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I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1. Project factsheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>QUALITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMME IN CENTRAL AFRICA (French acronym PIQAC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO ID</td>
<td>100080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Regional Africa – Central Africa sub-region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country(ies)</td>
<td>Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Gabon, Central African Republic, and Chad (CEMAC) and Democratic Republic of Congo and São Tomé and Príncipe (CEEAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project donor(s)</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation start date</td>
<td>12/1/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected duration at project commencement</td>
<td>48 months (including 6 months for the initial phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected implementation end date</td>
<td>31 August, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing agency(ies)</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinating agency</td>
<td>Communauté Economique et Monétaire de l’Afrique Centrale (CEMAC) ; Département des Infrastructures et du Développement Durable de la Communauté Economique et Monétaire de l’Afrique Centrale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterpart</td>
<td>National Focal Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO RBM code</td>
<td>HC22 - Competitive trade &amp; CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost (USD)</td>
<td>6,781,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term review date</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned terminal evaluation date</td>
<td>November 2018-February 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Project document/ UNIDO Open Data Platform)

2. Project context

This project is a component of a much larger EU programme for the Central African region. Entitled “The Programme of Support to Trade and Economic Integration (PACIE in the French acronym) of the 10th European Development Fund (EDF), it is funded by the European Union and led by the Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa (CEMAC) in consultation with the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS). This is a framework programme with a budget Euro 68 million, covering the six CEMAC member countries (Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Gabon - Equatorial Guinea was not eligible for this project - the Central African Republic and Chad) as well as two ECCAS member countries (Democratic Republic of Congo and São Tomé and Príncipe). The PACIE programme is partly a continuation of the PAIRAC projects (Support Programme Regional Integration in Central Africa) and FASTRAC (Transport Facilitation Programme in Africa Centrale) of the 9th EDF, whose aim it is to correct the shortcomings, to improve, supplement and / or consolidate incorporating lessons learned.

The PACIE proposes to support the dynamics of Central Africa (CA) towards the realization of its vision of integration and sustained and sustainable integration into the global economy. The specific objective of

1 Data to be validated by the Consultant
PACIE is to deepen economic integration in Central Africa and strengthen regional market competitiveness within a framework of good regional governance that takes into account the main issues inherent in the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) and the regional economic and trade integration agenda. The intervention strategy of PACIE is to act on various parameters determining the integration process economic. It is structured around five components:

Component 1: Quality policy – which aims to draft a regional quality policy for the CEMAC for adoption by beneficiary countries.

Component 2: Strengthening quality infrastructure and institutions – which aims to achieve regional and operational quality infrastructure institutions which provide support services for private sector development and regional trade.

Component 3: Promotion of quality – which aims to engage the private sector and consumers to participate in programme outreach activities.

Component 4: PIQAC governance – which aims to operationalize (steering) committees at regional and national, make managerial procedures available, and set up the Programme Management Unit responsible for effective coordination Programme activities.

Component 5: Monitoring and evaluation and visibility – which aims to establish a monitoring system for the activities, results and objectives of the Programme; analyse and implement the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation; ensure that the recommendations of the final evaluation are taken into consideration and communicated to the donor, the implementing agency and the beneficiaries; to ensure that PIQAC activities are known and visible to stakeholders.

3. Project objective and expected outcomes

The intervention aims to adopt a regional approach to making quality infrastructure services to the private sector in the region more efficient and accessible. Thus, the intervention also aims at developing regional coordination and creating strong links between and within CEMAC member countries. Where possible, key regional personnel in regional level will organize and perhaps facilitate coordination meetings between relevant national bodies.

The UNIDO intervention framework was developed taking into account the objectives of the technical assistance the German Metrology Agency’s programme - Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt (PTB). Thus, the actions planned in this component of the PACIE will be implemented in a complementary manner to the current PTB activities in the region, essentially focused on metrology.

As a component of PACIE, PIQAC aims to contribute to PACIE’s overall goal, namely to promote peace and security, poverty-reducing growth and sustainable management of natural resources in Central Africa. By supporting the regional quality infrastructure, PIQAC aims at strengthening the commercial capabilities and competitiveness of enterprises.

PIQAC aims to strengthen the commercial capacity and competitiveness of the private sector through support for quality infrastructure, particularly in the context of the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA), currently under negotiation between the regional communities of the region.

The Programme envisaged contributing to the establishment of permanent capacities within the CEMAC Commission and ECCAS in charge of the management and implementation of this Programme, as well as other similar programmes to be developed in the future. There are three specific objectives of the Project, namely: the quality level, the institutional level and the level of enterprises and consumers in the region, i.e.:
1) Develop and adopt policies at the regional and national levels to support and promote intraregional trade and exports;

2) Establish and strengthen quality infrastructure institutions providing effective se intra-regional and international;

3) Engage the private sector and consumers to apply the principles and practices of quality in their behaviors and their operations / productions.

*Expected Outcomes:*

Three technical outcomes were identified:

- **Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2:** A quality policy is developed at regional level and applied to National levels.

- **Outcomes 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5:** Regional quality infrastructure institutions are developed and strengthened through a coordination mechanism for normalization and promotion activities and for the promotion of quality at regional level. Technical regulations and certification schemes are developed and disseminated and applied to priority products. Key analytical labs are identified and strengthened to ensure quality and safety of priority products.

- **Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2:** Private sector and consumers are aware of the importance of quality for better consumer protection and business competitiveness through a regional and national competition.

The full logical framework is included as annex 1.

4. **Project implementation arrangements**

Management and governance responsibilities include the identification of implementation modalities, effective delegation of decisions and direct support from UNIDO field offices. The Programme should contribute to the establishment of permanent capacities within the CEMAC Commission and ECCAS in charge of the management and implementation of this Programme, as well as other similar programmes to be developed in the future.

The governance and management model comprises four levels, namely the strategic level, the level of global coordination / management, the regional operational level and the national operational level (see Figure 1).
Experience from other regional programmes has demonstrated the need for high-level technical expertise at the central coordination level. In addition to coordinating the Programme, such experts also provide technical interventions to various stakeholders at the regional and national levels. This specialized team supervises the work of international consultants.

Due to its large scale in terms of results and programmed budget as compared to other similar programmes implemented to date in the region, a specific management mechanism was established.

The composition and functions of the actors at different levels is briefly described below. The start-up phase of the PIQAC is crucial to define the roles and detailed responsibilities of the different actors, through:

- the terms of reference of the steering committees (at regional and national level) and the appointment of representatives
- the management procedures manual (including the responsibilities of the different actors)
- the communication and visibility manual to ensure the proper use of communication channels
- methodology for establishing annual work plans.

### 4.1.1 Strategic level

Given its complexity, the PIQAC’s governance is ensured by the establishment of two-level steering committees whose main objectives are:

- to supervise PIQAC implementation,
- to provide strategic guidelines for its implementation and
- to define corrective measures, if necessary.

The interactions between the different representatives of National Technical Coordinating Committees (TNCs, French acronym) provide confidence, cooperation and coordination. Regular meetings are
scheduled to ensure a consistent dialogue on the sustainability and impact of PIQAC and to create a sense of ownership.

**First level - Regional Steering Committee (CRP, French acronym)**

Functions: Provide policy guidance and facilitate regional implementation of the PIQAC implementation and serve as a liaison structure with regional authorities and major donors, and to ensure the Programme’s compliance with socio-economic and industrial policies of the region.

Composition: Representatives of the CEMAC Commission, the ECCAS General Secretariat, the chairs and vice-chairs of national steering committees, EU representatives (observers), and UNIDO representatives (observer) and the Project Manager (PM) of UNIDO HQ. Other observers are invited as needed.

Meetings: The CRP should meet twice a year during the first year and once a year during the following years. The chairmanship of the meetings is ensured by one of the chairmen of the national steering committees.

The terms of reference of the CRP should have been established in the start-up phase of the Programme.

**Second level - National Steering Committees (CNP, French acronym) in each beneficiary country**

Functions: To monitor country-level implementation of the Programme.

Composition: Government representatives (Ministries of Economy, Industry and Commerce, Agencies in charge of SMEs and Quality Infrastructure, etc.); public and private sector institutions, as well professional organisations. Delegates from the public and private sectors share the positions of President and Vice-President of the CNP. Representatives of the EU and UNIDO in the country may also participate in the Committee (as an observer). Synergies with existing steering committees in a few beneficiary countries (Cameroon, Republic of Congo and Central African Republic as part of the future national programme) should have been sought.

The terms of reference of the CNP should have been established in the start-up phase of the Programme.

**4.1.2 Level of overall coordination/management**

UNIDO provides overall programme coordination/management, represented by its technical staff in the Headquarters-based Department of Trade, Investment and Innovation (PTC/TII). At this level, a regular exchange concerning different aspects of coordination of PIQAC is planned with the donor as well as with CEMAC.

Functions: The UNIDO Department of Trade, Investment and Innovation (PTC/TII) contributes technically to the implementation of the programme. As technical expertise in the region is limited, the Department ensures that the capacities of national and regional experts are created/strengthened; undertakes the overall coordination, planning and financial and programmatic management; proposes international experts, international workshops and training materials, study tours and procurement management.

Composition: Programme Manager (PM, GP French acronym) (part time), Quality Specialist, Administrative Assistant.

Management and communication procedures should have been established in the start-up phase of the Programme.

In addition, the Programme will benefit from the following specific resources provided by UNIDO (not included in PIQAC’s budget):
- Relevant Divisions of the Department of Trade, Investment and Innovation (PTC/TII) Service to follow global issues of the Programme (funded from UNIDO's regular budget);
- Two regional and national offices (Cameroon and Democratic Republic of Congo) in the Central African region supporting the implementation of the Programme technically and administratively (financed from UNIDO's regular budget);
- A programme implementation network established in Central Africa under previous and ongoing programmes in the region;
- Methods, tools and databases provided by UNIDO to ensure harmonization and quality in the implementation of the Programme;
- Experience in managing large-scale programmes through the implementation of several national and regional programmes in Africa (West and East Africa) and Asia (SAARC and Mekong River Commission);
- Stable and strong institutional relationships with governments and regional / national organizations
- Rich UNIDO global network with its relevant technical expertise.

4.1.3 Regional Operational Level

The regional operational level is to be provided by the Programme Management Unit (PMU, CGP French acronym). The PMU is dedicated to the implementation of PIQAC and functions as the interlocutor for all the experts (international and national) as well as for all the stakeholders. At the regional level, the CGP is the main actor coordinating the technical interventions, while at the national level the technical interventions are facilitated in cooperation with the actors in the national operational level. The PMU is located at CEMAC HQ, in Bangui, Central African Republic.

Functions: Under the supervision of the UNIDO Representative in Cameroon and the GP, to ensure the launching, implementation, coordination of technical interventions with the various counterparts and the regular preparation of reports on the implementation of the Programme at the regional and national levels; to propose a general work plan and a schedule of field operations to the steering committees; to assist with the resolution of specific issues emerging in the field; serve as the CRP Secretariat, be dedicated to the implementation of the PIQAC.

Composition: Senior Technical Advisor (CTP, French acronym), Standardization Technical Coordinator (CTN, French acronym), Certification Technical Coordinator (CTC) - (long-term international / regional technical expertise, Administrative Assistant, Driver.

Management and communication procedures should have been established in the start-up phase of the Programme.

4.1.4 National operational level

The national operational level is provided by the National Focal Points (PFN, French acronym) and the National Technical Coordinators (CTN, French acronym) based within the PFNs.

Functions: PFNs are responsible for anchoring / coordinating the Programme at the national level and are designated by the Ministry responsible for implementing national activities. PFNs should ensure long-term sustainability of the Programme through full involvement of stakeholders at the national level. Synergies should be sought with countries with national technical assistance programmes (Cameroon, Republic of Congo, and Central African Republic as part of the future national programme).

Composition: To be supported by qualified national experts, National Technical Coordinators (CTNs, French acronym). Staff costs are taken by the management of national counterparts, but PIQAC pays a
part-time salary premium (as should be reflected in the Programme budget) to compensate for the workload related to the implementation of PIQAC activities and to the high responsibilities under the Programme.

The terms of reference of the PFNs and CTNs should have been established in the start-up phase of the Programme.

Figure 2. Structure of management and coordination

4.1.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

UNIDO was due to provide periodic implementation reports to the CEMAC Commission and the EU Delegation in accordance with the provisions of the Contribution Agreement, including analytical financial reporting in euro reflecting the costs incurred by component.

A monitoring system with objectively verifiable progress indicators should have been implemented as defined in the start-up phase of the Programme, at the level of activities, results and specific objectives. At the same time, baseline studies should have provided information needed for programming activities and real needs. A national monitoring expert was meant to be hired on a part-time basis to evaluate the progress of the Programme and to provide recommendations to the Steering Committees and the Programme Management Unit. The results on the various indicators should be reported regularly in the implementation reports mentioned above.

A mid-term evaluation was to be carried out. The lessons learned, the recommendations of the evaluation and the corrective actions to be implemented should have been analyzed in consultation with the EU and CEMAC and the logical framework modified as appropriate.

The implementation of the management and coordination mechanism should bring the following results:

- Ownership of the Programme by the CEMAC Commission and the Ministries in charge at the national level; as a consequence, increased visibility of EU-funded development activities in the region;
- Strengthening technical capacities and human potential in the region among the beneficiaries of this Programme (CEMAC, the Ministries concerned, technical institutions, associations, consumers, the private sector);
- Improvement of national and regional technical expertise (national experts, consulting firms, etc.) to implement development activities for private sector enterprises and technical institutions;
- Programme compliance with regional and national industrial policies
- Improvement of the sustainability at the mid-point of the implementation of the Programme;
- Effective programme delivery due to simplified and decentralized decision-making procedures and facilitated financial management;

5. **Budget information**

Table 1. Budget breakdown by component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Component</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1 - Quality policy</td>
<td>61,250.00</td>
<td>67,900.00</td>
<td>67,900.00</td>
<td>197,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2 - Strengthening quality infrastructure</td>
<td>1,044,400.00</td>
<td>1,739,400.00</td>
<td>716,300.00</td>
<td>3,500,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3 - Promotion of quality</td>
<td>66,050.00</td>
<td>62,050.00</td>
<td>45,725.00</td>
<td>173,825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 4 - Governance</td>
<td>159,350.00</td>
<td>160,700.00</td>
<td>120,600.00</td>
<td>440,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 5 - Monitoring, evaluation and visibility</td>
<td>102,968.50</td>
<td>106,368.50</td>
<td>89,890.42</td>
<td>299,227.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 6 - Management</td>
<td>311,324.00</td>
<td>261,324.00</td>
<td>255,770.00</td>
<td>828,418.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,745,342.50</td>
<td>2,397,742.50</td>
<td>1,296,185.42</td>
<td>5,439,270.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-direct costs (7%)</td>
<td>122,173.98</td>
<td>167,841.98</td>
<td>90,732.98</td>
<td>380,748.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>1,867,516.48</td>
<td>2,565,584.48</td>
<td>1,386,918.40</td>
<td>5,820,019.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. UNIDO budget execution, EUR (Grant 2000002879)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of Expenditure</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>5,516.51</td>
<td>575,680.69</td>
<td>431,405.73</td>
<td>430.08</td>
<td>1,013,033.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>62,638.10</td>
<td>3,190.78</td>
<td>795,827.70</td>
<td>(4,121.16)</td>
<td>857,535.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Meetings</td>
<td>57,799.55</td>
<td>208,007.71</td>
<td>70,611.28</td>
<td>1,224.61</td>
<td>337,643.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local travel</td>
<td>66,603.04</td>
<td>84,859.01</td>
<td>28,224.79</td>
<td>(18.72)</td>
<td>179,668.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Consult./Staff</td>
<td>102,136.11</td>
<td>227,355.28</td>
<td>300,582.81</td>
<td>200,845.40</td>
<td>830,919.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>47,753.73</td>
<td>35,343.91</td>
<td>98,082.53</td>
<td>15,179.60</td>
<td>196,359.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Source: Project document
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 12/1/2014 to the estimated completion date in 31/08/2018.

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 Policy³ 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

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

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

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

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

(c) Field visit to project sites in countries in the Region:
   - On-site observation of results achieved by PIQAC, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies;
   - Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Country Office(s) representative to the extent that he/she was involved in the project, and the project’s management members and the various national [and sub-regional] authorities dealing with project activities as necessary;

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

2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

The 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 PIQAC performed? Has PIQAC done the right things? Has PIQAC done things right, with good value for money?

(c) What have been the PIQAC’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 programme?

The evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of PIQAC 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. The detailed questions to assess each evaluation criterion are provided in annex 2.
Table 3. 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></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>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>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

IV. Evaluation process

The evaluation will be conducted from November 2018 to February 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 December 2018 to February 2019. The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned for January 2019. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project in Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Gabon, Central African Republic, and Chad (CEMAC) and Democratic Republic of Congo and São Tomé and Príncipe (CEEAC). 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 5. Tentative timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Desk review and writing of inception report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Briefing with UNIDO project manager and the project team based in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vienna through Skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>Field visit to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of January 2019</td>
<td>Debriefing in Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation of first draft evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>Internal peer review of the report by UNIDO’s Independent Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Division and other stakeholder comments to draft evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of February 2019</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 field will support the evaluation team.

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.

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 feed-back in preparing the evaluation report. A presentation of preliminary findings will take place at UNIDO HQ after the field mission.

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

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

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).

---

6 The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV.
The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality, attached as Annex 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>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, capacity and competitiveness are strengthened in the CEMAC Region⁷</td>
<td>Intra-regional and international trade increases in priority sectors</td>
<td>Regional and national export statistics</td>
<td>Global economic stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive development of RASFF⁸ data from the region</td>
<td>Stable political and economic situation in the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEMAC and ECCAS continue their process of harmonization and coordination of national policies and the promotion of integration programmes in the different sectors, including industry and trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEMAC and ECCAS continue their process of adopting measures for the integration of the private sector, especially the creation of a favorable environment for the promotion of small and medium-enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and adopt policies at the regional and national levels to support and promote intra-regional trade and exports</td>
<td>A regional quality policy is adopted and in force at regional level</td>
<td>Law, decrees etc. on quality policies at national and regional level</td>
<td>Stable political and economic situation in the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National quality policies are adopted and in force at national level</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEMAC and ECCAS continue their process of harmonization and coordination of national policies and the promotion of integration programmes in the different sectors, including industry and trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEMAC and ECCAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁷ References to “CEMAC” include CEMAC members (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Gabon and Chad) as well as the two non-member states of CEMAC (DR Congo and Sao Tome and Principe)

⁸ Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish and strengthen quality infrastructure institutions providing effective services tailored to the needs of the private sector and consumers for priority regional products, leading to improved intraregional and international trade</td>
<td>Regional and national services provided by quality infrastructure institutions to the private sector and consumers are increasing</td>
<td>Service delivery reports provided by quality infrastructure institutions</td>
<td>General economic stability&lt;br&gt;Stable political and economic situation in the region&lt;br&gt;Effective management and good governance of institutions; engagement and participation of the private sector in programme interventions&lt;br&gt;Adequate resources allocated for quality infrastructure institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring the private sector and consumers to apply the principles and practices of quality in their behavior and operations / productions</td>
<td>Demand for quality information by the private sector and consumers is increasing&lt;br&gt;Quality information for the private sector and consumers is available</td>
<td>Dissemination and publication of information on quality, statistics on services provided by consumer protection associations&lt;br&gt;Reports on awareness campaigns on quality and consumer protection</td>
<td>Stable political and economic situation in the region&lt;br&gt;Available resources allocated for consumer protection associations and for support to the private sector&lt;br&gt;Engagement and involvement of the private sector and consumers in programme interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected results**

**Component 1 - A quality policy is developed at regional level and applied at national level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A quality policy is drafted at the CEMAC level and the beneficiary countries adopt it at national level</td>
<td>National and Regional Quality Policy assistants reports</td>
<td>Political and financial commitment at regional and national level to adopt quality policy(s) Stabile political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention logic</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.1</td>
<td>A quality policy is developed at regional level</td>
<td>A quality policy is drafted at regional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.2 ***⁹</td>
<td>National quality policies are derived from the regional quality policy</td>
<td>Beneficiary countries adapt regional quality policy according to national needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2 -</td>
<td>Regional quality infrastructure institutions are developed and strengthened</td>
<td>Regional quality infrastructure institutions are operational and support the development of the private sector and regional trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2.1</td>
<td>A coordination mechanism for standardization and quality promotion activities is established at regional level (CEMAC-NOR / M)</td>
<td>Development of a regional coordination mechanism for standardization and quality activities by a competent regional body and assignment of staff for its implementation at CEMAC level Start of the operation of the coordination mechanism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹ The results of the components annotated with a "***" will be continued in the second phase of the Programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**Result 2.2 ***** National Standardization Bodies (NSBs) Strengthened in Beneficiary Countries</td>
<td>National standards bodies are operational</td>
<td>Laws, decrees etc. establishing national standards bodies; documentation of their operational scheme and the staff recruited; business plans available; annual activity reports</td>
<td>Political and financial commitment to establish national standardization bodies Effective management and good governance of institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Result 2.3 ***** CEMAC regional standards, technical regulations and product certification schemes are developed, disseminated and applied for priority products</td>
<td>Identification of the necessary standards and regulations in the priority areas is made Regional standards (~ 20 regional standards based on international standards and European default) are adopted A model of a national product certification scheme and its dissemination to countries is developed</td>
<td>Reports on the development of CEMAC standards, technical regulations and product certification schemes Laws relating to standards, technical regulations and product certification</td>
<td>Political commitment to the harmonization of standards, technical regulations and product certification schemes Participation of all stakeholders in the development of CEMAC standards Financial and human resources available for the activities concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 2.4</strong> Food safety certification capabilities are strengthened (HACCP / ISO22000)</td>
<td>Auditors are trained and qualified in HACCP and ISO 22000 A food safety system is set up in the pilot companies (according to HACCP / ISO22000); business certification (about 10 companies)</td>
<td>Training documentation including certificates recognized for auditors Certificates obtained by companies in HACCP / ISO 22000</td>
<td>Existence of qualified people Existence of eligible companies willing to invest in upgrading to the adoption of a food safety system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 2.5</strong> Key analytical laboratories are identified and strengthened to ensure the quality and safety of priority products</td>
<td>Key laboratories and their essential needs are identified Laboratories are upgraded and operational (staff, equipment, etc.) The managerial and technical skills of the staff are reinforced The quality system is</td>
<td>Quality manual and procedures according to ISO 17025 Results of inter-laboratory tests Service statistics provided Certificates of accreditation</td>
<td>Basic technical skills required are available Budgets for laboratories (operational and investments) made available by national counterparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention logic</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adopted in laboratories (according to ISO 17025); laboratory accreditation (approx 7 laboratories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 3</strong> -</td>
<td>Private sector and consumers participate in programme outreach activities</td>
<td>Reports, statistics and surveys on participation in awareness and price campaigns Dissemination of information material</td>
<td>Stable political and economic situation in the region Engagement and involvement of the private sector and consumers in programme interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness campaigns of the role of the IQ are organized with the participation of the private sector, professional associations and consumers (at least 2,000 people)</td>
<td>Distribution of information material Participant surveys</td>
<td>Political and financial commitment to organize awareness campaigns Engagement and involvement of the private sector and consumers in programme interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 3.1</strong></td>
<td>The &quot;quality award&quot; procedures and the criteria for selecting candidates are established The awards ceremonies are held at the regional and national level</td>
<td>Reports and documentation on award procedures and ceremonies Business Participation Records Contest</td>
<td>Political and financial commitment to organize the contest A minimum of companies interested and eligible for the competition Maintaining the independence and integrity of the award process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 3.2</strong>*</td>
<td>Studies and activities that reinforce consumer protection at the regional and national level</td>
<td>The &quot;quality award&quot; procedures and the criteria for selecting candidates are established</td>
<td>Political and financial commitment to organize the contest A minimum of companies interested and eligible for the competition Maintaining the independence and integrity of the award process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 4</strong> -</td>
<td>Steering committees at regional and national level are operational Managerial procedures are available The Management Unit effectively coordinates Programme activities</td>
<td>Minutes of steering committee meetings Execution reports; financial reports</td>
<td>Stakeholders at regional and national level participate in steering committees Objective, impartial and non-political contributions from stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 5</strong> -</td>
<td>A monitoring system is established for the activities, results and objectives of the</td>
<td>Documentation on the monitoring system and corrective actions Evaluation reports</td>
<td>Beneficiaries provide access to the information required for the monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention logic</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The visibility of PIQAC is assured | Programme  
The recommendations of the mid-term evaluation are analyzed and, if necessary, implemented  
The recommendations of the final evaluation are taken into consideration and communicated to the donor, the implementing agency and the beneficiaries  
PIQAC activities are known and visible to stakeholders | Marketing tools / visibility equipment | System  
Stakeholders cooperate with evaluators  
Objective, impartial and non-political contributions from stakeholders |

Annex 3: GENERIC Job descriptions

UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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 countries involved in the Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Contract (EOD):</td>
<td>1st December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Contract (COB):</td>
<td>28th February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Working Days:</td>
<td>24 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 in 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>
</table>

<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 national evaluator, prior to field mission.</td>
<td>• Draft theory of change and Evaluation framework to submit to the Evaluation Manager for clearance. • Guidance to the national 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 agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning; • Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant.</td>
<td>2 day</td>
<td>Through skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conduct field mission to countries in the Region in 2019(^\text{10}).</td>
<td>• Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries,</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Countries participating in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.
<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>5. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ</td>
<td>• After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed.</td>
<td>2 day</td>
<td>Vienna, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 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.</td>
<td>• Draft evaluation report.</td>
<td>10 day</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>• Final evaluation report.</td>
<td>3 day</td>
<td>Home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>42 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

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

**Managerial competencies (as applicable):**
1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution

**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 engineering, development studies or related areas.

Technical and functional experience:
- Minimum of 15 years’ experience in industrial / quality infrastructure development and and/or evaluation (of development projects)
- Knowledge about donor programmes, strategies and relevant policies
- Experience in the evaluation of quality infrastructure development 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. Excellent knowledge of French is also required.
All reports and related documents must be in French, with executive summaries 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.
TITLE: National evaluation consultant

MAIN DUTY STATION AND LOCATION: Home-based

MISSION/S TO: Travel to potential sites within participating countries

START OF CONTRACT: 1st December 2018

END OF CONTRACT: 28th February 2019

NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS: 15 days spread over the above mentioned period

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.

PROJECT CONTEXT

The national evaluation consultant will evaluate the projects according to the terms of reference (TOR) under the leadership of the team leader (international evaluation consultant). S/he will perform the following tasks:

<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>MAIN DUTIES</td>
<td>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</td>
<td>Expected duration</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>Evaluation questions, questionnaires/interview guide, logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context; A stakeholder mapping, in coordination with the project team.</td>
<td>4 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);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If need be, recommend adjustments to the evaluation framework and Theory of Change in order to ensure their understanding in the local context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Carry out preliminary analysis of pertaining technical issues determined with the Team Leader. In close coordination with the project staff team verify the extent of achievement of project outputs prior to field visits. Develop a brief analysis of key contextual conditions relevant to the project | • Report addressing technical issues and question previously identified with the Team leader  
• Tables that present extent of achievement of project outputs  
• Brief analysis of conditions relevant to the project | 6 days            | Home-based     |
| Coordinate the evaluation mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with project staff in the field. | • Detailed evaluation schedule.  
• List of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. | 2 days            | Home-based     |
| Coordinate and conduct the field mission with the team leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required; Consult with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks. Conduct the translation for the Team Leader, when needed. | • 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. | 12 days (including travel days) | Countries in the Region |
| Follow up with stakeholders regarding additional information promised during interviews Prepare inputs to help fill in information | • Part of draft evaluation report prepared. | 8 days            | Home-based     |
MAIN DUTIES | Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved | Expected duration | Location
--- | --- | --- | ---
and analysis gaps (mostly related to technical issues) and to prepare of tables to be included in the evaluation report as agreed with the Team Leader. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and proof read the final version. |  | 32 days |  

**REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

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

*Managerial competencies (as applicable):*
1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution

*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 university degree in engineering or other relevant discipline like developmental studies with a specialization in industrial quality infrastructure.

*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 industrial quality infrastructure, including evaluation of development cooperation in developing countries is an asset

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

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

Executive summary (maximum 5 pages)

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

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

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

3. Project’s quality and performance
   3.1. Design
   3.2. Relevance
   3.3. Efficiency
   3.4. Sustainability
   3.5. Gender mainstreaming

4. Performance of Partners
   4.1. UNIDO
   4.2. National counterparts
   4.3. Donor

5. Factors facilitating or limiting the achievement of results
   5.1. Monitoring & evaluation
   5.2. Results-Based Management
   5.3. Other factors
   5.4. Overarching assessment and rating table

6. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
   6.1. Conclusions
   6.2. Recommendations
   6.3. Lessons learned
   6.4. Good practices

Annexes (to be put online separately later)

- Evaluation Terms of Reference
- Evaluation framework
- List of documentation reviewed
- List of stakeholders consulted
- Project logframe/Theory of Change
- Primary data collection instruments: evaluation survey/questionnaire
- Statistical data from evaluation survey/questionnaire analysis
Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Project Title:

UNIDO 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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?