



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

DRAFT

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Independent terminal evaluation**

**National Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production (NRECP) programme  
Indonesia**

UNIDO Project No.: 100224

**APRIL 2019**

## Contents

<b>I. Project background and overview .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1. Project factsheet.....	3
2. Project context.....	3
3. Project objective .....	5
4. Project implementation arrangements.....	6
5. Main findings on project progress .....	7
6. Budget information .....	11
<b>II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>III. Evaluation approach and methodology .....</b>	<b>16</b>
1. Data collection methods .....	17
2. Evaluation key questions and criteria .....	18
<b>IV. Evaluation process .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Evaluation team composition .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VI. Time schedule .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VII. Evaluation deliverables .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VIII. Quality assurance .....</b>	<b>22</b>
Annex 1: Project results framework .....	23
Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria .....	24
Annex 3: Job descriptions .....	30
Annex 4: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report .....	38
Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality .....	41
Annex 6. Guidance and checklist on lessons learned quality criteria .....	42
Annex 7. GEF Minimum requirements for M&E .....	45
Annex 8. Rating tables .....	46

## I. Project background and overview

### 1. Project factsheet

<b>Project title</b>	<b>National Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production (RECP) programme Indonesia</b>
<b>UNIDO project No. and/or ID</b>	<b>Project No. 100224</b>
<b>Region</b>	<b>Asia</b>
<b>Country(ies)</b>	<b>Indonesia</b>
<b>Planned implementation start date</b>	<b>05 June 2012</b>
<b>Planned implementation end date</b>	<b>30 June 2018</b>
<b>Actual implementation start date</b>	<b>January 2013</b>
<b>Actual implementation end date</b>	<b>30 June 2020</b>
<b>Executing partner(s)/entity(ies)</b>	<b>Indonesia Cleaner Production Center (ICPC)</b>
<b>Donor(s):</b>	<b>SECO (Swiss State Secretariat of Economic Affairs)</b>
<b>Total project allotment</b>	<b>Grant 200001268 RECP Indonesia:</b> 3,893,636.23 USD (forecasted at the exchange rate of the first installment) (3,714,545.84 USD) funds received at actual exchange rates) <b>Grant 200001121 RECP Global:</b> 118,433.00 EUR
<b>Mid-term review date</b>	<b>10-19 October 2016</b>

(Source: Project document, revised version 2015)<sup>1</sup>

### 2. Project context

#### Background

Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production (RECP) concerns the application of preventive environmental management practices and total productivity techniques with the triple aims of improving the productive use of materials, water and energy ('resource productivity'), reducing the generation of waste, waste water and emissions ('waste minimization') and reducing risks to humans ('human well-being'). RECP provides a cross sectoral approach for industries in all manufacturing and related sectors and of all sizes to reduce their environmental impact and improve productivity, ultimately contributing to enhanced competitiveness and conformance with market demands. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) have jointly promoted the application of RECP (and predecessor concepts) in developing and transition countries since 1995 in particular by supporting the establishment and operation of National Cleaner Production Centres (NCPs) and related entities. Since 2009, this

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

support is provided within the framework of the joint global UNIDO-UNEP RECP Programme, for which an independent evaluation was conducted in 2018. The 20 year results and experiences of the NCPCs have been documented in various publications.

RECP is strongly embedded in the international 2030 Agenda, in particular as contributor to the Sustainable Development Goals on sustainable consumption and production (SDG12), inclusive and sustainable industrialization (SDG9) and green economy and productive workforce (SDG8). At the regional level, RECP and related social and environmental responsible business conduct, have gained importance with the entering into force of the ASEAN Economic Community, as is also reflected in the ASEAN Socio Cultural Blueprint 2025, “forging ahead together”.

### **Project context**

The Government of Indonesia launched its first Cleaner Production (CP) initiatives in the mid- 1990s and has since then received international support (from GtZ/GiZ, JICA, AusAID, EC, USAID and others) for various CP and related projects, including the establishment of the Indonesia Cleaner Production Centre (ICPC). The development of CP in Indonesia though had until 2009 not connected to the global NCPC/RECP Programme of UNIDO and UNEP, a situation similar to other major ASEAN member states (Malaysia, Thailand and Philippines).

In March 2009 UNIDO received an official request through the Ministry of Environment for support to the implementation of CP in Indonesia. The Government of Switzerland, through the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) in May 2009 agreed to fund preparatory assistance. A project strategy was formulated (draft in June 2009) and endorsed by the parties. The objective was to review recent and current CP initiatives in Indonesia and to develop, in consultation with national government, ICPC and stakeholders in the private and civil sectors, a tailor-made proposal for supporting the establishment and operation of the Indonesian Network for Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production (INRECP, later referred to as RECP Indonesia (RECPI)). The first draft Project Document was completed in 2010, and thereafter a lot of discussions between the parties (Government and industry alike) and adjustments of the PD took place, until the final version of the PD was ready in March 2012. At this time, UNIDO could not start the implementation as the project funds had not been transferred (and consequently no staff had been recruited). Nevertheless, was officially launched (signed) in June 2012 to be officially announced at the Rio+20 Conference the same month.

Funds were transferred from SECO to UNIDO in September 2012. The start-up date of the Project was in November 2012 when the Inception Phase was kicked-off, following the official Government Regulation regarding the Project being signed on 11 November 2012.

Project implementation started in June 2012 and the initial project end date was in June 2018.

During 2013 it had become clear that within the existing log frame and intervention logic of the Project, it was necessary to modify project activities, enhance performance indicators, planning and in-country organization and coordination. This was necessary in light of (1) changes in government policy (on Green Industry (GI) and Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP)) and associated institutional arrangements; and (2) complementary interests and requests from both donor and recipient governments (including on Cradle to Cradle (C2C) and RECP monitoring and assessment tools). UNIDO therefore developed an amendment to reflect changes and confirm revised schedule of activities, performance

indicators, planning and role distribution. The amendment was finalized and approved (by the Project Management Committee) in May 2015, by which time a start had also been made with training of national experts and preparation for demonstration projects. Thereafter, UNIDO dispatched on 22nd June 2015 its Chief Technical Advisor for the programme.

The period until June 2015 therefore de facto served as an extended inception phase, whereafter it was foreseen that the project could move into an accelerated implementation mode for a 3 year period, with planned completion by 30 June 2018. A mid-term independent evaluation was conducted during October 2016.

Project end date was revised to 30 June 2019 in the 7<sup>th</sup> session of the PMC on 21 February 2017 and to 30 June 2020 in the eight session of the PMC on 18 April 2018.

The project document foresees regular monitoring, an independent mid-term review (MTR) and a terminal evaluation (TE). To date 9 meetings of the PMC were held and an independent mid-term evaluation was carried out in October-November 2016 (MTE report, February 2017), and included a field mission to Indonesia in October 2016.

### **3. Project objective**

The overall objective of the National RECP Programme is to improve resource productivity and environmental performance of manufacturing, tourism and micro-sector enterprises in Indonesia and thereby contribute to inclusive and sustainable industrial development in the country.

This overall objective will be achieved through the widespread implementation of RECP concepts, methods, practices, technologies, synergies and policies by enterprises and other organizations, governments at all levels, and the providers of business services, technology and finance.

Under this overarching outcome the Project works towards five – categories of – ‘contributing’ outcomes, respectively:

1. *RECP Capacity and Network*: Professional and institutional capacity for adapting and adopting RECP methods, practices and technologies strengthened and developed and widely utilized. Building upon the results and experiences of the previous Cleaner Production (CP) and related initiatives, including the ICPC, the RECP service delivery capacity will be further enhanced, through further development and institutionalization of the **CRECPI, ICPC, CAGIE, CTB and NRECPI**, including implementation of good management, organization and governance practices, widespread awareness raising on RECP opportunities and benefits, and continued and further training of an expanding cadre of national experts (including staff of **CRECPI, ICPC, CAGIE and CTB**).
2. *RECP Implementation and Replication*: RECP opportunities identified, evaluated and implemented in target enterprise groups through delivery of support services customized to the four main enterprise target groups, namely: small scale industries, industrial **zones**, tourism regions and micro-enterprises. These customized programmes include consecutively demonstration, adaptation and replication steps. The delivery of these programmes will be staggered over time. The support will include the setting-up of resource use and environmental data collection routines as an integral part of RECP service delivery, in order to assess environment, resource

use, economic and potential other social benefits accomplished by enterprises using a common framework of enterprise level indicators for resource productivity and pollution intensity (13).

3. *RECP Policy and Regulatory Framework*: **policy frameworks strengthened and put in place that foster the utilization of RECP methods, practices, technologies and (policy) instruments for the realization of the aims and objectives of the government's key RECP relevant government portfolios (in particular environment, industry, energy and tourism)**. To this end the Programme will contribute to creating at the suitable administrative levels mechanisms for mainstreaming RECP concepts, methods and policy instruments **in relevant industry, environment, tourism and energy/resource efficiency policies and strategies**, leading to an increased role of RECP **in government policy** in Indonesia.
4. *RECP Technology and Innovation*: increased availability and affordability of suitable RECP technologies for the target enterprise groups, **in particular those contributing to and/or inspired by Industrial Symbiosis (IS), Green Chemistry and Engineering (GC&E) and Cradle to Cradle (C2C)**. Upon identification, piloting and evaluation of key RECP technologies, **in particular through the application of these three innovation frameworks**, proposals will have been developed and promoted for their adaptation and widespread replication among target enterprises.
5. *RECP Investment and Finance*: appropriate financial instruments for RECP investments in target enterprise groups will have been proposed and promoted for implementation by financial intermediaries, **including through roundtables and other consultative formats with domestic financial institutions, board of investment and international financial institutions**. Upon assessment of gaps in enterprise finance, financial instruments adapted to RECP-type of investments will be **identified** and promoted to financial institutions. Moreover **technical** support will be provided for the pilot, evaluation and scaling-up of such financial instruments, including through training and capacity building of financial institutions (to operate the financial instruments) and business sector (to be able to benefit from the financial instruments).

#### 4. Project implementation arrangements

The UNIDO Project Manager (part time) sits in Vienna and the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA, full time) had his office in CRECPI, Bandung until June 2018. When the PMC took the decision to discontinue cooperation with CRECPI and to entrust the Jakarta based ICPC with the implementation of the outstanding project activities, the CTA's office was moved to the UNIDO Country Office (UCO) in Jakarta. These two staff, together with the National Project Officer (part time until June 2019), sitting in the UNIDO Country Office (UCO) in Jakarta, constitutes the Project Management Team.

The overall project steering body is the Project Management Committee (PMC) where the donor (SECO) is member, together with the main governmental partners: MoEF, being the Chair (represented by the Director of CEFS), and the MoI. Ex-officio members (read: observers) in the PMC are the UNIDO Representative (leading the UCO), the Head, or Deputy Head, of (originally foreseen CRECPI but now) ICPC, and the CTA.

It was foreseen that the Project should be implemented by UNIDO, in close cooperation with four national implementing partners, respectively: Indonesia Cleaner Production Centre (ICPC); Centre for Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production Indonesia (CRECPI), Centre for Assessment and Development of Green Industry and Environment (CADGIE) and Centre for Textiles in Bandung (CTB).

The Centre for Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production Indonesia (CRECPI), established in 2013 by the Institute of Technology in Bandung (ITB) and since refurbished and launched on 13th June 2014 by the Project, was foreseen to retain the principal technical role and become the primary implementation partner for the Indonesian RECP programme.

CRECPI is an operational unit established under the Environment Centre of the Institute of Technology in Bandung (ITB), the country's pre-eminent technical university. Within the framework of the national RECP Programme, UNIDO was to support the development and operationalization of CRECPI. Given that CRECPI did not have its own legal status, and with a view to smooth, effective and transparent implementation of project activities, ITB requested UNIDO to channel the contract through PT Ganesha Environment and Energy Services (GEES), a company under the ITB Business and Endowment Fund Unit (PBULD). Hence, GEES, has been providing, management, operational and support services to CRECPI, on behalf of ITB, the 'host institution' for CRECPI.

It was one of the declared intentions of the RECP program to establish a sustainable RECP service providing entity. Therefore major efforts were vested into providing the necessary support to establish CRECPI as an entity with its own legal status. Yet, these efforts did not result in the expected outcome and ITB failed to undertake the necessary steps to establish CRECPI as an entity with a separate legal status. Furthermore some serious deficiencies in service provision by GEES had to be observed from early 2017 onwards.

Throughout 2017, SECO started to voice serious concerns that funding of the RECP Indonesia program might be suspended unless the Indonesian counterparts will undertake the necessary steps to establish an RECP service providing entity with its own legal status. In line with the recommendations of the MTE, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry consequently ramped up its efforts to establish ICPC as an autonomous independent institution formally legalized as Yayasan Produksi Berish Nasional (PPBN) in November 2017 responsible to carry out tasks to create demand and provide RECP related services in the country.

In its eight meeting in April 2018, the PMC decided that UNIDO should terminate the contract with GEES and enter into a contractual agreement with ICPC for the execution of outstanding project deliverables by ICPC. Considering the need to build the institutional capacities of ICPC as the new RECP promoting institution and to enable ICPC to execute outstanding project activities, further considering available financial resources a non-cost extension until end June 2020 was agreed by the PMC.

## **5. Main findings on project progress from Mid-term Evaluation (2016)**

During the first year of accelerated implementation, emphasis has been placed on training of national experts, industry and government outreach and consultation (under output 1), in plant assessments in food, textile and tourism sectors and Makassar and Batam regions (under output 2) and providing policy support, in the main to MoI (in area of GI) and MoEF (in area of SCP). By the end of June 2016, amongst others following activities had been completed:

- 63 national experts completed theoretical part of the RECP assessors training and were working towards completion of the practical part;
- 8 industry awareness and 6 industry consultation workshops were organized;
- RECP assessments were started in 71 demonstration enterprises;

- Inputs were provided to the development and promotion of various Green Industry Policy initiatives, including the Green Industry Award, Green Industry Certification, Green Industry Auditor Training and Green Industry promotional campaigns and policy training.

Moreover, joint RECP training was developed and delivered in cooperation with two related Swiss funded projects in Indonesia, respectively the SMART Fish programme (Sustainable Market Access and Responsible Trading), implemented by UNIDO, and SCORE Programme (Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises), implemented by the International Labour Organization (ILO).

The main findings of the Mid Term Evaluation (October 2016) in term of Project Impact, Sustainability and Mainstreaming were:

- The Project implementation was almost 3 years delayed, mainly due to slow recruitment of the CTA. When full implementation started there were 3 years left of the Project, whereas the planned implementation period was 5 years.
- The Project was designed to scale-up RECP by “going wide” to several sectors and locations. Sustainability of the efforts is seriously at risk with spreading out too widely with the limited project time left, also creating higher transaction costs. The Team therefore suggests “going deeper” into the sectors and locations already started and securing a stronger anchorage there.
- The Project is to a large degree hinged on the proficiency and enthusiasm of the CTA, and is thus vulnerable. A national “Deputy CTA”-like person is lacking to secure continuity post-project, being a possible future coordinator/hub of RECP. Permanent employees in the implementing partner institutions to work closely with the other UNIDO project staff are also to most degree lacking to secure ownership and continuity. An Exit Strategy has not yet been prepared.
- The RCC has not developed as intended (as advisor to the PMC), and has de facto not been properly established, not being the driver for NRECP establishment. ICPC and the Project are now initiating an alternative two-pronged network model with an RECP Expert Pool and an RECP Forum.
- Legal enforcement of environmental industrial culprits is weak with little incentive for undertaking RECP in Indonesia, rather than reduction of operation costs.

In follow-up and response to the findings and recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation some adaptive management and changes to the logical framework, workplan and budget were required. In the paragraphs set out below the main MTE recommendations and the management responses are summarised. These responses have also informed the revision of the logical framework, the workplan and the budget as it was agreed in the meeting of the Project Management Committee in February 2017. In this Meeting of the PMC Dr Rene van Berkel already acted as the out-going CTA and Dr Permod Gupta was presented as the new incoming CTA.

**Recommendation 1:** The Project should not start activities in any new industrial sectors or geographical areas, but “go deeper” in the areas already started, as this will most likely increase the chances of sustainability in those sectors during the limited time remaining of the Project. (This means that chemical sector and micro sectors should not be started, and no activities should be started in Lake Toba (tourism) and in the industrial estate in Surabaya. Whether to stop the involvement in the metal sector must be carefully considered by the project management, as some awareness raising efforts have already been undertaken here and it could be detrimental to the RECP in general, and the Project in



particular, to stop at this point). This change in strategy will also make the Project saving funds on the travel budget item (lower transaction costs), which is already fully spent at the time of the Evaluation.

**Response:** The project will continue to focus on the textile (West Java and Central Java) and food sector (East Java and North Sumatra). Consolidation, replication and up-scaling will be achieved through a combination of RECP clubs/circles<sup>2</sup>, RECP clinics<sup>3</sup> and RECP helpdesk/Platforms. The metal sector will only be addressed in the 2 Industrial zones (Makassar, Batam). No activities will be launched in the chemical sector. Activities in the micro sectors will exclusively continue to focus on rice mills. In line with the decisions of the meeting in December 2016 and the priorities expressed by the Ministry of Tourism, activities to promote RECP in the tourism sector will continue in the Lake Toba Region and in Sleman/Magelang. RECP help desks will be used as intranet based strategy to reach large number of beneficiaries through RECP help desks (Sectoral and thematic) to be functional at various RECP partner institution and linkage with RECPnet globally.

This consolidation will allow to strengthen capacities for provision of high quality RECP advisory services and will allow to create strong demand for RECP advisory services as it is a prerequisite for sustainability.

**Recommendation 2:** Whether the activities in Component 3 (Policy and Regulatory Framework) should be reduced must be considered by the project management as part of totality and needs to support the efforts in the other components. With the lack of legal enforcement of the polluting enterprises, one idea could be to assist the local authorities (BAPEDAL) strengthening such enforcement in a limited geographical area (e.g. in an industrial estate) or for a specific sector in a certain location

- **Response:** The idea of legal/enforcement related policy pilots in selected localities and sectors is already in project planning, and will be more vigorously supported, both with MoEF (environmental regulation) as well as MoI (green industry certification). Realization though is contingent on commitment and engagement of national, regional and/or local authorities, which is beyond the direct control of project management. Pilot activities will only be considered in six Provinces targeted by project. No specific policy initiatives will be undertaken to support specifically MoEMR as had been planned in PD.

**Recommendation 3:** The two first outputs of Component 5 should continue as planned (with Output 5.2 only giving a broad outline of a future possible Financing Scheme for the industry). However, Output 5.3 must be dropped as that is outside the scope of the Project and should never have been there in the first place.

**Response:** Component 5 has been refined, limited to outputs 5.1 and 5.2, in a manner that also captures recent national developments on green finance<sup>4</sup>, including Ministerial Decree

---

<sup>2</sup> Global CP/RECP experience demonstrated successfully self-help approach for better multiplier effect of RECP applications with least resources by using RECP CLUB/Circle approach in sector of industries/cluster of industries in selected sectors/geographical region.

<sup>3</sup> RECP clinics are short duration useful marketing tools to reach and convince large number of industries/industrial sectors/thematic groups to practice RECP and share various mechanism and followed by quick RECP assessment/scan for providing limited assistance for RECP implementation

<sup>4</sup>Innovative tolos like Mutual Credit Guaranteed trust funds (MCGTF) used successfully for cluster of small and micro industries in India will be attempted for RECP financing in micro and informal sectors

(consultation draft). Global experience of best case examples of financial instruments will be compiled and shared with partner institutions.

**Recommendation 4:** The Project should actively support the efforts of the ICPC in establishing the institution as a foundation, enabling it to receive external funds and having income-generating activities.

**Response:** Taking into consideration the de-facto institutional limitations of each of the implementing partners and the diversity of RECP services to be provided (assessment, advocacy, training, policy dialogue etc.), project management will support each of the four implementing partners to become sustainable in complementary niche RECP service areas. For each, this would include, support for development of services portfolio, business model, appropriate legal, institutional and governance, taking note of the rich and diverse experience under the RECP/NCPC programme globally. Taking time and resource constraints into consideration the scope of support will be determined by willingness and ability of implementing partners to contribute to the network.

**Recommendation 5:** An Exit Strategy should be prepared for the Project without delay. This should focus on securing sustainability and rollout of the activities post-project. A “Deputy CTA”-like expert should be taken on board the Project to work closely with the international CTA. The person should preferably come from/be anchored in one of the implementing partner institution with a view to continue in this institution post-project.

**Response:** As part of the extension at no additional costs of project implementation period until 30 June 2019 a six month period in which the CTA will no longer be based full time in Indonesia but will only come in regular intervals for short term missions to Indonesia is foreseen. The CTA will focus on supporting and developing the head of an independent autonomous institution having legal entity. This head must consider the provision of RECP services beyond the project implementation period as a business opportunity. It will be endeavoured to develop an institutional set-up in which both ICPC and CRECPI will have complementary and mutually supporting roles and benefits from the provision of RECP advisory services. CRECPI as an autonomous institution will be supported to become the lead service provider for RECP application as a management tool by beneficiaries (as will ITB for the textile sector) and ICPC will be further strengthened with related to policy and fiscal instrument for RECP implementation.

**Recommendation 6:** The RCC would obviously not be established as other solutions are sought outside a RCC (lead by the MoEF). This function should then be removed from project strategy (as initially presented in the PD), and instead the new approach with a two-pronged networking model (RECP Expert Pool and RECP Forum) should be taken on board.

**Response:** Agreed

**Recommendation 7:** Preparation of written manuals for the RECP process should start without delay, as this is a felt need amongst both enterprises and the national experts. Such manuals should be specific for the various industrial sectors, and as such be documents of reference for the RECP assessors in their future work.

**Response:** RECP manuals in English and Bahasa will be prepared during quarter 2 of 2017. They will include business case/advocacy primer and an enterprise experiences (compendium), as well as methodological guidance and sector specific techniques and practices.

The logical framework, workplan and budget have been revised in line with these recommendations and responses.

Further details can be obtained from the MTR report (October 2016) and the half yearly progress reports.

## 6. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary

Description	Total (in USD)
Financing (SECO)	<b>Grant 200001268 RECP Indonesia:</b> \$3,727,798.76 USD excl. 13% psc (forecasted at the exchange rate of the first installment) 3,714,545.84 USD excl. 13% psc (funds received at actual exchange rates) <b>Grant 200001121 RECP Global:</b> 118,433.00 EUR

Source: Project document (revised version 2015)

Table 2. Financing plan summary – project component breakdown

Project outcomes	Total (in USD)
1. RECP Capacity and Network	325,555.62
2. RECP implementation and Replication	970,657.04
3. RECP Policy and Strategy	406,940.00
4. RECP Innovation	480,134.99
5. RECP investment	147,600.00
Project Management	1,562,748.58
<b>Total (in USD)</b>	<b>3,893,636.23</b>

Source: Project document (revised version 2015) this figure comprises both grants

Table 4. UNIDO budget execution<sup>5</sup> (Grant No.: 200000308) either this version of printout from SAP which contains the 3% of the 13%

UNIDO National Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production (RECP) Programme Indonesia							
SAP ID	100224						
period	1 Jan 2013 - 30 June 2020						
donor	Government of Switzerland, State Secretariat for Economic Affairs						
lead government counterpart	Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Indonesia						
Based on UNIDO financial accounts as consolidated @ COB 30 October 2018							
Financial Summary							
Project budget	inc 13% PSC	inc 13% PSC	net project budget	program support costs			
Donor Commitment	CHF 4,244,936.00	\$ 4,399,808.94	\$ 3,893,636.23	\$ 506,172.71			
Grant 20001268 RECP Indonesia	CHF 4,064,136.00	\$ 4,197,436.80	\$ 3,714,545.84	\$ 482,890.96	\$	3,714,545.84	
Grant 200001121 RECP Global C2C	CHF 180,800.00	€ 133,829.29	€ 118,433.00	\$ 15,396.29			
Funds Transferred to UNIDO							
Grant 200001268 RECP Indonesia	CHF 4,064,136.00	\$ 4,197,436.80	\$ 3,714,545.84	\$ 482,890.96			
Grant 200001121 RECP Global C2C	CHF 180,800.00	€ 133,829.29	€ 118,433.00	\$ 15,396.29			
Total Direct Expenditures until 31 Dec 2018							
Grant 200001268 RECP Indonesia	\$	2,606,737.08					
Grant 200001121 RECP Global C2C	€	117,402.68					
Funds Available 1 Jan 2019							
Grant 200001268 RECP Indonesia	\$	1,107,808.76					
Grant 200001121 RECP Global C2C	€	1,030.32					
Total remaining programmable budget							
Grant 200001268 RECP Indonesia	\$	1,107,808.76					
Grant 200001121 RECP Global C2C	€	1,030.32					
Part 1: Financial report by output/workstream (Grant 200001268 RECP Indonesia)							
Workstream	UNIDO Reference	Jan 2013 - Dec 2017	Jan-March 2018	April-June 2018	July-Sept 2018	Oct-Dec 2018	Jan 2013-Dec 2018
1. RECP Capacity and Network	100224-1-01-04	\$ 219,806.39	\$ 17,471.54	\$ 48,171.29	\$ 1,668.46	\$ 400.89	\$ 287,518.57
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	\$ 489.64					\$ 489.64
1500	Local travel	\$ 321.37	\$ 203.99	\$ 914.52			\$ 1,439.88
1600	Staff Travel	\$ -					\$ -
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	\$ 89,421.68	\$ 16,389.02	\$ (329.82)			\$ 105,480.88
2100	Contractual Services	\$ 28,526.59		\$ 46,000.00		\$ (1,907.30)	\$ 72,619.29
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	\$ 77,958.63	\$ (77.22)	\$ (7.00)		\$ 2,045.15	\$ 79,919.56
3500	International Meetings	\$ -					\$ -
4300	Premises	\$ 511.20		\$ 513.02			\$ 1,024.22
4500	Equipment	\$ 2,457.02					\$ 2,457.02
5100	Other Direct Costs	\$ 20,120.26	\$ 955.75	\$ 1,080.57	\$ 1,668.46	\$ 263.04	\$ 24,088.08
7100	Contingencies	\$ -					\$ -

<sup>5</sup> Disbursement: Expenditure, incl. commitment

1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	\$	-			\$	53.37	\$	53.37
1500	Local travel	\$	(15.28)					\$	(15.28)
1600	Staff Travel	\$	-					\$	-
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	\$	135,686.83	\$	26,479.33	\$	(791.77)	\$	161,374.39
2100	Contractual Services	\$	-			\$	40,000.00	\$	40,000.00
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	\$	39,769.78	\$	845.63	\$	0.27	\$	41,786.74
3500	International Meetings	\$	-					\$	-
4300	Premises	\$	-					\$	-
4500	Equipment	\$	3,421.22					\$	3,421.22
5100	Other Direct Costs	\$	1,024.08	\$	0.01	\$	30.20	\$	(21.31)
7100	Contingencies	\$	-					\$	-
<b>4. RECP Innovation</b>	<b>100224-1-01-07</b>	\$	<b>61,869.49</b>	\$	<b>6,016.83</b>	\$	<b>(138.22)</b>	\$	<b>-</b>
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	\$	-					\$	-
1500	Local travel	\$	-					\$	-
1600	Staff Travel	\$	-					\$	-
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	\$	17,000.17	\$	5,199.50	\$	(138.22)	\$	22,061.45
2100	Contractual Services	\$	12,222.68					\$	12,222.68
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	\$	32,535.08	\$	817.33			\$	33,352.41
3500	International Meetings	\$	-					\$	-
4300	Premises	\$	-					\$	-
4500	Equipment	\$	-					\$	-
5100	Other Direct Costs	\$	111.56					\$	111.56
7100	Contingencies	\$	-					\$	-
<b>5. RECP Investment</b>	<b>100224-1-01-08</b>	\$	<b>3,492.37</b>	\$	<b>-</b>	\$	<b>10,000.00</b>	\$	<b>-</b>
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	\$	-					\$	-
1500	Local travel	\$	-					\$	-
1600	Staff Travel	\$	-					\$	-
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	\$	-	\$	-			\$	-
2100	Contractual Services	\$	-			\$	10,000.00	\$	10,000.00
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	\$	3,425.31	\$	-			\$	3,425.31
3500	International Meetings	\$	-					\$	-
4300	Premises	\$	-					\$	-
4500	Equipment	\$	-					\$	-
5100	Other Direct Costs	\$	67.06					\$	67.06
7100	Contingencies	\$	-					\$	-

<b>Project Management &amp; Monitoring</b>	<b>100224-1-01-10</b>	\$	<b>1,093,839.45</b>	\$	<b>116,411.81</b>	\$	<b>94,070.61</b>	\$	<b>133,476.30</b>	\$	<b>51,291.39</b>	\$	<b>1,489,089.56</b>
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	\$	621,144.06	\$	70,636.98	\$	51,529.53	\$	107,638.96	\$	44,850.32	\$	895,799.85
1500	Local travel	\$	116,100.96	\$	4,715.29	\$	9,507.64	\$	14,888.02	\$	(917.67)	\$	144,294.24
1600	Staff Travel	\$	89,118.45	\$	5,446.58	\$	1,507.89	\$	(41.82)	\$	7,466.03	\$	103,497.13
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	\$	152,466.03	\$	32,661.85	\$	4,664.19	\$	7,206.75	\$	(1,147.06)	\$	195,851.76
2100	Contractual Services	\$	54,208.15	\$	103.35								54,311.50
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	\$	1,200.25										1,200.25
3500	International Meetings	\$	8,410.65										8,410.65
4300	Premises	\$	-										-
4500	Equipment	\$	24,378.10										24,378.10
5100	Other Direct Costs	\$	26,812.80	\$	2,847.76	\$	26,861.36	\$	3,784.39	\$	1,039.77	\$	61,346.08
7100	Contingencies	\$	-										-
<b>Independent Evaluation</b>	<b>100224-1-53-03</b>	\$	<b>19,988.38</b>	\$	<b>-</b>	\$	<b>-</b>	\$	<b>-</b>	\$	<b>-</b>	\$	<b>19,988.38</b>
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	\$	17,141.20										17,141.20
1500	Local travel	\$	-										-
1600	Staff Travel	\$	-										-
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	\$	2,840.37										2,840.37
2100	Contractual Services	\$	-										-
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	\$	-										-
3500	International Meetings	\$	-										-
4300	Premises	\$	-										-
4500	Equipment	\$	-										-
5100	Other Direct Costs	\$	6.81										6.81
7100	Contingencies	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
	<b>Direct Project Costs</b>	\$	<b>2,031,517.18</b>	\$	<b>223,046.47</b>	\$	<b>165,803.05</b>	\$	<b>133,309.47</b>	\$	<b>53,060.91</b>	\$	<b>2,606,737.08</b>
	<b>13% PSC</b>	\$	<b>264,097.23</b>	\$	<b>28,996.04</b>	\$	<b>21,554.40</b>	\$	<b>17,330.23</b>	\$	<b>6,897.92</b>	\$	<b>338,875.82</b>
	<b>grand total</b>	\$	<b>2,295,614.41</b>	\$	<b>252,042.51</b>	\$	<b>187,357.45</b>	\$	<b>150,639.70</b>	\$	<b>59,958.83</b>	\$	<b>2,945,612.90</b>

**Part 2: Financial report by UNIDO budget line (Grant 200001268 RECP Indonesia)**

Budget line	UNIDO reference	Jan 2013 - Dec 2017	Jan-March 2018	April-June 2018	July-Sept 2018	Oct-Dec 2018	Jan 2013-Dec 2018
international experts	1100	\$ 638,774.90	\$ 70,636.98	\$ 51,529.53	\$ 107,638.96	\$ 44,903.69	\$ 913,484.06
project travel	1500	\$ 116,407.05	\$ 4,919.28	\$ 10,422.16	\$ 14,888.02	\$ 519.65	\$ 147,156.16
staff travel	1600	\$ 89,118.45	\$ 5,446.58	\$ 1,507.89	\$ (41.82)	\$ 7,466.03	\$ 103,497.13
national experts	1700	\$ 511,099.31	\$ 138,896.86	\$ 485.23	\$ 7,206.75	\$ (1,147.06)	\$ 656,541.09
contracted services	2100	\$ 387,457.05	\$ 103.35	\$ 73,387.07	\$ (1,793.10)	\$ (1,783.05)	\$ 457,371.32
training	3000	\$ 180,708.48	\$ (498.99)	\$ (35.35)	\$ -	\$ 3,236.52	\$ 183,410.66
international meetings	3500	\$ 8,410.65	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,410.65
premises	4300	\$ 511.20	\$ -	\$ 513.02	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,024.22
equipment	4500	\$ 50,272.24	\$ (122.71)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,149.53
other direct costs	5100	\$ 48,757.85	\$ 3,665.12	\$ 27,993.50	\$ 5,410.66	\$ (88.56)	\$ 85,738.57
contingencies	7100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (46.31)	\$ (46.31)
Direct Project Costs		\$ 2,031,517.18	\$ 223,046.47	\$ 165,803.05	\$ 133,309.47	\$ 53,060.91	\$ 2,606,737.08
13% PSC		\$ 264,097.23	\$ 28,996.04	\$ 21,554.40	\$ 17,330.23	\$ 6,897.92	\$ 338,875.82
grand total		\$ 2,295,614.41	\$ 252,042.51	\$ 187,357.45	\$ 150,639.70	\$ 59,958.83	\$ 2,945,612.90

**Part 3: Financial report by output/workstream (Grant 200001121 RECP Global C2C)**

Workstream	UNIDO Reference	Jan 2013 - Dec 2017	Jan-March 2018	April-June 2018	July-Sept 2018	Oct-Dec 2018	Jan 2013-Dec 2018
C2C	100224-1-01-07	€ 43,034.98	€ (604.79)	€ -	€ 3,457.98	€ 71,514.51	€ 117,402.68
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	€ 26,165.61	€ (368.79)			€ 45.38	€ 25,842.20
1500	Local travel	€ 75.45			€ 3,457.98	€ 2,115.97	€ 5,649.40
1600	Staff Travel	€ -				€ 5,046.63	€ 5,046.63
1700	Nat. Consult./Staff	€ 12,604.78					€ 12,604.78
2100	Contractual Services	€ -				€ 39,480.00	€ 39,480.00
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	€ 4,172.13				€ 24,834.21	€ 29,006.34
3500	International Meetings	€ -					€ -
4300	Premises	€ -					€ -
4500	Equipment	€ -					€ -
5100	Other Direct Costs	€ 17.01	€ (236.00)			€ (7.68)	€ (226.67)
7100	Contingencies	€ -					€ -

Source: UNIDO. ERP database as of [date]

## II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

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

The TE has an additional purpose of drawing lessons and developing recommendations for UNIDO, the Government, Donors, and the project stakeholders and partners that may help improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities in the country and on a global scale upon project completion. The TE report should include examples of good practices for other projects in the focal area, country, or region.

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

The overall purpose of the TE is to assess whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective, i.e. is to improve resource productivity and environmental performance of manufacturing, tourism and micro-sector enterprises in Indonesia and thereby contribute to inclusive and sustainable industrial development in the country and to what extent the project has also considered sustainability and scaling-up factors for increasing contribution to sustainable results and further impact.

The evaluation has three specific objectives:

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

## III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The TE will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy<sup>6</sup>, UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle<sup>7</sup>.

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

---

<sup>6</sup> UNIDO. (2018). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (DGB/2018/08, dated 1 June 2018)

<sup>7</sup> UNIDO. (2006). Director-General's Administrative Instruction No. 17/Rev.1: Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle (DGAI.17/Rev.1, 24 August 2006)



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

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

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

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

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

## 1. Data collection methods

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

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

- (a) **Desk and literature review** of documents related to the project, including but not limited to:
  - The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports), mid-term review report, output reports, back-to-office mission report(s), end-of-contract report(s) and relevant correspondence
  - Notes from meetings of committees involved in the project
- (b) **Stakeholder consultations** will be conducted through structured and semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion. Key stakeholders to be interviewed include:
  - UNIDO Management and staff involved in the project; and
  - Representatives of donors and counterparts
- (c) **Field visit** to Indonesia
  - On-site observation of results achieved by the project, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies
  - Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Country Office(s) representative to the extent that he/she was involved in the project, and the project's management members and the various national [and sub-regional] authorities dealing with project activities as necessary

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

## 2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

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

The key evaluation questions are the following:

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

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

Table 5. Summary of Project evaluation criteria

Index	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
<b>A</b>	<b>Progress to Impact</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Project design</b>	<b>Yes</b>
1	• Overall design	Yes
2	• Logframe	Yes
<b>C</b>	<b>Project performance</b>	<b>Yes</b>
1	• Relevance	Yes
2	• Effectiveness	Yes
3	• Efficiency	Yes
4	• Sustainability of benefits	Yes
<b>D</b>	<b>Cross-cutting performance criteria</b>	
1	• Gender mainstreaming	Yes
2	• Environment and socio-economic aspects <sup>8</sup>	

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M&amp;E: (focus on Monitoring) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ M&amp;E design</li> <li>✓ M&amp;E implementation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results-based Management (RBM)</li> </ul>	Yes
<b>E</b>	<b>Performance of partners</b>	
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNIDO</li> </ul>	Yes
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National counterparts</li> </ul>	Yes
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Donor</li> </ul>	Yes
<b>F</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	Yes

### 3. Rating system

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

Table 1. Project rating criteria

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).	

## 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. 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 October-December 2019.

The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned for November 2019.

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

The Final Evaluation report will be submitted 2 weeks after comments received.

## **VII. Evaluation deliverables**

### **Inception report**

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

The Inception Report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework (“evaluation matrix”); division of work between the International Evaluation Consultant and the national consultant; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable<sup>9</sup>.

### **Evaluation report and review procedures**

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

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

---

<sup>9</sup> The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report and a Guide on how to formulate lessons learned (including quality checklist) prepared by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

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 as per the revised project document 2015**

**Annex 2: Project results framework as endorsed in the 8<sup>th</sup> PMC in April 2018**

## Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria

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

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



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

No.	Evaluation criteria
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Efficiency</u></li> <li>✓ How economically are the project resources/inputs (concerning funding, expertise, time...) being used to produce results?</li> <li>✓ To what extent were expected results achieved within the original budget? If no, please explain why.</li> <li>✓ Are the results being achieved at an acceptable cost? Would alternative approaches accomplish the same results at less cost?</li> <li>✓ What measures have been taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used? Were the project expenditures in line with budgets?</li> <li>✓ To what extent did the expected co-financing materialize, in cash or in-kind, grants or loan? Was co-financing administered by the project management or by some other organization? Did short fall in co-financing or materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results?</li> <li>✓ Could more have been achieved with the same input?</li> <li>✓ Could the same have been achieved with less input?</li> <li>✓ How timely was the project in producing outputs and outcomes? Comment on the delay or acceleration of the project's implementation period.</li> <li>✓ To what extent were the project's activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the Project Team and annual Work Plans?</li> <li>✓ Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet the requirements?</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Sustainability of benefits</u></li> <li>✓ Will the project results and benefits be sustained after the end of donor funding?</li> <li>✓ Does the project have an exit strategy?</li> <li><i>Financial risks:</i></li> <li>✓ What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the project ends?</li> <li><i>Socio-political risks:</i></li> <li>✓ Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> <li>✓ What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?</li> <li>✓ Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow?</li> <li>✓ Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?</li> <li><i>Institutional framework and governance risks:</i></li> <li>✓ Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits?</li> <li>✓ Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency and required technical know-how in place?</li> <li><i>Environmental risks:</i></li> <li>✓ Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?</li> <li>✓ Are there any project outputs or higher level results that are likely to have adverse environmental impacts, which, in turn, might affect the sustainability of project benefits?</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Monitoring of long-term changes</u></li> </ul> <p>The M&amp;E of long-term changes is often incorporated in 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"> <li>✓ Did the project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?</li> <li>✓ What were the accomplishments and shortcomings in establishment of this system?</li> <li>✓ Is the system sustainable — that is, is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and does it have financing? How likely is it that this system continues operating upon project completion?</li> <li>✓ Is the information generated by this system being used as originally intended?</li> </ul>
<b>D</b>	<b>Cross-cutting performance criteria</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Gender mainstreaming</u></li> <li>✓ Did the project design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? Was the gender marker assigned correctly at entry?</li> <li>✓ Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)? Were there gender-related project indicators?</li> <li>✓ Are women/gender-focused groups, associations or gender units in partner organizations consulted/ included in the project?</li> <li>✓ How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?</li> <li>✓ Do the results affect women and men differently? If so, why and how? How are the results likely to affect gender relations (e.g., division of labour, decision-making authority)?</li> <li>✓ To what extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?</li> </ul>
2	✓ Environment and socio-economic aspects
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>M&amp;E: (focus on Monitoring)</u></li> <li>✓ <b>M&amp;E design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Was the Monitoring plan at the point of project approval practical and sufficient?</li> <li>○ Did it include baseline data and specify clear targets and appropriate indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio economic results?</li> <li>○ Did it include a proper M&amp;E methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of the M&amp;E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection;</li> <li>○ Did it include budget adequate funds for M&amp;E activities?</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ <b>M&amp;E implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How was the information from M&amp;E system used during the project implementation? Was an M&amp;E system in place and did it facilitate timely tracking of progress toward project results by collecting information on selected indicators continually throughout the project implementation period? Did project team and manager make decisions and corrective actions based on analysis from M&amp;E system and based on results achieved?</li> <li>○ Are annual/progress project reports complete and accurate?</li> <li>○ Was the information provided by the M&amp;E system used to improve performance and adapt to changing needs? Was information on project performance and results achievement being presented to the Project Steering Committee to make decisions and corrective actions? Do the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

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

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

### Annex 3: Job descriptions

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

<b>Title:</b>	International evaluation consultant, team leader
<b>Main Duty Station and Location:</b>	Home-based
<b>Missions:</b>	Missions to Vienna, Austria and Indonesia
<b>Start of Contract (EOD):</b>	01/10/2019
<b>End of Contract (COB):</b>	31/12/2019
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	27-35 working days spread over 3 months

#### ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

#### PROJECT CONTEXT

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

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

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
Undertake a desk review of project documentation (incl. familiarization with the SECO funded programmes and strategies, and with relevant policies such as those on project cycle, M&E, co-financing, fiduciary standards, gender, and environmental and social safeguards) and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instruments accordingly (if needed); Assess the adequacy of legislative and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant</li><li>• An adjusted table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context</li><li>• A draft list of stakeholders to be interviewed during the evaluation field mission</li><li>• A brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework</li></ul>	5 days	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
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	3 days	Home-based
Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to be interviewed and planned site visits) submitted to evaluation and project manager</li> </ul>	2 days	Vienna, Austria
3. Undertake evaluation field mission <sup>10</sup> to consult field project stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries to verify and complete preliminary evaluation findings from desk review and assess the institutional capacities of the recipient country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field mission conducted</li> <li>Evaluation/debriefing presentation of the evaluation's preliminary findings prepared, draft conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt to stakeholders in the country, at the end of the mission</li> <li>Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks</li> </ul>	6-10 days	Country: Indonesia Cities: Jakarta, Bandung, Yogyakarta, Banten and Makassar
4. Debriefing mission: Present preliminary findings, recommendations and lessons learnt to project stakeholders at UNIDO HQ for factual validation and comments Hold additional meetings with and obtain additional data from evaluation/project manager and other stakeholders as required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Power point presentation</li> <li>Feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed</li> <li>Additional meetings held as required</li> </ul>	2 days	Vienna, Austria
5. Prepare the draft evaluation report, with inputs from the National Consultant, and in accordance with the evaluation TOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager for review and comments</li> </ul>	6/8 days	Home-based

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

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
Submit draft evaluation report to the evaluation manager for feedback and comments			
6. Revise the draft evaluation report based on comments and suggestions received through the evaluation manager and edit the language and finalize the evaluation report according to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division standards  Prepare a two pages summary of a take-away message from the evaluation	Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager  Two pages summary take-away message from the evaluation submitted to the evaluation manager	3/5 days	Home-based
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27/35 days</b>	

#### MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

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

**Technical and functional experience:**

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

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

**Reporting and deliverables**

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



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

**Absence of conflict of interest:**

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

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

<b>Title:</b>	National evaluation consultant
<b>Main Duty Station and Location:</b>	Home-based
<b>Mission/s to:</b>	Travel to potential sites within Indonesia
<b>Start of Contract:</b>	01/10/2019
<b>End of Contract:</b>	31/12/2019
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	25-30 days spread over 3 months

### ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

### PROJECT CONTEXT

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

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

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

<b><u>MAIN DUTIES</u></b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>
<p>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 framework, specifically in the context of the project's objectives and targets</p>			
<p><b>Coordination of evaluation field mission</b> agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with project staff in the field</p> <p>Assist and provide detailed analysis and inputs to the team leader in the preparation of the inception report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed evaluation schedule</li> <li>• List of stakeholders to be interviewed during the field mission</li> </ul>	6 days	Home-based (telephone interviews)
<p><b>Participation in interviews during evaluation field missions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview notes</li> <li>• Input to presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission</li> </ul>	6-10 days	Home based, including in-country (Indonesia) project sites at Jakarta, Bandung, Yogyakarta, Banten and Makassar
<p><b>Draft evaluation report</b></p> <p>Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the team leader</p>	Inputs to the draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation team leader	4 days	Home-based

<b>MAIN DUTIES</b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>
<p><b>Final evaluation report and summary take-away message</b> Contribute to the finalization of the evaluation report on basis of comments and suggestions received through the evaluation team leader</p> <p>Contribute to the preparation of a two pages summary of a take-away message from the evaluation</p>	Inputs to the Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation team leader	2-3 days	Home-based
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>25-30 days</b>	

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

**Core values:**

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

**Core competencies:**

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

**Managerial competencies (as applicable):**

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

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

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

**Technical and functional experience:**

- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.
- Minimum of 5 years' 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 Bahasa Indonesia is required.

**Absence of conflict of interest:**

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

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

### **Acknowledgement (incl. list of evaluation team members)**

### **Abbreviations and acronyms**

### **Glossary of evaluation-related terms**

#### **Executive summary**

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

#### **I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process**

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

#### **II. Country and project background**

- Brief country context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project<sup>11</sup> and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
  - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
  - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
  - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
  - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
  - Counterpart organization(s)

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

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

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

---

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

- 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: 100224

### Evaluation team

Evaluation team leader:

National evaluation consultant:

Evaluation manager (IED):

Quality review done by:

Date:

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

### Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

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

## Annex 6. Guidance and checklist on lessons learned quality criteria

### UNIDO evaluation lessons learned

#### Definition

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) (2002) defines lessons learned related to the evaluation of development assistance as follows: **“Generalizations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact.”**<sup>12</sup>

Focus  
on  
generalization

The International Labour Organisation (ILO) provides one of the most comprehensive definitions of lessons learned with relevance for evaluations in the UN system (2014) **“A lesson learned is an observation from project or programme experience which can be translated into relevant, beneficial knowledge by establishing clear causal factors and effects. It focuses on a specific design, activity, process or decision and may provide either positive or negative insights on operational effectiveness and efficiency, impact on the achievement of outcomes, or influence on sustainability. The lesson should indicate, where possible, how it contributes to 1) reducing or eliminating deficiencies; or 2) building successful and sustainable practice and performance”**<sup>13</sup>.

Focus  
on  
transferability  
&  
generalization

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

#### What is not a lesson learned?

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

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

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

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

<sup>15</sup> [www.globalhivmeinfo.org/Pages/Glossary.aspx](http://www.globalhivmeinfo.org/Pages/Glossary.aspx)

[globalhivmeinfo.org/DigitalLibrary/Digital%20Library/Glossary%20of%20Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation%20Terms.doc](http://globalhivmeinfo.org/DigitalLibrary/Digital%20Library/Glossary%20of%20Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation%20Terms.doc)

## Examples of lessons learned

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

## Examples of statements that do not qualify as lessons learned

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

## Lessons learned quality criteria checklist

The evaluator should cite and explain the points below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Ratings 4-6 are satisfactory and meet quality criteria.**

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

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

## **Annex 7. Minimum requirements for M&E<sup>16</sup>**

### **Minimum requirement 1: Project design of M&E**

All projects will include a concrete and fully budgeted M&E plan by the time of approval. This M&E plan will contain as a minimum:

- SMART indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management;
- SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, indicators identified at the corporate level;
- Baseline for the project, with a description of the problem to be addressed, with indicator data, or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation;
- Identification of reviews and evaluations that will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluations of activities; and
- Organizational set-up and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

### **Minimum requirement 2: Application of project M&E**

Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&E plan, comprising:

- SMART indicators for implementation are actively used, or if not, a reasonable explanation is provided;
- SMART indicators for results are actively used, or if not, a reasonable explanation is provided;
- The baseline for the project is fully established and data compiled to review progress reviews, and evaluations are undertaken as planned; and
- The organizational set-up for M&E is operational and budgets are spent as planned.

---

<sup>16</sup> [http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME\\_Policy\\_2010.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf)

## Annex 8. Rating tables

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

**Evaluation Rating Table**

#	Evaluation criteria	Definition	Mandatory rating
<b>A</b>	<b>Progress to impact</b>	<b>Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, including redirecting trajectories of transformational process and the extent to which conditions for trajectory change are being put into place.</b>	Yes
<b>B</b>	<b>Project design</b>	<b>Formulation of the intervention, the plan to achieve a specific purpose.</b>	Yes
1	Overall design	Assessment of the design in general.	Yes
2	Logframe	Assessment of the logical framework aimed at planning the intervention.	Yes
<b>C</b>	<b>Project performance</b>	<b>Functioning of a development intervention.</b>	Yes
1	Relevance	The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.	Yes
2	Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.	Yes
3	Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.	Yes
4	Sustainability of benefits	The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.	Yes
<b>D</b>	<b>Cross-cutting performance criteria</b>	<b>Other important criteria that cut across the UNIDO intervention.</b>	
1	Gender mainstreaming	The extent to which UNIDO interventions have contributed to better gender equality and gender related dimensions were considered in an intervention.	Yes
2	M&E	Refers to all the indicators, tools and processes used to measure if a development intervention has been implemented according to the plan (monitoring) and is having the desired result (evaluation).	Yes
3	Results-based management (RBM)	Assessment of issues related to results-based work planning, results based M&E and reporting based on results.	Yes
<b>E</b>	<b>Performance of partners</b>	<b>Assessment of partners' roles and responsibilities engaged in the intervention.</b>	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
<b>F</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the analysis made under Project performance and Progress to Impact criteria above but not an average of ratings.</b>	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. The aim of the system is to quantify the judgment of evaluators, identify good and poor practices, to facilitate aggregation within and across projects and enable tracking performance trends over a period. The six-point rating system, with six (6) representing the best and one (1) the worst score, allows for nuanced assessment of performance and results. The same rating scale is used for all rating areas as shown below.

#### UNIDO evaluation rating scale

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

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

**Table below** contains the formula applied to transform the results of UNIDO’s six-point rating scale to the GEF’s four-point scale for sustainability<sup>17</sup>.

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

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
- Efficiency
- Progress to Impact
- Sustainability of benefits

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



## Partners' performance

UNIDO's projects are characterized by a group of main partners with specific roles and responsibilities. UNIDO itself acts as project implementer and supervisor. Though supplemented by implementation performance criteria listed above, the criteria to assess UNIDO as a partner are more specific and help to address frequent issues in its performance. Governments are local executors, and owners of the project and donors provide project funding. Hence, rating the partners is a key part of UNIDO project evaluations<sup>18</sup>. The six-point rating scale applies<sup>19</sup>.

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

### Project design

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

### Implementation

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

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

### Project design

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

### Implementation

- Ownership of the project
- Financial contributions (cash or in-kind)
- Support to the project, based on actions and policies
- Counterpart funding
- Internal government coordination
- Exit strategy, planned together with UNIDO, or arrangements for continued funding of certain activities

---

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

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

- Facilitation of the participation of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), civil society and the private sector where appropriate
- Suitable procurement procedures for timely project implementation
- Engagement with UNIDO in policy dialogue to promote the up-scaling or replication of innovations

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

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

### **Gender mainstreaming**

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

In line with the UNIDO Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women Strategy, 2016-2019, all UNIDO technical assistance projects post-2015 are to be assigned a gender marker and should go through a gender mainstreaming check-list before approval. UNIDO's gender marker is in line with UN System-wide action plan (SWAP) requirements, with four categories: 0 — no attention to gender, 1 — some/limited attention to gender, 2a — significant attention to gender, 2b — gender is the principal objective<sup>20</sup>.

Besides, Guides on Gender Mainstreaming for Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) Projects in different areas of UNIDO's work have been developed and published during 2015<sup>21</sup>, which have specific guidance on suitable outputs/activities/indicators per technical area.

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

For terminal evaluations of projects that have been approved after 2015, evaluations should assess if the rating was correctly done at entry, if appropriate outputs/activities/indicators and monitoring were put in place during implementation and what results can be actually observed at the time of terminal evaluation (in line with UNIDO's organizational results

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

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

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.