate the project according to the terms of reference (TOR) under the leadership of the team leader (international evaluation consultant). S/he will perform, inter alia, the following main tasks:

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
<p>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 Russian (questionnaires, logic models) as required</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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A list of evaluation questions; questionnaires /interview guide; logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context • A list of key data available; and to be collected • A brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework in the context of the project • Input to inception report 	7 days	Home-based

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
necessary Analyze and assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework, specifically in the context of the project's objectives and targets			
Coordination of evaluation field 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 Assist and provide detailed analysis and inputs to the team leader in the preparation of the inception report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed evaluation schedule List of stakeholders to be interviewed during the field mission 	6 days	Home-based (telephone interviews)
Participation in interviews during evaluation field missions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview notes Input to presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission 	8 days	Home based, including in-country project sites
Draft evaluation report Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the team leader	Inputs to the draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation team leader	4 days	Home-based
Final evaluation report and summary take-away message Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation report on basis of comments and suggestions received through the evaluation team leader Contribute to the preparation of a two pages summary of a take-away message from the evaluation	Inputs to the Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation team leader	2 days	Home-based
TOTAL		27 days	

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism

3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:

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

Managerial competencies (as applicable):

1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree in science, business administration, economics, other relevant discipline with a specialization in trade, project management, SME development is desirable.

Technical and functional experience:

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

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English and Spanish 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

Acknowledgement (incl. list of evaluation team members)

Abbreviations and acronyms

Glossary of evaluation-related terms

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 project¹⁰ 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:

- A. Project design
- B. Implementation performance
 - Ownership and relevance (Report on the relevance of project towards countries and beneficiaries, country ownership, stakeholder involvement)
 - Effectiveness (The extent to which the development intervention's objectives, outcomes and deliverables were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance)
 - Efficiency (Report on the overall cost-benefit of the project and partner countries' contribution to the achievement of project objectives)

¹⁰ 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.)

- 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 partner countries, 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 countries 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 8. 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

For further guidance on the formulation and expected quality of lessons learned, please consult the guidance document on lessons learned prepared by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (annex 6). The document also includes a checklist on the quality of lessons learned.

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: Cosmetic Sector Quality Programme
UNIDO Project ID: 120354

Evaluation team

Evaluation team leader:

National evaluation consultant:

Evaluation manager (IED):

Quality review done by:

Date:

Report quality criteria	UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division 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 and checklist on lessons learned quality criteria

UNIDO evaluation lessons learned

Definition

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) (2002) defines lessons learned related to the evaluation of development assistance as follows: ***“Generalizations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact.”***¹¹

Focus
on
generalization

The International Labour Organisation (ILO) provides one of the most comprehensive definitions of lessons learned with relevance for evaluations in the UN system (2014) ***“A lesson learned is an observation from project or programme experience which can be translated into relevant, beneficial knowledge by establishing clear causal factors and effects. It focuses on a specific design, activity, process or decision and may provide either positive or negative insights on operational effectiveness and efficiency, impact on the achievement of outcomes, or influence on sustainability. The lesson should indicate, where possible, how it contributes to 1) reducing or eliminating deficiencies; or 2) building successful and sustainable practice and performance”***.¹²

Focus
on
transferability
&
generalization

UNIDO evaluation lessons learned contain information about the context, challenges, causal factors, target users and success/failure, as also shown in below **Lessons learned quality criteria checklist**.

What is not a lesson learned?

Lessons learned are not:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simply restating or paraphrasing existing doctrine, policy, process, etc. This does not qualify as an appropriate and bona fide lessons learned¹³.• Just applicable to a specific situation but applicable to a generic situation¹⁴• The same as recommendations. Recommendations usually refer to very specific situations including who should take action on what by when
---------------------------------	--

¹¹ <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>

¹² ILO Evaluation Unit, 2014: Guidance Note 3: Evaluation lessons learned and emerging good practices

¹³ www.dtic.mil/ndia/2004cmmi/CMMIT2Tue/LessonsLearnedtc3.pdf

¹⁴ www.globalhivmeinfo.org/Pages/Glossary.aspx
globalhivmeinfo.org/DigitalLibrary/Digital%20Library/Glossary%20of%20Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation%20Terms.doc

Examples of lessons learned

Source	Well-identified lessons learned in UNIDO evaluations
UNIDO, 2016: Independent UNIDO country evaluation: Thailand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A more effective collaboration between the government of Thailand and UNIDO (<i>context; target users</i>) will be more beneficial in developing a “country programme” that identifies the priority areas in which they should work together and then seek funding from potential sources (<i>success</i>) than the choice of the projects being driven by UNIDO on the basis of the financial support the latter is able to mobilize (<i>causal factor; challenge</i>).
UNIDO, 2017: Evaluación final independiente del proyecto: Centro de Automatización Industrial y Mecatrónica (Uruguay)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important that UNIDO projects get adequate technical in-house support (<i>context</i>). When this capacity is limited to persons that at a later stage get detached from the project the risk emerges (<i>challenge</i>) that UNIDO can’t adequately meet the expectations raised (<i>causal factor; failure</i>). UNIDO (<i>target user</i>) risks to lose its reputation as a strategic partner in such situations.
UNIDO, 2016: Independent Terminal Evaluation: Demonstration of BAT/BEP in fossil fuel-fired utilities and industrial boilers in response to the Stockholm Convention on POPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To UNIDO programme managers (<i>target users</i>): The implementation of this regional project involving six countries (<i>context</i>) was very challenging and required more time and better planning to meet deadlines (<i>challenge</i>). One important lesson that emerged is that the design should be kept simple. For the same set of objectives, the design should consider to have smaller number of components meaning less administrative burden and more flexibility (<i>success</i>) resulting in a better and more successful implementation process (<i>causal factor</i>). <i>Lesson learned was amended for this guideline.</i>
UNIDO, 2016: Independent terminal evaluation. Industrial Energy Efficiency in Ecuador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To UNIDO country director (<i>target user</i>): Lack of synergies (<i>challenge</i>) between energy efficiency projects and Clean Production activities developed by UNIDO at local level (<i>context</i>) drives to lose opportunities (<i>failure</i>) for a more efficient achievement of shared goals (<i>causal factor</i>). <i>Lesson learned was amended for this guideline.</i>

Examples of statements that do not qualify as lessons learned

Statements identified in UNIDO evaluation reports in the lessons learned sections that are in fact no lessons learned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Focus on product development innovation methods and tools”. <i>The context, challenge, causal factors, success/failure and target users are omitted. This statement resembles more to a recommendation with suboptimal formulation.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “UNIDO, as the International executing Agency, was instrumental in: a) introducing new technologies such as the Vallerani System, the use of Zander in tree planting; b) linking environmental preservation to economic development; c) providing support to the HCEFLCD for upgrading its nursery network”. <i>The context, challenge, causal factors, success/failure and target users are omitted. This statement is a finding.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Include in the peer review process also other agencies, such as UNEP and UNDP, which also support countries in the implementation of Enabling Activities and NIP update projects for the Stockholm Convention”. <i>The context, challenge, causal factors, success/failure and target users are omitted. This statement resembles more to a recommendation with suboptimal formulation.</i>

Lessons learned quality criteria checklist

The evaluator should cite and explain the points below.

✓ **Context** – Explain the context from which the lesson has been derived (e.g. economic, social, political). If possible, point to any relevance to the broader UNIDO mandates or broader technical or regional activities.

✓ **Challenges** – Cite any difficulties, problems or obstacles encountered / solutions found - Positive and negative aspects should be described.

✓ **Causal factors** – Present evidence for “how” or “why” something did or did not work?

✓ **Target users affected by the lessons learned should be cited** (e.g. Management, programme managers, donors or beneficiaries)

✓ **Success or failure** – The lessons learned should cite any decisions, tasks, or processes that constitute reduced or eliminated deficiencies or built successful and sustainable practice and performance; or have the potential of success. Avoid repetition of failure

✓ **The lesson learned is not mistaken for a recommendation or conclusion**

(Source: ILO Evaluation Unit, 2014: Guidance Note 3: Evaluation lessons learned and emerging good practices, amended with UNIDO IEV)

For assessing the quality of evaluation lessons learner UNIDO uses a 6-point (with one point for each criterion) rating scheme:

Ratings 4-6 are satisfactory and meet quality criteria.

Ratings 1-3 are unsatisfactory and fail to meet quality criteria.

The criterion “The lesson learned is not mistaken for a recommendation or conclusion” **is an exclusion criterion**, i.e. when this criterion is met the lesson learned automatically fails the quality check regardless the quality in other criteria.

Annex 7. GEF Minimum requirements for M&E¹⁵ (not applicable)

Minimum requirement 1: Project design of M&E

All projects will include a concrete and fully budgeted M&E plan by the time of work program entry for full-sized projects (FSP) and CEO approval for medium-sized projects (MSP). This M&E plan will contain as a minimum:

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

Minimum requirement 2: Application of project M&E

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

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

¹⁵ http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf

Annex 8. Rating tables

The following table should be used for rating the different key evaluation criteria:

Evaluation Rating Table

#	Evaluation criteria	Definition	Mandatory rating
A	Progress to impact	Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, including redirecting trajectories of transformational process and the extent to which conditions for trajectory change are being put into place.	Yes
B	Project design	Formulation of the intervention, the plan to achieve a specific purpose.	Yes
1	Overall design	Assessment of the design in general.	Yes
2	Logframe	Assessment of the logical framework aimed at planning the intervention.	Yes
C	Project performance	Functioning of a development intervention.	Yes
1	Relevance	The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.	Yes
2	Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.	Yes
3	Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.	Yes
4	Sustainability of benefits	The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.	Yes
D	Cross-cutting performance criteria	Other important criteria that cut across the UNIDO intervention.	
1	Gender mainstreaming	The extent to which UNIDO interventions have contributed to better gender equality and gender related dimensions were considered in an intervention.	Yes
2	M&E	Refers to all the indicators, tools and processes used to measure if a development intervention has been implemented according to the plan (monitoring) and is having the desired result (evaluation).	Yes
3	Results-based management (RBM)	Assessment of issues related to results-based work planning, results based M&E and reporting based on results.	Yes
E	Performance of partners	Assessment of partners' roles and responsibilities engaged in the intervention.	Yes
1	UNIDO	Assessment of the contribution of partners to project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting, supervision and backstopping and evaluation. The performance of each partner will be assessed individually, based on its expected role and responsibilities in the project life cycle.	Yes
2	National counterparts		Yes
3	Donor		Yes
F	Overall assessment	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.	Yes

It is acknowledged that some issues covered by one criterion might overlap with others. Yet to enable UNIDO to learn from the deeper evaluation analyses and lessons on a number of areas, separate criteria are included such as those on Monitoring and Evaluation and Results-Based Management. The consistent use of the criteria pertinent to the evaluation object allow for comparability of UNIDO's performance over time. Evaluation questions are formulated around those evaluation criteria in UNIDO, as specified in the following section.

Rating systems and criteria

UNIDO introduced a six-point rating system for the evaluation criteria in 2015, in line with the practice adopted by other development agencies, including the GEF. The aim of the system is to quantify the judgment of evaluators, identify good and poor practices, to facilitate aggregation within and across projects and enable tracking performance trends over a period. The six-point rating system, with six (6) representing the best and one (1) the worst score, allows for nuanced assessment of performance and results. The same rating scale is used for all rating areas as shown below.

UNIDO evaluation rating scale

Score		Definition*	Category
6	Highly satisfactory	Level of achievement presents no shortcomings (90% - 100% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	SATISFACTORY
5	Satisfactory	Level of achievement presents minor shortcomings (70% - 89% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	
4	Moderately satisfactory	Level of achievement presents moderate shortcomings (50% - 69% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	
3	Moderately unsatisfactory	Level of achievement presents some significant shortcomings (30% - 49% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	UNSATISFACTORY
2	Unsatisfactory	Level of achievement presents major shortcomings (10% - 29% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	
1	Highly unsatisfactory	Level of achievement presents severe shortcomings (0% - 9% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	

Note: * For impact, the assessment will be based on the level of *likely* achievement, as it is often too early to assess the long-term impacts of the project at the project completion point.

Table below contains the formula applied to transform the results of UNIDO’s six-point rating scale to the GEF’s four-point scale for sustainability¹⁶.

Formula transforming UNIDO ratings into GEF ratings

UNIDO rating	UNIDO sustainability rating:	GEF sustainability rating:
6	Highly likely (HL)	Likely (L)
5	Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)
4	Moderately likely (ML)	Moderately Likely (ML)
3	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Moderately Unlikely (MU)
2	Unlikely (U)	Moderately Unlikely (MU)
1	Highly unlikely (HU)	Unlikely (U)

This formula underscores the distinction of ratings into “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory”, both in applying UNIDO’s six-point rating scale and the transformation into the GEF four-point rating scale for sustainability. To ensure coherence in ratings, the rating is defined above. The use of benchmarks like the performance of peers for the same criteria helps to facilitate the interpretation of ratings.

Project design

Criteria for rating project design are related to the logical framework approach and the quality of overall project design. These criteria include:

Overall design quality

- Pertinence to country priorities, needs of target groups and UNIDO strategies
- Consideration and use of lessons and evaluative evidence from other projects
- Technical feasibility and validity of project design
- Budgeted M&E plan with clear timelines, roles, and responsibilities
- Adequacy of risk assessment (for example financial, sociopolitical, institutional, environmental and implementation aspects)

Logframe/logframe-like matrix based on the project’s theory of change

- Clarity and logic of results-chain, including impacts, outcomes and outputs
- SMART indicators
- Adequacy of Means of Verification and Assumptions

Implementation performance

Implementation performance criteria correspond broadly to DAC criteria and need to be customized according to the context of the intervention to be evaluated.

- Relevance
- Effectiveness

¹⁶ GEF uses a four-point scale for the criterion of sustainability.

- Efficiency
- Progress to Impact
- Sustainability of benefits

Partners' performance

UNIDO's projects are characterized by a group of main partners with specific roles and responsibilities. UNIDO itself acts as project implementer and supervisor. Though supplemented by implementation performance criteria listed above, the criteria to assess UNIDO as a partner are more specific and help to address frequent issues in its performance. Governments are local executors, and owners of the project and donors provide project funding. Hence, rating the partners is a key part of UNIDO project evaluations¹⁷. The six-point rating scale applies¹⁸.

The key issues to be addressed to rate **UNIDO's performance** are:

Project design

- 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

- 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
- Overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document
- Project's governance system
- National management and overall coordination mechanisms
- UNIDO HQ-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical input

To assess the **performance of national counterparts**, the evaluation looks into the following issues:

Project design

- Responsiveness to UNIDO's invitation for engagement in designing the project

Implementation

- Ownership of the project
- Financial contributions (cash or in-kind)
- Support to the project, based on actions and policies
- Counterpart funding

¹⁷ As practiced by the World Bank and the International Fund for Agriculture Development.

¹⁸ 6 = Highly satisfactory; 5 = Satisfactory; 4 = Moderately satisfactory; 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory; 2 = Unsatisfactory; 1 = Highly unsatisfactory

- 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

For the assessment of **donor performance**, the following issues require ratings:

- 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

Gender mainstreaming

The UNIDO Policy on gender equality and the empowerment of women, issued initially in April 2009, and revised in March 2015 (UNIDO/DGB/(M).110/Rev.), 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. It commits the organization that evaluations will demonstrate effective use of the UNEG guidance on evaluating from a human rights and gender equality perspective, as indicated by the Organization's meta-evaluation scores according to the UNEG Evaluation Scorecard.

In line with the UNIDO Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women Strategy, 2016-2019, all UNIDO technical assistance projects post-2015 are to be assigned a gender marker and should go through a gender mainstreaming check-list before approval. UNIDO's gender marker is in line with UN System-wide action plan (SWAP) requirements, with four categories: 0 — no attention to gender, 1 — some/limited attention to gender, 2a — significant attention to gender, 2b — gender is the principal objective¹⁹.

Besides, Guides on Gender Mainstreaming for Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) Projects in different areas of UNIDO's work have been developed and published during 2015²⁰, which have specific guidance on suitable outputs/activities/indicators per technical area.

If the project design and gender analysis/existing indicators are not sufficient to allow for an accurate appraisal at the final evaluation, specific indicators could be created during the evaluation planning stage (preparing and revising the inception report) and assessed during the evaluation process. Together with the budget, the time required to adequately carry out a gender responsive evaluation will need to be taken into account. The evaluation time depends on the questions the assessment needs to answer, on how deep the analyses are

¹⁹ http://intranet.unido.org/intra/Gender_Mainstreaming_Tools_and_Guides

²⁰ www.unido.org/en/what-we-do/cross-cutting-issues/gender/publications.html

requested to be, and on financial and human resources available as well as other external factors.

For terminal evaluations of projects that have been approved after 2015, evaluations should assess if the rating was correctly done at entry, if appropriate outputs/activities/indicators and monitoring were put in place during implementation and what results can be actually observed at the time of terminal evaluation (in line with UNIDO's organizational results reporting to SWAP). The Gender Mainstreaming six-point rating scale should then be used accordingly.

For projects that have **2a** or **2b ratings** at project design/entry at least one evaluation team member should have demonstrated/significant experience in evaluating GEEW projects. For other projects, evaluators are encouraged to further familiarize themselves with the key gender aspects and impacts of UNIDO projects, both through the foundation modules of "I know Gender" online course of UN Women and the UNIDO's Guides on Gender Mainstreaming ISID Projects.