



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent terminal evaluation of project

**Support the Arab Accreditation Cooperation (ARAC) to be sustained, effective
and internationally recognized as key driving force**

for regional trade integration

UNIDO Project No.: 140261

November 2020

Contents

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	3
1.	Project factsheet	3
2.	Project context.....	3
3.	Project objective and expected outcomes	5
4.	Project implementation arrangements	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.	Main findings of the Mid-term review (MTR)	7
6.	Budget information	9
II.	Scope and purpose of the evaluation	9
III.	Evaluation approach and methodology.....	10
1.	Data collection methods.....	10
2.	Evaluation key questions and criteria	11
3.	Rating system.....	12
IV.	Evaluation process	13
V.	Time schedule and deliverables.....	13
VI.	Evaluation team composition	14
VII.	Reporting.....	14
VIII.	Quality assurance	15
	Annex 1: Project Logical Framework.....	16
	Annex 2: Job descriptions	18
	Annex 3 Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report.....	24
	Annex 4: Checklist on evaluation report quality	26
	Annex 5: Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and Projects	27

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1. Project factsheet¹

Project title	Support the Arab Accreditation Cooperation (ARAC) to be sustained, effective and internationally recognized as key driving force for regional trade integration
UNIDO ID	140261
Country	Regional
Project donor(s)	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
Project implementation start date	May 2018
Expected duration	27 months (Original 24 months)
Expected implementation end date	31 December 2020 (original date 30 June 2020)
Programme Site	Arab region (AIDMO members)
Implementing agency	UNIDO
Government coordinating agency	AIDMO/LAS
Counterparts	Regional: Arab Accreditation Cooperation Body (ARAC), Individual countries: National Accreditation Bodies
Thematic Area Code	Department of Trade, Investment and Innovation Department of Agri-business Development
Project Inputs:	
- UNIDO input (grant):	\$ 3,085,500 (incl. 10% UNIDO support costs)
- Counterpart inputs:	In-kind

(Source: Project document)

2. Project context

RATIONALE

The League of Arab States Region has one of the lowest levels of intra-regional trade despite preferential market access and significant cultural homogeneity. Trade potential exists but is as yet untapped. The International Trade Centre's (ITC's) analysis finds that by removing remaining obstacles to trade, there is the potential to increase total trade of member states by 10% and create at least 2 million jobs.

The modest evidence of regional integration among the LAS trading partners hints at factors other than 'conventional' tariffs hindering the free exchange of goods across LAS markets. Exporting companies seeking access to foreign markets, and companies importing products, do indeed need to comply with a wide range of requirements including technical regulations, product standards and customs procedures. These non-tariff measures (NTMs) affect intra-regional trade in the LAS, especially in manufacturing products. This is despite the fact that preferential agreements are in place which include provisions for the elimination of non-tariff barriers to trade.

Technical barriers to trade (TBT) and sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures, and the compliance with the two respective WTO agreements, are perceived as most challenging. According to the ITC report, more

¹ Data to be validated by the evaluation team.

than half (54%) of the NTM cases fall into this category, which comprises technical regulations i.e. product-specific requirements such as tolerance limits for residues, hygienic requirements or measures on labeling and packaging, and conformity assessment measures aiming at proving compliance with technical regulations e.g. through testing and certification.

It is understood that compliance with standards and technical regulations as well as mutual recognition of conformity assessment procedures (i.e. testing, inspection, and certification) are only one set of actions that are needed to enhance trade, but that compliance issues do constitute a major element of competitiveness of local enterprises and products. It is also acknowledged that efficient and sustainable support in the area of quality and technology support, standards, conformity assessment, and in particular accreditation, are best viable and self-sustaining if carried out in regional coordination and/or undertaken at regional level. Such regional division of labour based on the estimated work load and demand - such as for calibration services, or based on the need to have a harmonized regional approach - such as for accreditation and standardization, will allow to pool scarce resources, achieve economies of scale, and will allow for more easily obtaining international recognition.

Accreditation ensures that consumers, suppliers, purchasers and specifiers can have confidence in the quality and safety of goods, and in the provision of services throughout the supply chain.

With its many potential benefits for the quality of goods and in the provision of services throughout the supply chain, accreditation underpins practical applications of an increasingly wide range of activities across all sectors of the economy, from fishing to forestry, construction to communications. E.g. Independent research has confirmed that accreditation has a positive economic value of nearly £1bn on the UK economy each year.

In particular in the area of food trading highest safety standards are applied, and large retailers, food organizations and regulatory agencies around the world are dependent on the services of food testing laboratories to ensure that the biological and chemical components of the food they process or package are safe for consumers. Using an accredited laboratory to assess this important safety information means government bodies, regulators, and ultimately consumers, can have confidence in the testing, measurement and calibration data generated.

Developing countries like League of Arab states' members see these issues as being crucial in regard to their ability to participate in, and benefit from, regional and international trade, and have therefore requested assistance regarding the upgrading of their food safety control and quality infrastructure system, including accreditation, to give the region a greater opportunity for prosperity through the development of a tool and quality assurance mechanism which will ultimately allow for enhancing the food safety structure at national and regional level.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Founded in 1968, the Arab Industrial Development and Mining Organization (AIDMO) is one of the largest technical organizations currently operating under the umbrella of the League of Arab States. With the aim to promote industrial development in the Arab region, the organization has substantially grown in its mandate and currently follows the industrial development strategy adopted during the Arab Summit of 2005 held in Algeria.

By hosting the Arab Standards Centre, AIDMO is in charge of the regional activities on standards and Quality Infrastructure and acts as the coordinating regional body between all standards institutes in the region.

To fulfil its planned objectives of trade facilitation between member states, AIDMO embarked on an ambitious project of harmonization of standards, conformity assessment, accreditation and metrology infrastructures in the Member States.

AIDMO initiated programme identification through a request to the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) for assistance. AIDMO knew Sida due to its long history in training regional experts in fields related to QI in cooperation with the Swedish Board for Accreditation and Conformity Assessment (SWEDAC). Sida suggested AIDMO to explore the option of cooperating with UNIDO. Following Sida's agreement in principle to provide funding, a technical assistance project was jointly designed by UNIDO and AIDMO to support the implementation of the Arab Standardization Strategy (2009 – 2013).

The project witnessed the establishment of the Arab Accreditation Cooperation (ARAC) which achieved important key milestones over the past years with 17 member countries becoming members of ARAC and completed major steps towards international recognition and sustainability. Furthermore, the project developed an innovative module on Good Governance and Professional Practices through the development of Regional Arab Guidelines on Good Governance and capacity building activities.

In May 2014, a final independent evaluation was conducted to provide all the partners (AIDMO, UNIDO, Sida) with an assessment of project quality. The approach applied was found to be satisfactory responding to AIDMO's core objectives and in line with its needs and priorities. A clear recommendation was made on the need to expand the implementation through a new project in order to capitalize and expand the successful results both at regional and national level.

Due to the delay in starting this project, specific set of activities were supported under the SAFE project with the aim of bridging the support to ARAC and ensure the finalization of the international recognition process, in October 2017, ARAC has been officially recognized as a regional accreditation cooperation body by ILAC & IAF.

3. Project objective, expected outcomes and implementation strategy

Objective of the project

The broader objective/impact of the project is to facilitate regional trade & integration, enhance health & safety, protect the environment, and provide consumer protection through strengthening the regional coordination on implementing cooperation in accreditation.

The specific objective of the project is to ensure an effective and internationally recognized regional cooperation on accreditation as key driving force for regional trade integration.

Outputs and activities

OUTCOME 1: Regional cooperation on accreditation is sustained, effective and internationally recognized as key driving force for regional trade integration.

Output 1.1: ARAC, as a regional cooperation body, is legally incorporated, technically / financially sustainable and international recognized (ILAC MRA & IAF MLA Signatory).

Key Activities

- 1.1.1 Finalise the legal registration, business plan and hosting arrangements of ARAC and the revision of its bylaws to reflect the new status (legal status, financial status, membership arrangements and the hosting arrangements).
- 1.1.2 Support the effective operations of ARAC Secretariat in supporting ARAC to provide leadership and regional coordination on accreditation for its members and support its transformation into the new legal and hosting arrangements
- 1.1.3 Support ARAC in developing its gender and anti-corruption good governance policies, its integration into ARAC policies and procedures and provide training to its members on the application of these policies, practices and guidelines.
- 1.1.4 Enhance ARAC Peer Evaluation System and MLA and support the implementation of ARAC MLA and peer-evaluation action plan to maintain the ILAC/IAF MLA/MRA signatory status. Support the expansion of ARAC pool of evaluators in the different accreditation fields to meet the growing demand by its members.
- 1.1.5 Support ARAC in the design and implementation of a regional pilot initiative on proficiency testing as a cross-cutting element of regional cooperation on accreditation.
- 1.1.6 Support ARAC in the design and development of ARAC integrated IT platform and ARAC management information system and software and facilitate the linkages with its members in an effective, inclusive, cost-effective and transparent manner.
- 1.1.7 Facilitate the well-functioning of ARAC structure and support the effective operations of ARAC committees (GA, EXCOM, MLA, MLA Group, TC, CMC) and committees subgroups in implementing the agreed action plans and strategies of ARAC and covering all accreditation activities/disciplines included in the ARAC MLA.
- 1.1.8 Sustain and strengthen ARAC partnerships at regional and international levels and support ARAC in maintaining the ILAC/IAF MLA/MRA signatory status.
- 1.1.9 Support ARAC in its endeavours to be an influential member of ILAC and IAF and strengthen the effective participation of ARAC in the international accreditation platforms and committees (ILAC/IAF, PAC, EA, APLAC, AFRAC, PAC, IAAC)
- 1.1.10 Facilitate collaboration, cooperation and mutual assistance among members by means of training activities, meetings of experts and sharing of information and experiences.
- 1.1.11 Support ARAC in the identification and involvement of relevant stakeholders, including the private sector and end users, and the setup of a stakeholder committee as part of ARAC governance system with the aim to reach out and involve all stakeholders in the field of accreditation, and raise awareness of stakeholders regarding ARAC MLA and need for accreditation in the regional and international marketplace.
- 1.1.12 Enhance ARAC communication and advocacy capacities at international, regional and national levels and conduct extended outreach programme to its members, stakeholders and interested parties to promote the relevance and importance of ARAC as a regional coordination body.

Output 1.2: Up to 4 ARAC members supported to become ARAC MLA signatories

Key Activities

- 1.2.1 Prepare guidelines for its members on how to reach the ARAC recognition, and provide advice and guidance on capacity building of ABs.
- 1.2.2 Support ARAC peer-evaluation process for 4 members towards a future signatory under the MLA system of ARAC
- 1.2.3 Expand the technical support program of ARAC and expand the program to other new members of ARAC
- 1.2.4 Support ARAC members in their efforts to initiate the process of ARAC recognition for their national accreditation systems.
- 1.2.5 Organize the needed training and awareness activities at regional and national levels to promote ARAC within its target members and to enhance national consultation as well as engagement with relevant stakeholders including the private sector and the end users.

Output 1.3: Project Management

- 1.3.1 Development and implementation of the project Communication strategy
- 1.3.2 Ensuring an effective management, monitoring and evaluation of the project

4. Main findings of Phase I evaluation

Recommendations from the evaluation report	Actions taken/planned under this project
1. Finalize the Programme as planned, including commissioning a management consulting firm to explore the best strategic options for the legal status of ARAC, the development of a comprehensive business plan.	An international expert in Business Planning was recruited in April 2014 and developed the business plan and sustainability model of ARAC.. During phase II, an international expert (legal advisor) will be recruited for the legal registration and setup of ARAC as an independent body.
2. Apply for an additional non-cost extension until 30 September 2014 or the approval of Sida's funding for the proposed follow-up phase (whatever comes earlier) to complete remaining programme activities, finalize the proposal for a follow-up phase and maintain the operations of ARAC.	The additional non-cost extension until 30 September 2014 was initiated in May 2014 and completed in July 2014
3. In close coordination with AIDMO, develop a detailed proposal for a possible follow up phase along the following lines:	The final draft of the Phase II project document addressing all the recommendations made has been developed and is under review by all partners
a) Consistently apply good practices in project design, including the proper application of the logical framework tool and result-based budgeting.	A revised and improved logical framework will be used in phase II project document.
b) Key objectives of follow-up support should be to (a) achieve recognition and ensure financial, institutional and technical sustainability of ARAC, (b) enhancing	The phase II project document is addressing all these recommendations:

<p>accreditation capacities at the national level of AIDMO member countries and (c) addressing the constraints of services for proficiency testing and traceability with the Arab region.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - output 1.1 will focus on the financial, institutional and technical sustainability of ARAC in addition to proficiency testing services - output 1.2 will focus on the enhancement of accreditation capacities at national level
<p>c) In order to avoid the development of duplicate capacities, support to in the field of traceability and proficiency testing should be provided based on an analysis of demand and existing supply of services.</p>	<p>This will be carried out during the implementation of phase II</p>
<p>d) Develop a clear strategy to gradually phase out donor-funding support for ARAC and the regional cooperation framework on QI within AIDMO, while maintaining the benefits for Member States.</p>	<p>An international expert was recruited in April 2014 and developed a comprehensive Business Plan and sustainability model for ARAC.</p>
<p>e) After the formal incorporation of ARAC as an independent organization with own legal personality, shift the financial support modality of ARAC from a project structure (directly covering operating costs) to subcontract ARAC for specific project outputs to be delivered. Funding through subcontracts should be gradually phased out upon an agreed schedule.</p>	<p>This option will be considered in phase II after the assessment of all the risks and once ARAC is legally and financially independent.</p>
<p>f) Consider using ARAC's expertise for UNIDO projects in other countries to provide ARAC with the opportunity for generating revenues and gaining practical experience outside the region (under subcontracts).</p>	<p>UNIDO will promote ARAC services within its technical cooperation projects in other regions such as the Eurasian region under which ARAC and Kazakhstan Accreditation body have signed a Memorandum of Understanding in 2013 in this regard.</p>
<p>g) Define specific synergies (economies of scale and scope) with the planned Regional Food Safety Project and the Aid-for-Trade Project (if approved), including the option to share certain management resources between projects.</p>	<p>The definition of specific synergies with the other Regional projects has been addressed in the design of phase II to avoid duplication and ensure the cost effectiveness of the project.</p> <p>A portfolio of cross-cutting officers will be shared with the Regional Food Safety project and the Aid-for-Trade project which was already discussed and agreed with AIDMO and Sida in a review meeting held in Cairo in January 2014.</p>
<p>h) Plan for the recruitment of a monitoring specialist (might be shared with the Food Safety and Aid for Trade Project).</p>	<p>A portfolio of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) specialist will be recruited and shared with the Regional Food Safety project and the Aid-for-Trade project.</p>
<p>i) Consider applying ROM in the form of a self-evaluation with support of an external specialist with extensive experience in evaluation and TCB (might be combined with ROM for the Regional Food Safety Project). ROM might be used instead of an external mid-term review.</p>	<p>The use of ROM will be considered for Phase II as well as the other Regional projects.</p> <p>The design of ROM approach will be further developed through the recruitment of an expert in ROM.</p>

5. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown²

Project outcomes	Donor (\$)	Co-Financing (\$)	Total (\$)
Output 1: ARAC, as a regional cooperation body, is legally incorporated, technically / financially sustainable and international recognized (ILAC MRA & IAF MLA Signatory).	1,250,000		1,250,000
Output 2: Up to 4 ARAC members supported to become ARAC MLA signatories	800,000		800,000
Output 3: Project Management	750,000		750,000
Agency support cost (13%)	280,500		280,500
Total (\$)	3,085,500		3,085,500

Source: Project document / progress report

Table 2. UNIDO budget execution, USD \$ (Grant n. 2000003926)

Items of expenditure	2018	2019	2020	Total expend.	% /total
Staff & Intern Consultants	76,086.30	433,858.21	248,533.36	758,477.87	51%
Tech Services		22,504.00		22,504.00	2%
Local travel	41,645.59	70,140.55	20,460.32	132,246.46	9%
Staff Travel	9,547.22	11,743.08	5,504.68	26,794.98	2%
Nat.Consult./Staff		8,950.10	27,323.38	36,273.48	2%
Contractual Services		150,820.44	21,291.81	172,112.25	12%
Train/Fellowship/Study		3,898.13		3,898.13	0%
International Meetings	103,063.64	172,482.45	41,263.68	316,809.77	21%
Premises			608.40	608.40	0%
Equipment	0.00	-2,141.45	0.00	-2,141.45	0%
Other Direct Costs	4,324.18	22,850.15	-1,539.03	25,635.30	2%
Grand Total	234,666.93	895,105.66	363,446.60	1,493,219.19	100%

Source: UNIDO Project Management database as of 03 June 2020

II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is twofold: i) improve future interventions through feedback of lessons learned; and ii) provide a basis for accountability. The independent terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in 1/6/2018 to the estimated completion date in 31/12/2020.

² Source: Project document.

The evaluation has two specific objectives:

- (i) Assess the project performance and results in terms of OECD/DAC criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and coherence as well as its progress towards its broader objective/ impact. This shall be done in line with project documentation, agreement and subsequent coordination between UNIDO and Sida as well as UNIDO's integrated results and performance framework (IRPF)³ and the respective organizational objectives, outcomes and targets; and
- (ii) Identify and analyze project findings to enable the incorporation of lessons learned and prepare recommendations for enhancing the quality and performance of similar future interventions, the design of new phase/project and organizational learning. Lessons learned and recommendation shall be specific and actionable communicating clearly what worked as planned and what didn't; including the main reason why that happened and how to mitigate those challenges and improve in the future.

III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy⁴ and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle⁵.

UNEG Norms and Standards for evaluation shall also be observed.

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

The evaluation will use a theory of change approach and mixed methods to collect data and information from a range of sources and informants. It will pay attention to triangulating the data and information collected before forming its assessment. This is essential to ensure an evidence-based and credible evaluation, with robust analytical underpinning. However, considering the Covid 19 pandemic situation and restrictions in travels and person to person contacts prevailing in most of the countries, data collection methods will be adjusted according to the document ODG/EIO/01 dated 06 April 2020: Covid 19, measures by the office of Evaluation and Internal Audits (EIO) for its activities.

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

1. Data collection methods

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

- (a) **Desk and literature review** of documents related to the project, including but not limited to:

³ AI/2020/02 dated 6 May 2020

⁴ UNIDO. (2018). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (UNIDO/DGB/2018/08 dated 01 June 2018)

⁵ 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 original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports, mid-term review report, output reports, back-to-office mission report(s), end-of-contract report(s) and relevant correspondence.
 - Notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project.
- (b) **Stakeholder consultations** will be conducted through structured and semi-structured interviews, online surveys and focus group discussion if necessary. Key stakeholders to be interviewed include:
- UNIDO Management and staff involved in the project; and
 - Representatives of donors (Sida), counterparts and stakeholders.
 - all target groups (direct and indirect beneficiaries)

2. Evaluation key questions and criteria

The key evaluation questions are the following:

- Has the project contributed to its broader objective/impact to facilitate regional trade & integration, enhance health & safety, protect the environment, and provide consumer protection. If so, how and how much.
- 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/drivers to address the drivers, overcome barriers and contribute to its broader long-term objectives/impact?
- How well has the project performed? Was the intervention logic effective and implemented efficiently (best value for money)? What did not go as planned, why and how it could improve?
- What have been the project's key measurable results (outputs, outcome and impact)? To what extent have the expected results been achieved or are likely to be achieved? To what extent the achieved results will sustain after the completion of the project?
- What lessons can be drawn from the successful and unsuccessful decisions made in designing, implementing and managing the project to enhance the quality of future aid policy, design of new phase/project and organizational learning
- Is there political will and commitment in target group countries/institutions to implement necessary reforms supported by this program? Which ones and how? If not enough, what could be done differently to improve?

The evaluation will assess the likelihood of sustainability of the project results after the project completion. The assessment will identify key risks (e.g. in terms of financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental risks) and explain how these risks may affect the continuation of results after the project ends. Table 1 below provides the key evaluation criteria to be assessed by the evaluation. The details questions to assess each evaluation criterion are in annex 2 of UNIDO [Evaluation Manual](#).

Table 1. Project evaluation criteria

#	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
A	Impact	Yes
B	Project design	Yes
1	• Overall design	Yes
2	• Logframe	Yes

#	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
C	Project performance	Yes
1	• Relevance	Yes
2	• Effectiveness	Yes
3	• Efficiency	Yes
4	• Sustainability of benefits	Yes
5	• Coherence	Yes
D	Cross-cutting performance criteria	
1	• Gender mainstreaming	Yes
2	• M&E: ✓ M&E design ✓ M&E implementation	Yes
3	• Results-based Management (RBM)	Yes
4	• Environmental impacts	Yes
E	Performance of partners	
1	• UNIDO	Yes
2	• National counterparts	Yes
3	• Donor	Yes
F	Overall assessment	Yes

Performance of partners

The assessment of performance of partners will ***include*** the quality of implementation and execution of the Partner Agencies and project executing entities (EAs) in discharging their expected roles and responsibilities. The assessment will take into account the following:

- Quality of Implementation, e.g. the extent to which the agency delivered effectively, with focus on elements that were controllable from the given Partner Agency's perspective and how well risks were identified and managed.
- Quality of Execution, e.g. the appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting of goods and services.

3. Rating system

In line with the practice adopted by many development agencies, the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division uses a six-point rating system, where 6 is the highest score (highly satisfactory) and 1 is the lowest (highly unsatisfactory) as per Table 6.

Table 2. Project rating criteria

Score	Definition	Category	
6	Highly satisfactory	Level of achievement presents no shortcomings (90% - 100% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	SATISFACTORY

5	Satisfactory	Level of achievement presents minor shortcomings (70% - 89% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	
4	Moderately satisfactory	Level of achievement presents moderate shortcomings (50% - 69% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	
3	Moderately unsatisfactory	Level of achievement presents some significant shortcomings (30% - 49% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	UNSATISFACTORY
2	Unsatisfactory	Level of achievement presents major shortcomings (10% - 29% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	
1	Highly unsatisfactory	Level of achievement presents severe shortcomings (0% - 9% achievement rate of planned expectations and targets).	

IV. Evaluation process

The evaluation will be conducted from August – December 2020. The evaluation will be implemented in five phases which are not strictly sequential, but in many cases iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping:

- i. Inception phase: The evaluation team will prepare the inception report providing details on the methodology for the evaluation and include an evaluation matrix with specific issues for the evaluation;
- ii. Desk review and data analysis;
- iii. Online interviews, survey and literature review;
- iv. Data analysis and report writing.

V. Time schedule and deliverables

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from August – December 2020. At the end of the data collection, online interviews and surveys, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project by zoom or any other online platforms. The tentative timelines are provided in Table 7.

The draft TE report will be submitted 4 to 6 weeks after the end of the mission. The draft TE report is to be shared with the UNIDO PM, UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, and other stakeholders for receipt of comments. The ET leader is expected to revise the draft TE report based on the comments received, edit the language and form and submit the final version of the TE report in accordance with UNIDO ODG/EIO/EID standards.

Table 3. Tentative timelines

Timeline	Tasks
September/October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitments • Development of TOR and share with key stakeholders • Review of project materials including that of phase1 and preparation of the inception report

October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online briefing with UNIDO project manager and UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division in Vienna⁶ • Data collection (interviews, surveys) and analysis • Presentation of first evaluation findings
Mid-week of December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of the draft report
Last week December	Stakeholder comments to draft evaluation report received
January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final evaluation report • Clearance and publishing

VI. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluation expert with extensive experience in the region acting as the team leader. The evaluation expert will possess relevant experience and skills in evaluation management and expertise in private sector development and business registration. The expert will be contracted by UNIDO. A regional consultant will be recruited in case the international expert is not proficient in Arabic and not familiar with the region.

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

The UNIDO Project Manager and the project team and the UNIDO Regional Office will support the evaluation team.

An evaluation manager from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division will provide technical backstopping to the evaluation team and ensure the quality of the evaluation. The UNIDO Project Manager, UNIDO Representative in the Arab Region and national/regional project teams will act as resourced persons and provide support to the evaluation team and the evaluation manager.

VII. Reporting

Inception report

This Terms of Reference (ToR) provides some information on the evaluation methodology, but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager, the Team Leader will prepare, in collaboration with the regional expert, 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”); people to be interviewed, surveys and focus group meetings conducted also may be included.

Evaluation report format and review procedures

⁶ Could be substituted with online meeting depending on the situation of Covid19

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO's 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 errors of fact to the draft report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to UNIDO's Independent Evaluation Division for collation and onward transmission to the project evaluation team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

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

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

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in annex 3.

VIII. Quality assurance

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

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. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO's evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation report are reviewed by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

Annex 1: Project Logical Framework

Strategic of Intervention	Key Performance Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
<p>Development goal/impact</p> <p>Regional coordination on implementing cooperation in accreditation strengthened in order to facilitate regional trade & integration, enhance health & safety, protect the environment, and provide consumer protection</p>	<p>Increase of % of products circulated among Arab countries, certified through ARAC certification/accreditation chain</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional trade statistics ▪ Testing rejection reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The cooperation level of all countries in providing accurate and up-to-date data and information on regional trade, testing, rejections...
<p>Outcome 1:</p> <p>Regional cooperation on accreditation is effective and internationally recognized as key driving force for regional trade integration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of increase in revenue generated after ARAC recognition ▪ ARAC established as autonomous and sustainable structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ARAC financial reports ▪ ARAC bylaws ▪ ARAC progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commitments of the different countries to pay for ARAC services ▪ Commitment of member states to adopt a revised bylaws emphasizing ARAC's sustainability and autonomy
<p>Output 1.1</p> <p>ARAC, as a regional cooperation body, is legally incorporated, technically / financially sustainable and international recognized (ILAC MRA & IAF MLA Signatory).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.1. Increase in # of ARAC members. 1.1.2. Increase in # of ARAC MLA signatories from Arab countries. 1.1.3. % of increase in # of accreditations per country member of ARAC. 1.1.4. % of increase in accredited conformity assessment bodies in the region. 1.1.5. % of the beneficiaries from the private sector conformity assessment bodies per country and across the region. 1.1.6. Level of satisfaction of end users on the accreditation services at country level. 1.1.7. # of mutual recognition agreements signed between ARAC members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ARAC progress reports ▪ Results of the different surveys conducted by ARAC and the project. ▪ Reports submitted by ARAC members on their operations. ▪ The report of the project M&E system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The cooperation level of all countries in providing the accurate and up-to-date data and information on their capacities in accreditation fields. ▪ Commitments of the different countries to work closely and jointly ▪ The political sensitivity between countries in the region ▪ Commitments of the different countries to work closely and jointly with ARAC

Strategic of Intervention	Key Performance Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
	1.1.8. Increase in ARAC revenues due to peer evaluations services. 1.1.9. # of ARAC peer evaluators qualified and operational in the region		
Output 1.2 Up to 4 ARAC members supported towards future ARAC MLA signatories	1.2. No. of national accreditation bodies enhanced 1.3. No. of professionals trained and sensitized at country level. 1.4. % of increase in accredited conformity assessment bodies per country. 1.5. No. of qualified and trained national auditors and assessors per country. 1.6. % of the beneficiaries from the private sector conformity assessment bodies per country and across the region. 1.7. Level of satisfaction of end users on the accreditation services at country level. 1.8. No. of SMEs benefiting and satisfied with the accredited services they procure per country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project progress reports ▪ Reports produced by ARAC on regular basis ▪ Training evaluation reports ▪ MLA Group decisions and reports ▪ The project M&E reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commitments of the target countries ▪ The different levels of capacities within ARAC members (capacity gaps). ▪ Lack of capacity to implement a new national structures ▪ The political stability in the target countries

Annex2: Job descriptions



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	International senior evaluation expert, team leader
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Missions:	No travel
Start of Contract (EOD):	01 October 2020
End of Contract (COB):	20 December 2020
Number of Working Days:	42 w/d over a period

1. ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Independent Evaluation Division 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.

2. PROJECT CONTEXT (See evaluation terms of reference attached)

Duties: The senior international evaluation consultant will act as a Team Leader in this project evaluation according to the terms of reference. She/he will be responsible for the preparation of the evaluation report, including the coordination of inputs from other team members. The Team Leader will perform the following tasks:

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
<p>1. Review project documentation and relevant country/region background information (national/regional policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data related to QI and accreditation); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument if needed;</p> <p>Prepare an inception report which streamlines the specific questions to address the key issues in the TOR, specific methods that will be used and data to collect in the field visits, detailed evaluation methodology confirmed, draft theory of change, and tentative agenda for field work.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjust table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; Prepare a map of stakeholders to interview during the field missions; The inception report. Submitted to evaluation manager. 	7	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
<p>Define technical issues and questions to be addressed prior to the field visit.</p> <p>Determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument if needed.</p> <p>In coordination with the project manager, the project management team and the technical evaluators, determine the suitable sites to be visited and stakeholders to be interviewed.</p>			
<p>2. Online briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning; • Division of evaluation tasks with the team members. 	3	Home-based
<p>3. Conduct data collection, interviews, online surveys etc and analysis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; • Agreement with the team members on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; • Evaluation presentation of the evaluation's initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission. 	18	Home-based
<p>4. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed 	2	Home-based
<p>5. Prepare the evaluation report, with inputs from the team members, according to the TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the team member and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report;</p> <p>Share the evaluation report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft evaluation report. 	10	Home-based
<p>6. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final evaluation report. 	4	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.			
TOTAL		44 days	

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:

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

Managerial competencies (as applicable):

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

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education:

Advanced degree in economics, development studies or related areas.

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 15 years’ experience in evaluation of development projects and programmes
- Knowledge about private quality infrastructure operational programs and strategies knowledge about accreditation is an asset.
- Experience in the evaluation of QI projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks
- Working experience in developing countries

Languages:

Fluency in written and spoken English is required, French is an asset.

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.



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	Regional evaluation expert
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	No travel
Start of Contract:	10 October 2020
End of Contract:	24 December 2020
Number of Working Days:	33 w/d over the above mentioned period

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The Independent Evaluation Division 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.

PROJECT CONTEXT

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

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
<p>Desk review</p> <p>Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country/region background information; in cooperation with the team leader, determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in English (questionnaires, logic models);</p> <p>If need be, recommend adjustments to the evaluation framework and Theory of Change in order to ensure their understanding in the local context.</p>	<p>Evaluation questions, questionnaires/interview guide, logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the regional context;</p> <p>A stakeholder mapping, in coordination with the project team.</p>	4 days	Home-based
<p>Carry out preliminary analysis of pertaining technical issues determined with the Team Leader.</p> <p>In close coordination with the project staff team verify the extent of achievement of project outputs prior to field visits.</p> <p>Develop a brief analysis of key contextual conditions relevant to the project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report addressing technical issues and question previously identified with the Team leader • Tables that present extent of achievement of project outputs • Brief analysis of conditions relevant to the project 	6 days	Home-based

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
Coordinate the evaluation mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with project staff in the field.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed evaluation schedule. • List of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. 	2 days	Home-based
<p>Conduct data collection, interviews, online surveys etc and analysis with the team leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required.</p> <p>Consult with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks.</p> <p>Conduct the translation for the Team Leader, when needed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations of the evaluation’s initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission. • Agreement with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks. 	15 days	Home-based
<p>Follow up with stakeholders regarding additional information promised during interviews</p> <p>Prepare inputs to help fill in information and analysis gaps (mostly related to technical issues) and to prepare of tables to be included in the evaluation report as agreed with the Team Leader.</p> <p>Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and proof read the final version.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of draft evaluation report prepared. 	6 days	Home-based
TOTAL		33 days	

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:

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

Managerial competencies (as applicable):

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

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree in Engineering, QI related topics, Development economics, business administration or private sector development .

Technical and functional experience:

- Excellent knowledge of Arab region's quality infrastructure topics, policy, institutional arrangement and mechanism, knowledge about accreditation is an asset.
- Evaluation experience, including evaluation of development cooperation in developing countries is an asset
- Experienced working with international/regional; development partners as well as ministries, agencies, NGOs from the ARAB region.;
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.

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

Absence of conflict of interest:

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

Annex 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 (maximum 3-4 pages) [in which languages? Only in English?]

Evaluation purpose and methodology

Key findings

Conclusions and recommendations

Project ratings

Tabular overview of key findings – conclusions – recommendations

1. Introduction

1.1. Evaluation objectives and scope

1.2. Overview of the Project Context

1.3. Overview of the Project

1.4. Theory of Change

1.5. Evaluation Methodology

1.6. Limitations of the Evaluation

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

2.1. Project's achieved results and overall effectiveness

2.2. Progress towards impact

2.2.1. Behavioral change

2.2.1.1. Economically competitive - Advancing economic competitiveness

2.2.1.2. Environmentally sound – Safeguarding environment

2.2.1.3. Socially inclusive – Creating shared prosperity

2.2.2. Broader adoption

2.2.2.1. Mainstreaming

2.2.2.2. Replication

2.2.2.3. Scaling-up

3. Project's quality and performance

3.1. Design

3.2. Relevance

3.3. Efficiency

3.4. Sustainability

3.5. Gender mainstreaming

4. Performance of Partners

4.1. UNIDO

4.2. National counterparts

4.3. Donor

5. Factors facilitating or limiting the achievement of results

5.1. Monitoring & evaluation

5.2. Results-Based Management

5.3. Other factors

5.4. Overall assessment and rating table

6. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

6.1. Conclusions

6.2. Recommendations

6.3. Lessons learned

6.4. Good practices

Annexes (to be put online separately later)

- Evaluation Terms of Reference
- Evaluation framework
- List of documentation reviewed
- List of stakeholders consulted
- List of interviewees
- Summary of project identification and financial data, incl. an updated table of expenditures to date and other detailed quantitative information
- Project logframe/Theory of Change
- Primary data collection instruments: evaluation survey/questionnaire
- Statistical data from evaluation survey/questionnaire analysis
- Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may be appended later in an annex.

Annex 4: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Project Title:

UNIDO ID:

Evaluation team:

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.

A. Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Gender responsive evaluation questions

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

B.1. Design

- Is the project/project in line with the UNIDO and national policies on gender equality and the empowerment of women?
- Were gender issues identified at the design stage?
- Did the project/project design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? If so, how?
- Were adequate resources (e.g., funds, staff time, methodology, experts) allocated to address gender concerns?
- To what extent were the needs and priorities of women, girls, boys and men reflected in the design?
- Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)?

- If the project/project is people-centered, were target beneficiaries clearly identified and disaggregated by sex, age, race, ethnicity and socio-economic group?
- If the project/project promotes gender equality and/or women's empowerment, was gender equality reflected in its objective/s? To what extent are output/outcome indicators gender disaggregated?

B.2. Implementation management

- Did project monitoring and self-evaluation collect and analyse gender disaggregated data?
- Were decisions and recommendations based on the analyses? If so, how?
- Were gender concerns reflected in the criteria to select beneficiaries? If so, how?
- How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?
- If the project/project promotes gender equality and/or women's empowerment, did the project/project monitor, assess and report on its gender related objective/s?

B.3. Results

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