



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

DRAFT

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Independent terminal evaluation**

**Overcoming policy, market and technological barriers to support technological innovation and south-south technology transfer: the pilot case of ethanol production from cassava**

UNIDO Project No.: GF/THA/12/001

UNIDO Project ID: 100264

GEF ID: 4037

**JULY 2018**

## Contents

<b>I. Project background and overview.....</b>	<b>3</b>
1. Project factsheet.....	3
2. Project context.....	4
3. Project objective .....	5
4. Project implementation arrangements.....	6
5. Main findings on project progress .....	7
6. Budget information.....	8
<b>II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Evaluation approach and methodology.....</b>	<b>10</b>
1. Data collection methods .....	11
2. Evaluation key questions and criteria .....	12
<b>IV. Evaluation process.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>V. Evaluation team composition .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>VI. Time schedule.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>VII. Evaluation deliverables.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>VIII. Quality assurance.....</b>	<b>17</b>
Annex 1: Project results framework .....	18
Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria .....	25
Annex 3: Job descriptions .....	31
Annex 4: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report .....	38
Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality .....	41
Annex 6: Guidance and checklist on lessons learned quality criteria .....	42
Annex 7: GEF Minimum requirements for M&E .....	45
Annex 8: Rating tables .....	46

## I. Project background and overview

### 1. Project factsheet

<b>Project title</b>	Overcoming policy, market and technological barriers to support technological innovation and south-south technology transfer: the pilot case of ethanol production from cassava
<b>UNIDO project No. and/or ID</b>	UNIDO Project ID: 100264 UNIDO Project No.: GF/THA/12/001
<b>GEF project ID</b>	4037
<b>Region</b>	Asia and the Pacific
<b>Country</b>	Thailand
<b>Planned implementation start date</b>	28 March 2012
<b>Planned implementation end date</b>	31 January 2016
<b>Actual implementation start date</b>	6 June 2012
<b>Actual implementation end date</b>	December 2018
<b>GEF Focal Areas and Operational Project</b>	Climate Change, CC-SP4 Strategic Program
<b>Implementing agency</b>	UNIDO
<b>Executing partner(s)/entity(ies)</b>	King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT), Thailand; Liquor Distillery Organization (LDO), Thailand; Ministry of Industry and Trade (MOIT); Viet Nam, Food Industries Research Institute (FIRI), Viet Nam
<b>Donor:</b>	GEF
<b>Total project allotment (GEF Grant + co-financing at CEO Endorsement)</b>	USD34,403,000
<b>Total co-financing at design (in cash and in-kind)</b>	USD 31,623,000
<b>Mid-term review date</b>	February 2015

(Source: Project document)<sup>1</sup>

### 2. Project context

The UNIDO project Overcoming policy, market and technological barriers to support technological innovation and south-south technology transfer: the pilot case of ethanol production from cassava deals with technical innovation and South-South technology transfer from Thailand to neighboring countries, notably Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam (LMV), to address the issue of the region's high dependence on fossil fuels for transportation.

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

The four countries are part of the Association of South-East Asian countries (ASEAN), an Association whose total population accounts for more than 600 million people, with a combined economic power ranking the region somewhere between India and Japan.

Over the past decade, most ASEAN countries experienced a steady economic and social growth, accompanied often by relevant reductions in poverty, which resulted in rapid growth in energy consumption per capita. Despite being relatively well endowed in terms of energy resources, the region remains an energy-thirsty one, characterized by a very low level of energy efficiency, as its transport sector and its manufacturing industry are highly energy intensive.

ASEAN's primary energy need is projected to triple between 2005 and 2030 by an average annual growth rate of around 4%. Even under the most optimistic assumptions, ASEAN will face formidable challenges in securing the energy it will need over the next few decades to sustain its growth momentum. At the same time, many of ASEAN's current fossil fuel reserves will be exhausted or be far from sufficient to respond to the projected demand. On this issue, then, renewable energy has received increasing attention because of worldwide effort to mitigate global warming and alleviate soaring oil price.

The concerned Governments, then, decided to exploit the use of biofuels as an alternative to fossil fuels. Indeed, bioenergy is an important energy resource since it is renewable, widely available and carbon neutral. Using bioenergy as an alternative to fossil fuels – which are limited resources – is one way to reduce GHG emissions and improve energy security.

Therefore, biomass is considered as a promising alternative energy source in future strategic energy planning in the national and regional context. The project builds upon the collaboration between UNIDO and National Science and Technology Development Agency (NSTDA) in Thailand to develop a concept note seeking an opportunity for GEF to support the transfer of Thailand's bioethanol technology production from cassava to neighboring countries.

Approved in March 2012, the project implementation started in June 2012 and the initial project end date was in January 2016. After an extension phase, the actual implementation end date is expected to be December 2018.

The project document foresees regular monitoring, an independent mid-term review (MTR) carried out in February 2015 and a terminal evaluation (TE).

### **3. Project objective**

The key objective of the proposed project is to foster technical innovation and South-South technology transfer from Thailand to neighboring countries, notably Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam, to address the issue of the region's high dependence on fossil fuels for transportation.

The following three technical **project components** have been developed to achieve the project objective:

### **Project Component 1: Institutional capacity strengthening for VHG-SSF technology dissemination**

Component 1 aims to strengthen the institutional capacity of KMUTT (replaced NSTDA) in ethanol technology by developing a full package of practices for the technology, including production know-how to increase cassava yield and new VHG-SSF fermentation technology. KMUTT, by working closely with UNIDO, has the lead for this component.

Under this component, four main outputs have been identified:

1. Information hub established for disseminating and supporting the south-south technology transfer;
2. Ethanol technology package finalized for dissemination;
3. Manuals, tool kits and structured training programs developed for technology transfer;
4. Database on ethanol technology developed and maintained by ethanol information hub.

### **Project Component 2: South-South technology transfer: capacity building and policy dialogue with participants from LMV**

Component 2 includes activities that build the capacity of recipient countries and other interested parties as observers, familiarize with the new bio-ethanol technology and engage policy makers in dialogues for creating the necessary awareness and formulating the policy in support of the new ethanol technology package. Most of these activities towards the creation of conducive environment for bioethanol will be carried out after seeing the successful operation of the demonstration units in Thailand and Viet Nam.

KMUTT for Thailand and MOIT for Viet Nam are the main responsible in these activities and they are expected to deliver the following outputs:

1. Regional awareness created for the new technology package;
2. Training conducted in Thailand for farmers, entrepreneurs and technicians;
3. Training conducted in Thailand for engineers, scientists and researchers;
4. Pricing practices and policy environment improved.

### **Project Component 3: Demonstration and commercialization of the technology and private sector development**

The private company KKS, after receiving assistance through KMUTT and FIRI, is responsible for the establishment, the operations and the maintenance of a commercial plant in Myanmar. The ultimate goal is to ensure the sustainability of this plant and to provide institutional continuity, replicability and global environmental benefits of the project.

## **4. Project implementation arrangements**

UNIDO, as the GEF implementing Agency, is responsible for implementing the project, delivering the planned outputs and achieving the expected outcomes. UNIDO is executing the project in collaboration with the concerned Government

Ministries of respective governments, KMUTT, FIRI, LDO and the private stakeholders.

Among the other responsibilities, UNIDO is responsible for:

- Releasing the GEF funds at appropriate periods;
- Selecting experts, project briefing, approval of contracts for the implementation activities;
- Procuring, initial operations, monitoring and reporting;
- Providing assistance on formal GEF procedures that apply to the project execution, including reporting issues and formal channel of correspondence between the project and the GEF secretariat;
- Coordinating with the project steering committee to review the project every 2 months during the project implementation period;
- Providing administrative support and financial budgetary follow up required for the execution of the project;
- Annual auditing of the project by following GEF procedures;
- Managing, supervising and monitoring the work of the international teams and for ensuring that the deliverables are technically sound and consistent with the project requirements.

National Science and Technology Development Agency, NSTDA (replaced by KMUTT, Thailand) is responsible for:

- Establishing the information hub in Thailand;
- Packaging of the bio-ethanol technology package for transfer;
- Preparation of manuals, toolkits and structured training programs for technology transfer;
- Operation and maintenance of the ethanol technology database;
- Conducting regional workshops on bio-ethanol production;
- Coordination of the study tour for LMV countries participants;
- Various trainings to farmers, technicians, entrepreneurs, researchers and scientists;
- Assisting FIRI in the establishment of a technical center in Viet Nam;
- Establishing the 200 l/d demonstration plant in Thailand;
- Assisting FIRI in the establishing the 50 l/d demonstration plant in Viet Nam;
- Facilitating the technical services and technology transfer for establishing the 400,000 l/d plant in Myanmar.

Food Industries Research Institute, FIRI (Viet Nam) is responsible for:

- Establishing of a technical centre in Viet Nam;
- Establishing of 50 l/d demonstration plant in Viet Nam;
- Conducting several policy forums in Viet Nam;
- Providing technical and expert advisory service to ethanol producers and investors in Viet Nam for commercialization of the technology.

Liquor Distillery Organization, LDO (Thailand), is responsible for:

- Hosting the 200 l/d demonstration unit on its industrial site in Bangkla, Thailand

Ministry of Industry and Trade, MOIT (Viet Nam), is responsible for:

- Implementing the 50 l/d demonstration unit at Hanoi, Viet Nam

Kaung Kyaw Say Group of Companies, KKS (Myanmar), is responsible for:  
- Implementing the 400,000 l/d commercial plant in Myanmar.

According to the project document, UNIDO established a Project Management Unit (PMU) in UNIDO Regional Office, Bangkok, with close collaboration with UNIDO Country Office in Viet Nam. PMU would consist of recruited administrative staff, project national experts, designated KMUTT persons and a Project Manager.

The responsibilities of PMU would be as follows:

- Project coordination within the project and with other project stakeholders including experts and government agencies;
- Day-to-day project operations including management, monitoring and evaluation of activities as stipulated in the project work plan;
- Assisting KMUTT, MOIT and FIRI to organize training activities, study tours and others as shown in the work plan.

## **5. Main findings on project progress**

Conducted from mid-February to mid-May 2015, the mid-term evaluation covers the period from March 2012 to February 2015. Below a summary of main findings from the evaluation report:

Design: the project design was weak as it was prepared without full and active participation of relevant national stakeholders and with a lack of insight regarding CO2 emissions abatement. As a result, the Project Results Framework (PRF) and target indicators were not developed well enough to address the key barriers and the associated risks.

Relevance: the project is relevant to the national development and environmental priorities of the countries concerned. The project is in line with UNIDO's mandate and is consistent with the GEF Climate Change focal area strategic program SP4: Promoting sustainable energy production from biomass.

Effectiveness: the project has so far achieved none of the planned outputs that would lead to the project outcomes. While a part of the delay in project execution can be attributed to reasons beyond UNIDO's control, the inordinate delays and inadequate project performance are a result of poor quality of the work plan and insufficient tracking and monitoring of the project's performance. Some partners have yet to be involved actively in the project.

Efficiency: the project implementation was delayed 2 years due to change in the main executing partner, political turmoil in Thailand and the delay in signing of sub-contract between UNIDO and the main executing partner. However, after the project got started, not enough efforts have been made by UNIDO and its main executing partner to ensure the project's cost-effectiveness. Substantial GEF resources have been engaged but none of the outputs has been delivered and very little confirmed co-financing has materialized.

Sustainability: the participating governments realize the importance of bio-ethanol development but the formulation of transparent policies and incentives requires coordination among key government agencies. Other key stakeholders are likely to fall in line when the government sends a strong policy signal. The project has limited impacts of sharing the Thai experience of bio-ethanol promotion initiatives with the

neighboring countries. There are no identified potential risks to environmental sustainability.

Further details can be obtained from the MTR report.

## 6. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary

Description	Project Preparation (in USD)	Project (in USD)	Total (in USD)
Financing (GEF /others)	100,000	2,600,000	<b>2,700,000</b>
Co-financing <sup>2</sup> (in cash and/or in-kind)	80,000	31,623,000	<b>31,703,000</b>
<b>Total (in USD)</b>	<b>180,000</b>	<b>34,223,000</b>	<b>34,403,000</b>

Source: Project document/GEF: CEO endorsement document

Table 2. Financing plan summary – project component breakdown

Project outcomes	GEF grant amount (excl. PPG) (in USD)	Co-financing (in USD)	Total (in USD)
1. Institutional capacity strengthening for very VHG-SSF technology dissemination	330,500	1,187,000	<b>1,517,500</b>
2. South-South technology transfer: capacity building and policy dialogue with participants from Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam	757,500	1,253,000	<b>2,010,500</b>
3. Demonstration and commercialization of the technology and private sector development	1,262,000	28,492,000	<b>29,754,000</b>
Project Management	250,000	691,000	<b>941,000</b>
<b>Total (in USD)</b>	<b>2,600,000</b>	<b>31,623,000</b>	<b>34,223,000</b>

Source: Project document/GEF: CEO endorsement document

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

Table 3. Co-financing source breakdown

<b>Name of co-financier (source)</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Type (Specify: cash and/or in-kind)</b>	<b>Total (in USD)</b>
<b>KMUTT, Thailand</b>	National Government	Cash	555,000
<b>KMUTT, Thailand</b>	National Government	In-kind	2,400,000
<b>LDO, Thailand</b>	National Government	Cash	1,500,000
<b>LDO, Thailand</b>	National Government	In-kind	630,000
<b>MOIT, Viet Nam</b>	National Government	In-kind	375,000
<b>FIRI, Viet Nam</b>	National Government	Cash	722,000
<b>FIRI, Viet Nam</b>	National Government	In-kind	250,000
<b>Kaung Kyaw Say Group of Companies (KKS), Myanmar</b>	Private sector	Cash	25,000,000
<b>UNIDO</b>	Implementing Agency	Cash	80,000
<b>UNIDO</b>	Implementing Agency	In-kind	111,000
<b>Total co-financing (in USD)</b>			<b>31,623,000</b>

Source: Project document/GEF: CEO endorsement document

Table 4. UNIDO budget execution<sup>3</sup> (Grant No.: 200000323), in USD

Items of Expenditure	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total exp.
Contractual services		380,000.00	827,419.97	77,074.51	493,822.81	97,179.79	- 785.63	1,874,711.45
Equipment				3,403.45	3,636.26	834.50		7,874.21
International meetings	6,500.00	-1,039.59	8,493.92	-2,113.59		4,266.76		4,266.76
Local travel	1,346.84	8,715.16	9,228.77	2,482.21	6,837.04	5,029.53	2,975.71	36,615.26
Natl. Consult./Staff	10,383.77	11628.25	12,012.17	26,857.26	67,716.87	70,054.25	45,754.63	244,407.2
Intl. Consult./Staff								
Other Direct Costs	1,040.01	889.37	1,360.73	-2,168.26	3,635.39	6,903.24		11,660.48
Premises								
Staff and Intern			17,389.19	21,282.06	2,522.36	12,762.77		53,956.38
Staff Travel		19.20			-19.20			0
Train/Fellowship/Study						1,612.62	42.12	1,654.74
<b>Grand Total (in USD)</b>	<b>19,270.62</b>	<b>400,212.39</b>	<b>875,904.75</b>	<b>126,817.64</b>	<b>578,151.53</b>	<b>198,643.46</b>	<b>47,986.83</b>	<b>2,235,146.48</b>

Source: UNIDO. ERP database as of 08/03/2017

<sup>3</sup> Disbursement: Expenditure, incl. commitment

## **II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation**

The terminal evaluation (TE) 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 TE 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 similar future projects and activities in the country and on a global scale upon project completion. The TE report should include examples of good practices for other projects in the focal area, country, or region.

The TE should provide an analysis of the attainment of the project objective and the corresponding 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 TE is to assess whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective, i.e. to foster technical innovation and South-South technology transfer from Thailand to neighboring countries, 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 TE will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy<sup>4</sup> UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle<sup>5</sup>.

In addition, the GEF Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies must to be considered.

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

---

<sup>4</sup> UNIDO. (2018). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (DGB/2018/08, 1 June 2018)

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

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

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

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

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

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), mid-term review report, 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 Thailand
  - 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?
- (e) What is the project's contribution and relevance to the *Poznan Strategic Program on Technology Transfer*, as conceptualized and approved by the GEF?

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
<b>A</b>	<b>Progress to Impact</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Project design</b>	<b>Yes</b>
1	• Overall design	Yes
2	• Logframe	Yes
<b>C</b>	<b>Project performance</b>	<b>Yes</b>
1	• Relevance	Yes
2	• Effectiveness	Yes
3	• Efficiency	Yes
4	• Sustainability of benefits	Yes

Index	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
<b>D</b>	<b>Cross-cutting performance criteria</b>	
1	• Gender mainstreaming	Yes
2	• Environment and socio-economic aspects <sup>6</sup>	Yes
2	• M&E: (focus on Monitoring) ✓ M&E design ✓ M&E implementation	Yes
3	• Results-based Management (RBM)	Yes
<b>E</b>	<b>Performance of partners</b>	
1	• UNIDO	Yes
2	• National counterparts	Yes
3	• Donor	Yes
<b>F</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	Yes

#### 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 (incl. familiarization with GEF programmes and strategies, and with relevant GEF policies such as those on project cycle, M&E, co-financing, fiduciary standards, gender, and environmental and social safeguards)
  - ✓ 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

<sup>6</sup> 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)

- ✓ 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 resource 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 social safeguards and 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.

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

## **VI. Time schedule**

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from August to October 2018.

The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned for September 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 timetable<sup>7</sup>.

### **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.

The ET will present its preliminary findings to the local stakeholders at the end of the field visit and take into account their feed-back in preparing the evaluation report. A presentation of preliminary findings will take place at UNIDO HQ after the field mission.

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

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in annex 4. The ET should submit the final version of the TE report in accordance with UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division standards.

---

<sup>7</sup> 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.

## **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

Project Strategy		Objectively verifiable indicators				
		Indicator(quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Goal	To reduce GHG emission in the ethanol production sector as well as due to increased use of ethanol for fuel in Thailand and LMV countries.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incremental avoided GHG emission due to increased number of ethanol plants using VHG - SSF technology established.</li> <li>2. Incremental GHG emission reduction due to increased use of ethanol as biofuel replacing fossil fuels.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Usage of conventional fossil fuel</li> <li>2. CO<sub>2</sub> emission due to fossil fuel usage instead of ethanol as fuel.</li> <li>3. CO<sub>2</sub> emission due to conventional method of ethanol production technology.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 400,250 l/d of ethanol production plant added during the project leading to cumulative emission reduction of 2,760,524 t CO<sub>2</sub>e over a period of 10 years.</li> <li>2. At least 800,500 l/d of ethanol production added during the next 10 years leading cumulative emission reduction of 5,521,049 t CO<sub>2</sub>e.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Physical verification of plants in operation.</li> <li>2. End of project survey.</li> </ol>	<p>Continuous support of all participating countries, Ministries, organizations and project investors.</p> <p>Environmental protection and fossil fuel conservation becomes a priority for consumers</p>
Objective of the project	Removing barriers, and creating conducive environment for promoting ethanol technology and South-South technology transfer.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Installed capacity of the demonstration projects</li> <li>2. Installed capacity of commercial plant</li> <li>3. Bio-ethanol production from these plant (l/day).</li> <li>4. No. of persons trained for the new technology.</li> <li>5. Improved policy and</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New ethanol production technology not yet disseminated and commercialized.</li> <li>2. Inadequate support policies and pricing strategies to support bio-ethanol production.</li> <li>3. Low private sector participation</li> <li>4. Not enough support</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To implement demonstration of cumulative 250 l/day capacity to implement commercial plant of capacity 400,000 l/day.</li> <li>2. To train at least 250 people under the project.</li> <li>3. To train banks and financial institutions.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Physical verification of the project.</li> <li>2. Training programmes conducted.</li> <li>3. Government papers for policy and pricing</li> <li>4. Private sector investment and documents on lending</li> </ol>	<p>Continued support of different governments, NSTDA, LDO &amp; FIRI</p>

Project Strategy		Objectively verifiable indicators				
		Indicator(quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		<p>pricing environment in respective countries.</p> <p>6. Percentage increase in private sector investment.</p> <p>7. Percentage increase in lending by financial institutions.</p> <p>8. No. of replication projects under development in Thailand and LMV countries.</p>	from financing institutions.	<p>4. To assist at least 5 private sector project development.</p> <p>5. Cumulative bio-ethanol production of 132.1 million litre per year from project activity plants and 264.2 million litre per year from replication plants</p>	5. Replication projects under development.	
Outcome 1	Enhanced capacity of NSTDA, Thailand to lend sustainable support to the region	<p>1. Increased capacity of NSTDA for technology transfer.</p> <p>2. Technology package developed.</p> <p>3. Manuals, training materials and toolkits developed.</p> <p>4. Database developed and operated</p>	NSTDA do not have sufficient capacity for technology transfer	Ethanol information clearing house and Centre for excellence established at NSTDA	<p>1. Physical verification.</p> <p>2. Published manual on technology package</p> <p>3. Published technology training modules</p> <p>4. Physical operation of the database</p>	Continuous support of the Thai Government & NSTDA
Output 1.1	Information hub established for disseminating and supporting the south-south technology transfer.	<p>1. Information hub established.</p> <p>2. South-South technology transfer</p>	No organisation exists for technology dissemination and transfer.	NSTDA, Thailand developed as Ethanol information clearing house.	<p>1. Physical verification.</p> <p>2. Government reports.</p> <p>3. End of project M&amp;E report.</p>	Continuous support of the Thai Government & NSTDA.

Project Strategy		Objectively verifiable indicators				
		Indicator(quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		model developed.			4. Activities of the clearing house.	
Output 1.2	Ethanol technology package finalised for dissemination	VHG-SSF ethanol production technology developed as package.	New technology package not available.	NSTDA's new ethanol production technology is developed for dissemination.	Published manual on technology package	Continuous support of the Thai Government & NSTDA.
Output 1.3	Manuals, tool kits and structured training programs developed for technology transfer.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Technology training module developed.</li> <li>2. Training programmes developed.</li> <li>3. Follow-up tools and procedures developed for monitoring.</li> </ol>	Manuals, toolkits, training programmes not available for technology transfer	To develop manuals, toolkits and training programs for technology transfer.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Published technology training modules.</li> <li>2. Training program approved by the Project Steering Committee.</li> <li>3. Monitoring tools and procedures.</li> </ol>	Continuous support of the Thai Government & NSTDA.
Output 1.4	Database on ethanol technology developed and maintained by ethanol information hub	Data base developed, tested, launched and operated.	No database available for the new ethanol technology.	To develop, operate and maintain ethanol database.	Physical operation of the database.	Continuous support of the Thai Government & NSTDA.
Outcome 2	Conducive environment to promote bio-ethanol technology and strengthened policies to promote ethanol for replacing conventional fuels.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improved pricing and policy environment.</li> <li>2. No. of persons involved with new bio-ethanol technology (farmers, entrepreneurs, technicians, researchers) trained.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inadequate policies and pricing strategies for bio-ethanol production.</li> <li>2. Lack of interest among key stakeholders for the new bio-ethanol technology</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To improve the pricing and policy environment.</li> <li>2. To train at least 250 persons for the promotion of new bio-ethanol production (in all sectors including farmers,</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policy and pricing reports.</li> <li>2. No. of persons trained/ attended workshops.</li> <li>3. Training / workshop reports.</li> <li>4. Study tour reports.</li> </ol>	Continuous support of different governments, NSTDA & FIRI.

Project Strategy		Objectively verifiable indicators				
		Indicator(quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			3. Lack of technical expertise for bio-ethanol production.	entrepreneurs, researchers, etc.)	5. Published training materials.	
Output 2.1	Regional awareness created for the new technology package.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. of regional workshops conducted in Thailand.</li> <li>No. of national workshops conducted in Thailand and Vietnam.</li> <li>No of study tours organized for person (no).</li> </ol>	Very little awareness about new bio-ethanol production technology.	To create sufficient awareness in the new technology.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional workshop report.</li> <li>National workshop reports.</li> <li>Study tour reports.</li> </ol>	Continuous support of government of Thai, LMV countries, respective government officials and from private investors.
Output 2.2	Trainings conducted in Thailand for farmers, entrepreneurs and technicians.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training materials prepared</li> <li>No. of farmers, entrepreneurs and technicians trained.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entrepreneurs and technicians not aware of the new bio-ethanol production technology.</li> <li>Low productivity yield in Cassava in LMV countries.  Farmers are not aware of the improved cassava cultivation practices.</li> </ol>	To train at least 150 farmers, 30 entrepreneurs and 30 technicians for the promotion of new ethanol production technology.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Published training modules.</li> <li>Training reports.</li> <li>Number of persons trained.</li> <li>End of project survey.</li> </ol>	Continuous support of government of Thai, LMV countries, local farmers, entrepreneurs and technicians.
Output 2.3	Trainings conducted in Thailand for engineers,	1. Training materials	Engineers, scientists, and researchers are less	To train at least 40 engineers, scientists,	1. Published training	Continuous support of government of Thai,

Project Strategy		Objectively verifiable indicators				
		Indicator(quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	scientists and researchers.	prepared. 2. No. of engineers, scientists and researchers trained.	aware in new bio-ethanol production technology.	and researchers for the promotion of new bio-ethanol production technology.	modules. 2. Training reports. 3. Number of persons trained. 4. End of project survey.	and Vietnam, local engineers, scientists, and researchers.
Output 2.4	Pricing practices and policy environment improved.	1. Assessment report on policy needs. 2. No. of experts trained in pricing and policy requirements for bio-ethanol. 3. Policy intervention tools created.	Insufficient policies and pricing strategy for the improvement of bio-ethanol.	Adequate policy environment and pricing practices are in place.	1. Assessment reports on policy needs. 2. No. of experts trained. 3. Training reports. 4. Policy forum reports. 5. Reports with policy and pricing strategy.	Continuous support of NSTDA, MOIT, Vietnam and other respective government counterparts.
Outcome 3	Strengthened technological and technical cross-border cooperation and improved investment climate in Thailand and LMV.	1. Private made aware of opportunities of the technology. 2. Technical centre established as a result of cross-border cooperation. 3. No. of replication projects developed. 4. Capacity of demonstration and commercial projects established as a result	1. No demonstration plants exist for the new ethanol production technology. 2. Private sector and financial institutions sceptical about the new technology.	1. To establish technical centre at FIRI, Vietnam. 2. To implement demonstration projects of capacity 50 l/d in Vietnam. 3. To implement commercial plant of capacity 400,000 l/d in Myanmar. 4. To replicate at least 5 projects in Thai	1. Physical verification. 2. Government reports. 3. Project development activities for replication projects.	Continuous support of different governments, NSTDA, LDO & FIRI.

Project Strategy		Objectively verifiable indicators				
		Indicator(quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		of cross-border cooperation.		and LMV countries		
Output 3.1	A demonstration plant established in Thailand with ethanol production capacity of 200 l/day.	Capacity of demonstration plant and operation of the plant.	No demonstration plants exist for the new ethanol production technology.	To implement a 200 l/d demonstration project and operate it in Thailand.	1. Physical verification. 2. Government reports.	Continuous support of Thai Government, LDO & NSTDA.
Output 3.2	Training centre established at FIRI, Vietnam, to disseminate and provide trainings on the new technology package.	1. Training centre established at FIRI, Vietnam. 2. Operation of the training centre. 3. Toolkits and manuals (NSTDA) adjusted for local conditions.	No technical centre available for the development of bio-ethanol technology in Vietnam.	Establishment and sustainable operation of the centre.	1. Physical verification of the centre. 2. No. of persons trained. 3. Training report. 4. Model to ensure sustainability of the centre.	Continuous support of NSTDA, Vietnamese Government and FIRI.
Output 3.3	A demonstration plant established in Vietnam with ethanol production capacity of 50 l/d capacity.	Capacity of the demonstration plant and operation of the plant	No demonstration plants exist for the new ethanol production technology.	To implement a 50 l/d demonstration project and operate it in Vietnam	1. Physical verification. 2. Government reports.	Continuous support of NSTDA, Vietnamese Government and FIRI.
Output 3.4	Financing opportunities improved to finance the new technology.	Percentage increase in financing for new ethanol technology by the financing institutions.	Financial institutions reluctant to finance for the new bio-ethanol production technology.	Financial institutions ready to finance the new bio-ethanol production technology.	1. % increase on financing. 2. End of project survey. 3. Final evaluation.	Continuous support of financial institutions.

Project Strategy		Objectively verifiable indicators				
		Indicator(quantified and time-bound)	Baseline	Target	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Output 3.5	Private sector assisted in project development for replicating the projects.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No. of interested entities identified.</li> <li>2. At least 5 replication projects developed in Thai and LMV countries.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Private entities less interested.</li> <li>2. Lack of knowledge in project development.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To identify interested private project developers.</li> <li>2. At least 5 replication projects developed.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bankable project proposal readied for financing.</li> <li>2. Project reports.</li> </ol>	Continuous support of Government of Thai and LMV countries, financial institutions and private investors.
Output 3.6	Bio-ethanol production technology commercialized with the establishment of 400,000 l/d plant in Myanmar.	Capacity of the commercial plant with and its operation in Myanmar.	No commercial plants exist for the new ethanol production technology.	To implement and operate the project in Myanmar.	Physical verification of the project.	Continuous support of NSTDA, private sector and Myanmar government.
Output 3.7	Demonstration projects evaluated, lessons learnt and information widely distributed.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Plant performance study reports.</li> <li>2. Full scale demonstration site visits and seminars.</li> <li>3. Dissemination leaflets.</li> <li>4. Website.</li> </ol>	No demonstration projects are in place to study the performance and to learn the lessons from the demonstration plants.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Performance assessment report.</li> <li>2. Full scale demonstration site visits and seminar.</li> <li>3. Website.</li> <li>4. Project leaflet.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Performance monitoring report.</li> <li>2. Site visit/seminar.</li> <li>3. Programme evaluation form.</li> <li>4. Seminar material, leaflet, website.</li> </ol>	Sustained investor support to visit the project while in operation and data collection.

## Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria

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

No.	Evaluation criteria
<b>A</b>	<b>Progress to impact</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <u>Likelihood</u> to contribute to the expected impact</li> <li>✓ 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.</li> <li>✓ <u>Replication</u>: To what extent the project's specific results (e.g. methodology, technology, lessons, etc.) are reproduced or adopted</li> <li>✓ <u>Mainstreaming</u>: To what extent information, lessons or specific results of the project are incorporated into broader stakeholder mandates and initiatives such as laws, policies, regulations and project?</li> <li>✓ <u>Scaling-up</u>: To what extent the project's initiatives and results are implemented at larger geographical scale?</li> <li>✓ What difference has the project made to the beneficiaries?</li> <li>✓ What is the change attributable to the project? To what extent?</li> <li>✓ What are the social, economic, environmental and other effects, either short-, medium- or long-term, on a micro- or macro-level?</li> <li>✓ What effects are intended or unintended, positive or negative?</li> </ul> <p>[The three UNIDO impact dimensions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <u>Safeguarding environment</u>: To what extent the project contributes to changes in the status of environment.</li> <li>✓ <u>Economic performance</u>: To what extent the project contributes to changes in the economic performance (e.g. finances, income, costs saving, expenditure) of individuals, groups and entities?</li> <li>✓ <u>Social inclusiveness</u>: To what extent the project contributes to changes in capacity and capability of individuals, groups and entities in society, such as employment, education, and training?] </li></ul>
<b>B</b>	<b>Project design</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Overall design</u><sup>8</sup></li> <li>✓ The project design was adequate to address the problems at hand?</li> <li>✓ Is the project consistent with the Country's priorities, in the work plan of the lead national counterpart? Does it meet the needs of the target group? Is it consistent with UNIDO's Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development? Does it adequately reflect lessons learnt from past projects? Is it in line with the donor's priorities and policies?</li> <li>✓ Is the applied project approach sound and appropriate? Is the design technically feasible and based on best practices? Does UNIDO have in-house technical expertise and experience for this type of intervention?</li> <li>✓ To what extent the project design (in terms of funding, institutional arrangement, implementation arrangements...) as foreseen in the project document still valid and relevant?</li> <li>✓ Does the project document include a M&amp;E plan? Does the M&amp;E plan specify what, who and how frequent monitoring, review,</li> </ul>

<sup>8</sup> 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); is it in line with GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards: Separation of Implementation and Execution Functions in GEF Partner Agencies? (GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01)).

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<p>evaluations and data collection will take place? Does it allocate budget for each exercise? Is the M&amp;E budget adequately allocated and consistent with the logframe (especially indicators and sources of verification)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Were there any changes in project design and/or expected results after start of implementation.</li> <li>✓ Did the project establish a baseline (initial conditions)? Was the evaluation able to estimate the baseline conditions so that results can be determined?</li> <li>✓ Risk management: Are critical risks related to financial, social-political, institutional, environmental and implementation aspects identified with specific risk ratings? Are their mitigation measures identified? Where possible, are the mitigation measures included in project activities/outputs and monitored under the M&amp;E plan?</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Logframe</u></li> <li>✓ Expected results: Is the expected result-chain (impact, outcomes and outputs) clear and logical? Does impact describe a desired long-term benefit to a society or community (not as a mean or process), do outcomes describe change in target group's behaviour/performance or system/institutional performance, do outputs describe deliverables that project will produce to achieve outcomes? Are the expected results realistic, measurable and not a reformulation or summary of lower level results? Do outputs plus assumptions lead to outcomes, do outcomes plus assumptions lead to impact? Can all outputs be delivered by the project, are outcomes outside UNIDO's control but within its influence?</li> <li>✓ Indicators: Do indicators describe and specify expected results (impact, outcomes and outputs) in terms of quantity, quality and time? Do indicators change at each level of results and independent from indicators at higher and lower levels? Do indicators not restate expected results and not cause them? Are indicators necessary and sufficient and do they provide enough triangulation (cross-checking)? Are they indicators sex-diaggregated, if applicable?</li> <li>✓ Sources of verification: Are the sources of verification/data able to verify status of indicators, are they cost-effective and reliable? Are the sources of verification/data able to verify status of output and outcome indicators before project completion?</li> </ul>
<b>C</b>	<b>Project performance</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Relevance</u></li> <li>✓ How does the project fulfil the urgent target group needs?</li> <li>✓ To what extent is the project aligned with the development priorities of the country (national poverty reduction strategy, sector development strategy)?</li> <li>✓ How does project reflect donor policies and priorities?</li> <li>✓ Is the project a technically adequate solution to the development problem? Does it eliminate the cause of the problem?</li> <li>✓ To what extent does the project correspond to UNIDO's comparative advantages?</li> <li>✓ Are the original project objectives (expected results) still valid and pertinent to the target groups? If not, have they been revised? Are the revised objectives still valid in today's context?</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Effectiveness</u></li> <li>✓ What are the main results (mainly outputs and outcomes) of the project? What have been the quantifiable results of the project?</li> <li>✓ To what extent did the project achieve their objectives (outputs and outcomes), against the original/revised target(s)?</li> <li>✓ What are the reasons for the achievement/non-achievement of the project objectives?</li> <li>✓ What is the quality of the results? How do the stakeholders perceive them? What is the feedback of the beneficiaries and the stakeholders on the project effectiveness?</li> <li>✓ To what extent is the identified progress result of the project rather than external factors?</li> <li>✓ What can be done to make the project more effective?</li> </ul>

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Were the right target groups reached?</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Efficiency</u></li> <li>✓ How economically are the project resources/inputs (concerning funding, expertise, time...) being used to produce results?</li> <li>✓ To what extent were expected results achieved within the original budget? If no, please explain why.</li> <li>✓ Are the results being achieved at an acceptable cost? Would alternative approaches accomplish the same results at less cost?</li> <li>✓ What measures have been taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used? Were the project expenditures in line with budgets?</li> <li>✓ 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?</li> <li>✓ Could more have been achieved with the same input?</li> <li>✓ Could the same have been achieved with less input?</li> <li>✓ How timely was the project in producing outputs and outcomes? Comment on the delay or acceleration of the project's implementation period.</li> <li>✓ To what extent were the project's activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the Project Team and annual Work Plans?</li> <li>✓ Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet the requirements?</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Sustainability of benefits</u></li> <li>✓ Will the project results and benefits be sustained after the end of donor funding?</li> <li>✓ Does the project have an exit strategy?</li> <li><i>Financial risks:</i></li> <li>✓ What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the project ends?</li> <li><i>Socio-political risks:</i></li> <li>✓ Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> <li>✓ What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?</li> <li>✓ Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow?</li> <li>✓ Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?</li> <li><i>Institutional framework and governance risks:</i></li> <li>✓ Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits?</li> <li>✓ Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency and required technical know-how in place?</li> <li><i>Environmental risks:</i></li> <li>✓ Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> <li>✓ Are there any project outputs or higher level results that are likely to have adverse environmental impacts, which, in turn, might affect the sustainability of project benefits?</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Monitoring of long-term changes</u></li> <li>The M&amp;E of long-term changes is often incorporated in GEF-supported projects as a separate component and may include</li> </ul>

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<p>determination of environmental baselines; specification of indicators; and provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis, and use. This section of the evaluation report will describe project actions and accomplishments towards establishing a long-term monitoring system. The evaluation will address the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Did the project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?</li> <li>✓ What were the accomplishments and shortcomings in establishment of this system?</li> <li>✓ Is the system sustainable — that is, is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and does it have financing? How likely is it that this system continues operating upon project completion?</li> <li>✓ Is the information generated by this system being used as originally intended?</li> </ul>
<b>D</b>	<b>Cross-cutting performance criteria</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Gender mainstreaming</u></li> <li>✓ Did the project design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? Was the gender marker assigned correctly at entry?</li> <li>✓ Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)? Were there gender-related project indicators?</li> <li>✓ Are women/gender-focused groups, associations or gender units in partner organizations consulted/ included in the project?</li> <li>✓ How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?</li> <li>✓ Do the results affect women and men differently? If so, why and how? How are the results likely to affect gender relations (e.g., division of labour, decision-making authority)?</li> <li>✓ To what extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?</li> </ul>
2	✓ Environment and socio-economic aspects <sup>9</sup>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>M&amp;E: (focus on Monitoring)</u></li> <li>✓ <b>M&amp;E design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Was the Monitoring plan at the point of project approval practical and sufficient?</li> <li>○ Did it include baseline data and specify clear targets and appropriate indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio economic results?</li> <li>○ Did it include a proper M&amp;E methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of the M&amp;E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection;</li> <li>○ Did it include budget adequate funds for M&amp;E activities?</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ <b>M&amp;E implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How was the information from M&amp;E system used during the project implementation? Was an M&amp;E system in place and did it facilitate timely tracking of progress toward project results by collecting information on selected indicators continually throughout the project implementation period? Did project team and manager make decisions and corrective actions based on analysis from M&amp;E system and based on results achieved?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>9</sup> 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"> <li>○ Are annual/progress project reports complete and accurate?</li> <li>○ Was the information provided by the M&amp;E system used to improve performance and adapt to changing needs? Was information on project performance and results achievement being presented to the Project Steering Committee to make decisions and corrective actions? Do the Project team and managers and PSC regularly ask for performance and results information?</li> <li>○ Are monitoring and self-evaluation carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and impact in the logframe? Do performance monitoring and reviews take place regularly?</li> <li>○ Were resources for M&amp;E sufficient?</li> <li>○ How has the logframe been used for Monitoring and Evaluation purposes (developing M&amp;E plan, setting M&amp;E system, determining baseline and targets, annual implementation review by the Project Steering Committee...) to monitor progress towards expected outputs and outcomes?</li> <li>○ How well have risks outlined the project document and in the logframe been monitored and managed? How often have risks been reviewed and updated? Has a risk management mechanism been put in place?</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>Project management</u></li> <li>✓ Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.</li> <li>✓ Review whether the national management and overall coordination mechanisms have been efficient and effective? Did each partner have assigned roles and responsibilities from the beginning? Did each partner fulfil its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions)?</li> <li>✓ The UNIDO HQ-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (e.g. problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)?</li> <li>✓ 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?"</li> </ul>
<b>E</b>	<b>Performance of partners</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>UNIDO</u></li> <li>✓ <b>Design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mobilization of adequate technical expertise for project design</li> <li>○ Inclusiveness of project design (with national counterparts)</li> <li>○ Previous evaluative evidence shaping project design</li> <li>○ Planning for M&amp;E and ensuring sufficient M&amp;E budget</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ <b>Implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Timely recruitment of project staff</li> <li>○ Appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services</li> <li>○ Project modifications following changes in context or after the Mid-Term Review</li> <li>○ Follow-up to address implementation bottlenecks</li> <li>○ Role of UNIDO country presence (if applicable) supporting the project</li> <li>○ Engagement in policy dialogue to ensure up-scaling of innovations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Coordination function</li> <li>○ Exit strategy, planned together with the government</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>National counterparts</u></li> <li>✓ <b>Design</b></li> <li>○ Responsiveness to UNIDO's invitation for engagement in designing the project</li> <li>✓ <b>Implementation</b></li> <li>○ Ownership of the project</li> <li>○ Support to the project, based on actions and policies</li> <li>○ Counterpart funding</li> <li>○ Internal government coordination</li> <li>○ Exit strategy, planned together with UNIDO, or arrangements for continued funding of certain activities</li> <li>○ Facilitation of the participation of Non-Governmental Organizations(NGOs), civil society and the private sector where appropriate</li> <li>○ Suitable procurement procedures for timely project implementation</li> <li>○ Engagement with UNIDO in policy dialogue to promote the up-scaling or replication of innovations</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <b>Donor</b></li> <li>✓ Timely disbursement of project funds</li> <li>✓ Feedback to progress reports, including Mid-Term Evaluation</li> <li>✓ Support by the donor's country presence (if applicable) supporting the project for example through engagement in policy dialogue</li> </ul>
F	<p><b>Overall project achievement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the analysis made under Project performance and Progress to Impact criteria above but not an average of ratings.</li> </ul>

### Annex 3: Job descriptions

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

<b>Title:</b>	International evaluation consultant, team leader
<b>Main Duty Station and Location:</b>	Home-based
<b>Missions:</b>	Missions to Vienna, Austria and to Thailand
<b>Start of Contract (EOD):</b>	01/08/2018
<b>End of Contract (COB):</b>	31/10/2018
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	27-35 working days spread over 3 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 (incl. familiarization with the GEF programmes and strategies, and with relevant GEF policies such as those on project cycle, M&E, co-financing, fiduciary standards, gender, and environmental and social safeguards) 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant</li> <li>• An adjusted table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context</li> <li>• A draft list of stakeholders to be interviewed during the evaluation field mission</li> <li>• A brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework</li> </ul>	5 days	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
project's activities and analyze other background info.			
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	Home-based
Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to be interviewed and planned site visits) submitted to evaluation and project manager</li> </ul>	2 days	Vienna, Austria
3. Undertake evaluation field mission <sup>10</sup> 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"> <li>Field mission conducted</li> <li>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</li> <li>Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks</li> </ul>	6-10 days	Thailand
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"> <li>Power point presentation</li> <li>Feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed</li> <li>Additional meetings held as required</li> </ul>	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager for review and comments</li> </ul>	6/8 days	Home-based

<sup>10</sup> The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
comments			
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  Prepare a two pages summary of a take-away message from the evaluation	Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager  Two pages summary take-away message from the evaluation submitted to the evaluation manager	3/5 days	Home-based
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27/35 days</b>	

#### MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

**Education:** Advanced degree in environment, energy, engineering, development studies or related areas

**Technical and functional experience:**

- Minimum of 10 years' experience in environmental project management and/or evaluation (of development projects), including social safeguards and gender
- Knowledge about GEF operational programs and strategies and about relevant GEF policies such as those on project life cycle, M&E, incremental costs, and fiduciary standards
- Experience in the evaluation of GEF projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks
- Working experience in developing countries

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

**Reporting and deliverables**

- 1) 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 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)

<b>Title:</b>	National evaluation consultant
<b>Main Duty Station and Location:</b>	Home-based
<b>Mission/s to:</b>	Travel to potential sites within Thailand
<b>Start of Contract:</b>	01/08/2018
<b>End of Contract:</b>	31/10/2018
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	25-30 days spread over 3 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 TOR under the leadership of the team leader (international evaluation consultant). S/he will perform, inter alia, the following main tasks:

<b><u>MAIN DUTIES</u></b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>
<p><b>Desk review</b> Review and analyze project documentation (incl. familiarization with the GEF programmes and strategies, and with relevant GEF policies such as those on project cycle, M&amp;E, co-financing, fiduciary standards, gender, and environmental and social safeguards) and relevant country background information; in cooperation with the team leader, determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in Thai (questionnaires, logic models) as required; If need be, recommend adjustments to the tools in order</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A list of evaluation questions; questionnaires /interview guide; logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context</li> <li>• A list of key data available; and to be collected</li> <li>• A brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework in the context of the project</li> <li>• Input to inception report</li> </ul>	7 days	Home-based

<b><u>MAIN DUTIES</u></b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>
to ensure their understanding in the local context; Coordinate and lead interviews in local language and assist the team leader with translation where necessary; Analyze and assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework, specifically in the context of the project's objectives and targets.			
<b>Coordination of evaluation field mission</b> agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with project staff in the field; Assist and provide detailed analysis and inputs to the team leader in the preparation of the inception report.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed evaluation schedule</li> <li>• List of stakeholders to be interviewed during the field mission</li> </ul>	6 days	Home-based (telephone interviews)
<b>Participation in interviews during evaluation field missions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview notes</li> <li>• Input to presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission</li> </ul>	6-10 days	Home based, including in-country project sites in Thailand
<b>Draft evaluation report</b> 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
<b>Final evaluation report and summary take-away message</b> 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	2-3 days	Home-based
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>25-30 days</b>	

**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 environmental science, engineering or other relevant discipline like developmental studies with a specialization in industrial energy efficiency and/or climate change.

**Technical and functional experience:**

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

**Languages:** Fluency in written and spoken English and Thai 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 project<sup>11</sup> and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
  - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
  - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
  - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
  - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
  - Counterpart organization(s)

#### **III. Project assessment**

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

##### **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)
- 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

---

<sup>11</sup> Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g. relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives, etc.)

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:  
UNIDO Project ID:  
GEF ID:

### 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.**"<sup>12</sup>

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**"<sup>13</sup>.

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?

<b>Lessons learned are not:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simply restating or paraphrasing existing doctrine, policy, process, etc. This does not qualify as an appropriate and bona fide lessons learned<sup>14</sup>.</li><li>• Just applicable to a specific situation but applicable to a generic situation<sup>15</sup></li><li>• The same as recommendations. Recommendations usually refer to very specific situations including who should take action on what by when</li></ul>
---------------------------------	--

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> ILO Evaluation Unit, 2014: Guidance Note 3: Evaluation lessons learned and emerging good practices

<sup>14</sup> [www.dtic.mil/ndia/2004cmmi/CMMIT2Tue/LessonsLearnedtc3.pdf](http://www.dtic.mil/ndia/2004cmmi/CMMIT2Tue/LessonsLearnedtc3.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> [www.globalhivmeinfo.org/DigitalLibrary/Digital%20Library/Glossary%20of%20Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation%20Terms.doc](http://www.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"> <li>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>).</li> </ul>
UNIDO, 2017: Evaluación final independiente del proyecto: Centro de Automatización Industrial y Meca- trónica (Uruguay)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 loose its reputation as a strategic partner in such situations.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>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></li> </ul>
UNIDO, 2016: Independent terminal evaluation. Industrial Energy Efficiency in Ecuador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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></li> </ul>

## 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"> <li>“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></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“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></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“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></li> </ul>

## 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&E<sup>16</sup>**

### **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.

---

<sup>16</sup> [http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME\\_Policy\\_2010.pdf](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
<b>A</b>	<b>Progress to impact</b>	<b>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.</b>	Yes
<b>B</b>	<b>Project design</b>	<b>Formulation of the intervention, the plan to achieve a specific purpose.</b>	Yes
1	Overall design	Assessment of the design in general.	Yes
2	Logframe	Assessment of the logical framework aimed at planning the intervention.	Yes
<b>C</b>	<b>Project performance</b>	<b>Functioning of a development intervention.</b>	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
<b>D</b>	<b>Cross-cutting performance criteria</b>	<b>Other important criteria that cut across the UNIDO intervention.</b>	
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
<b>E</b>	<b>Performance of partners</b>	<b>Assessment of partners' roles and responsibilities engaged in the intervention.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
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
<b>F</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>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.</b>	<b>Yes</b>

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 sustainability<sup>17</sup>.

### 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

<sup>17</sup> GEF uses a four-point scale for the criterion of sustainability.

## 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
- 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 evaluations<sup>18</sup>. The six-point rating scale applies<sup>19</sup>.

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

---

<sup>18</sup> As practiced by the World Bank and the International Fund for Agriculture Development.

<sup>19</sup> 6 = Highly satisfactory; 5 = Satisfactory; 4 = Moderately satisfactory; 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory; 2 = Unsatisfactory; 1 = Highly unsatisfactory

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
- 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 objective<sup>20</sup>.

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 2015<sup>21</sup>, which have specific guidance on suitable outputs/activities/ indicators per technical area.

---

<sup>20</sup> [http://intranet.unido.org/intra/Gender\\_Mainstreaming\\_Tools\\_and\\_Guides](http://intranet.unido.org/intra/Gender_Mainstreaming_Tools_and_Guides)

<sup>21</sup> [www.unido.org/en/what-we-do/cross-cutting-issues/gender/publications.html](http://www.unido.org/en/what-we-do/cross-cutting-issues/gender/publications.html)

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 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.