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I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1. Project factsheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Implementation of BAT and BEP for reduction of UP-POPs releases from open burning sources in Armenia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO ID</td>
<td>150063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF Project ID</td>
<td>5038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country(ies)</td>
<td>Republic of Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project donor(s)</td>
<td>GEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation start date</td>
<td>1st September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected duration</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected implementation end date</td>
<td>31 December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF Focal Areas and Operational Project</td>
<td>GEF-5: POPs CHEM-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing agency(ies)</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Partners</td>
<td>Ministry of Nature Protection of the Republic of Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF project grant (excluding PPG, in USD)</td>
<td>853,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project GEF CEO endorsement / approval date</td>
<td>15 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO input (in kind, USD)</td>
<td>40,000 (cash) + 60,000 (in-kind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing at CEO Endorsement, as applicable</td>
<td>3,388,420 (cash + in-kind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost (USD), excluding support costs and PPG</td>
<td>4,241,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term review date</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned terminal evaluation date</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Project document)

2. Project context

Since its formulation in 2015, the GEF-funded project *Implementation of BAT and BEP for reduction of UP-POPs releases from open burning source* has been very relevant for the Republic of Armenia. Indeed, the situation of waste collection and transportation is outdated and insufficient, particularly in the rural areas, where almost all industrial and municipal wastes are disposed to landfills without separation and open burning of waste is common. This is because it is the cheapest and easiest means of volume reduction and disposal of combustible materials.

This solution, though, is not efficient in reducing the sanitary risks due to the pathogens present in the waste. In particular, contaminated ashes from processes (incinerators, cement kilns or industrial boilers) are often dispersed in open dedicated fields and waste oils are burnt. Poor or incomplete combustion due to insufficient air (smoldering phases typical of open burning), inhomogeneous and poorly-mixed fuel materials, the presence of chlorinated precursors and catalytic metals (copper, iron) are the main

1 Data to be validated by the Evaluation Team
factors for the formation and releases of Unintentionally Produced Persistent Pollutants (UP-POPs) in open burning processes. Releases from uncontrolled burning processes also include polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), heavy and volatile metals (Pb, Cu, Cd, Hg, Mn) and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5). The volatile nature of these pollutants impacts wildlife and humans far away from their point of release.

The main objective of the project is to facilitate the implementation of the Stockholm Convention – ratified by Armenian Government in 2003 – particularly its obligations on the continuous reduction of UP-POPs from open burning sources.

To achieve its goals, the project provided the opportunity for involving national stakeholders, such as some Ministries, municipalities, local authorities, research and academic institutions, NGOs and universities as technical partners. The private sector was also tapped to participate in the project, in particular by implementing BAT/BEP, and making a shift from burning of waste to recycling or re-use. Relevant government ministries and departments, laboratories have also been involved for awareness raising activities and for the coordination of the project implementation.

In particular, the Hazardous Substances and Wastes Policy Division, as a structural subdivision of the Ministry of Nature Protection of the Republic of Armenia regulates the problems dealing with chemicals and wastes. It performs the following activities:

- Develop concepts and strategy, as well as programs aimed at management of chemicals and wastes;
- Develop drafts of the legislative acts on chemicals and waste management;
- Carry out Inventory of wastes generated on the territory of the Republic of Armenia;
- Analyze of risks degree at enterprises, on the territory of which there is production, use of chemicals and wastes, which are potentially subject to industrial accidents, as well as inventory/accounting of a.m. enterprises;
- Coordinate activities dealing with chemicals and wastes management, as well as classification of chemicals produced and used and wastes generated on the territory of Armenia, according to degree of hazard;
- Expertise of Safety Passports for the hazardous industrial entities.

3. Project objective and expected outcomes

In the Republic of Armenia, open burning of industrial and municipal wastes is very common at landfills and illegal dumps as it is considered the cheapest and easiest way to reduce the volume of the waste. The combustion of these wastes generates different types of pollutants such as PAHs, NOx, Sox and Annex C POPs. These pollutants are airborne, thus travelling large distances and impacting both wildlife and humans far away from their point of release.

The main objective of the project is the reduction of UP-POPs releases from open-burning sources in Armenia through the introduction of BAT and BEP; at the same time, the project also aims at creating capacity within both the Government and private sector on BAT/BEP implementation.

The project also addresses the priorities listed in the National Implementation Plan (NIP) of 2005. Among these:
- Improvement of legislative/regulatory background for regulation of POPs relevant issues; setting up institutional capacities/structures and strengthening the interaction amongst concerned Ministries and Agencies aimed at revealing main sources of POPs-related pollution, reducing their releases and eliminating the most hazardous ones, investigating environmental contamination by Pops and taking joint actions for prevention of their impact on human health;

- Carrying out detailed inventory on main sources of POPs and POPs-containing wastes;

- Inventory taking on PCB-containing oils and equipment in energy and industry sectors of the Republic of Armenia;

- Replacement of PCB-containing oils and equipment, which are currently exploited at different entities of energy sectors and industry of Armenia, by PCB-free oils and equipment;

- Providing monitoring of POPs polluted/contaminated sites, development of analytical screening methods for POPs with the purpose of initial/preliminary assessment of local contaminations;

- Establishment of the Central Analytical Laboratory on POPs to ensure analyses and control on the environment;

- Environmentally sound elimination/disposal of PCB-containing oils and PCB-containing equipment, as well as existing stockpiles of obsolete pesticides;

- Implementation of sound/safe technologies, which exclude POPs generation, releases in industrial area/zones and the environment;

- Arrangement of epidemiological and statistical studies on POPs impact to human health and risk assessment;

- Carrying-out wide information and awareness raising activities on POPs problem in order to develop and establish an information system embracing issues on prevention of POPs harmful impact, as well as their after-effects for human and environmental health;

- Ensuring implementation of actions aimed to meet the objectives of Stockholm Convention;

- Extending and strengthening international cooperation relevant to POPs management, information exchange of data obtained as a result of R&D (researches, technical design developments), monitoring studies, BAT and BEP.

**Expected Outcomes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project component</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Regulatory framework and institutional strengthening | National regulatory and enforcement infrastructures in place to assure continuous release reduction of Annex C POPs from open burning sources | 1.1: Waste management regulatory framework updated  
1.2: Adequate management capacity built in implementing BAT/BEP and waste management practices  
1.3: Adequate capability strengthened in monitoring activities and in evaluating and reporting data of U-POPs releases |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project component</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotion of BAT/BEP at selected demonstration locations</td>
<td>Annex C POPs releases into the environment are gradually reduced from open burning activities</td>
<td>2.1: Cost and benefits of the available BAT/BEP measures for reducing Annex C POPs releases from open burning assessed&lt;br&gt;2.2: Pilot demonstration activities carried out in a selected site promoting waste reduction, re-use, recycle and BAT/BEP implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Awareness and dissemination</td>
<td>Project activities are sustainable and replicated</td>
<td>3.1: Awareness raising campaigns implemented&lt;br&gt;3.2: U-POPs from open burning and chemical safety of waste management related matters incorporated into educational curricula</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Project implementation arrangements

**UNIDO**: GEF implementing agency for the project, it is responsible for overall project implementation. A National Project Officer was appointed to undertake full coordination with the Project Management Team (PMT).

**Ministry of Nature Protection of the Republic of Armenia (MoNP)**: The Hazardous Substances and Waste Policy Division of the Ministry of Nature Protection of the Republic of Armenia (HSWPD) is the executing agency for the project as it is the national focal point for the Stockholm Convention in Armenia. It is responsible of the day-to-day management of the project.

**The Environmental Monitoring and Information Center (EMIC)**, successor of the Waste Research Center (WRC), is a state non-commercial organization at the Ministry of Nature Protection of the Republic of Armenia. EMIC is the cooperating agency which entered into contractual arrangements with UNIDO to perform specific activities in the project. EMIC is engaged in the development of scientifically based recommendations aimed at implementing the most appropriate measures in minimizing open burning activities in dumpsites and in the adoption of the BAT/BEP at dumpsites/landfills. At the same time it is involved in the development of the manuals for landfill operation and control and in the assessment of the proposed solutions to decrease the risks for the population. Finally, EMIC is engaged in the process of taking samples of different environmental media for further analyses.

**The Ararat Communal Service** under Ararat municipality is responsible for the execution of the demonstration activities under Component 2 with the supervision of HSWMD and UNIDO.

**Project Management Unit (PMT)**: was established within MoNP to ensure adequate organizational structure and to facilitate day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress based on the project's annual work plan and its indicators. A National Project Coordinator (from the Ministry) heads the PMT. The PMT regularly informs UNIDO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion.
**Project Steering Committee (PSC):** the National Project Coordinator from the Ministry of Nature Protection chairs the PSC. The PSC comprises of representatives from relevant ministries, UNIDO and other relevant stakeholders. The members of the PSC were supposed to be finalized during the project inception phase. The PSC planned to hold its regular sessions twice a year throughout the project implementation, but additional meetings could be held if necessary. A Technical Working Group (TWG) may also be formed to discuss technical issues that may arise during project implementation. The TORs of both PSC and TWG would be formulated and agreed during the project inception phase.

**Technical Working Group (TWG):** it includes a representative from the MoNP, the operating entity and NPC.

![Diagram of project execution and stakeholders](image)

5. **Main findings of the Mid-term review**

The mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the project was undertaken between September and October 2017 and has the following main **findings**:

**Relevance and Design:** the project takes into account and reflects national and local priorities and strategies and stakeholders consider the project highly relevant. Project design and objectives are in line with a) the GEF-5 strategies for chemicals management; b) the Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) strategy of UNIDO; c) global environmental objectives of the GEF.

**Efficiency:** at the stage of the MTR and despite an initial delay of one year due to institutional changes in the MoNP, the economical inputs of the project had very quickly converted into outputs, therefore the project was assessed as efficient. The planning and construction of the pilot demonstration of Material Recovery Facility (MRF) finished in 14 months at a very reasonable cost.

**Effectiveness:** overall the project was assessed as effective as the results achieved at that stage provided a foundation for delivering key project outcomes.

**Likelihood of Sustainability:** it was assessed as high.
Key recommendations

To UNIDO:
- It is recommended that in future projects the subcontract between the IA and the EA includes clauses that payments are not only linked to progress reports, but reporting of materialized co-financing as well.
- It is recommended that international experts should also send their mission reports to the national counterpart organization.
- Project implementation is delayed by approximately 1 year, therefore an extension until September 2018 is recommended.
- Project starting time should be better communicated to the national counterparts and the duration of the contracts need to be in line with the project implementation timeframe.

To the Government and counterpart organizations:
- The material flow at the MRF needs to be designed and the procurement of the equipment/tools (weight bridge, compactor, bailer, forklift, storage shelves/places for the bailed recycled wastes) shall be based on that plan in order to assure that the work at the MRF will be efficient.
- Discussion with the potential buyers of the segregated wastes shall also start prior to the procurement of the equipment used in the material flow at the MRF. This will assure that the quality, weight and outside dimensions of the bailed segregated wastes will meet the expectations of the buyers.
- It is also important to generate enough financial resources within one or two years to expand the landfill cell at the MRF. It is advised that the cost and benefit assessments of the MRF be prepared as soon as possible in order to assure that the required financing for running, maintaining, expanding, and long-term monitoring of the landfill cells is available.
- It is also recommended to open the MRF for the public as a buy-back center for segregated wastes. With this a much higher segregated waste quality could be achieved than through sorting of incoming mixed waste. This may prepare citizens, enterprises for the next level of waste management - segregation at source.
- It is recommended that new generations of experts are also trained together with the current ones to foster knowledge and knowledge transfer.
- In the future it would be better if the progress reports included the indicators of the logical framework and the results would be compared against those indicators. Similarly it would be very informative if the materialized co-financing were also reported.

6. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing (GEF / others)</td>
<td>853,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing (Cash and In-kind)</td>
<td>3,388,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (USD)</td>
<td>4,241,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project document / progress report
### Table 2. Financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project component</th>
<th>Donor (GEF/other) (USD)</th>
<th>Co-Financing (USD)</th>
<th>Total (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Framework and institutional strengthening</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>1,180,000</td>
<td>1,363,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of BAT/BEP at selected demonstration locations</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>1,448,420</td>
<td>1,938,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness and dissemination</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management costs</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (USD)</strong></td>
<td><strong>853,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,388,420</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,241,420</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project document / progress report

### Table 3. Co-Financing source breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Co-finanier (source)</th>
<th>In-kind</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>% over total co-financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Nature protection (National Government)</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union Framework of the European Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument (Other Multilateral Agency)</td>
<td>1,084,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank (Other Multilateral Agency)</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ararat Municipality (Local Government)</td>
<td>443,460</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Centre for Toxic Compounds in the Environment (Others)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau for Chemical Substances Poland (Others)</td>
<td>210,960</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^2\) Source: Project document
### Table 1: UNIDO budget execution (Grant 2000003074)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Co-financier (source)</th>
<th>In-kind</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>% over total co-financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Co-financing (USD)</td>
<td>3,348,420</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>3,388,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project document

### Table 4. UNIDO budget execution (Grant 2000003074)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of expenditure</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Total expend.</th>
<th>% /total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>447,509</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>22,945</td>
<td></td>
<td>470,629</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1,120.75</td>
<td>1,120.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,241.50</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local travel</td>
<td>3,876.71</td>
<td>6,922.63</td>
<td>2,006.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,806</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Consult./Staff</td>
<td>24,766.53</td>
<td>94,215.94</td>
<td>94,415.60</td>
<td>72,829.62</td>
<td>286,227.69</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>1,044.59</td>
<td>2,856.31</td>
<td>431.63</td>
<td>1,015.53</td>
<td>5,348.06</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; Intern Consultants</td>
<td>8,028.99</td>
<td>12,957.30</td>
<td>27,769.17</td>
<td>22.77</td>
<td>48,778.23</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train/Fellowship/Study</td>
<td>1,402.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,402.14</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>39,118.96</td>
<td>566,477.18</td>
<td>127,935.81</td>
<td>98,830.92</td>
<td>826,311.87</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Completion rate (current expenditure/GEF grant)**: 96.8%

Source: UNIDO Project Management database as of 22 August 2018

## II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to independently assess the project to help UNIDO improve performance and results of ongoing and future programmes and projects. The independent terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in 1/9/2015 to the estimated completion date in 31/12/2018.

The evaluation has two specific objectives:

(i) Assess the project performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and progress to impact; and

(ii) 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 Policy⁴ and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle⁴. In addition, the GEF Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies will be applied.

---

The evaluation will be carried out as an independent in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project will be informed and consulted throughout the evaluation. The evaluation team leader will liaise with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EIO/IED) on the conduct of the evaluation and methodological issues.

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

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

1. Data collection methods

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

(a) **Desk and literature review** of documents related to the project, including but not limited to:
   - The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports, mid-term review report, output reports, back-to-office mission report(s), end-of-contract report(s) and relevant correspondence.
   - Notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project.

(b) **Stakeholder consultations** will be conducted through structured and semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion. Key stakeholders to be interviewed include:
   - UNIDO Management and staff involved in the project; and
   - Representatives of donors, counterparts and stakeholders.

(c) **Field visit** to project sites in the Republic of Armenia.

(d) **Data and information analysis** will be taken during and after the field visits and will form the basis to prepare the evaluation report.

2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

The key evaluation questions are the following:

(a) What are the key drivers and barriers to achieve the long term objectives? To what extent has the project helped put in place the conditions likely to address the drivers, overcome barriers and contribute to the long term objectives?

(b) How well has the project performed? Has the project done the right things? Has the project done things right, with good value for money?

(c) What have been the project’s key results (outputs, outcome and impact)? To what extent have the expected results been achieved or are likely to be achieved? To what extent the achieved results will sustain after the completion of the project?

(d) What lessons can be drawn from the successful and unsuccessful practices in designing, implementing and managing the project?

The evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of the project results after the project completion. The assessment will identify key risks (e.g. in terms of financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental risks) and explain how these risks may affect the continuation of results after the project ends. Table 5 below provides the key evaluation criteria to be assessed by the evaluation. The details questions to assess each evaluation criterion are in annex 2 of the UNIDO Evaluation Manual.
Table 5. Project evaluation criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Mandatory rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Project design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Overall design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Logframe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Project performance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Relevance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Effectiveness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Efficiency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>• Sustainability of benefits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Cross-cutting performance criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Gender mainstreaming</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>• M&amp;E:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Results-based Management (RBM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Performance of partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• UNIDO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>• National counterparts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Donor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Overall assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance of partners

The assessment of performance of partners will include the quality of implementation and execution of the GEF Agencies and project executing entities (EAs) in discharging their expected roles and responsibilities. The assessment will take into account the following:

- Quality of Implementation, e.g. the extent to which the agency delivered effectively, with focus on elements that were controllable from the given GEF Agency’s perspective and how well risks were identified and managed.
- Quality of Execution, e.g. the appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services.

Other Assessments required by the GEF for GEF-funded projects:

The terminal evaluation will assess the following topics, for which ratings are not required:

a. The need for follow-up: e.g. in instances financial mismanagement, unintended negative impacts or risks.

b. Materialization of co-financing: e.g. the extent to which the expected co-financing materialized, whether co-financing was administered by the project management or by some other organization; whether and how shortfall or excess in co-financing affected project results.
c. **Environmental and Social Safeguards**: appropriate environmental and social safeguards were addressed in the project’s design and implementation, e.g. preventive or mitigation measures for any foreseeable adverse effects and/or harm to environment or to any stakeholder.

3. **Rating system**

In line with the practice adopted by many development agencies, the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division uses a six-point rating system, where 6 is the highest score (highly satisfactory) and 1 is the lowest (highly unsatisfactory) as per **Error! Reference source not found.**.

Table 6. Project rating criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Highly satisfactory</td>
<td>Level of achievement clearly exceeds expectations and there is no shortcoming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Level of achievement meets expectations (indicatively, over 80-95 per cent) and there is no or minor shortcoming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderately satisfactory</td>
<td>Level of achievement more or less meets expectations (indicatively, 60 to 80 per cent) and there are some shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Level of achievement is somewhat lower than expected (indicatively, less than 60 per cent) and there are significant shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Level of achievement is substantially lower than expected and there are major shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Level of achievement is negligible and there are severe shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. **Evaluation process**

The evaluation will be conducted from October to December 2018. The evaluation will be implemented in five phases which are not strictly sequential, but in many cases iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping:

i. Inception phase: The evaluation team will reconstruct the Theory of Change of the project and an evaluation matrix with specific questions for the evaluation; the specific site visits will be determined during the inception phase, taking into consideration the findings and recommendations of the mid-term review.

ii. Desk review and data analysis;

iii. Interviews, survey and literature review;

iv. Country visits;

v. Data analysis and report writing.

---

V. Time schedule and deliverables

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from October to December 2018. The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned for December 2018. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project in the Republic of Armenia. The tentative timelines are provided in Error! Reference source not found..

After the evaluation field mission, the evaluation team leader will visit UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of the preliminary findings of the terminal evaluation. The draft TE report will be submitted 4 to 6 weeks after the end of the mission. The draft TE report is to be shared with the UNIDO PM, UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, the UNIDO GEF Coordinator and GEF OFP and other stakeholders for receipt of comments. The ET leader is expected to revise the draft TE report based on the comments received, edit the language and form and submit the final version of the TE report in accordance with UNIDO ODG/EIO/EID standards.

Table 7. Tentative timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>Desk review and preparation of the TOC and Evaluation Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>Briefing with UNIDO project manager based in Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10 December 2018</td>
<td>Field visit to Republic of Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Preparation of first draft evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Debriefing in Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal peer review of the report by UNIDO’s Independent Evaluation Division and other stakeholder comments to draft evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of December 2018</td>
<td>Final evaluation report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluation consultant acting as the team leader and one national evaluation consultant. The evaluation team members will possess relevant strong experience and skills on evaluation management and conduct together with expertise and experience in innovative clean energy technologies. Both consultants will be contracted by UNIDO.

The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions annexed to these terms of reference. The ET is required to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including terminal evaluation verification on request to the GEF partnership up to three years after completion of the terminal evaluation.

According to UNIDO Evaluation Policy, members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the project under evaluation.

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

An evaluation manager from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division will provide technical backstopping to the evaluation team and ensure the quality of the evaluation. The UNIDO Project Manager and national project teams will act as resourced persons and provide support to the evaluation team and the evaluation manager.
VII. Reporting

Inception report

This Terms of Reference (ToR) provides some information on the evaluation methodology, but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager, the Team Leader will prepare, in collaboration with the national consultant, a short inception report that will operationalize the ToR relating to the evaluation questions and provide information on what type of and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). It will be discussed with and approved by the responsible UNIDO Evaluation Manager.

The Inception Report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework (“evaluation matrix”); division of work between the International Evaluation Consultant and national consultant; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable.\(^6\)

Evaluation report format and review procedures

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

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

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

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in annex 4.

VIII. Quality assurance

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on methodology and process of UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, providing inputs

---

\(^6\) The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV.
regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report and evaluation report by UNIDO’s Independent Evaluation Division).

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality, attached as Annex 5. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO’s evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation report are reviewed by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, which will submit the final report to the GEF Evaluation Office and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.
### Annex 1: Project Logical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Objectives</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>National &amp; Local &amp; International &amp; Private Sector-backed &amp; Joint Ventures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce POP releases in open burning sources in Armenia through the introduction of BAT/BEP</td>
<td>No. of men/women trained on BAT/BEP</td>
<td>BAT/BEP released in 2012 Inventory</td>
<td>BAT/BEP implemented in major dumping sites in the POPs releases in the national inventory</td>
<td>Involvement of at least two technical staff and private sector partners trained on BAT/BEP</td>
<td>A new set of regulatory instruments</td>
<td>In Armenia, there is currently only a loose framework for waste management in the legislation</td>
<td>Waste Management Regulatory Framework does not include BAT/BEP in its provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create capacity and private sector on BAT/BEP implementation</td>
<td>No. of men/women trained on BAT/BEP</td>
<td>BAT/BEP released in 2012 Inventory</td>
<td>BAT/BEP implemented in major dumping sites in the POPs releases in the national inventory</td>
<td>Involvement of at least two technical staff and private sector partners trained on BAT/BEP</td>
<td>A new set of regulatory instruments</td>
<td>In Armenia, there is currently only a loose framework for waste management in the legislation</td>
<td>Waste Management Regulatory Framework does not include BAT/BEP in its provisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- BAT/BEP: Best Available Techniques/Best Environmental Practices
- POPs: Persistent Organic Pollutants
- BSIS: Best Sustainable Industrial Strategy
- OAIS: Optimal Allocation of Industrial Strategies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Output 1.2</strong>: Adequate management capacity built in implementing BAT/BEP and sound waste management practices</th>
<th>Number of men/women trained</th>
<th>No current capacity on BAT/BEP implementation</th>
<th>At least 20 core men/women trained on BAT/BEP implementation in landfills</th>
<th>Training reports, courses on BAT/BEP</th>
<th>Relevant national and local institutions are fully involved in training activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.3</strong>: Strengthened capacities in monitoring activities and in evaluating and reporting data on UP-POPs releases.</td>
<td>Number of staff from governmental laboratory institutions provided with the necessary skills to carry out sampling, analysis and reporting of UP-POPs.</td>
<td>Currently, capacity of governmental laboratory institutions on sampling and analysis of UP-POPs is still inadequate.</td>
<td>At least 4 core staff (focal points) intensively trained to analyze and evaluate UP-POPs.</td>
<td>Training Reports National UP-POPs inventory report</td>
<td>Strengthening of National laboratories is within NIP priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2</strong>: Annex C POPs releases into the environment are gradually reduced from open burning activities</td>
<td>Amount of UP-POPs reduced in the selected demonstration site</td>
<td>230 mg TEQ/year on the selected demonstration site.</td>
<td>5.5 mg TEQ/year on the selected demonstration site.</td>
<td>UP-POPs release assessment</td>
<td>Support from local stakeholders/dumpsite operators on the demonstration project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of GHG reduced in the selected demonstration site</td>
<td>No study on GHG releases on the demonstration site is made</td>
<td>At least 80% GHG reduction due to proper waste segregation and recycling</td>
<td>Experts and facility report on the recycling activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of jobs created in recycling/waste management</td>
<td>Recycling of wastes is currently not being done in the selected demonstration site</td>
<td>Establishment of a recycling center and creation of jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value of materials recycled</td>
<td>No valuation is made on the amount of recyclable materials</td>
<td>Valuation of the recyclable materials to be undertaken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.1</strong>: Cost and benefits of available BAT/BEP measures for reducing Annex C POPs releases from open burning analyzed</td>
<td>UP-POPs precursors analysis carried out</td>
<td>No current study made on the selected demonstration site</td>
<td>Technical, social and risk assessment studies undertaken</td>
<td>Evaluation Report Risk Assessment Report</td>
<td>Support from the local dumpsite operators in carrying out the assessment of the demonstration site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.2:</strong> Demonstration activities carried out in a selected site promoting waste reduction, re-use, recycle and BAT/BEP implementation.</td>
<td>BAT/BEP interventions carried out</td>
<td>Currently, no sound waste management is in place in the candidate site.</td>
<td>At least one demonstration site implementing BAT/BEP to arrest indiscriminate burning of wastes</td>
<td>Cooperation Agreements set up with selected municipality and stakeholders. Report on BAT/BEP implementation</td>
<td>Investment from the municipality to implement BAT/BEP interventions timely available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3:</strong> Project activities are sustainable and replicated</td>
<td>Number of institution in the country engaged and strengthened to deliver awareness raising campaigns.</td>
<td>The awareness of the UP-POPs and BAT/BEP issues is very limited.</td>
<td>At least 2 institutions engaged and strengthened to deliver training</td>
<td>Cooperative Agreement with training institutions. Awareness raising plan and strategy report.</td>
<td>Willingness of relevant stakeholders to cooperate and participate in the activities is present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3.1:</strong> Awareness raising campaigns implemented.</td>
<td>Number of targeted awareness raising and dissemination workshop held</td>
<td>Previous awareness raising workshops did not focus on the issue of BAT/BEP and UP-POPs</td>
<td>At least one targeted awareness raising workshop and one dissemination workshop held</td>
<td>Awareness raising plan and strategy report. List of targeted stakeholders contacted. Reports / recording of raising awareness initiatives.</td>
<td>Target stakeholders identified are willing to participate in raising awareness initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3.2:</strong> UP-POPs from open burning and chemical safety waste management related matters incorporated into the educational curricula</td>
<td>Number of university involved in setting up dedicated courses</td>
<td>POPs issues are not being taught in the educational system</td>
<td>At least one university deploying the designed courses</td>
<td>Course curriculum Teaching modules</td>
<td>Suitable expert is available to design the required course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT**

The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EVQ/IEV) 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/EVQ/IEV is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

2. **PROJECT CONTEXT**

See details in the evaluation Terms of Reference

3. **DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Working Days</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument if needed; Streamlines specific questions to address key issues in the TOR, specific methods that will be used and data to collect in the field visits,</td>
<td>• Adjust table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; • Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions; • Draft theory of change and Evaluation framework matrix to submit to the Evaluation Manager for clearance</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN DUTIES</td>
<td>Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved</td>
<td>Working Days</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| detailed evaluation methodology confirmed, draft theory of change, and tentative agenda for field work. | • Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning;  
• Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant. | 0.5 day       | Vienna    |
| 2. Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ. | • Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP), etc. for the collection of data and clarifications;  
• Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks;  
• Evaluation presentation of the evaluation's initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country, including the GEF OFP, at the end of the mission. | 5 days        | Armenia   |
| 3. Conduct field mission in between 3-7 December 2018 to consult field project partners and beneficiaries to verify and complete preliminary evaluation findings from desk review and assess the institutional capacities of the recipient country. Present the evaluation preliminary findings and recommendations to national stakeholders and project staff at the Project Closing Workshop on 10 December 2018. | • After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed | 1 day         | Vienna, Austria |
| 4. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ. | • Draft evaluation report. | 7 days       | Home-based  
(including 2 days in Yerevan on 8 and 9 December 2018) |
| 5. Prepare the evaluation report, with inputs from the National Consultant, according to the TOR;  
Coordinate the inputs from the National Consultant and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report;  
Share the evaluation report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments. | • Final evaluation report. | 2.5 days     | Home-based |
| 6. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards. |                                                                                                           |              |           |
| **TOTAL**                                                                 |                                                                                                           | **21 days**  |           |
REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:
1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

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

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

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

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

Technical and functional experience:
- Minimum of 10 years’ experience in environmental/energy projects dealing with environmentally sound management (ESM) and POP phase-out, as well as project evaluation experience
- 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) 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.
2) 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.
UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title: National evaluation consultant

Main Duty Station and Location: Home-based

Mission/s to: Travel to potential sites within Armenia

Start of Contract: 1 November 2018

End of Contract: 31 December 31 2018

Number of Working Days: 15 working days (WAE)

1. ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EVQ/IEV) 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. ODG/EVQ/IEV is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

2. PROJECT CONTEXT

See details in the evaluation Terms of Reference

3. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>Evaluation questions, questionnaires/interview guide, logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context; A stakeholder mapping.</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information; in cooperation with the team leader, determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in English (questionnaires, logic models); If need be, recommend adjustments to the tools in order to ensure their understanding in the local context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the support of the project staff in Armenia, coordinate the evaluation mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings</td>
<td>• Detailed evaluation schedule • List of stakeholders to interview</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAIN DUTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN DUTIES</th>
<th>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with project staff in the field.</td>
<td>during the field missions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect, analyze data and information as requested by the team leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit and translate for the team leader, as required; Consult with the team leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks.</td>
<td>• Presentations of the evaluation’s initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission. • Agreement with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks.</td>
<td>6 days (including travel days)</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the Team Leader.</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report prepared.</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to the revision of the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.</td>
<td>Final evaluation report prepared.</td>
<td>1 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15 days</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

**Core values:**
1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

**Managerial competencies:**
1. Strategy and direction
2. Judgement and decision making
3. Conflict resolution

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

### MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

**Education:** Advanced university degree in environmental science, chemistry, engineering or other relevant discipline like developmental studies with a specialization in environment management.

**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 is an asset

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

Requirements
Relevant university degree; over 5 years’ experience in planning, implementation, monitoring and/or evaluation of projects in developing countries; excellent oral and written communication skills in English; demonstrated familiarity with procedures and practices of international technical cooperation.

Absence of Conflict of Interest:
According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the project/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before or shortly after the completion of her/his contract with UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV.
Annex 4- Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report

Executive summary (maximum 5 pages)

- Evaluation purpose and methodology
- Key findings
- Conclusions and recommendations
- Project ratings
- Tabular overview of key findings – conclusions – recommendations
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Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Project Title:
UNIDO ID:
Evaluation team:
Quality review done by:            Date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report quality criteria</th>
<th>UNIDO IEV assessment notes</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Was the report well-structured and properly written? (Clear language, correct grammar, clear and logical structure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Did the report include the actual project costs (total, per activity, per source)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of both the M&amp;E plan at entry and the system used during the implementation? Was the M&amp;E sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Quality of the lessons: were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6: Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and Projects

A. Introduction

Gender equality is internationally recognized as a goal of development and is fundamental to sustainable growth and poverty reduction. The UNIDO Policy on gender equality and the empowerment of women and its addendum, issued respectively in April 2009 and May 2010 (UNIDO/DGB(M).110 and UNIDO/DGB(M).110/Add.1), provides the overall guidelines for establishing a gender mainstreaming strategy and action plans to guide the process of addressing gender issues in the Organization’s industrial development interventions.

According to the UNIDO Policy on gender equality and the empowerment of women:

Gender equality refers to the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys. Equality does not suggest that women and men become ‘the same’ but that women’s and men’s rights, responsibilities and opportunities do not depend on whether they are born male or female. Gender equality implies that the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are taken into consideration, recognizing the diversity of different groups of women and men. It is therefore not a ‘women’s issues’. On the contrary, it concerns and should fully engage both men and women and is a precondition for, and an indicator of sustainable people-centered development.

Empowerment of women signifies women gaining power and control over their own lives. It involves awareness-raising, building of self-confidence, expansion of choices, increased access to and control over resources and actions to transform the structures and institutions which reinforce and perpetuate gender discriminations and inequality.

Gender parity signifies equal numbers of men and women at all levels of an institution or organization, particularly at senior and decision-making levels.

The UNIDO projects/projects can be divided into two categories: 1) those where promotion of gender equality is one of the key aspects of the project/project; and 2) those where there is limited or no attempted integration of gender. Evaluation managers/evaluators should select relevant questions depending on the type of interventions.

B. Gender responsive evaluation questions

The questions below will help evaluation managers/evaluators to mainstream gender issues in their evaluations.
B.1. Design

- Is the project in line with the UNIDO and national policies on gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- Were gender issues identified at the design stage?
- Did the project design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? If so, how?
- Were adequate resources (e.g., funds, staff time, methodology, experts) allocated to address gender concerns?
- To what extent were the needs and priorities of women, girls, boys and men reflected in the design?
- Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)?
- If the project is people-centered, were target beneficiaries clearly identified and disaggregated by sex, age, race, ethnicity and socio-economic group?
- If the project promotes gender equality and/or women’s empowerment, was gender equality reflected in its objective/s? To what extent are output/outcome indicators gender disaggregated?

B.2. Implementation management

- Did project monitoring and self-evaluation collect and analyse gender disaggregated data?
- Were decisions and recommendations based on the analyses? If so, how?
- Were gender concerns reflected in the criteria to select beneficiaries? If so, how?
- How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?
- If the project promotes gender equality and/or women’s empowerment, did the project monitor, assess and report on its gender related objective/s?

B.3. Results

- Have women and men benefited equally from the project’s interventions? Do the results affect women and men differently? If so, why and how? How are the results likely to affect gender relations (e.g., division of labour, decision making authority)?
- In the case of a project with gender related objective/s, to what extent has the project achieved the objective/s? To what extent has the project reduced gender disparities and enhanced women’s empowerment?