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I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1. Project factsheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Capacity Strengthening and Technical Assistance for the implementation of Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plans (NIPs) in African Least Developed Countries (LDCs) of the ECOWAS Sub-region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO ID</td>
<td>104064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF Project ID</td>
<td>3969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Africa (ECOWAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country(ies)</td>
<td>Benin, Burkina Faso, Central Africa Republic, Chad, Gambia, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project donor</td>
<td>GEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation start date</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected duration</td>
<td>60 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected implementation end date</td>
<td>31 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF Focal Areas and Operational Project</td>
<td>FEM 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing agency</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government coordinating agency</td>
<td>Ministries of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor funding</td>
<td>USD 4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project GEF CEO endorsement / approval date</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO input (in kind, USD)</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing at CEO Endorsement, as applicable</td>
<td>USD 4,793,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost (USD), excluding support costs and PPG</td>
<td>USD 8,793,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term review date</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned terminal evaluation date</td>
<td>January – March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Project document)

1 Data to be validated by the Evaluation Team
2. Project context

To address the issue of the continuous degradation of the environment, the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) of the Sub-region ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States) adopted a list of measures to strengthen the environmental protection. During the last years, in particular, these countries focused on preventive approaches and on total control of the pollution. To achieve these goals, the ECOWAS Member States ratified the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), with the aim of protecting both human health and the environment against the negative effect of the POPs. According to the article 7 of the Convention, each party has to develop and try to apply a national plan for the implementation of its obligations.

The preliminary gap analyses conducted to assess the baseline situation of each State against the Convention’s requirements showed a widespread need of strengthening the capacities and the technology transfer components. Furthermore, the analyses showed other shortages, namely: awareness raising and training; monitoring of POPs in core media and the others; technology transfer for cleaner production; policies and regulations; inventory for intentionally generated POPs releases (pesticides, PCBs) and wastes containing POPs; identification of contaminated sites; an initial inventory of unintentionally produced POPs (UP-POPs) and introduction of BAT/BEP to mitigate and eliminate the releases of UP-POPs by key emitting industries; measures for environmentally sound management of wastes to reduce UP-POPs emitting from current open burning practices; financial mechanisms to ensure implementation of each action plan; development and enhancement of capacity in support of Convention implementation; and establishment a long-term mechanism to control POPs releases.

The project “Capacity Strengthening and Technical Assistance for the implementation of Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plans (NIPs) in African Least Developed Countries (LDCs) of the ECOWAS Sub-region”, officially launched at the beginning of December 2011 and implemented by UNIDO, seeks an answer to these issues. The implementation of this project is expected to support the ECOWAS countries to comply with the obligations of the Convention, thanks to the financial support of the GEF and other donors.

3. Project objective and expected outcomes

The overall objective of the proposed project is to reduce POPs emissions through strengthening and/or building capacity required in the LDCs of the ECOWAS sub-region to implement their Stockholm Convention NIPs in a sustainable, effective and comprehensive manner while building upon and contributing to strengthening country’s foundational capacities for sound management of chemicals and waste in general. The immediate objective of the project is to create an enabling environment in the ECOWAS Sub-region by establishing/amending laws, regulations, policies and standards, strengthening institutions for the remediation of contaminated sites, introducing BAT/BEP to industrial processes, managing municipal solid wastes, health-care wastes, supporting the phasing out of agricultural use of POP pesticides through the promotion of best agricultural practices including the use of bio-botanical pesticides and promoting locally designed technologies development.

Expected Outcomes and Outputs:

- Outcome 1: Introduction of BAT/BEP in industrial production processes and others mentioned in Annex C of Article 5 of the Convention;
  - Output 1.1: Regional ECOWAS BAT/BEP Forum established;
  - Output 1.2: Human resources for BAT/BEP developed, technical knowledge shared in SMEs;
  - Output 1.3: BAT/BEP in textile and leather dyeing and finishing, in waste oil refinery and food
smoke-curing source categories initiated.

- Outcome 2: Reduction of exposure to POPs at workplace and from waste;
  - Output 2.1: The concept of “Cleaner Solid Municipal and Health Care Waste Management System” introduced to the national plans of waste management (prevention and mitigation of UP-POPs release from open burning and landfill fires);
  - Output 2.2: Bio-botanical pesticides produced and promoted in agriculture including market-gardening in urban areas for most affected staple food crops;
  - Output 2.3: Strategy developed to audit, formalize and scale-up to MSEs informal management practices of PCBs solid and liquid waste, plastic waste, used paper and e-waste.

- Outcome 3: Identification and assessment of contaminated Land/sites;
  - Output 3.1: Site identification strategies, protocols and guidelines formulated and applied in the sub-region based on the UNIDO Toolkit
  - Output 3.2: Capacity to manage the contaminated sites strengthened.

- Outcome 4: Establishment of project management structure and M&E mechanism.
  - Output 4.1: Project management structure established;
  - Output 4.2: M&E framework designed and implemented according to GEF M&E procedures.

4. Project implementation arrangements

- **Programme Coordination Body (PCB):** comprising of representatives from UNEP, UNIDO, executing agencies, RECs, the Stockholm Convention Centres (SCCs), the Basel Convention Regional Centres (BCRCs). The PCB meets twice per year for the first two years, and has the role of overseeing the programme implementation.

- **Sub-regional Project Steering Committee (SPSC)** oversees the project execution. SPSC includes representatives from UNEP, UNIDO, executing agency staff, POPs/NFPs, the BCRC and relevant organizations relating to project execution. SPSC approves annual work plans, agrees on terms of reference for external consultants and oversees project activities. Furthermore, it also provides guidance to the executing agency and meets once every six months for the first 18 months, and annually thereafter. Among its main responsibilities: ensuring that the project's outputs meet the programme objectives; monitoring and reviewing of the project; ensuring that scope aligns with the agreed portfolio requirements; fostering positive communication outside of the focal points regarding the project's progress and outcomes; advocating for programme objectives and approaches and for exchanges of good practices between countries; reporting on project progress.

- **National project teams,** coordinated by the POPs/NFPs are responsible for executing activities at the national level. National project teams also include members of the NIP NCC and other relevant stakeholders. The National project teams meet once every three months to plan upcoming project activities and evaluate recently completed of ongoing activities. A project focal point (a UNIDO part-time professional and support staff) is established within UNIDO to assist in the project execution.

- **UNIDO and UNEP Regional Office of Africa** act as the Sub-regional executing agencies overseeing the development, implementation and management of the project.
The project management structure as designed is provided in Error! Reference source not found.

5. Main findings of the Mid-term review (MTR)

In accordance with the policies and procedures of both UNIDO and the GEF relative to the follow-up and to the evaluation, a mid-term independent evaluation was conducted in July 2017. The key findings are:

- the regulative framework for POPs management was strengthened by the adoption of the declaration on the creation of the BAT/BEP forum for Western and Central Africa adopted on September 12th 2012 in Arusha, Tanzania.

- successful development of the directives on the BAT/BEP for the ecologically-rational management of the biomedical waste on the basis of the lessons learnt by the pilot project GEF/UNDP together with the one on lubricating oils management;

- establishment of a research and training laboratory, through the implementation of the experimental demonstrations in various countries of the sub-region. As for the experts and national executives, around thirty were trained on the BAT/BEP in the textile, leather and oil refinery industries in 2012 in Dakar. Furthermore, additional thirty experts were trained on waste management with an emphasis on the reduction of the risks and on the concept of cleaner management of the solid municipal and biomedical wastes. Finally, around thirty experts coming from different institutions were trained at the regional level to allow them to collect the scientific data of the contaminated sites and to estimate the potential risks on human beings, fauna, flora and the environment in its whole;

- beginning of a dynamic coordination process among the ECOWAS Member States of the ECOWAS since 2011, with periodic meetings among executive members of the organ of coordination of the program including the sub-region of ECOWAS, COMESA and SADC.
6. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project outcomes</th>
<th>Co-Financing ($)</th>
<th>Donor (GEF/other) ($)</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Introduction of BAT/BEP in industrial production processes and others mentioned in Annex C of Article 5 of the Convention</td>
<td>1,556,500</td>
<td>1,760,000</td>
<td>3,316,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Reduction of exposure to POPs at workplace and close proximity of POPs wastes and UP-POPs emitting sources</td>
<td>1,080,500</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>2,280,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Identification and assessment of contaminated land/sites</td>
<td>1,797,952</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>2,597,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Establishment of project management structure and project M&amp;E mechanism</td>
<td>358,500</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>598,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ($)</td>
<td>4,793,452</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>8,793,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project document / progress report

Table 2. Co-Financing source breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Co-financier (source)</th>
<th>In-kind</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Total Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMA/CEDEAO</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission CEDEAO</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Union Africaine</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm Convention Secretariat</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASGIPC (SAICM)</td>
<td>1,148,452</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,148,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Co-financing ($)</td>
<td>3,798,452</td>
<td>995,000</td>
<td>4,793,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project document

---

2 Source: Project document.
Table 3. UNIDO budget execution (Grant n. 500123 - 500271 - 200000297)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of expenditure</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Total expenditure</th>
<th>% over total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>331,058</td>
<td>31,192</td>
<td>257,854</td>
<td>628,934</td>
<td>16,6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,097</td>
<td>331,508</td>
<td>54,781</td>
<td>608,141</td>
<td>195,457</td>
<td>162,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Meetings</td>
<td>271,701</td>
<td>135,886</td>
<td>13,699</td>
<td>28,498</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>35,612</td>
<td>60,288</td>
<td>548,060</td>
<td>14,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local travel</td>
<td>44,454</td>
<td>28,945</td>
<td>16,345</td>
<td>6,176</td>
<td>9,217</td>
<td>47,162</td>
<td>10,121</td>
<td>162,420</td>
<td>4,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff travel</td>
<td>11,243</td>
<td>10,542</td>
<td>7,502</td>
<td>10,740</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,054</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Consult./Staff</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,099</td>
<td>24,511</td>
<td>20,564</td>
<td>55,990</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>14,564</td>
<td>2,806</td>
<td>-1,264</td>
<td>2,372</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>22,455</td>
<td>0,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; Intern Consultants</td>
<td>72,631</td>
<td>126,409</td>
<td>100,877</td>
<td>245,152</td>
<td>81,393</td>
<td>128,724</td>
<td>103,960</td>
<td>859,146</td>
<td>22,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train/Fellowship/Study</td>
<td>23,641</td>
<td>11,607</td>
<td>11,579</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>43,983</td>
<td>-620</td>
<td>92,785</td>
<td>2,5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>258</td>
<td>&gt;0,01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>448,225</td>
<td>332,972</td>
<td>482,260</td>
<td>361,428</td>
<td>1,102,909</td>
<td>461,064</td>
<td>599,837</td>
<td>3,774,590</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNIDO Project Management database as of 11th October 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 terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in 6/12/2011 to the estimated completion date in 31/3/2019.

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 Policy\(^3\), Evaluation Manual and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle\(^4\). 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. The location will be decided at the inception phase together with the project management unit.

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 1 below provides the key evaluation criteria to be assessed by the evaluation. The details questions to assess each evaluation criterion are in annex 2.
Table 1. Project evaluation criteria

<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></td>
<td>• Overall design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Logframe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Project performance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relevance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effectiveness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efficiency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td>• Gender mainstreaming</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• M&amp;E:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ M&amp;E design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ M&amp;E implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td>• UNIDO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• National counterparts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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. 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 2. 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 January to March 2019. The evaluation will be implemented in five phases which are not strictly sequential, but in many cases iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping:

i. Inception phase: The evaluation team will prepare the inception report providing details on the methodology for the evaluation and include an evaluation matrix with specific issues for the evaluation; 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 January to March 2019. The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned between 17 February and 1 March 2019. 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 3. Tentative timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>Desk review and writing of inception report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 11 January 2019</td>
<td>Briefing with UNIDO project manager and the project team based in Vienna through Skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Feb – 1 Mar 2019</td>
<td>Field visit to selected countries (tentatively Niger, Guinea, Togo and Mali, to be confirmed at Inception Phase)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Week 11 March 2019 (to be confirmed with the project manager & evaluation team) | Debriefing in Vienna  
Preparation of first draft evaluation report |
| March 2019                       | Internal peer review of the report by UNIDO’s Independent Evaluation Division and other stakeholder comments to draft evaluation report |
| March 2019                       | Final evaluation report                                              |

VI. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international senior evaluation consultant acting as the team leader and one international junior evaluation consultant. The evaluation team members will possess relevant strong experience and skills on evaluation management and expertise and experience in environmental management. 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 will support the evaluation team throughout the evaluation process, including arranging meetings with stakeholders during the field visits. 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 missions.

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 team, 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”); tools for collecting data prior to field work; division of work between the team members; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable.

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.

---

6 The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV.
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 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>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.1: Sub-regional ECOWAS BAT/BEP Forum established</strong></td>
<td>➢ Existence of the ECOWAS sub-regional BAT/BEP Forum</td>
<td>➢ Legal instrument supporting BAT/BEP forum</td>
<td><strong>Assumptions:</strong> Willingness of the countries to establish the Forum <strong>Risks:</strong> Regional ECOWAS BAT/BEP Forum not established due to lack of Governments in the ECOWAS sub-region to sustain their commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 1.1.1:</strong> Convene a workshop to prepare declaration for establishment of the regional ECOWAS BAT/BEP Forum</td>
<td>➢ Verify the physical presence of the Declaration</td>
<td>➢ Workshop proceedings and copy of Declaration</td>
<td>➢ Capabilities of experts to elaborate the regional action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 1.1.2:</strong> Launch the Regional Forum for development and formulation of a regional action plan on BAT/BEP</td>
<td>➢ Launching and existence of the Regional Forum</td>
<td>➢ Workshop report and regional action plan</td>
<td>➢ Willingness of the industries to introduced BAT/BEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 1.1.3:</strong> Assist in enhancing industry performance in the region in conformity with the BAT/BEP guidelines and provisional guidance document including regional, local and traditional practices and socio-economic considerations</td>
<td>➢ At least two industries in the region that are in conformity with BAT/BEP</td>
<td>➢ Report on factory visit and laboratory test</td>
<td>➢ Resistance to work together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 1.1.4:</strong> Develop partnerships in the region for successful implementation of the regional action plan</td>
<td>➢ Memorandum of Understanding to implement regional action plan</td>
<td>➢ Signed MOU to implement regional action plan</td>
<td>➢ Reluctance of the industries due to high cost involved in introducing BAT/BEP into the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.2: Human Resource for BAT/BEP developed, technical knowledge shared in SMEs and informal sector</strong></td>
<td>➢ Number of experts trained on BAT/BEP in textile, leather and oil refinery sectors</td>
<td>➢ Database on experts trained on BAT/BEP</td>
<td><strong>Assumption:</strong> Willingness of all stakeholders to participate in training and awareness building <strong>Risks:</strong> Enduring and effective cooperation between ECOWAS member states is unable to be achieved for the implementation of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Logic</td>
<td>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</td>
<td>Sources of Verification</td>
<td>Assumptions/Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Activity 1.2.1**: Carry out training workshops in BAT/BEP in textile dyeing and finishing | ➢ Number of experts in the textile sector trained in BAT/BEP  
➢ At least two experts in the leather sector trained in BAT/BEP  
➢ Number of experts in the oil refinery sector trained in BAT/BEP  
➢ Number of participants from the informal sector in awareness raising campaigns | ➢ Training workshops report  
➢ Awareness raising campaigns report | ➢ Willingness of all stakeholders to participate in training workshops  
➢ Willingness of informal sector actors to participate in the campaigns |
| **Activity 1.2.2**: Carry out training workshops in BAT/BEP in leather dyeing and finishing |                                                                                         |                                                               |                                                                                  |
| **Activity 1.2.3**: Carry out training workshops in BAT/BEP in waste oil refinery |                                                                                         |                                                               |                                                                                  |
| **Activity 1.2.4**: Undertake targeted awareness raising campaigns in BAT/BEP for informal sector |                                                                                         |                                                               |                                                                                  |
| **Output 1.3: BAT/BEP in textile and leather dyeing and finishing, in waste oil refinery and in food smoke-curing source categories initiated** | ➢ BAT/BEP in textile, leather, waste oil refinery and food smoke-curing sectors introduced | ➢ Existence of pilot demonstration sites | ➢ Willingness of the actors to participate in pilot demonstration and to implement the improved technology  
**Risks**: Health and safety related issues when BAT/BEP strategies are implemented |
| **Activity 1.3.1**: Carry out pilot demonstration of BAT/BEP in textile dyeing and finishing | ➢ Number of pilot demonstration in the sectors  
➢ Number of actors/operators trained on BAT/BEP | ➢ Visit the pilot demonstration sites  
➢ Training report | ➢ Willingness of the factories to introduce pilot projects  
➢ Personnel protection equipment (PPE) and training to operators of the facilities will be provided to increase awareness on risks to health and occupational safety |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2: Reduction of exposure to POPs at workplace and close proximity of POPs waste and UP-POPs emitting sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Output 2.1 Concept of cleaner municipal solid waste and health-care waste management system introduced in national waste management systems to mitigate UP-POPs releases** | Number of city municipalities implementing the concept of cleaner MSW and HCW management system | Existence of pilot demonstration for MSW and HCW management system                          | Assumption: Decision makers to promote the implementation of sound waste management measures adopted in the NIP  
Risks: Occupational potential exposure to POPs from informal activities in waste management is not understood by various stakeholders |
| **Activity 2.1.1. Organise national workshops on "Cleaner Waste Management" with the aim to promote business and job opportunities in the field of waste management.** | Number of awareness raising workshops on MSW management organised for national and local decision makers  
Awareness raising and training workshops on waste management held in city municipalities  
Number of experts trained on cleaner waste management  
Regional centres with operational waste management programmes  
Number of revised training manuals produced  
Number of pilot demonstration of cleaner HCW management | Training and workshop reports  
Activity reports of selected regional centres to host the training programmes sites  
Reports on visits to centres and pilot demonstration site  
Manuals produced | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Intervention Logic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sources of Verification</strong></th>
<th><strong>Assumptions/Risks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2.1.5</strong> Carry out pilot demonstration of cleaner HCW management based on the lessons learnt from the GEF/UNDP Demonstration Project and support replication activities in the sub-region</td>
<td>➢ Number of micro- or small enterprises producing bio-botanical pesticides</td>
<td>➢ Memorandum of Understanding between the private investor(s) and the governments to co-finance bio-botanical pesticides production initiatives</td>
<td><strong>Assumption:</strong> Associations of the smallholder farmers exist in the countries and their members aware of the risks posed by POP pesticides to their own health, that of the consumer as well as to the environment. <strong>Risks:</strong> Reluctance of urban agricultures to use bio-botanical pesticides as alternatives to POPs and the like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.2: Bio-botanical pesticides produced and promoted in agriculture including market-gardening in urban areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2.2.1</strong> Organise (in cooperation with FAO/RENPAP/MoA) national training workshops for market gardeners on integrated pest management in crop protection and post-harvest management with particular focus on the use of bio-botanical pesticides</td>
<td>➢ Number of awareness workshops held for smallholder farmers on integrated pest management and use of bio-botanical pesticides</td>
<td>➢ Workshop reports ➢ Inventory reports ➢ Scientific publications, ➢ Laboratories research reports ➢ MSc and/or PhD thesis ➢ National Chambers of Commerce records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2.2.2</strong> Review existing data and conduct national inventory of existing bio-botanical pesticides formulations</td>
<td>➢ Inventory reports on bio-botanical pesticides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2.2.3</strong> Facilitate field testing of Bio-botanical pesticides in cooperation with research institutions, RENPAP, FAO and farmers associations.</td>
<td>➢ Number of producers using and/or willing to use individually or in cooperatives the new natural bio-pesticide formulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2.2.5</strong> Support PPP model for the creation of a national MSE to produce and promote the use of bio-botanical pesticides</td>
<td>➢ Research activities on field application of bio-botanical pesticides for pest management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Number of MSEs producing and/or providing bio-botanical pesticides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Logic</td>
<td>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</td>
<td>Sources of Verification</td>
<td>Assumptions/Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Output 2.3. Strategy developed to audit, formalize and scale-up to micro- or small enterprises informal management practices of PCBs solid and liquid waste, plastic waste, used paper and e-waste** | ➢ Number of micro- or small enterprises using BAT/BEP for waste recycling | ➢ Copy of strategy document | ➢ MoA promotes and supports integrated pest management in crop protection and post harvest management  
➢ Smuggling of non-registered pesticides is controlled  
➢ Bio-botanical pesticides are economically affordable  
**Assumption:** Private investors are willing to promote green micro- or small enterprises recycling plastic bags and the like in the production of various consumer products  
**Risks:** Lack of ability to develop appropriate arrangements to attract national and international private investment or secure support for the development of PPP |
| **Activity 2.3.1. Identify the informal collection system of PCBs waste and perform environmental audits to determine the need for enhancing collection and channelling of the PCBs waste streams on an ESM manner in line with the GEF/UNDP Pilot project in the Sub-region.** | ➢ Inventory on collection of PCBs wastes in the sub-region  
➢ Inventory on existing plastic waste management options  
➢ Development of a sub-regional plastic waste management concept  
➢ Number of national/sub-regional micro- or small enterprise recycling plastic bags in an ESM concept  
➢ Number of national/sub-regional micro- or small enterprises recycling paper and e-waste in an ESM manner  
➢ Number of initiatives supported  
➢ Number of enterprises on recycling paper and e-wastes at national level | ➢ Survey and audit reports  
➢ Copy of inventory reports on existing plastic waste management options  
➢ Scientific publications  
➢ Laboratory reports  
➢ MSc and/or PhD thesis  
➢ National chambers of commerce records  
➢ Report of site visits | ➢ The national power companies, the private owners of electrical transformers and the handicraftsmen using or recycling PCBs waste collaborate tightly in the NIP’s action plan on the management of PCBs and their waste.  
➢ The academia and the various actors in the management of MSW collaborate to mitigate the risk posed by the land filling or open burning of plastic bags and the like |
## Intervention Logic

**Activity 2.3.4** Support the creation of a Micro- or Small Enterprise for an environmentally sound recycling of plastic bags form an existing structure.

**Activity 2.3.5** Investigate the current informal paper and e-waste management and the management of other halogenated solid and liquid waste streams.

**Activity 2.3.6** Provide support for activities to prevent irrational dumping and open burning of paper, e-waste and other halogenated solid and liquid waste.

**Activity 2.3.7** Support PPP model for creation of a Micro- or Small Enterprise for an environmentally sound recycling of paper and e-wastes in the national level.

### Outcome 3: Identification and assessment of contaminated land/sites

**Output 3.1: Contaminated sites identification strategies, protocols and guidelines formulated and applied in the Sub-region based on the UNIDO Toolkit**

- Number of identified and assessed contaminated sites in the sub-region
- Percentage of population that are aware of the danger of contaminated sites to human health and environment
- Strategy, protocol and guidelines document
- National map of contaminated sites

**Assumption:** Commitment of countries to clean up contaminated sites (hot spots)

**Risks:** Remediation of contaminated sites not seen as priority by decision makers

**Activity 3.1.1** Prepare manuals, procedures, protocols and guidelines for local use for the identification of POPs contaminated sites and for conducting risk assessment of these sites

**Activity 3.1.2** Develop a methodology for the selection of economically feasible and environmentally sound POPs contaminated site remediation technologies

- Physical presence of the strategy document including procedures, protocols and guidelines for
- Validated document that stipulate the step by step approach to select benign technology for the clean up of contaminated sites
- Copy of strategy document
- Copy of materials and reports of validation workshops
- Activity report of the pilot demonstration project

**Assumption:** Stakeholders involvement during the process of formulating the strategy and methodology

**Risks:** Resistance to use new technology on the part of implementers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Activity 3.1.3** Conduct study to identify environmentally sound remediation technologies or benign ways of cleaning up of the contaminated sites | > Validated review report on cost benefit analysis and effectiveness of various remediation technologies  
> Number of pilot demonstration project to validate effectiveness of low cost remediation technology and methodology  
> Number of contaminated sites remediation plan in the sub-region | > Report on the effectiveness of the pilot demonstration project  
> Copy of remediation plan for the identified hotspots in the sub-region | > Timely delivery of laboratory analysis results  
> Least cost technologies may not always be efficient |
| **Activity 3.1.4** Undertake pilot demonstration project to verify the effectiveness of the low cost remediation technology and validate contaminated site identification methodology  
**Activity 3.1.5** Prepare contaminated site remediation plans of the identified hot spots in the Sub-region. | **Output 3.2: Capacity to manage contaminated sites strengthened** | > Number of experts trained on use of the Toolkit on contaminated sites developed by UNIDO | **Assumption:** Willingness of the countries to support and commit for the replication of pilot demonstration project  
**Risks:** Difficulty in identification and management of contaminated sites with POPs chemicals |
| **Activity 3.2.1** Launch training workshop, using the UNIDO Toolkit and the FAO manuals and guidelines, to experts from the relevant institutions to enable them collect scientific data from contaminated sites and assess potential risks to humans, wildlife and the environment  
**Activity 3.2.2** Create database and website within the ECOWAS Sub-region, linked to UNIDO website, to share and disseminate data/information collected from contaminated sites and hotspots  
**Activity 3.2.3** Raise awareness among the major stakeholders, including decision makers, on the health risk that may result from exposure to POPs contaminated sites | > Number of stakeholders who regularly use the website and database from each country  
> Operational database and website  
> Number of initiated awareness raising programme  
> List of economic and financial incentives put in place by the governments for private investors  
> Memorandums of Understanding between the government or any public body and the private sector  
> Ministerial declaration of the ECOWAS LDC member States within the AMCEN meetings | > URL of website  
> Training workshop reports on contaminated sites  
> Workshop reports  
> Countries willing to replicate the pilot demonstration project  
> Reports on the pilot demonstration projects in relation with policy development, incentives, and the public-private partnerships  
> Reports on the success stories  
> AMCEN meeting reports | > Experts that will participate in the workshop may not be the relevant experts  
> Willingness of stakeholders to participate in workshops  
> Willingness of stakeholders to participate in the fund raising workshops |
| **Activity 3.2.4:** Assess aspects of involvement of technology providers for the development of public-private partnerships in managing contaminated land/sites  
**Activity 3.2.5** Develop mechanism to mobilize funds from within the ECOWAS LDC member states for the remediation of contaminated sites to ensure project sustainability | **Activity 3.2.6** | > Head of States decision at ECOWAS summit | **ECOWAS Head of States summit reports** |
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>International evaluation consultant, team leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Duty Station and Location:</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions:</td>
<td>Missions to Vienna, Austria and Niger, Guinea, Togo &amp; Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Contract (EOD):</td>
<td>10 January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Contract (COB):</td>
<td>31st March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Working Days:</td>
<td>43 working days spread over the above mentioned period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 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. 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.

2. PROJECT CONTEXT

Detailed background information of the project can be found the terms of reference (TOR) for the terminal evaluation.
<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). Define technical issues and questions to be addressed by the national technical evaluator prior to the field visit. Determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument if needed. In coordination with the project manager, the project management team and the national technical evaluator, determine the suitable sites to be visited and stakeholders to be interviewed.</td>
<td>• Adjusted table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; • Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. • Identify issues and questions to be addressed by the local technical expert</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 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, confirm the evaluation methodology, draft theory of change, and tentative agenda for field work. Provide guidance to the national evaluator to prepare initial draft of output analysis and review technical inputs prepared by evaluation analyst, prior to field mission.</td>
<td>• Draft theory of change and Evaluation framework to submit to the Evaluation Manager for clearance. • Guidance to the evaluation analyst evaluator to prepare output analysis and technical reports</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Home based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ (included is preparation of presentation).</td>
<td>• Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission schedule (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning; • Division of evaluation tasks with the evaluation analyst.</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Through skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conduct field mission in 2019(^7).</td>
<td>• Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders,</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>Selected countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.
### MAIN DUTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved</strong></th>
<th><strong>Working Days</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country, including the GEF OFP, at the end of the mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(specific project site to be identified at inception phase)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ

- After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed.
3 day Vienna, Austria

6. Prepare the evaluation report, with inputs from the evaluation analyst, according to the TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the evaluation analyst and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report. Share the evaluation report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.

- Draft evaluation report.
10 day Home-based

7. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.

- Final evaluation report.
3 day Home-based

TOTAL

43 days

### REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

**Core values:**

**Managerial competencies (as applicable):**
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

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

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

Technical and functional experience:
- Minimum of 15 years’ experience in evaluation of development projects and programmes
- Good working knowledge in environmental management
- 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 French and English is required.

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.
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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>
<tr>
<td>k. Are the main cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights and environment, appropriately covered?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Was the report delivered in a timely manner? (Observance of deadlines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports
A rating scale of 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately satisfactory = 4, Moderately unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.
Annex 6: Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and Projects

A. Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Gender responsive evaluation questions

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

B.1. Design

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

B.2. Implementation management

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

B.3. Results

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