



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

DRAFT

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Independent terminal evaluation**

**Towards a green economy in Uruguay: stimulating sustainable  
production practices and low-emission technologies in prioritized  
sectors**

UNIDO project ID: 120323

GEF ID: 4890

**MAY 2020**

## Contents

<b>I. Project background and overview .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1. Project factsheet .....	3
2. Project context .....	4
3. Project objective .....	5
4. Project implementation arrangements.....	6
5. Main findings on project progress .....	6
6. Budget information .....	7
<b>II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>III. Evaluation approach and methodology.....</b>	<b>9</b>
1. Data collection methods.....	10
2. Evaluation key questions and criteria.....	10
<b>IV. Evaluation process .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>V. Evaluation team composition.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>VI. Time schedule .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>VII. Evaluation deliverables.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>VIII. Quality assurance .....</b>	<b>15</b>
Annex 1: Project results framework.....	16
Annex 2: Job descriptions.....	24
Annex 3: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report.....	31
Annex 4: Checklist on evaluation report quality .....	34
Annex 5. Guidance and checklist on lessons learned quality criteria .....	35
Annex 6. GEF Minimum requirements for M&E .....	38
Annex 7. Rating tables .....	39

## I. Project background and overview

### 1. Project factsheet

<b>Project title</b>	Towards a green economy in Uruguay: stimulating sustainable production practices and low-emission technologies in prioritized sectors
<b>UNIDO project No. and/or ID</b>	120323
<b>GEF project ID</b>	4890 (Full-Sized Project)
<b>Region</b>	Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Uruguay
<b>Planned implementation start date</b> (as indicated in CEO endorsement/Approval document)	19 November 2013
<b>Planned implementation end date</b> (for GEF projects, as indicated in CEO endorsement/Approval document)	18 November 2017
<b>Actual implementation start date</b>	1 December 2013
<b>Actual implementation end date</b>	31 December 2020 <sup>1</sup>
<b>GEF Focal Areas and Operational Project</b> (in addition, also indicate whether the project is linked to a GEF programme)	Climate Change / CCM-1 and CCM-3 Objectives GEF-5
<b>Implementing agency</b>	UNIDO
<b>Executing partner(s)/entity(ies)</b>	Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining (MIEM), Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment (MVOTMA) and Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fishery (MGAP)
<b>Donor(s):</b>	Global Environment Facility (GEF)
<b>Total project allotment</b>	USD 3,392,727
<b>Total co-financing at design</b> (in cash and in-kind)	Cash (incl. Investment): USD 30,515,189 In-kind: USD 1,894,811
<b>Materialized co-financing at project completion</b> (in cash and in-kind) <sup>2</sup>	Cash (incl. Investment): USD 20,930,864 In-kind: USD 829,996
<b>Mid-term review date</b>	April 2016

(Source: Project document, MTR and Open Data Platform as of 6 February 2020)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Confirmation of project extension pending

<sup>2</sup> Amount materialized at Midterm, as per MTR

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

## 2. Project context

Uruguay is one of the smallest countries in South America in terms of land surface (176,215 km<sup>2</sup>) and has a population of approximately 3.38 million people. It stands out in Latin America for being an egalitarian society and for its high per capita income, low level of inequality and poverty and the almost complete absence of extreme poverty.<sup>4</sup>

In July 2013, the World Bank classified Uruguay as a high-income country. By 2017, the Gross National Income per capita at purchasing power parity (PPP) amounted to USD21,870.

Since 2003, the Uruguayan economy has had positive economic growth rates, averaging 4.1% from 2003 to 2018. The country has diversified its export markets and in 2018, Uruguay's traditional trading partners, Brazil and Argentina, only represented 12% and 5% respectively of the total merchandise exports. Nowadays, its main trading partners are China (26%) and the European Union (18%).

Uruguay's strong macroeconomic performance was also reflected in the labor market, with a historically low unemployment rate recorded in 2011 (6.3%), which however increased to 7.9% in 2018, given the noticeable slowdown in economic growth.

The agricultural sector is the main pillar of the Uruguayan economy. Over the last decade, the sector has experienced a period of rapid growth, intensification and modernization. The warm, humid climate and the abundance of grasslands and arable soils create adequate conditions for agriculture, as they provide natural pastures for cattle and sheep breeding. The country produces large surpluses of meat, dairy products, agricultural products, wood, leather and wool. There are more than 32,000 cattle farms in the country with a total stock of over 11 million bovines and 7.4 million sheep. The large majority (near 80%) are family-run cattle farms.

In Uruguay, waste and residues from traditional activities in the primary sector were not of major concern in the past decades. Residues from agriculture and agribusiness facilities, such as sawdust, rice husk, and cow manure were commonly piled up or disposed of on the land. Bagasse is burned as a common practice. Non-appropriately treated liquid manure (wastewater) is in some cases discharged into streams and rivers.

Reconciling national economic objectives to produce more food and primary products in more efficient and competitive ways for export, whilst at the same time meeting national sustainability objectives to minimize environmental impacts and reduce the intensity of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, poses a number of challenges. The agriculture sector currently contributes approximately 75 percent to Uruguay's total GHG emissions, with methane from enteric fermentation accounting for more than half of these emissions.

The government established a *National Action Plan* that also tackles the environmentally appropriate management of residues and waste flows including the dairy and meat sectors. Some agribusiness follow a proactive approach and pursue cleaner production practices as a business strategy. Other companies adhere to the mandatory requirements, since investments in environmental measures are considered financially unrewarding.

The large majority of small farm holders in Uruguay are not generally aware enough of the most important environmental issues related to their business. Given their limited investment capacity and the lack of readily available solutions for waste valorization, the government expects coercive regulation to have a limited effect.

Under the prevailing situation, it could be expected that GHG emissions continue to rise and the environmentally appropriate treatment of waste and wastewater to lag behind.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/uruguay/overview>

The implementation of the project “Towards a green economy in Uruguay: stimulating sustainable production practices and low-emission technologies in prioritized sectors” started in December 2013. The initially planned project duration was 48 months, as per CEO Endorsement. The actual implementation end date is 31 December 2020<sup>5</sup>.

The project document foresees regular monitoring, a mid-term review (MTR), which was conducted at the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of implementation (MTE report, April 2016) and which included a field mission to Uruguay (14 to 18 March 2016), and a terminal evaluation (TE).

The project was also reviewed under the independent country evaluation Uruguay, conducted between October 2014 and January 2015<sup>6</sup>.

### **3. Project objective**

The overall objective of the project is to transform the different kinds of waste generated in the agriculture and the agro-industry production chains in Uruguay in various types of energy and/or other by-products with the aim of reducing GHG emissions, while contributing to the development of a low carbon sustainable production model supported by an adequate technology development and transfer.

The following **project components** were developed to achieve the project objectives:

**Project Component 1: Policy and regulatory framework strengthening.**

The activities to be undertaken under PC-1 are intended to adjust the regulatory and policy frameworks in order to promote investments and allow the development of waste valorization projects to generate energy, by-products and reduce GHG emissions. These activities also involve the removal of financial barriers and the development and implementation of policies, provisions and guidelines for financial instrument(s) that will lead to the deployment of waste valorization projects in Uruguay.

**Project Component 2: Knowledge base (technological capacities) in the field of waste-to-energy, waste valorization and low-emission waste treatment technologies strengthened.** This component builds upon the work undertaken during the PPG phase with regard to the identification and location of waste sources (mapping and characterization), the characterization of globally available (state-of-the-art) technologies, the identification of market and technology barriers as well as opportunities for waste-to-energy, low-emission waste treatment and waste valorization technologies, amongst others. As such the characterization of disaggregated (department level) physical and chemical characterization of at least the 16 identified waste streams with valorization potential is to be undertaken. Research and prefeasibility studies (including social, environmental and economic dimensions) in the targeted sectors to determine the most viable waste valorization processes and business models are also to be conducted.

**Project Component 3: Demonstration of waste valorization and renewable energy technologies’ applications.** With the goal of proving the applicability of low-emission waste treatment, waste-to-energy, by-products generation and waste valorization technologies in the Uruguayan context, this component aims to design, install, monitor and assess small- as well as large-scale demonstration projects in the targeted sectors. This component complements the previous component and it is intended for demonstrating the applicability of more technologically advanced waste treatment techniques, in comparison to the current “first generation” technologies that are employed in the country at the moment.

---

<sup>5</sup> Confirmation of Project extension pending

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.unido.org/resources-evaluation/reports-country-evaluations>

**Project Component 4:** Capacity building, training and dissemination campaign for the adoption of low carbon waste valorization initiatives. This component aims to enhance the capacities of sector agents to deliver state-of-the-art sustainable production schemes through sustainable waste management and low-emission treatment technologies in prioritized sectors. Activities entail the setting-up of a running web-based knowledge management platform, a dissemination campaign and the creation of training courses and toolkits, amongst others.

**Project Component 5:** Monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring of project progress is essential for the adequate and timely delivery of results. This project component covers project monitoring and oversight by UNIDO in close coordination with MIEM (DNE), MVOTMA (DINAMA) and MGAP, as well as a mid-term and terminal evaluation of the project. Independent consultants will be contracted to perform the mid-term and final evaluation of the project in compliance with UNIDO and GEF requirements.

The following are, in brief, some of the expected results of the project/programme:

- The policy framework to promote sustainable production schemes and implement low-emission technologies in prioritised sectors (agricultural and farming sector, processing industries, small communities) has been strengthened.
- The design and implementation of waste-to-energy valorization alternatives and low-emission waste treatment technologies have been enhanced due to an improved knowledge base.
- Waste-to-energy and other feasible waste valorization applications have been adopted in the targeted sectors.
- The capacities of sector agents to deliver state-of-the-art sustainable production schemes through sustainable waste management and low-emission treatment technologies in prioritized sectors have been strengthened.
- A monitoring plan has been prepared and implemented.

#### **4. Project implementation arrangements**

**UNIDO** as the GEF Implementing Agency for the project oversees the implementation of the project and contracts all members of the Project Management Unit (PMU) including the Project Coordinator.

The executing counterparts are:

- the **Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining (MIEM)** via the DNE (National Energy Directorate)
- the **Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment (MVOTMA)** via the DINAMA (National Environment Directorate)
- The **Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fishery (MGAP).**

The Project Steering Committee (SC) will include representatives of the three ministries and UNIDO's Regional Office in Uruguay.

#### **5. Main findings on project progress**

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) covered the project's activities carried out during the period December 2013 to March 2016. Key findings are summarized below.

- The project was elaborated in a timely manner with full support and participation of relevant country representatives. It was formulated following a logical framework approach and is aligned to the thematic development objectives of the country. Although it considered relevant environmental and social risks, the MTR did not find evidence of a specifically designed system to track these.
- The MTR found the project to be highly relevant to national development at various levels (policy, economic, social and environmental) and to all target groups. It is consistent with UNIDO’s mandate, ISID, and relevant to CCM-1 and CCM-3 Objectives of the GEF-5 Results Framework. It addresses the severe environmental consequences of waste and residue generation resulting from activities of a traditional primary sector (agriculture / animal farming) and aims at delivering technology solutions and capacity building for their valorization.
- At midterm, activities have overall been delivered in a timely manner, cost efficiently, in line with the project outcomes. Although it is considered that the project could deliver most of the expected results in the available timeframe, this does not include the achievement of the project overall objective, the sustainable reduction of GHG emissions.
- The midterm review found sustainability of the project likely or highly likely, due to a high level of ownership and countrywide commitment of “continuing to support the project in the long term and facilitating and encouraging replication of results”.
- Project coordination and management by the RO and HQ was assessed as effective and timely and M & E systems are in place.

Further details can be obtained from the MTR report (April 2016).

## 6. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary

Description	Project Preparation (in USD)	Project (in USD)	Total (in USD)
Financing (GEF /others)	50,000	3,392,727	3,442,727
Co-financing <sup>7</sup> (in cash and/or in-kind)	60,000	32,410,000	32,470,000
<b>Total (in USD)</b>	<b>110,000</b>	<b>35,802,727</b>	<b>35,912,727</b>

Source: Project document/GEF: CEO endorsement document

Table 2. Financing plan summary – project component breakdown

Project outcomes	GEF grant amount (excl. PPG) Donor(s) (USD)	Co-financing (in USD)	Total (in USD)
1. Policy and regulatory framework	494,727	495,000	989,727
2. Knowledge base (technological capacities) strengthened	395,000	415,000	810,000
3. Demonstration of waste valorization and renewable energy technologies’ applications	1,775,000	30,705,000	32,480,000
4. Capacity building, training and dissemination campaign	475,000	475,000	950,000
5. Monitoring and Evaluation	90,000	70,000	160,000

<sup>7</sup> Co-financing types are grant, soft loan, hard loan, guarantee, in kind, or cash.

<b>Subtotal (in USD)</b>	3,229,727	32,160,000	35,389,727
Project Management	163,000	250,000	413,000
<b>Total project costs</b>	<b>3,392,727</b>	<b>32,410,000</b>	<b>35,802,727</b>

Source: Project document/GEF: CEO endorsement document

Table 3. Co-financing source breakdown

<b>Name of co-financier (source)</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Type (Specify: cash and/or in-kind)</b>	<b>Total (in USD)</b>
<b>UNIDO</b>	Implementing Agency	Cash	60,000
<b>UNIDO</b>	Implementing Agency	In-kind	50,000
<b>Government</b>	National Government	In-kind	1,844,811
<b>Government</b>	National Government	Cash	13,055,189
<b>Counterparts</b>	Private Sector	Investment	10,000,000
<b>Counterparts</b>	Private Sector	Cash	7,400,000
<b>Total co-financing (in USD)</b>			32,410,000

Source: Project document/GEF: CEO endorsement document

## II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date up to the date of the evaluation. It will assess project performance against the following evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, and coherence<sup>8</sup>.

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

The overall purpose of the TE is to assess whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective, i.e. to transform the different kinds of waste generated in the agriculture and agro-industry production chains in Uruguay into various types of energy

<sup>8</sup> As per new DAC evaluation criteria:

<https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>



and/or other by-products with the aim of reducing GHG emissions, and to what extent the project has also considered sustainability and scaling-up factors for increasing contribution to sustainable results and further impact.

The evaluation has three specific objectives:

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

### III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The TE will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy<sup>9</sup>, the UNIDO Evaluation Manual<sup>10</sup>, UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation<sup>11</sup> and with the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle<sup>12</sup>.

Due to the global COVID-19 pandemic, the terminal evaluation will be conducted in line with measures announced by the Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight (EIO) for evaluation, internal audit and investigation activities. It will consider overall UNIDO guidance and rules responding to the global crisis, thus prioritizing the health and safety of all parties involved.

In addition, GEF Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies and the UNIDO-GEF Project Operational Manual must be considered.

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

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

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

---

<sup>9</sup> UNIDO. (2018). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (DGB/2018/08, dated 1 June 2018)

<sup>10</sup> UNIDO. (2018). Evaluation Manual (ODG/EIO/IED/16/R.27, March 2018)

<sup>11</sup> UNEG. (2016). Norms and Standards for Evaluation (June 2016)

<sup>12</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)

The analysis and assessment of the project theory of change will identify causal and transformational pathways from the project outputs to outcomes and longer-term impacts, and drivers as well as barriers to achieve them. The learning from this analysis will be useful to feed into the design of the future projects so that the management team can effectively manage them based on results<sup>13</sup>.

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<sup>14</sup>, surveys and direct observation. This approach will not only enable the evaluation to assess causality through quantitative means but also to provide reasons for why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The specific mixed methodological approach will be described in the inception report.

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

- (a) **Desk and literature review** of documents related to the project, including but not limited to:
  - The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports), mid-term review report, output reports, back-to-office mission report(s), end-of-contract report(s) and relevant correspondence
  - Notes from meetings of committees involved in the project
- (b) **Stakeholder consultations** will be conducted through structured and semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion<sup>15</sup>. Key stakeholders to be interviewed include:
  - UNIDO Management and staff involved in the project; and
  - Representatives of donors, national GEF focal point and counterparts
- (c) **Site visits**<sup>16</sup>
  - On-site observation of results achieved by the project, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies
  - Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Country Office representative to the extent that he/she was involved in the project, and the project's management members and the various national authorities dealing with project activities as necessary
- (d) Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluation team and/or by the Independent Evaluation Division for triangulation purposes

## 2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

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

---

<sup>13</sup> Refer to: Theory of Change Primer, GEF STAP, 2019 ([https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF\\_STAP\\_C.57\\_Inf.04\\_Theory%20of%20Change%20Primer\\_0.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF_STAP_C.57_Inf.04_Theory%20of%20Change%20Primer_0.pdf))

<sup>14</sup> To be conducted remotely (e.g. tele-conference, skype, zoom) if and when needed

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> To be conducted in line with rules and restrictions of the Uruguayan Government responding to the COVID-19 Pandemic

The key evaluation questions are the following:

- (a) What are the key drivers and barriers to achieve the long-term objectives? To what extent has the project helped put in place the conditions likely to address the drivers, overcome barriers?
- (b) How well has the project performed? Has the project done the right things? Has the project done things right, with good value for money?
- (c) To what extent did the initiative deliver against the needs of key stakeholders?
- (d) What are the project's key results (outputs, outcome and impact)? To what extent have the expected results been achieved or are likely to be achieved?
- (e) To what extent has the project contributed to the development of technical capacities and programmatic tool? Could these be replicated within the UNIDO portfolio?
- (f) To what extent has the project contributed to building institutional capacity of the project's main stakeholders?
- (g) To what extent has the involvement of the Private Sector contributed to the achievement of results and project objectives?
- (h) To what extent has the project contributed to strengthening policy and regulatory frameworks?
- (i) To what extent will the achieved results sustain after completion of the project?
- (j) To what extent has the project contributed to the achievement of long-term objectives and the possibility of transformational change?
- (k) How well does the intervention fit? Is the project compatible and consistent with policies and/or other interventions in the country in the same context?
- (l) What lessons can be drawn from the successful and unsuccessful practices in designing, implementing and managing the project?
- (m) To what extent have recommendations from the Mid-Term Review been considered and implemented?

The TE will assess the likelihood of sustainability of project results after the project completion. The assessment will identify key risks (e.g. in terms of financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental risks) and explain how these risks may affect the continuation of results after the project ends. Table 5 below provides the key evaluation criteria to be assessed by the evaluation. Detailed guiding questions to assess each evaluation criterion are in annex 2 of the UNIDO Evaluation Manual<sup>17</sup>. The **rating criteria** and table to be used is presented in annex 7.

Table 5. Summary of Project evaluation criteria

Index	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
<b>A</b>	<b>Progress to Impact</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Project design</b>	<b>Yes</b>
1	• Overall design	Yes
2	• Logframe	Yes
<b>C</b>	<b>Project performance</b>	<b>Yes</b>
1	• Relevance	Yes
2	• Effectiveness	Yes
3	• Efficiency	Yes

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.unido.org/resources-evaluation/evaluation-resources>

4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability of benefits</li> </ul>	Yes
<b>D</b>	<b>Cross-cutting performance criteria</b>	
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender mainstreaming</li> </ul>	Yes
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment and socio-economic aspects<sup>18</sup></li> </ul>	
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

#### IV. Evaluation process

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

- UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (IED) identifies and selects the evaluation team members, in consultation with the project manager
- Inception phase
  - ✓ Desk review and data analysis: The evaluation team will review project-related documentation and literature and carry out a data analysis (incl. familiarization with relevant GEF programmes and strategies, and with concerned GEF policies such as those on project cycle, M&E, co-financing, fiduciary standards, gender, and environmental and social safeguards)
  - ✓ Briefing of consultant(s)
  - ✓ Preparation of inception report: The evaluation team will prepare the inception report providing details on the methodology for the TE 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.
  - ✓ Analysis and assessment of the theory of change to identify causal and transformational pathways from the project outputs to outcomes and longer-term impacts
  - ✓ Interviews, survey
- Field phase
  - ✓ Site visits<sup>19</sup> to verify and triangulate data, collect additional information/data and to ensure adequate involvement of stakeholders and counterparts in the country in the evaluation process.
  - ✓ ET debriefing in the field to project stakeholders

<sup>18</sup> All GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects have incorporated relevant environmental and social considerations into the project design / GEF-6 projects have followed the provisions specified in UNIDO/DGAI.23: UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP)

<sup>19</sup> In line with Government restrictions

- Reporting phase
  - ✓ After field visits, debriefing<sup>20</sup> with preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations by the ET leader
  - ✓ Data analysis and draft report writing
  - ✓ Draft report submission
  - ✓ Sharing and factual validation of draft report with stakeholders
  - ✓ Final evaluation report Submission and QA/clearance by IED, and
  - ✓ Two pages summary take-away message
- EIO/IED Final report issuance and distribution with the respective management response sheet and further follow-up, and publication of evaluation report in UNIDO intra- and internet sites

## **V. Evaluation team composition**

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

The evaluation team will be composed of one or two national consultants (one acting as the team leader). The evaluation team members will possess relevant strong experience and skills on evaluation and evaluation management, including social safeguards and gender. Expertise and experience in the related technical subject of the project is required. The evaluation consultants will be contracted by UNIDO.

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

The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions in annex 2 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.

The UNIDO GEF Coordinator and GEF OFP(s) will be briefed on the evaluation and provide support to its conduct. GEF OFP(s) will, where applicable and feasible, also be briefed and debriefed at the start and end of the evaluation mission.

## **VI. Time schedule**

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from June to September 2020.

The evaluation field visits are tentatively planned for June/July 2020.

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

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

---

<sup>20</sup> To be conducted via teleconference

## VII. Evaluation Deliverables

### Inception report

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

The Inception Report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework (“evaluation matrix”); division of work between the Evaluation Consultant and the national consultant; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable<sup>21</sup>.

### Evaluation report and review procedures

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (the suggested report outline is in annex 3) 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 error 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 evaluation team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

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

The TE report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated, and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary (in Spanish and English) 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<sup>22</sup> and follow the outline given in annex 3. The ET should submit the final version of the TE report in accordance with UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division standards.

---

<sup>21</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.

<sup>22</sup> In case the evaluation team cannot deliver the report English a Spanish version might be accepted and translated into English for submission to the GEF.

## **VIII. Quality assurance**

All UNIDO independent evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the 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 independent 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 4. UNIDO's Independent Evaluation Division should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO's evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation report are reviewed by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, which will issue and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet, as well as submit to relevant stakeholders as required.

## Annex 1: Project results framework

Results		Indicators	Baseline and Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
<b>Objective</b>					
Transform the different kinds of waste generated in the agriculture and the agro-industry production chains in Uruguay in various types of energy and/or other by-products with the aim of reducing GHG emissions, while contributing to the development of a low carbon sustainable production model supported by an adequate technology development and transfer.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quantified reduction and/or avoidance of GHG emissions (in tCO<sub>2</sub>e)</li> </ul>	<b>Baseline:</b> Lifetime tons of CO <sub>2</sub> eq emissions avoided (equals 0) <b>Target:</b> Lifetime tons of CO <sub>2</sub> eq emissions avoided (1,396,143 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GEF climate change mitigation tracking tool</li> </ul>	A: Continued support and interest from public and private sector to implement advanced, low carbon emission waste valorization technologies A: Data to calculate CO <sub>2</sub> eq emission reductions is available R: Economic, financial or political crisis threaten the sustainability of the Project and prevent the targeted sectors from adopting low-carbon technologies
<b>PC#1: Policy and regulatory framework strengthening</b>					
<b>Outcome 1:</b> The policy framework to promote sustainable production schemes and implement low-emission technologies in prioritized sectors (agricultural and farming sector, processing industries, and small communities) has been strengthened.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of new or revised policies and/or regulations proposed</li> <li>Number of financial incentives designed</li> </ul>	<b>Baseline:</b> Insufficient support for waste valorization in place <b>Target:</b> Improved policies, regulations and instruments that promote waste valorization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Official publications</li> <li>Final evaluation</li> </ul>	A: Government of Uruguay's commitment to improving policy and legislation  R: Policies and regulations are not strengthened
<b>Outputs:</b>					
Output 1.1	Establishment of a Taskforce coordinated by DNE/DINAMA/MGAP responsible for preparing strategies in the targeted sectors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operating Taskforce</li> <li>Number of men and women participating in the Taskforce</li> </ul>	<b>Baseline:</b> no dedicated taskforce exists. <b>Target:</b> establishment of an operative taskforce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Official documentation e.g. meeting minutes</li> <li>Members of the Taskforce</li> </ul>	A: Commitment from DNE/DINAMA/MGAP to establish the Taskforce  R: Lack of personnel to be part of the Taskforce
Output 1.2	Studies have been carried out as inputs for enhancing policy instruments covering at least	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of studies carried out</li> </ul>	<b>Baseline:</b> insufficient information on the mentioned areas on what	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documentation</li> <li>Appraisals by counterparts</li> </ul>	A: Government of Uruguay's commitment to allow for the conduction of the studies



	10 fields; amongst others, these include: (i) biogas production and uses of biogas; ii) production of synthetic diesel from organic matter; iii) use of dry manure for combustion; iv) production and application of bio-fertilizers to the soil.		issues need to be tackled to enhance the existing instruments. <b>Target:</b> Carry out studies covering the 10 areas.		R: Limited information to conclude the studies
Output 1.3	Development and implementation of an action plan to remove financial barriers and provide applicable mechanisms and instruments to favor the inclusion and adoption of new low-carbon waste valorization technologies in the targeted sectors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of mechanisms and instruments to overcome financial barriers proposed</li> </ul>	<b>Baseline:</b> no specific plans to remove financial barriers to favor the inclusion and adoption of new low-carbon waste valorization technologies <b>Target:</b> Develop an action plan to favor the inclusion and adoption of new low-carbon waste valorization technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action plan</li> <li>Project documentation</li> </ul>	A: Commitment of the government to provide incentives and mechanisms that remove the financial burden  R: Political and/or financial context forces the government to reduce the incentives or mechanisms
Output 1.4	Identification and design of financial instrument(s) targeting low carbon technologies for waste valorization and identification of local financial institutions (e.g. banks) that will implement the scale up of the technologies after this project is completed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of financial instrument(s) proposed</li> </ul>	<b>Baseline:</b> no specific financial instrument exists for waste valorization initiatives. <b>Target:</b> Design the structure of a financial instrument to be used in the promotion of waste valorization opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documentation</li> <li>Appraisals by counterparts</li> </ul>	A: Local capabilities to operate the financial instrument are established
Output 1.5	Development of new policy / regulation draft or revision of existing policy / regulation based on the pre-identified areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of modified, updated and/or new policies and regulations</li> </ul>	<b>Baseline:</b> Insufficient policy and regulatory framework to promote waste valorization initiatives in place.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documentation</li> <li>Appraisals by counterparts</li> </ul>	A: Taskforce and GoU commitment on collaborating with the drafting of new/revised documents

			<b>Target:</b> Establish provisions and guidelines in order to improve the policy and regulatory framework and draft new documents as necessary		R: Political issues affect the creation and drafting of new/revised regulations and policies.
<b>PC#2: Knowledge base (technological capacities) in the field of waste-to-energy, waste valorization and low-emission waste treatment technologies strengthened</b>					
<b>Outcome 2:</b> The design and implementation of waste-to-energy valorization alternatives and low-emission waste treatment technologies have been enhanced due to an improved knowledge base.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New knowledge resources made available to the public and stakeholders</li> </ul>	<b>Baseline:</b> Insufficient technological knowledge base in the country <b>Target:</b> Improve the technological knowledge base in the country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Official publications</li> <li>Final evaluation</li> </ul>	A: Commitment of the Government to promote the use of waste-to-energy and waste valorization technologies  R: Lack of data to improve the technological knowledge base	
<b>Outputs</b>					
Output 2.1	Disaggregated (department level) physical and chemical characterisation of at least the 16 identified waste streams with valorization potential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of waste streams characterized</li> <li>Number of characterized parameters and variables for each stream</li> </ul>	<b>Baseline:</b> basic characterization of waste streams, which is insufficient for statistics estimation <b>Target:</b> Full characterization of at least 16 waste streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documentation</li> <li>Laboratory reports</li> </ul>	A: State-of-the-art facilities to analyze residues are available to conduct the characterization  R: Data is not available, insufficient or not monitored
Output 2.2	Research and prefeasibility studies (including social, environmental and economic dimensions) conducted in the targeted sectors to determine the most viable waste valorization processes and business models.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of prefeasibility studies conducted</li> </ul>	<b>Baseline:</b> Lack of comprehensive information on waste valorization processes and business models <b>Target:</b> Complete prefeasibility studies in the targeted sectors to fill information gaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pre-feasibility studies</li> </ul>	A: Continued cooperation with national universities  R: Universities' support is removed

PC#3: Demonstration of waste valorization and renewable energy technologies' applications					
<p><b>Outcome 3:</b> Waste-to-energy and other feasible waste valorization applications have been adopted in the targeted sectors.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of implemented projects in the targeted sectors</li> </ul>	<p><b>Baseline:</b> No implementation of novel waste valorization technologies in projects. <b>Target:</b> conduction of at least 4 feasibility studies involving waste valorization</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project reports</li> <li>Surveys to project owners</li> <li>Visits to the plants</li> </ul>	<p>A: the facilities' owners are committed to promoting and carrying out the demonstration projects</p> <p>R: the projects cannot continue after project finalization due to lack of resources</p>
Outputs					
Output 3.1	<p>Four fully functional large-scale waste treatment plants have been commissioned (digestion of vinasse from bioethanol production, digestion of cow manure from dairy sector, co-digestion of combined waste feedstock in agro-industry and waste treatment and management projects in small size cattle breeding farms)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of fully functional large scale commissioned projects</li> </ul>	<p><b>Baseline:</b> No large-scale waste valorization plants are commissioned in the targeted industries. <b>Target:</b> 4 fully functional plants are commissioned.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects' feasibility studies and technical design files</li> <li>Field visits; plant commissioning reports; bill of lading; appraisals by counterparts, final evaluation.</li> </ul>	<p>A: Private companies willing to implement advanced, low-emission waste treatment technologies</p> <p>R: Lack of resources can put in danger the continuity of the full-scale projects</p>
Output 3.2	<p>Call for Proposals for and implementation of at least five small to medium scale projects, including (i) design of the call; (ii) feasibility and technical design studies for demonstrations in medium and small sized farms / industries in the targeted sectors; and (iii) implementation of at least five full-scale projects in medium and small sized</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of fully functional projects in small- and medium-sized agro-industries</li> </ul>	<p><b>Baseline:</b> No innovative waste valorization projects have been implemented in small- and medium-sized agro-industries. <b>Target:</b> Implementation of at least 5 waste valorization projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects' feasibility studies and technical design files</li> <li>Field visits; plant commissioning reports; bill of lading; appraisals by counterparts, final evaluation.</li> </ul>	<p>A: Private companies willing to implement advanced, low-emission waste treatment technologies</p> <p>R: Delays in the commissioning R: No responses are received after the Call for Proposals.</p>

	agro-industries.				
Output 3.3	Identification of a portfolio of potential waste valorization projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of projects included in the portfolio</li> </ul>	<p><b>Baseline:</b> No waste valorization project portfolio exists  <b>Target:</b> Development of one portfolio with potential projects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documentation</li> <li>Appraisals by counterparts</li> </ul>	<p>A: There will be continuous commitment to promote waste valorization  R: Farmers are not interested in participating in the initiative</p>
Output 3.4	Training of personnel on the operation of at least the four large-scale waste treatment undertakings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of personnel attending the training course, disaggregated by gender</li> <li>Number of training courses undertaken</li> </ul>	<p><b>Baseline:</b> Limited possibilities for training on the operation of waste valorization plants.  <b>Target:</b> Successful training of at least 1 (one) person per undertaking.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documentation</li> <li>Appraisal by counterparts and beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<p>A: Private companies willing to implement advanced, low-emission waste treatment technologies  R: People unable to attend the courses  R: Unsuccessful transfer of know-how to the attendees.</p>
<b>PC#4: Capacity building, training and dissemination campaign for the adoption of low carbon waste valorization initiatives</b>					
<b>Outcome 4:</b> The capacities of sector agents to deliver state-of-the-art sustainable production schemes through sustainable waste management and low-emission treatment technologies in prioritized sectors have been strengthened.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of women/men attending training courses as sector agents</li> <li>Number of users of the knowledge management platform</li> <li>Number of people reached by the dissemination campaign</li> </ul>	<p><b>Baseline:</b> Insufficient capabilities of the sector agents exist.  <b>Target:</b> Strengthening of at least 10 sector agents (between women and men) in the field of waste valorization.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documentation</li> <li>Publications</li> <li>Training materials</li> </ul>	<p>A: There is a critical amount of stakeholders and public in general committed to promote low-emission residues treatment technologies   R: Lack of interest and/or willingness of stakeholders in knowing about these new technologies</p>
<b>Outputs</b>					
Output 4.1	A running web-based knowledge management platform has been set up.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of online users that accessed the knowledge management platform</li> </ul>	<p><b>Baseline:</b> No dedicated web-based tool for information sharing in place.  <b>Target:</b> Have one on-line knowledge management platform running</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documentation</li> <li>Web-based platform</li> </ul>	<p>A: Access to internet  R: Insufficient access to internet or slow connections or webpage unavailability</p>
Output 4.2	Creation of at least (i) 2 toolkits and (ii) 2 training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of toolkits per</li> </ul>	<p><b>Baseline:</b> No publicly available information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project</li> </ul>	<p>A: People are interested in several subjects that justify the creation of</p>

	courses: (i) Toolkit on identification of waste valorization project opportunities and technological options, and toolkit on financing waste valorization opportunities and applying successful business models; and (ii) Training course on identification of waste valorization project opportunities and technological options, and training course on financing waste valorization opportunities.	<p>knowledge area created</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of training courses per knowledge area created</li> <li>• Number of users subscribing to the training courses, disaggregated by gender</li> </ul>	<p>exists on the waste valorization field and no training courses held on the waste valorization field</p> <p><b>Target:</b> Have at least 2 toolkits on the waste valorization field available on the platform and design and delivery of at least two training courses</p>	<p>documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web-based platform</li> <li>• Training course participants' list</li> </ul>	<p>a toolkit and there will be enough people interested in the courses</p> <p>R: There are not enough people interested in attending the course, and/or the course is not held</p>
Output 4.3	Establishment of a network between different productive sectors to ensure the sustainability of the knowledge management platform after the project is completed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of individual members of the network, disaggregated by gender</li> <li>• Number of member organizations (<i>no gender disaggregation applies here</i>)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Baseline:</b> No network involving productive sectors to ensure the sustainability of the knowledge management platform.</p> <p><b>Target:</b> Establish one network</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documentation</li> <li>• Appraisal by counterparts</li> </ul>	<p>A: The knowledge management platform has been successfully established and is operational</p>
Output 4.4	Dissemination campaign and a dissemination workshop to promote waste-to-energy, waste valorization and low-emission waste treatment activities to increase their adoption by farmers, industries and communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of dissemination products designed</li> </ul> <p>Type of audience reached (e.g. farmer, industry, other), disaggregated by gender (where feasible)</p>	<p><b>Baseline:</b> No dissemination programme is established for the promotion of waste valorization.</p> <p><b>Target:</b> One dissemination campaign and one dissemination workshop have been created.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documentation</li> <li>• Dissemination campaign plan</li> <li>• Publications</li> <li>• Workshop proceeding</li> </ul>	<p>A: Government is committed to supporting the dissemination campaign and workshop</p> <p>R: The campaign and workshop do not reach the desired stakeholders</p>
Output 4.5	Generation of knowledge about the waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of additional documents and</li> </ul>	<p><b>Baseline:</b> Initial interactions between</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge Platform</li> <li>• Universities</li> </ul>	<p>A: Universities are willing to collaborate with the project</p>

	valorization field through the collaboration with universities.	research conducted with universities' support	<p>UDELAR and one of the private companies have taken place.</p> <p><b>Target:</b> Generate a systematic collaboration between private companies and universities to improve knowledge exchange in the field</p>		R: Information is unavailable and/or there is a lack of resources to generate new information
--	---	---	--	--	---

2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>National counterparts</u></li> <li>✓ <b>Design</b></li> <li>○ Responsiveness to UNIDO’s invitation for engagement in designing the project</li> <li>✓ <b>Implementation</b></li> <li>○ Ownership of the project</li> <li>○ Support to the project, based on actions and policies</li> <li>○ Counterpart funding</li> <li>○ Internal government coordination</li> <li>○ Exit strategy, planned together with UNIDO, or arrangements for continued funding of certain activities</li> <li>○ Facilitation of the participation of Non-Governmental Organizations(NGOs), civil society and the private sector where appropriate</li> <li>○ Suitable procurement procedures for timely project implementation</li> <li>○ Engagement with UNIDO in policy dialogue to promote the up-scaling or replication of innovations</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <b>Donor</b></li> <li>✓ Timely disbursement of project funds</li> <li>✓ Feedback to progress reports, including Mid-Term Evaluation</li> <li>✓ Support by the donor’s country presence (if applicable) supporting the project for example through engagement in policy dialogue</li> </ul>
F	<p><b>Overall project achievement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the analysis made under Project performance and Progress to Impact criteria above but not an average of ratings.</li> </ul>

## Annex 2: Job descriptions

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

<b>Title:</b>	National evaluation consultant, team leader
<b>Main Duty Station and Location:</b>	Home-based , Uruguay
<b>Missions:</b>	Field Visits in Uruguay
<b>Start of Contract (EOD):</b>	[dd/mm/yyyy]
<b>End of Contract (COB):</b>	[dd/mm/yyyy]
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	38 working days spread over 3 months

#### ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

#### PROJECT CONTEXT

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

The National 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:

<b>MAIN DUTIES</b>	<b>Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Working Days</b>	<b>Location</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Desk review of project documentation and relevant country background information (National policies/strategies; GEF programmes/strategies, and GEF policies such as those on project cycle, M&amp;E, co-financing, fiduciary standards, gender, and environmental and social safeguards)</li><li>• Determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instruments accordingly (if needed);</li><li>• Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Table of evaluation questions</li><li>• A draft list of stakeholders to be interviewed during the field visits</li><li>• A brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework</li></ul>	6 days	Home-based



MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
project's activities and analyze other background info.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Briefing/Teleconference with UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders</li> <li>Prepare an inception report</li> <li>Coordination of field visits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inception report submitted to the evaluation manager</li> <li>Field /site visits agenda</li> </ul>	7 days	Home-based
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undertake evaluation visits<sup>23</sup> to consult field project stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries to verify and complete preliminary evaluation findings from desk review and assess the institutional capacities of the recipient country</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field mission conducted</li> <li>Evaluation/debriefing presentation of the evaluation's preliminary findings prepared, draft conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt to stakeholders in the country, at the end of the mission</li> </ul>	8 days	Uruguay
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Debriefing: Present preliminary findings, recommendations and lessons learnt to project stakeholders via teleconference for factual validation and comments</li> <li>Hold additional online meetings with and obtain additional data from evaluation/project manager and other stakeholders as required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Power point presentation</li> <li>Feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed</li> <li>Additional meetings held as required</li> </ul>	2 days	Home-based
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare the draft evaluation report, in accordance with the evaluation TOR</li> <li>Submit draft evaluation report to the evaluation manager for feedback and comments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation officer for review and comments</li> </ul>	8 days	Home-based
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise the draft evaluation report based on comments and suggestions received through the evaluation manager and edit the language and finalize the evaluation report according to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division standards</li> <li>Prepare a two pages summary of a take-away message from the evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation manager (incl. an Executive summary in English)</li> <li>Two pages summary take-away message (Evaluation Brief) from the evaluation submitted to the evaluation manager</li> </ul>	7 days	Home-based
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>38 days</b>	

<sup>23</sup> The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

## MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

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

### **Technical and functional experience:**

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

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

## **REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

### ***Core values:***

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

### ***Core competencies:***

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

### ***Managerial competencies (as applicable):***

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

### **Reporting and deliverables**

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

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

**Absence of conflict of interest:**

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

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

<b>Title:</b>	National evaluation consultant
<b>Main Duty Station and Location:</b>	Home-based
<b>Mission/s to:</b>	Travel to potential sites within Uruguay
<b>Start of Contract:</b>	[dd/mm/yyyy]
<b>End of Contract:</b>	[dd/mm/yyyy]
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	25 days spread over 3 months

### ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

### PROJECT CONTEXT

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

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

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

<b><u>MAIN DUTIES</u></b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>
	project		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Coordination of evaluation field mission</b> agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with project staff in the field</li> <li>• Provide inputs to the team leader in the preparation of <b>the inception report</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed evaluation schedule</li> <li>• List of stakeholders to be interviewed during the field mission</li> <li>• Input to inception report</li> </ul>	4 days	Home-based (telephone interviews)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in <b>interviews</b> during evaluation field missions</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interview notes</li> <li>• Input to presentations of the preliminary finding to stakeholders in the country</li> </ul>	8 days	Home based, including in-country project sites
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Draft evaluation report</b></li> <li>• Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the team leader</li> </ul>	Inputs to the draft evaluation report submitted to evaluation team leader	4 days	Home-based
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribute to the finalization of <b>the final evaluation report</b> on basis of comments and suggestions received through the evaluation team leader</li> <li>• Contribute to the preparation of a two pages summary of a take-away message from the evaluation</li> </ul>	Inputs to the Final evaluation report submitted to evaluation team leader	2 days	Home-based
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>25 days</b>	

#### MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

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

**Technical and functional experience:**

- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.
- Experience in the field of environment and energy, including evaluation of development cooperation in developing countries and social safeguards and gender is an asset

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

#### REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

***Core values:***

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

***Core competencies:***

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

***Managerial competencies (as applicable):***

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

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

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

**Abbreviations and acronyms**

**Glossary of evaluation-related terms**

### **Executive summary (in Spanish and English)**

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

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

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

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

- Brief country context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project<sup>24</sup> and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
  - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
  - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
  - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
  - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
  - Counterpart organization(s)

### **III. Project assessment**

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

- A. Project design
  - Assess design aspects such as participatory nature of design, adequate analysis of the project context, etc.
  - Discuss the quality of project design in relation to the explicit or implicit theory of change (based on the TOC analysis and assessment).
- B. Implementation performance
  - Ownership and relevance (Report on the relevance of project towards countries and beneficiaries, country ownership, stakeholder involvement)

---

<sup>24</sup> Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g. relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives, etc.)

- Effectiveness (The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives, outcomes and deliverables were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance)
  - Efficiency (Report on the overall cost-benefit of the project and partner countries’ contribution to the achievement of project objectives)
  - Likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes (Report on the risks and vulnerability of the project, considering the likely effects of sociopolitical and institutional changes in partner countries, and its impact on continuation of benefits after the project ends, specifically the financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks)
  - Project coordination and management (Report project management conditions and achievements, and partner countries commitment)
  - Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems (Report on M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and budgeting and funding for M&E activities)
  - Monitoring of long-term changes
  - Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results (Report on preparation and readiness / quality at entry, financial planning, UNIDO support, co-financing, delays of project outcomes/outputs, and implementation approach)
- C. Environment
- D. Gender mainstreaming

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

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

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

##### **A. Conclusions**

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

##### **B. Recommendations**

This section should be succinct and contain few (max. five) key recommendations which will be followed up under the management response. They should:

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

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:

- UNIDO
- Government and/or Counterpart Organizations
- Donor

Further guidance on the formulation of recommendations is available from the UNIDO Evaluation Manual.



**C. Lessons learned**

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

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

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

#### Annex 4: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Project title:  
UNIDO Project ID:  
GEF 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 5. Guidance and checklist on lessons learned quality criteria

UNIDO evaluation lessons learned

Definition

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development’s (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) (2002) defines lessons learned related to the evaluation of development assistance as follows: *“Generalizations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact.”*<sup>25</sup>

Focus on generalization

The International Labour Organisation (ILO) provides one of the most comprehensive definitions of lessons learned with relevance for evaluations in the UN system (2014) *“A lesson learned is an observation from project or programme experience which can be translated into relevant, beneficial knowledge by establishing clear causal factors and effects. It focuses on a specific design, activity, process or decision and may provide either positive or negative insights on operational effectiveness and efficiency, impact on the achievement of outcomes, or influence on sustainability. The lesson should indicate, where possible, how it contributes to 1) reducing or eliminating deficiencies; or 2) building successful and sustainable practice and performance”*<sup>26</sup>.

Focus on transferability & generalization

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

What is not a lesson learned?

<p><b>Lessons learned are not:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simply restating or paraphrasing existing doctrine, policy, process, etc. This does not qualify as an appropriate and bona fide lessons learned<sup>27</sup>.</li> <li>• Just applicable to a specific situation but applicable to a generic situation<sup>28</sup></li> <li>• The same as recommendations. Recommendations usually refer to very specific situations including who should take action on what by when</li> </ul>
--	--

<sup>25</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>

<sup>26</sup> ILO Evaluation Unit, 2014: Guidance Note 3: Evaluation lessons learned and emerging good practices

<sup>27</sup> [www.dtic.mil/ndia/2004cmmi/CMMIT2Tue/LessonsLearnedtc3.pdf](http://www.dtic.mil/ndia/2004cmmi/CMMIT2Tue/LessonsLearnedtc3.pdf)

<sup>28</sup> [www.globalhivmeinfo.org/Pages/Glossary.aspxglobalhivmeinfo.org/DigitalLibrary/Digital%20Library/Glossary%20of%20Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation%20Terms.doc](http://www.globalhivmeinfo.org/Pages/Glossary.aspxglobalhivmeinfo.org/DigitalLibrary/Digital%20Library/Glossary%20of%20Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation%20Terms.doc)

## Examples of lessons learned

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

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

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

## Lessons learned quality criteria checklist

The evaluator should cite and explain the points below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Annex 6. GEF Minimum requirements for M&E<sup>29</sup>**

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

All projects will include a concrete and fully budgeted M&E plan by the time of work program entry for full-sized projects (FSP) and CEO approval for medium-sized projects (MSP). This M&E plan will contain as a minimum:

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>29</sup> [http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME\\_Policy\\_2010.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf)

## Annex 7. Rating tables

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

**Evaluation Rating Table**

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

It is acknowledged that some issues covered by one criterion might overlap with others. Yet to enable UNIDO to learn from the deeper evaluation analyses and lessons on a number of

areas, separate criteria are included such as those on Monitoring and Evaluation and Results-Based Management. The consistent use of the criteria pertinent to the evaluation object allow for comparability of UNIDO’s performance over time. Evaluation questions are formulated around those evaluation criteria in UNIDO, as specified in the following section.

### Rating systems and criteria

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

#### UNIDO evaluation rating scale

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

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

**Table below** contains the formula applied to transform the results of UNIDO’s six-point rating scale to the GEF’s four-point scale for sustainability<sup>30</sup>.

<sup>30</sup> GEF uses a four-point scale for the criterion of sustainability.



### Formula transforming UNIDO ratings into GEF ratings

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

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

#### Project design

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

##### Overall design quality

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

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

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

#### Implementation performance

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

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Progress to Impact
- Sustainability of benefits

## Partners' performance

UNIDO's projects are characterized by a group of main partners with specific roles and responsibilities. UNIDO itself acts as project implementer and supervisor. Though supplemented by implementation performance criteria listed above, the criteria to assess UNIDO as a partner are more specific and help to address frequent issues in its performance. Governments are local executors, and owners of the project and donors provide project funding. Hence, rating the partners is a key part of UNIDO project evaluations<sup>31</sup>. The six-point rating scale applies<sup>32</sup>.

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

### Project design

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

### Implementation

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

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

### Project design

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

### Implementation

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

---

<sup>31</sup> As practiced by the World Bank and the International Fund for Agriculture Development.

<sup>32</sup> 6 = Highly satisfactory; 5 = Satisfactory; 4 = Moderately satisfactory; 3 = Moderately unsatisfactory; 2 = Unsatisfactory; 1 = Highly unsatisfactory

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

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

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

### **Gender mainstreaming**

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

In line with the UNIDO Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women Strategy, 2016-2019, all UNIDO technical assistance projects post-2015 are to be assigned a gender marker and should go through a gender mainstreaming check-list before approval. UNIDO's gender marker is in line with UN System-wide action plan (SWAP) requirements, with four categories: 0 — no attention to gender, 1 — some/limited attention to gender, 2a — significant attention to gender, 2b — gender is the principal objective<sup>33</sup>.

Besides, Guides on Gender Mainstreaming for Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) Projects in different areas of UNIDO's work have been developed and published during 2015<sup>34</sup>, which have specific guidance on suitable outputs/activities/indicators per technical area.

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

---

<sup>33</sup> [http://intranet.unido.org/intra/Gender\\_Mainstreaming\\_Tools\\_and\\_Guides](http://intranet.unido.org/intra/Gender_Mainstreaming_Tools_and_Guides)

<sup>34</sup> [www.unido.org/en/what-we-do/cross-cutting-issues/gender/publications.html](http://www.unido.org/en/what-we-do/cross-cutting-issues/gender/publications.html)

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

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

