



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

## **Independent Terminal Evaluation**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**UNIDO Project:** Inclusive and sustainable local economic development in Upper Egypt (SOHAG) – Phase 2 (HAYAT)

**UNIDO Project ID:** 150141

**November 2019**

## Table of contents

I. Project background and overview .....	3
I.1 Project factsheet.....	3
I.2 Project context.....	3
I.3 Project objective.....	4
I.4 Project implementation arrangements .....	6
I.5 Main findings on project progress .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
I.6 Budget information.....	7
II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation.....	9
III. Evaluation approach and methodology .....	9
III.1 Data collection methods.....	10
III.2 Key evaluation questions and criteria .....	10
IV. Evaluation process.....	12
V. Evaluation team composition.....	13
VI. Time schedule .....	13
VII. Evaluation deliverables .....	14
II. Quality assurance .....	15
Annex 1: Project's Logical Framework .....	16
Annex 2: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria.....	20
Annex 3: Job descriptions.....	26
Annex 4: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report .....	35
Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality .....	37
Annex 6. Guidance and checklist on lessons learned quality criteria.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex 7. Specific SDC checklist.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

## Project background and overview

### 1. Project factsheet

<b>Project title</b>	Inclusive and Sustainable Local Economic Development in Upper Egypt (Sohag) – Phase 2 (Hayat)
<b>UNIDO project ID</b>	150141
<b>Region</b>	Arab
<b>Country</b>	Egypt
<b>Planned implementation start date</b>	16 March 2017
<b>Planned implementation end date</b>	30 September 2019 (30 months)
<b>Actual implementation start date</b>	April 2017 (The project document was signed by counterparts on 16 March 2017)
<b>Actual implementation end date</b>	31 March 2020 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Implementing agency</b>	United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
<b>Government counterpart agency</b>	Ministry of Local Development (MoLD) Governorate of Sohag
<b>Support and cooperating agencies</b>	Ministry of Trade and Industry (MoTI) Ministry of Education and Technical Education (MoETE) Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MoALR) <sup>2</sup>
<b>Donor</b>	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
<b>Total project budget</b>	CHF 1,300,000

Source: Project document<sup>3</sup>

### 2. Project context

**Country background** Around 2.4 million people in the Governorate of Sohag suffer from income poverty<sup>4</sup>. The Governorate contains 250 of Egypt's poorest villages and approximately 30 percent of the population experience multidimensional poverty driven by inadequate infrastructure, low private capital accumulation and low investment in human capital<sup>5</sup>. At the same time, Sohag is richly endowed with natural resources and agriculture is the key economic sector, employing 50 percent of the labour force and utilizing 84 percent of the total cultivated area. Local industry holds potential for economic growth, especially those sectors based on agricultural resources.

Despite its rich soil and significant natural resources, scarcity of skilled agricultural labour has been identified by previous UNIDO interventions as a major barrier to realising productive capacity. The agribusiness sector in Sohag showed that there is a general need to improve the marketing situation and market access of farmers and farmers associations, recognizing the sector's potential for income generation and employment. Production and post-harvest treatment is another key area that requires technical assistance.

<sup>1</sup> A six month no-cost extension has been approved.

<sup>2</sup> MoALR was added on request of the members of the project steering committee at its first session in February 2018.

<sup>3</sup> Project information data throughout these TOR are to be verified during the inception phase.

<sup>4</sup> World Food Programme, 2013, *The Status of Poverty and Food Security in Egypt: Analysis and Policy Recommendations*. <https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/ena/wfp257467.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Egypt's Network for Integrated Development, 2013, *A Profile of Poverty across Egypt and Recommendations*. Policy Brief 15, [http://enid.org.eg/uploads/Pdf/Pb15\\_povertyprofile\\_egypt.pdf](http://enid.org.eg/uploads/Pdf/Pb15_povertyprofile_egypt.pdf).

**Project background** The project 150141 on “Inclusive and Sustainable Local Economic Development in Upper Egypt, Sohag” (hereafter referred to interchangeably as Hayat-Sohag or the Project) is being implemented by UNIDO in collaboration with the Ministry of Local Development (MoLD) and the Governorate of Sohag, and is funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC).

In alignment with the Government of Egypt’s Inclusive Economic Development Program for Lagging Regions (IEDLR) and the on-going Upper Egypt Local Development Program (UEDLP)<sup>6</sup>, the overall objective of the Project is to strengthen the socio-economic security of vulnerable households by capacitating them to become more economically active and self-sufficient. The focus is on communities, youth and women living in Tahta and Sohag districts.

Hayat-Sohag is an extension of a previous UNIDO project “Human security through inclusive socio-economic development in Upper Egypt” (hereafter referred to as Hayat-Minya), which was implemented in the nearby Governorate of Minya<sup>7</sup> during 2013-17, with the support, *inter alia*, of SDC. It also builds on other UNIDO interventions promoting employability and shared prosperity in Upper Egypt<sup>8</sup>.

Building on UNIDO’s work in Upper Egypt, project formulation was conducted in 2015 by UNIDO office in Cairo in close consultation with MoLD and SDC. Although the financing agreement between SDC and UNIDO was concluded on 17 December 2015, the project document was signed by the counterparts on 16 March 2017, following receipt of security clearance from the Government of Egypt (GoE). Implementation started soon after with an inception phase to define the target districts and the key sectors of intervention. The original duration of the project was 30 work months, with the completion date to 30 September 2019. With the wish to consolidate the project results, supported by MoLD and the Governorate of Sohag, SDC approved a six-month no-cost extension until 31 March 2020.

The project document foresees regular monitoring of progress and achievements against a set of defined indicators, disaggregated by gender and age, as well as an independent terminal evaluation (TE).

### 3. Project objective

With a view to strengthening socio-economic security in the target districts of Sohag and Tahta, the Project focuses on building sustainable communities. That is, communities that are economically viable, maintain the long-term productivity of their natural resources, offer equal opportunities to current and future generations, and are economically self-determinate. Economic empowerment of youth and socio-economic empowerment of women is a cross-cutting theme.

The ultimate objective of the Project is to provide assistance to at least 1,000 direct beneficiaries from the districts of Tahta and Sohag to help them improve their incomes/livelihoods. In addition to project management and monitoring and evaluation (M&E), the Project is structured as it follows.

---

<sup>6</sup> Under a loan from the World Bank, the UEDLP is being implemented the governorates of Sohag and Qena.

<sup>7</sup> Hayat-Minya project was jointly implemented by five UN agencies with UNIDO as lead agency over a period of five years. It was co-funded by the SDC, the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS) and the Government of Japan.

<sup>8</sup> Including: Imkan Project for Youth Employability and Entrepreneurship in Upper Egypt; Green Trade Initiative; and EMAP: Upgrading the Medicinal and Aromatic Plants Value Chain project.

**Table 1 Project logical framework**

The following <b>project components</b> ( <i>as seen in Figure 1 below</i> ) have been developed to achieve the project objectives: <b>OUTPUTS</b>	<b>OUTCOME</b>	<b>IMPACT</b>
<b>OP1.</b> Participatory governance framework for local development established and operational	Strengthened socio-economic security and improved local participation in target communities	Human security of vulnerable households, youth, women and children is improved in target communities through inclusive pro-poor socio economic development
<b>OP2.</b> Human Security Fund (HSF) established to realise community-based interventions in support to human (economic) security		
<b>OP3.</b> Employability and economic empowerment of youth and women is improved through skills development training and support schemes for employability and productivity		
<b>OP4.</b> Entrepreneurship programs for youth channelled via TVET schools complemented with financial education		

Source: Project Document, p.34-37

Annex 1 shows the project logical framework, detailing the indicators identified at the time of project formulation in 2015. As implementation started in 2017, adjustments to the original list of indicators were made to reflect the results of the inception report and the assessment of local horticultural and livestock value-chains and the findings of the independent terminal evaluation of Hayat-Minya.

The following are the key performance indicators (KPIs) at outcome and impact levels presented at the first Project Steering Committee in February 2018.

**Table 2 Key performance indicators at objective and outcome levels**

OBJECTIVE/ OUTCOME CODE	OBJECTIVE/OUTCOME DESCRIPTION	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPIs)
<b>OB</b>	Human security of vulnerable households, youth, women and children is improved in target communities	<b>KPI OB.1</b> Number of direct beneficiaries received assistance from the project to help them improve their incomes / livelihood received (disaggregated by age and gender)
		<b>KPI OB.2</b> percentage increase in economic security perception by beneficiaries
<b>OU</b>	Strengthened socio-economic security and improved local participation in target communities	<b>KPI OU.1</b> Number of community-led development plans elaborated/approved as a result, <i>inter alia</i> , of project intervention
		<b>KPI OU.2</b> Number of persons reached through HSF interventions in the domain of economic security and other human securities (disaggregated by age and gender)
		<b>KPI OU.3</b> Number of production units <sup>9</sup> that recorded increased productivity and/or income as a result of project intervention (disaggregated by age and gender)
		<b>KPI OU.4</b> Number of new start-ups established as a result of project intervention

<sup>9</sup> The term “production unit” refers to any company or association or cooperative or household that produce goods and/or services for sale or own consumption.

OBJECTIVE/ OUTCOME CODE	OBJECTIVE/OUTCOME DESCRIPTION	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPIs)
		<b>KPI OU.5</b> Number of individuals with new or better employment as a result of project intervention (disaggregated by age and gender)
		<b>KPI OU.6</b> Percentage of participants who applied knowledge or techniques from project training / awareness campaigns to improve their income generating prospects (disaggregated by gender and age)

Source: Project logical framework and monitoring and evaluation plan (LMEP)

#### 4. Project implementation arrangements

The overall strategic guidance for project implementation is provided by the Project Steering Committee (SC). It has been meeting twice annually since February 2018. Its members are the counterparts (Ministry of Local Development and Governorate of Sohag), government ministries and the donor.

UNIDO is the implementing agency. To this end, UNIDO is responsible for establishing a core project team which has been working with short-term experts, subcontractors and NGOs and in close cooperation with counterparts and local stakeholders. The HQs project manager (PM) has been supervising the project team. In addition, UNIDO acts as the Secretariat of SC.

#### 5. Main findings on project progress

Since March 2017, the Project has been working with Central and Local Government, the private sector, educational institutions and local communities to enhance economic opportunities for local communities, youth and women. The Project has been leveraging existing resources and assets to increase employability and strengthen productive groups through activity packages, which include awareness sensitization, formal training and follow up coaching/technical support. By the end of June 2019, the main results were the following:

**Table 3 Main project results at outcome and output level (as of June 2019)**

OUTCOME	RESULTS
<b>OU</b> Strengthened socio-economic security and improved local participation in target communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 600 persons reached through HSF interventions in the domain of economic security and other human securities, of which 130 were women and 247 youth</li> <li>• 100 loafah producers reporting an estimated 30% increase in productivity and 86% in revenue during the growing season 2017-18</li> <li>• Onion producers reporting 60% increase in productivity and 90% in income</li> <li>• A school plant nursery with a net profit of 7,890 EGP</li> <li>• More than 80% beneficiaries reporting application of knowledge and new techniques acquired through Hayat training/coaching in their work</li> <li>• 3 new production units launched</li> <li>• 330 individuals with new or better employment, of which 77 women and 163 youth</li> </ul>

Source: Project Progress Report Jan-Jun 2019, pp. 51-52

OUTPUTS	RESULTS
<b>OP1.</b> Participatory governance framework for local development established and operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>43 government officials with a better understanding of the processes of Local Economic Development</li> </ul>
<b>OP2.</b> Human Security Fund (HSF) established to realise community-based interventions in support to human (economic) security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>25 nongovernment organizations trained in human security and local economic development</li> <li>7 community-based groups developing concepts for community-based business enterprises</li> </ul>
<b>OP3.</b> Employability and economic empowerment of youth and women is improved through skills development training and support schemes for employability and productivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2,098 individuals have been reached and are applying their new knowledge, bringing about productivity/income gains in the selected value chains</li> <li>674 youth who are applying better agricultural practices with new technical skills (e.g. pesticide management and quality plant seedlings)</li> <li>784 women who are equipped with new technical skills to improve their livelihoods including women poultry producers, women working in loofah value addition and women university students</li> <li>100 nationally recognised pesticide applicators helping local farmers with green agricultural production, also creating a new source of income.</li> <li>1793 individuals that have participated in 13 awareness raising and agribusiness development events</li> </ul>
<b>OP4.</b> Entrepreneurship programs for youth channelled via TVET schools complemented with financial education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>68 teachers incorporating entrepreneurship competencies via lessons plans, reaching some 2,500 technical secondary school students</li> <li>26 teacher-student groups developing concepts for community-based business enterprises, of which 16 were selected to participate in Hayat school competition in April 2019.</li> </ul>

Source: Project Progress Report Jan-Jun 2019, pp.53-55

## 6. Budget information

**Table 4a. Financing plan summary – project component breakdown excl. psc**

Project outputs	Total (in CHF)
1. LED framework established	94,000.00
2. Human Security Fund established	374,697.79
3. Employability of women and youth improved	234,744.69
4. Entrepreneurship culture instilled	212,250.00
Project Management	167,750.00
Monitoring and Evaluation	67,000.00
<b>Total (in CHF)</b>	<b>1,150,442.48</b>

Source: Project Document

**Table 4b. Financing plan summary – project component breakdown excl. psc**

Project outputs	Total (in CHF)
1. LED framework established	91,262.15
2. Human Security Fund established	363,784.34
3. Employability of women and youth improved	247,907.52
4. Entrepreneurship culture instilled	230,748.59
Project Management	162,864.11
Monitoring and Evaluation	65,048.56
<b>Total (in USD)</b>	<b>1,161,615.27</b>

Source: UNIDO. ERP database as of 2 October 2019

**Table 5a. UNIDO budget execution<sup>10</sup> by budget line (Grant No.: 2000003297)**

Items of Expenditure	Expenditure (in USD)			
	2017	2018	2019	Total
International consultants	20,589.99	75,309.32	65,413.83	161,313.14
Local travel	8,509.01	39,732.68	30,336.72	78,578.41
Staff travel	5,468.88	9,746.16	5,218.14	20,433.18
National consultants	20,316.04	121,329.51	119,578.50	261,224.05
Contractual services	17,000.47	37,336.46	111,648.54	165,985.47
Training/Study tours	2,896.91	80,127.65	69,029.68	152,054.24
Premises	0	0	1,837.76	1,837.76
Equipment	0	13,664.85	7,848.94	21,513.79
Other direct costs	1,401.39	7,868.30	16,612.81	25,882.50
<b>Total</b>	<b>76,182.69</b>	<b>385,114.93</b>	<b>427,524.92</b>	<b>888,822.54</b>
Project support costs IDC	9,903.75	50,064.94	55,578.24	115,546.93
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>86,086.44</b>	<b>435,179.87</b>	<b>483,103.16</b>	<b>1,004,369.47</b>

Source: UNIDO. ERP database as of 2 October 2019

**Table 5b. UNIDO budget execution<sup>11</sup> by project output (Grant No.: 2000003297)**

Items of Expenditure	Expenditure (in USD)			
	2017	2018	2019	Total
1. LED framework established	0	6,337.61	22,521.64	28,859.25
2. Human Security Fund established	9,287.79	67,068.24	157,944.15	234,300.18
3. Employability of women and youth improved	13,854.84	112,474.73	102,156.99	228,486.56
4. Entrepreneurship culture instilled	39,994.33	114,754.31	69,950.55	224,699.19
Project Management	13,045.73	80,262.86	59,682.56	152,991.15
Monitoring and Evaluation	0	4,217.18	15,269.03	19,486.21
<b>Total</b>	<b>76,182.69</b>	<b>385,114.93</b>	<b>427,524.92</b>	<b>888,822.54</b>
Project support costs IDC	9,903.75	50,064.94	55,578.24	115,546.93
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>86,086.44</b>	<b>435,179.87</b>	<b>483,103.16</b>	<b>1,004,369.47</b>

Source: UNIDO. ERP database as of 2 October 2019

<sup>10</sup> Disbursement: Expenditure, incl. commitment

<sup>11</sup> Disbursement: Expenditure, incl. commitment

## I. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The overall purpose of the terminal evaluation (TE) is to assess whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective, as well as to what extent the project has also considered sustainability and scaling-up factors for increasing contribution to sustainable results and further impact. Through its assessment, the Evaluation Team (ET) should enable the Government, donors, counterparts, stakeholders and UNIDO to verify prospects for development impact and sustainability, while providing an analysis of the attainment of the project objectives, delivery and completion of project outputs/activities. 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.

In addition, the TE should draw lessons and develop recommendations for UNIDO, the Government, the donor and project stakeholders/partners, which may help improving the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities in the country and on a global scale. The TE report should include examples of good practices for other projects in the focal area, country, or region.

The TE will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date (April 2017) to the date of the evaluation. It will assess project performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

Specifically, TE has three main 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 implementation of future projects; and
- (iii) Develop a series of findings, lessons and recommendations for enhancing the design of new and implementation of ongoing projects by UNIDO, SDC and other relevant project counterparts.

## II. Evaluation approach and methodology

The TE will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy<sup>12</sup>, UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle<sup>13</sup>. The evaluation team will take into consideration the recently published DG Bulletin on UNIDO quality assurance framework (DGB/2019/11 of 30 May 2019) and PBC Conference Paper on UNIDO integrated results and performance framework IRPF (PBC.35/CRP.11).

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

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

The ET will use the Bennett's result chain 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

---

<sup>12</sup> UNIDO. (2018). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (DGB/2018/08, dated 1 June 2018)

<sup>13</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)

collected before forming its assessment. This is essential to ensure an evidence-based and credible evaluation, with robust analytical underpinning.

The Bennett's result chain 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), 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 and surveyed include:
  - UNIDO Management and consultants involved in the project;
  - Representatives of donors and counterparts
- (c) **Field visit to Cairo and Sohag governorate**
  - On-site observation of results achieved by the project, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries
  - Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Country Office(s) representative to the extent that he/she was involved in the project, the project's management members and various authorities dealing with project activities at national and governorate level
- (d) Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluation team and/or by the Independent Evaluation Division for triangulation purposes. Surveys will be administered to project's beneficiaries and involved trainers/trainers.

## 2. Key evaluation questions and criteria

The ET 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 contributed to put in place the conditions, which are likely to unleash the drivers, overcome barriers and, then, contribute to reach the long term objectives?
- (b) How well has the project performed? Has the project been implemented efficiently, 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 6 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.

Concerning Gender Mainstreaming, specific evaluation questions have been formulated:

- (e) What are the effects of the project/programme with regard to the reduction of inequalities between men and women?
- (f) Have the women benefited at least equally from the project/programme in comparison to the men?

The Evaluation Team will also assess the results connected to Output 1 (Governance), in particular:

- (g) Did the project succeed in establishing a participatory governance framework for local economic development?

**Table 6. 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	

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).	

### III. Evaluation process

The evaluation will be implemented in phases, which are not strictly sequential, but often iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping. The following are the main phases:

- a. **Evaluation team**  
UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (IED) identifies and selects the Evaluation Team members, in consultation with UNIDO Project Manager
- b. **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

**c. Field phase**

- ✓ Country field visit(s)
- ✓ ET Debriefing in the field to project stakeholders

**d. 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
- ✓ Two pages summary take-away message

**e. Terminal evaluation report**

IED follows up issuance and distribution of the TE report, publication of evaluation report in UNIDO intra/internet sites and completion of management response sheet from UNIDO Project Manager.

**IV. Evaluation team composition**

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

The evaluation team will be composed of 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, including gender. Expertise and experience in the related technical subject of the project is desirable. The evaluation consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions in Annex 4 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.

**V. Time schedule**

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from December 2019 to March 2020.

The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned for January/February 2020.

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

The Final Evaluation report will be submitted 2 weeks after comments received from project counterparts, key stakeholders and project team.

## VI. Evaluation deliverables

**Inception report** This Terms of Reference (ToRs) 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 UNIDO Project Manager, the international evaluation consultant will prepare, in collaboration with the national evaluation consultant, a short inception report that will operationalize the ToRs 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 evaluation 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>14</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.

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.

---

<sup>14</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.

## **VII. Quality assurance**

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessment 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 reports 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.

DRAFT

## Annex 1: Project's Logical Framework

Results	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions & Risks
<b>Impact</b>			
Human security of vulnerable households, youth, women and children is improved in target communities through inclusive, pro-poor socio-economic development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 1,000 direct beneficiaries received assistance from the project to help them improve their incomes/livelihood</li> <li>% change in <b>local community development index</b><sup>15</sup> at the household level in the targeted communities I.1.</li> </ul> <p>All data disaggregated by age, gender, and index domains including health, food, and economic security</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline data</li> <li>Progress Reports</li> <li>Training Reports</li> <li>Evaluation Report</li> </ul>	<p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precarious security conditions in target governorate may delay the implementation of certain project activities</li> <li>Political situation becomes unstable</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target communities participate in the project initiatives</li> <li>Strong support from the Governorate</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome</b>			
Strengthened socio-economic security and improved local participation in target communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of new businesses/start-ups and types of businesses</li> <li># of beneficiaries who were able to get a job</li> <li>Increase in productivity and/or profitability of the MSEs and farmer beneficiaries</li> <li>Functioning of inclusive and efficient participatory framework</li> <li>Community consultative units' propositions included in the planning of the sectoral development of Sohag for the year</li> </ul> <p>All data disaggregated by age and gender</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline data</li> <li>Client information sheets</li> <li>Project progress report</li> </ul>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project able to mobilize other support systems to help start-ups e.g. investors, finance from SFD or micro finance institutions</li> <li>Target beneficiaries (youth groups, women, MSEs/farmers, ) willing to participate in the project</li> </ul> <p>3.</p>

<sup>15</sup> The Local Community Development Index (LCDI) is a composite index comprised of various studied human security domains. These are namely: **Economic Insecurity** measured by the poverty index (lack of ownership of productive and non-productive assets) and by unemployment, **Health Insecurity** measured by level of health awareness and health issues faced by households, **Food Insecurity** measured by the CARE Int'l "Coping Strategies Index", and the **Security Perception Index** which involves household perceptions on their level of safety and security.

Results	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions & Risks
<b>Outputs</b>			
1. Participatory governance framework for local economic development is established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District LED Unit established in the two operational districts and functioning</li> <li>• Technical and operational staff of District LED Unit apply knowledge gained from training programs conducted</li> <li>• A mechanism for community consultative groups' contribution to the district action has been established and adopted</li> <li>• # of community consultative units trained on advocacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline</li> <li>• Training evaluation reports</li> <li>• Community development plans</li> <li>• Perception report</li> <li>• Interviews with community consultative units</li> </ul>	<p>The project is reinforced by the broader LED strategy of the government</p> <p>Risk: Certain groups try to monopolize the fora to serve particular interests</p> <p>Risk: Authorities do not start or pursue the consultation process after project closure.</p>
2. Human Security Fund (HSF) is established to enable target communities to implement at least 15 project interventions in different domains of human security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of priority projects financed</li> <li>• Extent to which HS fund disbursements are allocated effectively towards prioritized human security domains</li> <li>• Value and percentage of funds leveraged/ mobilized from sources external to the project (government, donors and private sector)</li> <li>• 3 of the projects funded are directly benefitting women</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Reports</li> <li>• Site visits and interviews with beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<p>The reporting and monitoring mechanisms will ensure transparency and accountability which are critical to the credibility of the fund</p> <p>Risk: Attempts to monopolize the HSF to serve personal interests</p>
3. Employability and economic empowerment of youth and women is improved through the introduction of training packages and innovative support schemes to encourage start-ups and improve productivity and incomes of existing MSEs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 women (60% ages 16-30 years old) assisted to establish their own livelihood activities</li> <li>• 100 farmers trained in vertical cultivation through greenhouses</li> <li>• 5 greenhouses established by the farmer beneficiaries as a result of project intervention</li> <li>• 5 Youth groups establish 5 start-ups in waste management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Client visit reports</li> <li>• Interviews with clients</li> <li>• Training Reports</li> </ul>	<p>Youth groups willing to participate in the project; project able to mobilize the target number of youth required</p> <p>MSEs willing to participate and avail of the services provided by the project</p> <p>Ability of the beneficiaries and the project to mobilize resources for counterpart funding</p>

Results	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions & Risks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 2 productive networks of MSEs undertaking joint activities to solve common problems</li> <li>Number and type of core, short-term skills training programs organized to qualify youth to specific job profiles in demand</li> <li>Number of youth who got jobs as a result of the skills training programs</li> </ul> <p>All data disaggregated by age and gender</p>		<p>Women interested and able to participate in the project activities</p> <p>Project beneficiaries qualify for the financial services offered by financing institutions</p> <p>Risks: Resistance to change in consolidated traditional practices</p> <p>Low interest among the beneficiaries trained in accessing financial products</p>
4. Entrepreneurship culture is instilled among the youth complemented with financial education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 50 unemployed youth from the communities trained to provide entrepreneurship training to youth and micro entrepreneurs (disaggregated by gender; of which 30% are female)</li> <li>Youth interns able to train 600 youth on entrepreneurship and 200 MSEs</li> <li>25 youth interns trained to provide industrial extension services to MSEs</li> <li>50 MSEs improve their productivity through industrial extension provided</li> <li>At least 10% of the youth trained on entrepreneurship have prepared their business plans and ready for submission to a financing institution</li> <li># of technical schools allocated by the Min. of Education/Directorate introducing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline data</li> <li>Training reports</li> <li>Attendance Sheets</li> <li>Evaluation report</li> </ul>	<p>Ministry of Education and the Directorate in the Governorate support the initiative to introduce entrepreneurship education</p> <p>Willingness of the teachers to handle additional subjects</p> <p>Students willing to learn entrepreneurship and parents support the initiative</p>

Results	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions & Risks
	entrepreneurship education in their schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• # of teachers trained on EDP (disaggregated by gender)</li> <li>• # of students who had undergone EDP training (disaggregated by gender)</li> <li>• Positive change in perception and mind-set of students on self-employment and business</li> </ul>		

The above table reproduces the original logical framework. As indicated in section 3 in chapter I, adjustments have been made to the list of KPIs.

DRAFT

## 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> </ul>

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <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-diaggregated, 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> </ul>

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>
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>✓ 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> </ul>

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Environment and socio-economic aspects</li> </ul>
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 Project team and managers and PSC regularly ask for performance and results information?</li> <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> </ul> </li> </ul>

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How well have risks outlined in 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>
<b>E</b>	<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> <li>○ Exit strategy, planned together with the government</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>National counterparts</u></li> <li>✓ <b>Design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Responsiveness to UNIDO's invitation for engagement in designing the project</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ <b>Implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ownership of the project</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

No.	Evaluation criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>

DRAFT

#### **4. Annex 3: Detailed questions to assess evaluation criteria**

See Annex 2 of the UNIDO Evaluation Manual

## Annex 4: 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 – Cairo and Sohag, Egypt
<b>Start of Contract (EOD):</b>	1 December 2019
<b>End of Contract (COB):</b>	31 March 2020
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	32 working days (w/d)

#### 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
<b>Inception phase</b>			
1. Undertake e a desk review of project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data	Comprehensive desk review of project documentation and country context	5 w/d	Home-based
2. In collaboration with the national evaluation consultant, determine key data to collect in the field and design appropriate methodology for data collection;	Data collection protocol		

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
3. In consultation with the national evaluation consultant, prepare a work plan for the evaluation detailing responsibilities of each ET member and list of stakeholders and beneficiaries to be interviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work plan and division of tasks of ET</li> <li>• Draft list of stakeholders and beneficiaries to be interviewed during the evaluation field mission</li> </ul>		
4. Draft an inception report—as per ToRs—detailing the specific aspects to address in the evaluation, Bennett’s result chain/theory of change to apply, the evaluation methodology, data collection methods, preliminary list of interview questions and tentative agenda for field work.	Inception report submitted to the IED evaluation manager		
5. Finalise inception report, work plan and field mission agenda with IED evaluation manager	Final evaluation work plan, final inception report and preliminary field mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to be interviewed and planned site visits)		
<b>Field mission phase</b>			
6. Undertake an evaluation field mission <sup>16</sup> in tandem with the national evaluation consultant to consult project stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries and collect empirical data/information to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project	Field mission conducted  Accurate information/data collected to assess project results	8 w/d	Cairo and Sohag
7. Examine the main findings of the evaluation mission with the national evaluation consultant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of project results</li> <li>• Agreement on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks</li> </ul>		
8. Present and discuss preliminary evaluation findings with counterparts, donor and relevant stakeholders at the end of the mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation of the ET’s preliminary findings, draft conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt to stakeholders in the country</li> </ul>		

<sup>16</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
<b>Reporting phase and terminal report</b>			
9. Undertake a debriefing mission to UNIDO HQ to: – Present preliminary findings, recommendations and lessons learnt to relevant for factual validation and comments – Hold additional meetings with Evaluation Manager/UNIDO Project Manager and other staff as required to obtain additional information, if 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>	2w/d	Vienna, Austria
10. Prepare the draft evaluation report, with inputs from the national evaluation consultant, and in accordance with the evaluation TOR	Draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager for review and comments	13 w/d	Home-based
11. Submit draft evaluation report to the evaluation manager for feedback and comments			
12. Revise the draft evaluation report based on comments and suggestions received through the Evaluation Manager and finalize the evaluation report according to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division standards, including language editing	Final evaluation report submitted to Evaluation Manager	3 w/d	
13. Prepare a two pages summary of a take-away message from the evaluation	Two pages summary take-away message from the evaluation submitted to the evaluation manager	1 w/d	
14. Prepare an end-of assignment report detailing activity undertaken and challenges faced, if any.	End-of-assignment report		

### **REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES**

1) At the beginning of the assignment the Consultant will submit a concise Inception Report, which will outline the general methodology and presents a concept Table of Contents

2) The field mission 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.

### **MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**Education:** Advanced degree in development studies, agricultural economics, education or related areas

**Technical and functional experience:**

- Minimum of 10 years' hands on experience in evaluation of development projects in the area of rural development
- Knowledge about entrepreneurship development in rural context
- Experience in project management of development projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks
- Working experience in developing countries

**Languages:** Fluency in written and spoken English is required. Knowledge of spoken and/or written Arabic an asset

### **REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

**Core values:**

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

**Core competencies:**

1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing skills
3. Communication and trust
4. Team orientation

**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>	In-country travel to project sites in Sohag Governorate, Egypt
<b>Start of Contract:</b>	1 December 2019
<b>End of Contract:</b>	31 March 2020
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	32 working days (w/d)

### **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>
<b>Inception phase</b>			
1. Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information	Comprehensive desk review of project documentation and country context	2 w/d	Home-based with possible in-country travel
2. In collaboration with the international evaluation consultant: - Determine key data to collect in the field, - Recommend adjustments to the country-specific context, - Design appropriate tools for key data collection accordingly - Translate key tools (questionnaires, interview	Data collection protocol and translation of relevant material into Arabic	4 w/d	

<b>MAIN DUTIES</b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>	
guides, etc.) into Arabic, as required				
3. In collaboration with the international evaluation consultant, prepare a work plan for the evaluation detailing responsibilities of each ET member and list of stakeholders and beneficiaries to be interviewed	Work plan and division of tasks of ET  Draft list of stakeholders and beneficiaries to be interviewed during the evaluation field mission	7 w/d		
4. Assist the International evaluation consultant in compiling and analyzing relevant country/project background information for the inception report, as required	Background information compiled/analysed			
<b>Field mission phase</b>				
5. Coordinate logistical arrangements for the evaluation field mission including setting up meetings, organising project site visits, preparing interview materials, etc.	Logistics for field mission arranged effectively	3 w/d		Home-based with in-country travel
6. Together with the team leader, participate actively in the field mission to assess project results and assist her/him with translation, when necessary	Interviews and site visits undertaken  Detailed interview notes taken	8 w/d		
7. Examine main findings of the evaluation mission with the international evaluation consultant	Analysis of project results  Agreement on the content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks			
8. Assist the team leader in presenting the preliminary findings to counterparts, donor and relevant stakeholders	Inputs of the ET's preliminary findings, draft conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt to stakeholders in the country			
<b>Reporting phase and terminal report</b>				
9. Triangulate data/information on project results and draft inputs for the evaluation report as agreed with the team leader	Inputs for the draft evaluation report submitted to team leader	7 w/d	Home-based	

<b><u>MAIN DUTIES</u></b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>
10. Assist the team leader in revising the terminal evaluation by corroborating data/information, incorporating comments and amend inconsistencies, as required	Inputs to the evaluation terminal report submitted to the team leader		
11. Assist the team leader in preparing a two pages summary of take-away messages from the evaluation	Inputs to the two-page summary of take-away messages	1 w/d	
12. Draft an end-of-assignment report detailing activities undertaken, challenges and recommendations	End-of-assignment report		

### **MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**Education:** Advanced university degree in developmental studies, agricultural economics, education or related areas

**Technical and functional experience:** A minimum of 5 years of hand-on experience in project management and/or evaluation of technical assistance projects; practical experience in data compilation; knowledge of rural development and/or entrepreneurship education

**Requirements:**

- sensitive to gender- and youth-related issues
- excellent communication and interpersonal skills
- excellent analytical skills and sound judgemental abilities
- computer literate and good writing skills

**Languages:** Fluency in English, Arabic mother-tongue.

### **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

**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 5: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report**

### **Executive summary (maximum 5 pages)**

Evaluation purpose and methodology

Key findings

Conclusions and recommendations

Project ratings

Tabular overview of key findings – conclusions – recommendations

### **1. Introduction**

1.1. Evaluation objectives and scope

1.2. Overview of the Project Context

1.3. Overview of the Project

1.4. Theory of Change

1.5. Evaluation Methodology

1.6. Limitations of the Evaluation

### **2. Project's contribution to Development Results - Effectiveness and Impact**

2.1. Project's achieved results and overall effectiveness

2.2. Progress towards impact

2.2.1. Behavioral change

2.2.1.1. Economically competitive - Advancing economic competitiveness

2.2.1.2. Environmentally sound – Safeguarding environment

2.2.1.3. Socially inclusive – Creating shared prosperity

2.2.2. Broader adoption

2.2.2.1. Mainstreaming

2.2.2.2. Replication

2.2.2.3. Scaling-up

### **3. Project's quality and performance**

3.1. Design

3.2. Relevance

3.3. Efficiency

3.4. Sustainability

3.5. Gender mainstreaming

### **4. Performance of Partners**

4.1. UNIDO

4.2. National counterparts

4.3. Donor

### **5. Factors facilitating or limiting the achievement of results**

5.1. Monitoring & evaluation

5.2. Results-Based Management

5.3. Other factors

5.4. Overarching assessment and rating table

### **6. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned**

6.1. Conclusions

6.2. Recommendations

6.3. Lessons learned

6.4. Good practices

### **Annexes (to be put online separately later)**

- Evaluation Terms of Reference
- Evaluation framework
- List of documentation reviewed

- List of stakeholders consulted
- Project logframe/Theory of Change
- Primary data collection instruments: evaluation survey/questionnaire
- Statistical data from evaluation survey/questionnaire analysis

## Annex 6: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Project title:

UNIDO Project ID:

### Evaluation team

Evaluation team leader:

National evaluation consultant:

Evaluation manager (IED):

Quality review done by:

Date:

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

### Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

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

## **Annex 7: Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and Projects**

### **A. Introduction**

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **B. Gender responsive evaluation questions**

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

#### **B.1. Design**

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

1.8.

#### **B.2. Implementation management**

- Did project monitoring and self-evaluation collect and analyse gender disaggregated data?
- Were decisions and recommendations based on the analyses? If so, how?
- Were gender concerns reflected in the criteria to select beneficiaries? If so, how?

- How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?
- If the project/project promotes gender equality and/or women's empowerment, did the project/project monitor, assess and report on its gender related objective/s?

1.9.

### **B.3. Results**

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

**Annex 7: Specific SDC checklist (to be filled in by the evaluator and to be included as Annex in the report)**

Key Aspects based on DAC criteria	Score (choose only one answer for each question)	Justification - compulsory (please write a short explanation with the main points and refer to the chapter(s) where the information that justify your assessment can be found)
<b>Assessment of relevance</b>		
1. The extent to which the objectives of the SDC projects/programmes are consistent with the demands and the needs of the target groups (incl. gender-specific requirements).	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Very good: Fully consistent</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good: Largely consistent</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor: Only partly consistent</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Bad: Marginally or not at all consistent</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not assessed / Not applicable</i> <sup>1</sup>	Click here to enter text.
2. The extent to which the objectives of the SDC projects/programmes are consistent with the demands and the needs of partner country (institutions respectively society) as well as the sector policies and strategies of the partner country	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Very good: Obvious consistency with demands and needs of society and in line with relevant sector policies and strategies</i> <sup>2</sup> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good: Consistency with demands and needs of society and in line with relevant sector policies and strategies</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor: Consistency with demands and needs of society not visible but in line with relevant sector policies and strategies</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Bad: Not consistent</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not assessed / Not applicable</i> <sup>1</sup>	Click here to enter text.
3. The extent to which the design of projects/programmes is adequate to achieve the goal and objectives (definition of target groups; choice of approach and operational elements; articulation of components; choice of partners; consistency with SDC policies and experiences).	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Very good: Fully adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good: Largely adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor: Only partly adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Bad: Marginally or not at all adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not assessed / Not applicable</i> <sup>1</sup>	Click here to enter text.
<b>Assessment of effectiveness</b>		
4. The extent to which the planned objectives at <u>outcome</u> level have been achieved taking into account their relative importance. If possible, distinguish the quality and quantity of results achieved.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Very good: Fully achieved or overachieved</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good: Largely achieved</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor: Partly achieved</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Bad: Marginally achieved</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not assessed / Not applicable</i> <sup>1</sup>	Click here to enter text.
5. The extent to which the projects/programmes contribute to poverty reduction, inclusion and/or reduction of vulnerabilities. <sup>3</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Very Good: Strong evidence of contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good: Evidence of contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor: Few evidence of contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Bad: No contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not assessed / Not applicable</i> <sup>1</sup>	Click here to enter text.

<sup>1</sup> This category applies a. if the ToR of the evaluation explicitly exclude the assessment of the criteria and/or of the key aspect(s) or b. if there is no information available to assess the criteria.

<sup>2</sup> The policies and strategies should not be in opposition to the needs of the society (applies mainly in governance and human rights).

<sup>3</sup> Dimensions for consideration are: a) economic (income and assets); b) human capacities (health, education, nutrition); c) ability to take part in society (status and dignity); d) political capacities (institutions and policies); e) resilience to external shocks.

6. The extent to which the outcomes achieved contribute to improved governance from a system perspective. <sup>4</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Very good: Strong evidence of contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good: Evidence of contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor: Few evidence of contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Bad: No contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not assessed / Not applicable</i> <sup>1</sup>	Click here to enter text.
7. The extent to which the outcomes achieved contribute to gender-specific results.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Very good: Strong evidence of contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good: Evidence of contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor: Few evidence of contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Bad: No contribution</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not assessed / Not applicable</i> <sup>1</sup>	Click here to enter text.
<b>Assessment of efficiency</b>		
8. The extent to which the relation between resources (mainly financial and human resources) and time (e.g. delays compared to planning) required and results achieved is appropriate (Cost-benefit ratio - CBR).	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Very good: Positive CBR based on a cost-benefit analysis (CBA)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good: Positive CBR, based on qualitative justification</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor: Poor CBR, based on qualitative justification</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Bad: Bad CBR demonstrated</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not assessed / Not applicable</i> <sup>1</sup>	Click here to enter text.
9. The extent to which the approaches and strategies used by the SDC projects/programmes are considered efficient (Cost-efficiency).	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Very good: Highly efficient</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good: Efficient</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor: Partly efficient</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Bad: Not efficient</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not assessed / Not applicable</i> <sup>1</sup>	Click here to enter text.
<b>Assessment of sustainability</b>		
10. The extent to which the positive results (outputs and outcomes) will be continued beyond the end of the external support. Considering also potential risks in the context.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Very good: Very likely based on evidence</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good: Likely based on evidence</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor: Little likelihood based on evidence</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Bad: Unlikely based on evidence</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not assessed / Not applicable</i> <sup>1</sup>	Click here to enter text.
11. The extent to which partner organizations are capable to carry on activities. Capacity includes technical, financial capacity, human resources and importance of the activity for the organization.	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Very good: Strong capacity (also to further develop without support)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Good: Reliable capacity</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor: Little capacity (require further support)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Bad: Still too weak capacity</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not assessed / Not applicable</i> <sup>1</sup>	Click here to enter text.

Additional information (if needed): [Click here to enter text.](#)

Project: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Assessor: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Date: [Click here to enter text.](#)

<sup>4</sup> Dimensions for consideration are: a) structure (informed policies, laws, corresponding to basic HR obligations; degree of decentralization/multilevel concertation/cooperation); b) good governance in the performance/interaction of responsible actors/institutions (GGov principles: participation, transparency, accountability, equality&non-discrimination, effectiveness & efficiency, rule of law); c) capabilities, behavior, empowerment of actors/institutions for positive change; d) consideration of important global or regional governance dimensions.