



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent terminal evaluation

SWITCH-Med, Demonstration and Networking Components

UNIDO Project ID: 130163

DECEMBER 2018

Contents

I.	Project background and overview	3
1.	Project factsheet	3
2.	Project context	3
3.	Project objective	6
4.	Project implementation arrangements	7
5.	Main findings on project progress	8
6.	Budget information	8
II.	Scope and purpose of the evaluation	10
III.	Evaluation approach and methodology	11
1.	Data collection methods	11
2.	Evaluation key questions and criteria	12
IV.	Evaluation process.....	14
V.	Evaluation team composition	14
VI.	Time schedule	15
VII.	Evaluation deliverables	15
VIII.	Quality assurance	16
	Annex 1: Project results framework	17
	Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria	26
	Annex 3: Job descriptions	33
	Annex 4: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report	43
	Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality	46
	Annex 6. Guidance and checklist on lessons learned quality criteria	47
	Annex 8. Rating tables	50

I. Project background and overview

1. Project factsheet

Project title	SWITCH-Med, Demonstration and Networking Components
UNIDO project No. and/or ID	130163
Region	Southern Mediterranean
Country(ies)	Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine and Tunisia
Planned implementation start date	1 February 2014
Planned implementation end date	31 December 2017
Actual implementation start date	1 February 2014
Actual implementation end date	31 December 2018
Implementing agency(ies)	UNIDO
Executing partner(s)/entity(ies)	Sustainable Consumption and Production - Regional Activity Center of the UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan (SCP-RAC/UNEP-MAP), and UN Environment – Economy Division (UNEP-Economy Division, previously DTIE)
Donor(s):	European Union (DG NEAR)
Total project allotment	20,000,000 EUR
Total co-financing at design (in cash and in-kind)	Cash: 1,000,000 EUR
Materialized co-financing at project completion (in cash and in-kind)	Cash: 1,000,000 EUR
Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM)	Oct-Nov. 2016

(Source: Project document)¹

2. Project context

Coordinating the ambitions of economic growth and environmental protection is a necessity in a world where natural resources are limited. The Southern Mediterranean region is greatly affected by water scarcity, population growth and rapid urbanization in coastal areas, growing waste generation, climate change and massive tourism. During the last few years, the region has experienced dramatic social and political changes. It has struggled during the economic crisis and governance remains a significant challenge. In spite of these challenges, this historical turning point presents opportunities to introduce and promote sustainable consumption and production practices through programs like the SWITCH-Med which can in turn support the development of a green economy.

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

The region has shown its commitment to sustainable development through the adoption of the SDGS, Paris Agreement and Barcelona Convention, among others. Those various commitments are supported by the regional dialogue within the Union for the Mediterranean concerning the environment, the water and the circular energy. The EU-funded SwitchMed goal was to facilitate the shift toward Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) in the Southern Mediterranean Region. To do so, the programme stimulated the demand and the supply side of sustainable consumption and production (SCP) in the southern Mediterranean countries, by acting on the key drivers and barriers, existing economic conditions and legislative frameworks. It supported the industry, emerging green entrepreneurs, civil society and policy makers through policy development, demonstration activities and networking.

The SWITCH-Med programme is a key action carried out under the EU-funded regional cooperation with the Mediterranean region to shift the region towards a Green Economy, and was implemented through collaborative efforts by the EU, UNIDO, UNEP/MAP-SCP/RAC and UN Environment Economy Division (formerly UNEP-DTIE). Project implementation started in February 2014 and the implementation end date is December 2018.

The SCP approach is at the core of the Green Economy and Green Industry concepts as it involves moving towards a transformation in the way goods and services are produced and consumed so that human development and the satisfaction of human needs is effectively decoupled from environmental degradation and resource depletion. Shifting toward a SCP approach calls for concerted efforts of all key actors in society: industry, civil society organisations (CSOs), consumers and policy makers. Each of these actors is facing specific problems and barriers in moving towards more sustainable consumption and/or production practices.

Industry of the Mediterranean Region is facing numerous challenges in its effort to be competitive while reducing its ecological footprint. Pressure from stakeholders throughout the supply chain is increasing, requiring internalization of the environmental costs associated to manufacturing, a more efficient use of resources and production inputs, compliance with national environmental regulation and adoption of international standards. However businesses often lack technical skills in identifying resource efficiency initiatives, establishing integrated environmental management systems as a sound business strategy and delivering more sustainable goods & services. The local market of service providers that can provide industry technical assistance on sustainable production needs to be further developed and strengthened.

Green entrepreneurs are called to have a leading role in the transition to green economies. Nevertheless, several factors hinder the emergence of local green entrepreneurship and the creation of green jobs. Overall there is a lack of entrepreneurial culture, and potential new green entrepreneurs tend to lack the experience to start a business effectively and the capacity to develop the green business opportunities that already exist in the local market. Technical support to entrepreneurs is scarce, and access to finance represents a major barrier.

On the other hand market opportunities for green entrepreneurs mostly arise within societies that are characterized by empowered Civil Society Organizations and by a critical mass of citizens that are aware of the environmental and social impacts associated with current unsustainable models of consumption and production. The limited demand for sustainable products in the southern Mediterranean countries is one of the core reasons for the still limited green entrepreneur's activity in the region.

Consumers/CSOs in the southern Mediterranean countries experience many challenges in shifting toward more sustainable lifestyles. For instance they lack information to enable them to purchase, use and dispose of products in an environmentally sound way. There is a general lack of awareness of most citizens on the environmental and social impacts associated with consumption choices and a low interest for green products and services. Raising civil society's awareness on the links between environment degradation, social disparities and patterns of consumption and production and supporting further involvement of civil society organizations in the processes of governance is therefore a key leverage point for the move towards more sustainable production and consumption.

Policy makers and regulatory authorities are essential for stimulating both the supply and the demand side for sustainable products at country level, by creating the necessary enabling environment through policy and economic instruments, as well as regulatory standards and voluntary agreements. While most southern Mediterranean countries have a relevant basic policy and regulatory framework in place, there is frequently a lack of enforcement, or absence of concrete practical initiatives putting this into practice. Beyond a lack of societal pressure, there is a perception that environmental protection would hinder rather than support growth and job creation. Concrete demonstration of positive synergies between policy/regulatory initiatives/instruments and economic development will be important to change the situation

SWITCH-Med overall objective is to facilitate the shift toward Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) in the Southern Mediterranean region by demonstrating successful examples of how this can be done. The initiative consists of three main components: a) a policy component; b) a demonstration component and c) a networking facility component. The EU contract with UNIDO covered the demonstration and networking facility components; while a separate contract with UNEP-MAP was undertaken for the policy component.

The project document foresees regular monitoring of activities throughout the programme, as well as an independent, terminal evaluation (TE). In addition the European Commission carried an independent Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) exercise focused on SWITCH-MED. The ROM was conducted in Oct-Nov. 2016 (ROM report, January 2017), it was contracted by DG NEAR and included a field mission to Algeria, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia. DG NEAR also conducted an independent evaluation of their regional and bilateral level programmes in the field of environment in the Neighbourhood South countries (2010-2017). The evaluation focused on their broader environmental programme but included SwitchMed as part of the overall evaluation.

A second phase of SwitchMed has been approved by the donor and is expected to commence in the first quarter of 2019. SwitchMed II will retain the same overall structure, will involve the same implementing partners and work in the same eight countries. The objective is to stimulate the creation of new greater business opportunities and decent employment while reducing the environmental footprint of existing economic activities in the Southern Mediterranean. It will build on the results of the first phase to further support and scale up the transition towards Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) practices which contribute to a green and circular economy in the region.

3. Project objective

The SWITCH-Med initiative is a multi-component programme supported by the EU. Its **overall objective** is to facilitate the shift toward Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) in the Southern Mediterranean region by demonstrating successful examples of how this can be done.

The **SWITCH-Med Policy component** aims at strengthening the regional environmental governance and policy frameworks provided by the Barcelona Convention and UNEP/MAP, with a focus on developing national SCP policy action plans in the beneficiary Mediterranean countries.

The **SWITCH-Med Demonstration component** focuses on the implementation of concrete actions tackling the barriers faced by key players responsible for the shift towards SCP patterns. It consists of three sub-components:

- **Subcomponent 1: Sustainable production - MED TEST² II:** increasing the demand and supply of sustainable production services to industry, including providing direct “TEST” technical assistance to industries.
- **Subcomponent 2: Green entrepreneurship and civil society empowerment:** strengthening Green Entrepreneurship in the Mediterranean Region; and empowering Mediterranean Civil Society Organizations towards more sustainable lifestyles.
- **Subcomponent 3: SCP National Action Plans demos:** implementing demonstration activities under the SCP National Action Plans (NAPs) developed with governments under the SWITCH Med policy component.

The **SWITCH-Med Networking Facility component** established a SCP regional platform which contributed to the visibility, effectiveness, long-term sustainability and impact of the Programme. This component also aimed at reinforcing the internationalization of start-ups and SMEs through closer cooperation between clusters, businesses and investment networks in Europe and four associated Mediterranean countries (Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia) with a specific focus on green business and resource efficiency.

The present project document describes solely the SWITCH-Med demonstration and networking facility components. The policy component was implemented by UNEP-MAP, under a separate contract with the European Commission, and executed by UNEP Economy Division and SCP/RAC.

Following are the 4 main outcomes of the project, in addition to project management:

- **Outcome 1:** increased demand for and supply of sustainable production services among industries in the southern Mediterranean countries.
- **Outcome 2:** boost Green Entrepreneurship in the Mediterranean Region; to empower Mediterranean Civil Society Organizations towards more sustainable lifestyles and to leverage interactive initiatives between Mediterranean Green Entrepreneurs and CSOs

² MED TEST I was a UNIDO project under the MedPartnership initiative – www.unido.org/MEDTEST

- **Outcome 3:** Pilot projects demonstrate how SCP can be integrated into the national policy
- **Outcome 4:** Contribute to the visibility, effectiveness, long-term sustainability and impact of the components of the SWITCH-Med Programme.

4. Project implementation arrangements

The SWITCH-Med initiative was conceived as a multi-stakeholder initiative involving different partners, namely UNIDO, SCP-RAC / UNEP-MAP and UN Environment Economy Division. Each organization had a direct responsibility for the management and monitoring of individual sub-components, as well as liaising with other partners to ensure synergies and cooperation. Responsibilities of each partner were as follow:

UNIDO was responsible for:

- The execution, including monitoring and reporting on progress for subcomponent 1 MED TEST II and for activities 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 of the NF component;
- Submission to the EC of snapshots reports every six months on the project's progress. This responsibility will consist of reporting on MED TEST II, and compilation and quality assurance of the contributions of partners for the other subcomponents and the NF;
- The submission of full fledged annual reports (technical and financial sections) to the EC, including compilation and quality assurance of the contributions from partners for the other subcomponents and the NF;
- Organization of periodical coordination meetings to be held every six months, including preparation of meeting reports;
- Organization of the Steering Committee meetings (the first SC meeting was organized by UNEP-MAP under the framework of the SWITCH-Med Policy Component);
- Provide active support to the Networking component, executed by SCP/RAC, by providing information on MED TEST II activities; to contribute to an effective coordination and synergies between partners and the project's components, including the Policy Component;
- Facilitate in-country coordination of activities between the MED TEST II and the other subcomponents.

In order to accomplish the above tasks, UNIDO established a project's management unit (PMU) formed by an UNIDO project manager, one full time administrative staff, an externally recruited project coordinator for day to day management of project's activities, a technical advisor for TEST subcomponent and a communication consultant.

SCP/RAC was responsible for:

- Execution, including monitoring, of subcomponent 2, GE/SC;
- Execution, including monitoring, of the Networking Facility component (excluding activities 4.3.1 and 4.3.2), including coordinating and maximizing synergies between agencies and the project's subcomponents as well as the Policy Component;
- Reporting on progress of GE/SC subcomponent and Networking component to UNIDO according to the defined format and schedule (snapshot report every 6 months and yearly full technical/financial report);
- Co-execute the SCP/NAPs subcomponent (covering 4 countries of 8) in coordination with UN Environment Economy Division, including monitoring and reporting of co-executed activities to UN Environment Economy Division;
- Participation to coordination meetings held every six months as well as SC meetings.

UNEP Economy Division was responsible for

- Co-execution, including monitoring, of subcomponent 3 (covering 4 countries of 8) SCP/NAPs in close cooperation with SCP/RAC;
- Reporting on progress of SCP/NAPs to UNIDO according the defined format and schedule (snapshot report every 6 months and yearly full technical/financial report);
- Participation to coordination meetings held every six months as well as SC meetings.

5. Main findings on project progress

The ROM expert conducted field missions covering four countries: Algeria, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia, at around the mid-point of the programme implementation. The following lists **some of the findings**:

Relevance: The expert considered the **project to be highly relevant** for regional development and found varying, but mostly satisfying links between SwitchMed and the country governments.

However, it was pointed out that in reality two things are principally missing:

- 1) There is very little exchange between national governments about the experiences of participating in SwitchMed.
- 2) National governments do not have a full overview of all donor initiatives and funding available for SCP.

Efficiency: There was a delay due to many factors including the security situation in the region. While the project expenditures on activities, including the use of incidentals, are within initial estimates. Consequently, it pointed out that until that point, SwitchMed is delivering its outputs cost-efficiently, if with some delays.

Effectiveness: overall quality of the SwitchMed's outputs as good. Delivery of project outputs is progressing, if somewhat delayed.

Sustainability: SwitchMed has a number of promising elements for achieving sustainability, but nothing has yet been achieved on the ground:

Further details can be obtained from the ROM report (January 2017).

6. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary

Description	Project Preparation (in EUR)	Project (in EUR)	Total (in EUR)
Financing (EU)	0	19,000,000	19,000,000
Co-financing ³ (in cash and/or in-kind)	0	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total (EUR)	0	20,000,000	20,000,000

³ Co-financing types are grant, soft loan, hard loan, guarantee, in kind, or cash.

Table 2. Financing plan summary – project component breakdown

Project outcomes	EU grant amount Donor(s) (in EUR)	Co-financing (in EUR)	Total (in EUR)
1. TEST	7,602,934	400,154	8,003,088
2. GE/SC	4,100,778	215,830	4,316,608
3. SCP NAPs	2,617,060	137,740	2,754,800
4. Networking Facility Component	3,422,007	180,105	3,602,113
Project Management	429,657	22,615	452,271
Contingency	827,564	43,556	871,120
Total (in EUR)	19,000,000	1,000,000	20,000,000

Source: Project document

Table 3. Co-financing source breakdown

Name of co-financier (source)	Classification	Type (Specify: cash and/or in-kind)	Total (in EUR)
UNIDO	Implementing Agency	Cash	462,874
SCP/RAC	Implementing partner	Cash	410,927
UNEP-DTIE	Implementing partner	Cash	82,644
Contingency (<5%)			43,556
Total co-financing (in EUR)			1,000,000

Source: Project document

Table 4. UNIDO budget execution⁴ (Grant No.: 4000492 and 2000002549)

Items of Expenditure	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total Exp.
Contractual Services	198,643	2,396,752	1,442,125	850,622	228,051	5,116,193
Equipment		16,706	790	3,172	-74	3,962
International Meetings		42,955	90,007	124,160	65,382	214,167
Local travel	25,872	23,968	44,282	72,589	36,997	116,871
Natl. Consult./Staff	89,318	146,986	271,606	228,034	213,358	735,944
Intl. Consult./Staff	174,826	486,512	645,316	823,436	642,599	1,468,752
Other Direct Costs	9,636	21,238	16,864	30,348	62,152	47,212

⁴ Disbursement: Expenditure, incl. commitment

Staff Travel	13067	34678	26,612	36,254	12080	62,866
Train/Fellowship/Study			3,285	20,493	2021	23,778
Grand Total	287,961	2,543,738	1,442,915	2,189,108	228,051	7,789,745

Source: UNIDO. Financial system (SAP, 1 October 2018)

II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

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

The TE has an additional purpose of drawing lessons and developing recommendations for UNIDO, the Government, Donors, the implementing partners, project stakeholders and local partners that may help improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities in the country and on a global scale upon project completion. The TE report should include examples of good practices for other projects in the focal area, country, or region. It should also provide recommendations to be taken into account for the phase two of the project, building on lessons learned and areas for improvement, in particular regarding sustainability of impact.

The TE should provide an analysis of the attainment of the project objective and the corresponding outputs and outcomes. Through its assessments, the Evaluation Team (ET) should enable the Government, counterparts, UNIDO, the implementing partners, key stakeholders and donors to verify prospects for development impact and sustainability, providing an analysis of the attainment of global environmental objectives, project objectives, delivery and completion of project outputs/activities, and outcomes/impacts based on indicators. The assessment shall include reexamination of the relevance of the objectives and other elements of project design according to the project evaluation parameters defined in chapter III below.

The overall purpose of the TE is to assess whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective [facilitate the shift toward Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) in the Southern Mediterranean region] and to what extent the project has also considered sustainability and scaling-up factors for increasing contribution to sustainable results and further impact.

The evaluation has three specific objectives:

- (i) Assess the project performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and progress to impact;
- (ii) Identify key learning to feed into the design and implementation of the forthcoming projects; and
- (iii) Develop a series of findings, lessons and recommendations for enhancing the design of new and implementation of ongoing projects by UNIDO.

III. Evaluation approach and methodology

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Data collection methods

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

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

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

⁵ UNIDO. (2018). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (DGB/2018/08, dated 1 June 2018)

⁶ UNIDO. (2006). Director-General's Administrative Instruction No. 17/Rev.1: Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle (DGAI.17/Rev.1, 24 August 2006)

- Notes from meetings of committees involved in the project
- (b) **Stakeholder consultations** will be conducted through structured and semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion. Key stakeholders to be interviewed include:
- UNIDO Management and staff involved in the project; and
 - Representatives of donors and counterparts
- (c) **Field visit** to 3 of the 8 SWITCH MED countries
- It is foreseen that the countries to be visited would be Algeria, Egypt and Jordan (to be confirmed)
 - On-site observation of results achieved by the project, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies
 - Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Country Office(s) representative to the extent that he/she was involved in the project, and the project's management members and the various national [and sub-regional] authorities dealing with project activities as necessary
- (d) **Implementing partners:** The evaluation will focus on the components and activities carried out by UNIDO but will also consider the work of the implementing partners in how the overall design and implementation contributed to attaining the objective of the programme, achievement of results and to provide recommendations for how to enhance the cooperation within the partnership.
- (e) Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluation team and/or by the Independent Evaluation Division for triangulation purposes

2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

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

The key evaluation questions are the following:

- (a) What are the key drivers and barriers to achieve the long term objectives? To what extent has the project helped put in place the conditions likely to address the drivers, overcome barriers and contribute to the long term objectives?
- (b) How well has the project performed? Has the project done the right things? Has the project done things right, with good value for money?
- (c) What have been the project's key results (outputs, outcome and impact)? To what extent have the expected results been achieved or are likely to be achieved? To what extent the achieved results will sustain after the completion of the project?
- (d) What lessons can be drawn from the successful and unsuccessful practices in designing, implementing and managing the project?

The evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of the project results after the project completion. The assessment will identify key risks (e.g. in terms of financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental risks) and explain how these risks may affect the continuation of results after the project ends. Table 5 below provides the key evaluation criteria to be assessed by the evaluation. The detailed questions to assess each evaluation criterion are in annex 2. The **rating criteria** and table to be used is presented in annex 8.

Table 5. Summary of Project evaluation criteria

Index	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
A	Progress to Impact	Yes
B	Project design	Yes
1	• Overall design	Yes
2	• Logframe	Yes
C	Project performance	Yes
1	• Relevance	Yes
2	• Effectiveness	Yes
3	• Efficiency	Yes
4	• Sustainability of benefits	Yes
D	Cross-cutting performance criteria	
1	• Gender mainstreaming	Yes
2	• Environment and socio-economic aspects	Yes
2	• M&E: (focus on Monitoring) ✓ M&E design ✓ M&E implementation	Yes
3	• Results-based Management (RBM)	Yes
E	Performance of partners	
1	• UNIDO	Yes
2	• National counterparts	Yes
3	• Donor	Yes
F	Overall assessment	Yes

IV. Evaluation process

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

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

V. Evaluation team composition

A staff from the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division will be assigned as Evaluation Manager and will coordinate and provide evaluation backstopping to the evaluation team and ensure the quality of the evaluation. The UNIDO Project Manager and national project teams will act as resourced persons and provide support to the evaluation team and the IED evaluation manager.

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

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

The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions in annex 3 to these terms of reference.

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

VI. Time schedule

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from January 2019 to March 2019. The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned for end of January-February.

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

VII. Evaluation deliverables

Inception report

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

The Inception Report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework (“evaluation matrix”); division of work between the International Evaluation Consultant and the national consultant; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable⁷.

Evaluation report and review procedures

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

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

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

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

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

VIII. Quality assurance

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

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality, attached as annex 5. UNIDO's Independent Evaluation Division should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO's evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation report are reviewed by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, which will issue and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet, as well as submit to relevant stakeholders as required.

Annex 1: Project results framework

Intervention logic/ description		Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Overall Objective: To facilitate the shift toward Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) in the Southern Mediterranean Region		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased number resource efficiency and environmentally sustainable policies adopted by Governments. Increased number of industries and civil society organizations applying SCP principles. 	Final, independent evaluation report	
DEMONSTRATION COMPONENT				
Subcomponent 1 – Sustainable production: MED TEST II				
Outcome⁸ 1: Increased demand for and supply of sustainable production services among industry in the southern Mediterranean countries		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 15-20 service providers of integrated SP services (TEST) for industry in the local market Turnover generated by SP service providers increases by 50% during project's lifetime Approx. 300-400 industries requesting SP services, out of which at least 130-150 receive assistance during the project. 	Annual reports/ list of references of service providers Industry co-financing List of industries/Industry requests for SP services M&E database	Political situation remains stable in the Mediterranean countries Economic crisis does not exacerbate in the region affecting private sector operations (manufacturing sector)
Outputs 1.1	SP service providers and stakeholders identified, engaged and capacitated for TEST scaling-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15- 20 national service providers (SP) selected through competitive bidding and framework contracts signed in each country National Advisory Boards and 	Contractual documents Minutes of Meetings/List of participants/ CVs Training reports	National service providers, private and public organizations, with some experience in SP services (cleaner production, energy efficiency, ISO14001, etc.)

⁸ The terminology Outcome and Outputs, used throughout the document, correspond to the terms Purpose and Results defined in the (March 2004) EC Project Cycle Management Guidelines.

		PMU set up and functional <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50-60 national experts from SP trained in TEST 		exist in each country.
Outputs 1.2	Integrated SP services delivered to a pool of demo industries – TEST demonstrated, hands on experience gained by local SP service providers and resource efficiency increased at demonstration sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approx. 130-150 companies have signed up for TEST At least 100 companies (or 80%) have successfully completed TEST Approx. 400 industry staff and 50/60 experts from SP capacitated on TEST At least 1500 RECP measures identified in industry 20% reduction in water/energy consumption and 10% BOD/COD pollution reduction identified in participating industries 60% of identified RECP low cost measures implemented in participating industry 	Contracts with companies List of company staff trained/involved in TEST Industry reports and baseline indicators for water, energy and pollution Field site visits and interviews with top of management industries	Industries are motivated to implement SP due to increasing cost for energy and raw materials, increasing pressure from supply chain and enforcement of environmental legislation At least 50% of TEST measures have Pay Back Period (PBP) of less than 6 months, as demonstrated by the MED TEST pilot initiative.
Outputs 1.3	TEST experience shared and enabling activities conducted for SP market uptake in the southern Mediterranean region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 1,000 people targeted by local dissemination events, including new industry TEST industry fact sheets and regional achievements publication Awareness of Institutional stakeholders (AB) in the Region raised on TEST 	Meeting reports/ List of participants to dissemination/networking events N. of downloads of TEST publications/website visitors Institutional stakeholders interviews	National institutions are committed to incentivize the adoption of sustainable production practices in manufacturing in the short-medium term (transition phase toward fully commercially based TEST applications)

Subcomponent 2 – Green Entrepreneurship and Civil Society Empowerment

<p>Outcome 2.1: Boosting Green Entrepreneurship in the Mediterranean Region</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 300 new Green Businesses projects, grassroots innovations, joint ventures are created • 30 receive technical and financial advice • 9 will be awarded with financial support 	<p>Business Plans developed by Green Entrepreneurs</p> <p>Progress/annual reports</p>	<p>There is a market for green entrepreneurs which can in turn create green jobs opportunities. Awareness and demand for green products & services from society is increasing. Financing Organizations becoming more interested in Green and Social projects business ideas</p>	
<p>Output 2.1</p>	<p>Strategic Local partners, Local trainers and Green entrepreneurs identified, capacitated, trained and supported to establish new Green Businesses projects in the target countries.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2850 new GE will be guided through an ad hoc training program • 300new GB projects will be created after the delivered training program • 30 GE will receive coaching and granting/access to financial mechanism • 90 local trainers capacitated 	<p>Reports on GE training sessions</p> <p>Green Business plans developed</p> <p>Interviews with selected GEs</p> <p>Signed collaborative agreements</p>	<p>Locals are willing to be trained to create green businesses. Governments support local green entrepreneurs.</p>
<p>Outcome 2.2: Empowering Mediterranean Civil Society Organizations towards sustainable lifestyles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCP approaches provided by 5 supported civil society lead initiatives are successfully replicated, supported and participated by citizens 	<p>ConsumpediaMED v2.0</p> <p>Progress/annual reports</p> <p>List of participating CSO</p>	<p>CSOs are growing and becoming more proactive in finding solutions</p> <p>Citizens become more interested in SCP's lifestyle patterns to follow.</p>	
<p>Output 2.2</p>	<p>Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) empowered to act as agent of change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 150-200 change agents capacitated 	<p>Progress/annual reports</p> <p>Plans/reports on</p>	<p>Green products & services demanded by society is</p>

	(to do awareness raising and to engage in governance processes) and to start up bottom-up community innovations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 400 new local initiatives business opportunities identified by the strategic local partners, in coordination with CP/RAC-UNEP/MAP • 9 civil society led initiatives on ecological and social innovation established/supported (1 per country) • 3000 new users registered to ConsumpediaMED 	Grassroots Innovations that are developed	increasing CSOs are interested in being trained on the application of good practices
Outcome 2.3 Leveraging interactive initiatives between Mediterranean Green Entrepreneurs and CSOs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interactive initiatives designed and facilitated 	Progress/annual reports on co-creation initiatives	Emerging interest in participatory and collaborative approach among different sectors
Output 2.3	Joint GE/CSOs' events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 synergy workshops organized • 9 co-creation workshops (1 per country) • Collaborative agreements among financing organizations to launch green credit line are signed 	Synergy workshop reports Co-creation workshop reports Co-financed projects	Public, Private and Civil society sitting together to get one common goal. Citizens and green entrepreneurs are willing to co-create together Financing Institutions are interested in supporting sustainable businesses
Subcomponent 3 – SCP National Action Plans Demos				
Outcome 3: Demo projects demonstrate how SCP can be integrated into the national policy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one demo project per country is successfully implemented 	Progress/annual reports	Political situation remains stable in the Mediterranean countries Economic crisis does not reduce stakeholder engagement and investment

				in SCP policies and activities
Output 3.1	Pilot demo project selected and designed after consultation with governments and national stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultations with governments (9) and national stakeholders held • At least one demo project is identified per country • Needs assessment developed for at least 9 demo projects • Strategy/workplan for at least 9 demo projects is developed and approved by government and stakeholders 	<p>Progress/annual reports</p> <p>List of pilot demo projects</p> <p>Needs assessment and strategy reports for each (9) demo project</p> <p>Communication from government approving/validating strategy</p>	<p>Partners and stakeholders engaged and motivated to participate actively in the project. Engagement and commitment of all project partners for approving the needs assessment</p> <p>Pilot demo projects are able to respond to the needs identified Engagement and commitment of all project partners to agree upon the activities of the workplan</p>
Output 3.2	Implementation of demo projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 9 demo projects successfully implemented 	<p>Progress/annual reports</p> <p>Workplans</p>	<p>Engagement and commitment of all project partners to agree upon the activities of the workplan</p>
Output 3.3	Dissemination of lessons learned and good practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publications produced on lessons learned, good practices and other project outputs • One regional event • At least 9 national dissemination events organized 	<p>Publications and promotional material developed</p> <p>Minutes/report on dissemination events</p>	<p>Continued active interest of beneficiaries and participants in the demo projects.</p>
NETWORKING FACILITY⁹ COMPONENT				

⁹ Hereafter in short: SWITCH-Med NF

<p>Outcome 4: Contribute to the visibility, effectiveness, long-term sustainability and impact of the components of the SWITCH-Med Programme.</p>	<p>A regional platform bringing all the components of the SWITCH-Med Programme together.</p> <p>Effective dissemination and increased visibility of the outputs of the components of the SWITCH-Med Programme in the Med region.</p> <p>Increased links and synergies among the components of the SWITCH-Med Programme and with external initiatives beyond the SWITCH-Med Programme components.</p> <p>Scaling-up opportunities identified for long-term sustainability of the SWITCH-Med Programme activities.</p> <p>Opportunities for business partnerships and financial investment networks identified and promoted between organizations of EU and selected countries (Lebanon, Tunisia, Morocco and Egypt).</p>	<p>SWITCH-Med Platform/Website online: about 1,000 visits per month and 150 downloads per month</p> <p>SWITCH-Med Networking Events, seminars, workshops, side events with key external stakeholders</p> <p>Impact framework and communications</p> <p>Progress/annual reports</p> <p>Financial instruments for green business promoted</p> <p>Eco-innovative business partnerships established</p>	<p>Political situation remain stable in the Mediterranean countries</p> <p>The partners and strategic local partners (industry, intermediaries, GEs, CSOs, policy-makers) of the SWITCH-Med Programme are collaborative</p>	
<p>Output 4.1</p>	<p>Exchange and synergise: Increase visibility of SWITCH-Med subcomponents, facilitate regular</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SWITCH-Med Platform/Website online: about 1,000 visits per month and 150 downloads per 	<p>Performance analytics and reports for the platform/website,</p>	<p>Political situation remain stable in the Mediterranean countries.</p>

	<p>exchange among all SWITCH-Med partners and connect with key external stakeholders</p>	<p>month</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 fact sheets prepared for each subcomponent and PSC¹⁰ as well as selected sectors (e.g. food, tourism) and SWITCH-Med target countries • Bi-monthly newsletter reaching 1,000 recipients • A SWITCH-Med social networking app (i.e. virtual community) with at least 500 users and social networking groups (e.g. Linked-in) • 3 networking events are organized with at least 150 participants • SWITCH-Med external stakeholders maps and engagement plans (regional one, country specific ones and component specific ones) • A database of SCP experts and service providers • A database of financing institutions • At least 3 side events, 3 thematic workshops and 3 webinars with a participants' satisfaction rate of at least 80% • 	<p>newsletter and social networking groups</p> <p>Fact sheets printed and online</p> <p>Reports of networking events</p> <p>External stakeholder engagement plans</p> <p>Online searchable databases</p> <p>Reports of side events, thematic workshops and webinars</p> <p>Progress/annual reports</p>	<p>The executing partners and strategic local partners (industry, intermediaries, GEs, CSOs, policy-makers) of the SWITCH-Med Programme are collaborative and committed to deliver information on their progress to the Networking Facility. Technical infrastructure available to use social networks and apps.</p>

¹⁰ Policy Support Component

<p>Output 4.2</p>	<p>Scale and impact: Harvest lessons learned for replicating demos, contributing to long-term sustainability of SWITCH-Med activities and making programme impact visible</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception workshop of the Scaling-up Action Learning experts • White papers on national level synthesis and 3 regional overarching scaling-up studies including roadmaps linked to green entrepreneurship, grass-root innovations and sustainable manufacturing • Key leverage points, interventions, partnerships, source of financing identified and initiated for long-term sustainability and replication of the demo components' actions (MED TEST, GE/CSO, SCP NAPs) • Comprehensive overview of service providers needs for sustainable production and consumption • SWITCH-Med impact framework including micro level (company/entrepreneur), meso level (sector/country) and macro level (regional) as well as a triple bottom line perspective and the long-term sustainability perspective. • At least 3 impact seminars (linked to the networking events) • At least 10 Impact briefs (country specific impact briefs i.e. for 9 countries and regional impact briefs per component on demand) • At least 5 impact videos (e.g. for 5 	<p>SWITCH-Med scaling-up scope of work paper (annually updated) Inception workshop report Scaling-up studies work plan Desk-based study/white paper showing a draft list of leverage points for driving change towards SCP in the target countries to be used at the synergy workshops 3 overarching scaling-up studies including roadmaps published online and in 3 languages on paper SWITCH-Med impact framework guidelines Impact seminar reports online 10 impact briefs online and printed on paper 5 impact videos online (e.g. uploaded on youtube or own SWITCH-Med video channel)</p>	<p>The strategic local partners and partners of the components of the SWITCH-Med Programme deliver the information smoothly to the Networking Facility</p> <p>The designated resource persons have the appropriate capacity and knowledge on scaling-up SCP actions</p> <p>Interviews and on-site visits are conducted without any disruption</p> <p>The partners and strategic local partners (industry, intermediaries, GEs, CSOs, policy-makers) of the SWITCH-Med Programme are collaborative and committed to deliver impact data to the Networking Facility.</p>
--------------------------	--	--	---	--

		selected countries)		
Output 4.3	Reinforced internationalization of start-ups and SMEs through closer cooperation between clusters, businesses and investment networks in Europe and four associated Mediterranean countries (Egypt, Lebanon, Tunisia and Morocco) with a specific focus on green business and resource efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 10 EU eco-innovative technologies/business models promoted for business partnerships • 4 national match-making/B2B events organized • 4 national dissemination workshops held to present the final outcomes of the Product Environmental Footprint pilots • At least 8 International Investment <u>Networks</u> attend peer-to-peer seminars • At least 12 national financial sector investors participate in peer-to-peer seminars 	<p>Eco-innovation fact sheets</p> <p>Matchmaking events reports</p> <p>Business plans/pre-feasibility study</p> <p>Workshop reports</p> <p>SWOT analysis and Business report on actions to promote investment networks</p>	<p>There are eco-innovative technologies and business solutions that are relevant and affordable for local SMEs and entrepreneurs.</p> <p>National financial sector and international investment networks are interested to develop and promote financial instruments for green business targeting SMEs and start-ups in the 4 countries</p>

Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria

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

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

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

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

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

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<p>Project team and managers and PSC regularly ask for performance and results information?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are monitoring and self-evaluation carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and impact in the logframe? Do performance monitoring and reviews take place regularly? ○ Were resources for M&E sufficient? ○ How has the logframe been used for Monitoring and Evaluation purposes (developing M&E plan, setting M&E system, determining baseline and targets, annual implementation review by the Project Steering Committee...) to monitor progress towards expected outputs and outcomes? ○ How well have risks outlined the project document and in the logframe been monitored and managed? How often have risks been reviewed and updated? Has a risk management mechanism been put in place?
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Project management</u> ✓ Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement. ✓ Review whether the national management and overall coordination mechanisms have been efficient and effective? Did each partner have assigned roles and responsibilities from the beginning? Did each partner fulfil its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions)? ✓ The UNIDO HQ-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (e.g. problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)? ✓ The project implemented outreach and public awareness campaigns. Outreach and public awareness materials produced are in line with the relevant UNIDO and donor advocacy guidelines?"
E	Performance of partners
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>UNIDO</u> ✓ Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mobilization of adequate technical expertise for project design ○ Inclusiveness of project design (with national counterparts) ○ Previous evaluative evidence shaping project design ○ Planning for M&E and ensuring sufficient M&E budget ✓ Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Timely recruitment of project staff ○ Appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services ○ Project modifications following changes in context or after the Mid-Term Review ○ Follow-up to address implementation bottlenecks ○ Role of UNIDO country presence (if applicable) supporting the project ○ Engagement in policy dialogue to ensure up-scaling of innovations ○ Coordination function

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

Annex 3: Job descriptions

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

Title:	International evaluation consultant, team leader
Main Duty Station:	Home-based
Missions:	Missions to Vienna, Austria and 3 countries of the MENA regions
Start of Contract (EOD):	1 January 2019
End of Contract (COB):	31 March 2019
Number of Working Days:	70 working days spread over 3 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

PROJECT CONTEXT

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

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

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
Undertake a desk review of project documentation (incl. familiarization with the EU programmes and strategies, and with relevant EU policies such as those on project cycle, M&E, co-financing, etc.) and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant • An adjusted table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context • A draft list of stakeholders to be interviewed during the evaluation field mission • A brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework 	12 days	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
instruments accordingly (if needed); Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project's activities and analyze other background info.			
Prepare an inception report which streamlines the specific questions to address the key issues in the TOR, specific methods that will be used and data to collect in the field visits, detailed evaluation methodology confirmed, draft theory of change, and tentative agenda for field work	Inception report submitted to the evaluation manager	4	Home-based
Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to be interviewed and planned site visits) submitted to evaluation and project manager 	2 days	Vienna, Austria
3. Undertake evaluation field mission ¹¹ to consult field project stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries to verify and complete preliminary evaluation findings from desk review and assess the institutional capacities of the recipient country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field mission conducted Evaluation/debriefing presentation of the evaluation's preliminary findings prepared, draft conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt to stakeholders in the country, at the end of the mission Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks 	18-20 days	[tentatively Algeria, Egypt, Jordan]
4. Debriefing mission: Present preliminary findings, recommendations and lessons learnt to project stakeholders at UNIDO HQ for factual validation and comments Hold additional meetings with and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Power point presentation Feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed Additional meetings held as required 	2 days	Vienna, Austria

¹¹ The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
obtain additional data from evaluation/project manager and other stakeholders as required			
5. Prepare the draft evaluation report, with inputs from the National Consultant, and in accordance with the evaluation TOR Submit draft evaluation report to the evaluation manager for feedback and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager for review and comments 	20 days	Home-based
6. Revise the draft evaluation report based on comments and suggestions received through the evaluation manager and edit the language and finalize the evaluation report according to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division standards Prepare a two pages summary of a take-away message from the evaluation	<p>Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager</p> <p>Two pages summary take-away message from the evaluation submitted to the evaluation manager</p>	10 days	Home-based
	TOTAL	70 days	

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

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

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 10 years' experience in environmental/energy project management and/or evaluation (of development projects), including social safeguards and gender
- Knowledge about relevant EU policies such as those on project life cycle, M&E, and fiduciary standards
- Experience in the evaluation of international cooperation 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 and French is required.

Reporting and deliverables

- 1) At the beginning of the assignment the Consultant will submit a concise Inception Report that will outline the general methodology and presents a concept Table of Contents
- 2) The country assignment will have the following deliverables:

- Presentation of initial findings of the mission to key national stakeholders
 - Draft report
 - Final report, comprising of executive summary, findings regarding design, implementation and results, conclusions and recommendations
- 3) Debriefing at UNIDO HQ:
- Presentation and discussion of findings
 - Concise summary and comparative analysis of the main results of the evaluation report

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

Absence of conflict of interest:

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

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

Title:	International evaluation consultant
Main Duty Station:	Home-based
Missions:	Missions to Vienna, Austria and 2-3 countries of the MENA region
Start of Contract (EOD):	15 February 2019
End of Contract (COB):	30 April 2019
Number of Working Days:	40 working days spread over 2.5 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

PROJECT CONTEXT

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

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

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
Undertake a desk review of project documentation (incl. familiarization with the EU programmes and strategies, and with relevant EU policies such as those on project cycle, M&E, co-financing, etc.) and relevant country background information; determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instruments accordingly (if needed); Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project's activities and analyze other background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant • An adjusted table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context • A draft list of stakeholders to be interviewed during the evaluation field mission • A brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework 	8 days	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
info.			
Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to be interviewed and planned site visits) submitted to evaluation and project manager 	2 days	Vienna, Austria
3. Undertake evaluation field mission ¹² to consult field project stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries to verify and complete preliminary evaluation findings from desk review and assess the institutional capacities of the recipient country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field mission conducted Evaluation/debriefing presentation of the evaluation's preliminary findings prepared, draft conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt to stakeholders in the country, at the end of the mission 	15 days	[tentatively Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon]
4. Debriefing mission: Present preliminary findings, recommendations and lessons learnt to project stakeholders at UNIDO HQ for factual validation and comments Hold additional meetings with and obtain additional data from evaluation/project manager and other stakeholders as required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Power point presentation Feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed Additional meetings held as required 	2 days	Vienna, Austria
5. Prepare the draft evaluation report for submission to evaluation manager, in coordination with team leader, and in accordance with the evaluation TOR.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager for review and comments 	8 days	Home-based
6. Revise the draft evaluation report based on comments and suggestions received through the evaluation manager and edit the language and finalize the evaluation report according to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division standards	Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager	5 days	Home-based
	TOTAL	40 days	

¹² The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

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

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 10 years' experience in environmental/energy project management and/or evaluation (of development projects), including social safeguards and gender
- Knowledge about relevant EU policies such as those on project life cycle, M&E, and fiduciary standards
- Experience in the evaluation of international cooperation 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 and Arabic is required.

Reporting and deliverables

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

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

Absence of conflict of interest:

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

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

Title:	National evaluation consultant
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	Not applicable
Start of Contract:	15 January 2019
End of Contract:	31 March 2019
Number of Working Days:	24 days spread over 2.5 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

PROJECT CONTEXT

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

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

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

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
framework, specifically in the context of the project's objectives and targets			
Coordination of evaluation field mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with project staff in the field Assist and provide detailed analysis and inputs to the team leader in the preparation of the inception report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed evaluation schedule List of stakeholders to be interviewed during the field mission 	5 days	Home-based (telephone interviews)
Participation in interviews during evaluation field missions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview notes Input to presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission 	5 days	Home based, including in-country project sites
Draft evaluation report Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the team leader	Inputs to the draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation team leader	4 days	Home-based
Final evaluation report and summary take-away message Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation report on basis of comments and suggestions received through the evaluation team leader Contribute to the preparation of a two pages summary of a take-away message from the evaluation	Inputs to the Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation team leader	3 days	Home-based
TOTAL		24 days	

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:

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

Managerial competencies (as applicable):

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

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree in environmental science, engineering or other relevant discipline like political science or developmental studies with a specialization in industrial energy efficiency and/or climate change.

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 7 years' experience in environmental/energy project management and/or evaluation (of development projects).
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.
- Experience in the field of environment and energy, including evaluation of development cooperation in developing countries and social safeguards and gender is an asset

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

Absence of conflict of interest:

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

Annex 4: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report

Acknowledgement (incl. list of evaluation team members)

Abbreviations and acronyms

Glossary of evaluation-related terms

Executive summary

- Must provide a synopsis of the storyline which includes the main evaluation findings and recommendations
- Must present strengths and weaknesses of the project
- Must be self-explanatory and should be maximum 3-4 pages in length

I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process

- Information on the evaluation: why, when, by whom, etc.
- Scope and objectives of the evaluation, main questions to be addressed
- Information sources and availability of information
- Methodological remarks, limitations encountered and validity of the findings

II. Country and project background

- Brief country context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project¹³ and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
 - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
 - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
 - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
 - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
 - Counterpart organization(s)

III. Project assessment

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

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

¹³ Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g. relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives, etc.)

- Likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes (Report on the risks and vulnerability of the project, considering the likely effects of sociopolitical and institutional changes in partner countries, and its impact on continuation of benefits after the project ends, specifically the financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks)
 - Project coordination and management (Report project management conditions and achievements, and partner countries commitment)
 - Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems (Report on M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and budgeting and funding for M&E activities)
 - Monitoring of long-term changes
 - Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results (Report on preparation and readiness / quality at entry, financial planning, UNIDO support, co-financing, delays of project outcomes/outputs, and implementation approach)
- C. Gender mainstreaming

At the end of this chapter, an overall project achievement rating should be developed as required in annex 8. The overall rating table should be presented here.

IV. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

A. Conclusions

This section should include a storyline of the main evaluation conclusions related to the project's achievements and shortfalls. It is important to avoid providing a summary based on each and every evaluation criterion. The main conclusions should be cross-referenced to relevant sections of the evaluation report.

B. Recommendations

This section should be succinct and contain few key recommendations. They should:

- be based on evaluation findings
- be realistic and feasible within a project context
- indicate institution(s) responsible for implementation (addressed to a specific officer, group or entity who can act on it) and have a proposed timeline for implementation if possible
- be commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
- take resource requirements into account.

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:

- UNIDO
- Government and/or Counterpart Organizations
- Donor

C. Lessons learned

- Lessons learned must be of wider applicability beyond the evaluated project but must be based on findings and conclusions of the evaluation
- For each lesson, the context from which they are derived should be briefly stated

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

Annexes should include the evaluation TOR, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, a summary of project identification and financial data, including an updated table of expenditures to date, and other detailed quantitative information. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Project title:

UNIDO Project ID:

Evaluation team

Evaluation team leader:

National evaluation consultant:

Evaluation manager (IED):

Quality review done by:

Date:

Report quality criteria	UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division assessment notes	Rating
A. Was the report well-structured and properly written? (Clear language, correct grammar, clear and logical structure)		
B. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?		
C. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?		
D. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?		
E. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes or did it explain why this is not (yet) possible? (Including assessment of assumptions, risks and impact drivers)		
F. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?		
G. Did the report include the actual project costs (total, per activity, per source)?		
H. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of both the M&E plan at entry and the system used during the implementation? Was the M&E sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation?		
I. Quality of the lessons: were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
J. Quality of the recommendations: did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can these be immediately implemented with current resources?		
K. Are the main cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights and environment, appropriately covered?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner? (Observance of deadlines)		

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

A rating scale of 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately satisfactory = 4, Moderately unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

Annex 6. Guidance and checklist on lessons learned quality criteria

UNIDO evaluation lessons learned

Definition

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) (2002) defines lessons learned related to the evaluation of development assistance as follows: **“Generalizations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact.”**¹⁴

Focus
on
generalization

The International Labour Organisation (ILO) provides one of the most comprehensive definitions of lessons learned with relevance for evaluations in the UN system (2014) **“A lesson learned is an observation from project or programme experience which can be translated into relevant, beneficial knowledge by establishing clear causal factors and effects. It focuses on a specific design, activity, process or decision and may provide either positive or negative insights on operational effectiveness and efficiency, impact on the achievement of outcomes, or influence on sustainability. The lesson should indicate, where possible, how it contributes to 1) reducing or eliminating deficiencies; or 2) building successful and sustainable practice and performance”**¹⁵.

Focus
on
transferability
&
generalization

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

What is not a lesson learned?

Lessons learned are not:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simply restating or paraphrasing existing doctrine, policy, process, etc. This does not qualify as an appropriate and bona fide lessons learned¹⁶.• Just applicable to a specific situation but applicable to a generic situation¹⁷• The same as recommendations. Recommendations usually refer to very specific situations including who should take action on what by when
---------------------------------	--

¹⁴ <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>

¹⁵ ILO Evaluation Unit, 2014: Guidance Note 3: Evaluation lessons learned and emerging good practices

¹⁶ www.dtic.mil/ndia/2004cmmi/CMMIT2Tue/LessonsLearnedtc3.pdf

¹⁷ www.globalhivmeinfo.org/Pages/Glossary.aspx

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

Examples of lessons learned

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

Examples of statements that do not qualify as lessons learned

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

Lessons learned quality criteria checklist

The evaluator should cite and explain the points below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ratings 4-6 are satisfactory and meet quality criteria.

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

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

Annex 8. Rating tables

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

Evaluation Rating Table

#	Evaluation criteria	Definition	Mandatory rating
A	Progress to impact	Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, including redirecting trajectories of transformational process and the extent to which conditions for trajectory change are being put into place.	Yes
B	Project design	Formulation of the intervention, the plan to achieve a specific purpose.	Yes
1	Overall design	Assessment of the design in general.	Yes
2	Logframe	Assessment of the logical framework aimed at planning the intervention.	Yes
C	Project performance	Functioning of a development intervention.	Yes
1	Relevance	The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.	Yes
2	Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.	Yes
3	Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.	Yes
4	Sustainability of benefits	The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.	Yes
D	Cross-cutting performance criteria	Other important criteria that cut across the UNIDO intervention.	
1	Gender mainstreaming	The extent to which UNIDO interventions have contributed to better gender equality and gender related dimensions were considered in an intervention.	Yes
2	M&E	Refers to all the indicators, tools and processes used to measure if a development intervention has been implemented according to the plan (monitoring) and is having the desired result (evaluation).	Yes
3	Results-based management (RBM)	Assessment of issues related to results-based work planning, results based M&E and reporting based on results.	Yes
E	Performance of partners	Assessment of partners' roles and responsibilities engaged in the intervention.	Yes
1	UNIDO	Assessment of the contribution of partners to project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting, supervision and backstopping and evaluation. The performance of each partner will be assessed individually, based on its expected role and responsibilities in the project life cycle.	Yes
2	National counterparts		Yes
3	Donor		Yes
F	Overall assessment	Overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the analysis made under Project performance and Progress to Impact criteria above but not an average of ratings.	Yes

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

Rating systems and criteria

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

UNIDO evaluation rating scale

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

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

Table below contains the formula applied to transform the results of UNIDO’s six-point rating scale to the GEF’s four-point scale for sustainability¹⁸.

Formula transforming UNIDO ratings into GEF ratings

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

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

Project design

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

Overall design quality

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

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

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

Implementation performance

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

- Relevance
- Effectiveness

¹⁸ GEF uses a four-point scale for the criterion of sustainability.

- Efficiency
- Progress to Impact
- Sustainability of benefits

Partners' performance

UNIDO's projects are characterized by a group of main partners with specific roles and responsibilities. UNIDO itself acts as project implementer and supervisor. Though supplemented by implementation performance criteria listed above, the criteria to assess UNIDO as a partner are more specific and help to address frequent issues in its performance. Governments are local executors, and owners of the project and donors provide project funding. Hence, rating the partners is a key part of UNIDO project evaluations¹⁹. The six-point rating scale applies²⁰.

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

Project design

- Mobilization of adequate technical expertise for project design
- Inclusiveness of project design (with national counterparts)
- Previous evaluative evidence shaping project design
- Planning for M&E and ensuring sufficient M&E budget

Implementation

- Timely recruitment of project staff
- Project modifications following changes in context or after the Mid-Term Review
- Follow-up to address implementation bottlenecks
- Role of UNIDO country presence (if applicable) supporting the project
- Engagement in policy dialogue to ensure up-scaling of innovations
- Coordination function
- Exit strategy, planned together with the government
- Overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document
- Project's governance system
- National management and overall coordination mechanisms
- UNIDO HQ-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical input

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

Project design

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

Implementation

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

¹⁹ As practiced by the World Bank and the International Fund for Agriculture Development.

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

- Internal government coordination
- Exit strategy, planned together with UNIDO, or arrangements for continued funding of certain activities
- Facilitation of the participation of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), civil society and the private sector where appropriate
- Suitable procurement procedures for timely project implementation
- Engagement with UNIDO in policy dialogue to promote the up-scaling or replication of innovations

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

- Timely disbursement of project funds
- Feedback to progress reports, including Mid-Term Evaluation, if applicable
- Support by the donor's country presence (if applicable) supporting the project for example through engagement in policy dialogue

Gender mainstreaming

The UNIDO Policy on gender equality and the empowerment of women, issued initially in April 2009, and revised in March 2015 (UNIDO/DGB/(M).110/Rev.), provides the overall guidelines for establishing a gender mainstreaming strategy and action plans to guide the process of addressing gender issues in the Organization's industrial development interventions. It commits the organization that evaluations will demonstrate effective use of the UNEG guidance on evaluating from a human rights and gender equality perspective, as indicated by the Organization's meta-evaluation scores according to the UNEG Evaluation Scorecard.

In line with the UNIDO Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women Strategy, 2016-2019, all UNIDO technical assistance projects post-2015 are to be assigned a gender marker and should go through a gender mainstreaming check-list before approval. UNIDO's gender marker is in line with UN System-wide action plan (SWAP) requirements, with four categories: 0 — no attention to gender, 1 — some/limited attention to gender, 2a — significant attention to gender, 2b — gender is the principal objective²¹.

Besides, Guides on Gender Mainstreaming for Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) Projects in different areas of UNIDO's work have been developed and published during 2015²², which have specific guidance on suitable outputs/activities/indicators per technical area.

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

²¹ http://intranet.unido.org/intra/Gender_Mainstreaming_Tools_and_Guides

²² www.unido.org/en/what-we-do/cross-cutting-issues/gender/publications.html

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

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