



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent Terminal Evaluation of Project

| EU-EAC MARKUP

**(European Union-East African Community
Market Access Upgrade Programme) |**

UNIDO ID: 170183

| 08/2023 |

List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition
AFA	Agriculture and Food Authority
CIDP	County Investment and Development Plan
CRMs	Certified Reference Materials
EAC	East African Community
EU	European Union
EUD	EU Delegation
FPEAK	Fresh Produce Exporters Association of Kenya
FPC	Fresh Produce Consortium
GIZ	German Agency for International Cooperation
HCD	Horticultural Crops Directorate
IEU	Independent Evaluation Unit
ITC	International Trade Centre
KEBS	Kenya Bureau of Standards
KENAS	Kenya Accreditation Service
KEPHIS	Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service
MARKUP	Market Access Upgrade Programme
PCM	Project Cycle Management
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization

Contents

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	4
1.	Project factsheet	4
2.	Project Context	4
3.	Project Objective and Expected Outcomes	6
4.	Project implementation arrangements	8
5.	Main findings of the Mid-term Review (MTR)	9
6.	Budget information.....	10
II.	SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION.....	12
III.	EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY.....	12
1.	Data collection methods	13
2.	Key evaluation questions and criteria.....	13
3.	Rating system.....	15
IV.	Evaluation Process	15
V.	TIME SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES.....	16
VI.	EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION	16
VII.	REPORTING	16
VIII.	QUALITY ASSURANCE.....	17
ANNEX 1:	LOGICAL FRAMEWORK	19
ANNEX 2:	JOB DESCRIPTIONS.....	24
ANNEX 3:	OUTLINE OF AN IN-DEPTH PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT	31
ANNEX 4:	QUALITY CHECKLIST	32

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1. Project factsheet¹

Project title	EU-EAC MARKUP (Market access Upgrade programme)
UNIDO ID	170183
Country(ies)	Kenya
Project donor(s)	EU
Project approval date	19.12.2018
Planned project start date (as indicated in project document)	01.02.2019
Actual project start date (First PAD issuance date)	01.02.2019
Planned project completion date (as indicated in project document)	December 2022, but extended at no cost till 30.09.2023
Actual project completion date (as indicated in UNIDO ERP system)	30.09.2023
Project duration (year): Planned: Actual:	4 years 4 years and 9 months
Implementing agency(ies)	UNIDO
Government coordinating agency	Ministry of Trade and Industry
Executing Partners	N/A
Donor funding	EUR 3,680,000
UNIDO input (in kind, EUR)	EUR 50,000
Total project cost (EUR), excluding support costs	EUR 3,485,981
Mid-term review date	30.03.2022 as part of EAC MARK UP Project
Planned terminal evaluation date	July 2023

Source: Project document, UNIDO ERP system

2. Project Context

The European Union (EU), in partnership with the East African Community (EAC), launched the Market Access Upgrade Programme (MARKUP) to support member countries to improve market access of agro-food products to the European Union (EU) and regional markets. The Market Access Upgrade Programme (MARKUP) is structured around two intervention levels: the EAC Window and the Partner States Window with country specific projects.

The EAC-Window was structured to support EAC efforts to improve the regional trade and business-enabling environment for the selected commodities, through enhanced capacity to advocate for the removal of sector trade barriers and improved sector standards and Sanitary and Phyto-Sanitary (SPS) measures harmonization. The project was focused on supporting the private sector in enhancing its export competitiveness, through increased awareness and compliance with destination market requirements as well as with improving access to finance

¹ Data to be validated by the Consultant

and business development opportunities (including by reinforcing business support organizations' capacities).

Result 1 (R.1) – Enhanced capacity to advocate for the removal of sector trade barriers.

Result 2 (R.2) – Sector standards and SPS measures harmonization approved.

Result 3 (R.3) – Export competitiveness enhanced for sector SMEs.

Result 4 (R.4) – Business development capacities approved for sector SMES.

The regional intervention is managed by International Trade Centre (ITC) and German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ).

The Partner States Window includes national interventions tailored to the countries' specific needs and complementing the EAC-Window where any single country needs it the most. Interventions focused on one or more of the following areas: reduction of trade barriers and quality assurance, enhancement of SME export competitiveness, and business promotion. UNIDO is the implementation partner for the Kenya-Partner States Window.

MARKUP Kenya-Partner States Window

The MARKUP Kenya implementation period started in February 2019 and is expected to end in September 2023.

The UNIDO component of the EAC-EU MARKUP programme was implemented in close coordination with the Kenya Ministry of Industry, Trade and Cooperatives, the EU Delegation to Kenya and other implementing agencies including International Trade Centre (ITC) and German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ). The main objective of MARKUP Kenya is to contribute to the economic development of Kenya by increasing the value of both extra and intra-regional agricultural exports in selected horticulture sub sectors (green beans and peas in pods, mangoes, passion fruit, chilies, herbs and spices, nuts).

Project location and duration

The project implementation started in February 2019 and was to cover at least 10 counties (among the 12 listed below), selected according to the following criteria:

- High productive areas (those with higher volumes of produce were to be preferred)
- Counties willing to partner in this programme and take ownership to ensure continuity of extensions services and enforcement of standards
- Counties with incubation or TVET centres
- County policies that promote an active private sector and export strategies
- Donor coverage (those counties having received less assistance will be preferred)
- Counties with supportive policy environment, e.g., County Investment and Development Plan (CIDP) identifies support/ enabling policies and institutions for agro-industry, particularly project target commodities

- Provision of infrastructure such as common manufacturing facilities, pack houses, warehouses, refrigerated transport trucks, etc.
- Inclusiveness of smallholder producers/SMEs, youth, and women e.g., through cooperatives and SME clusters

The following counties were targeted for the priority commodities: Bungoma, Busia, Homabay, Siaya, Trans Nzoia, Uasin Gishu, Taita Taveta, Nakuru, Makueni, Machakos, Kajiado and Embu.

Subsector	Value Chain	County Selected
Fruits	Mango	Makueni Machakos Embu
	Passion Fruit	Uasin Gishu Bungoma Trans Nzoia
Vegetables	French Beans	Trans Nzoia Bungoma Taita Taveta Machakos Kajiado
	Snow Peas	Trans Nzoia Nakuru Taita Taveta
Herbs & Spices	Export Oriented herbs e.g., Basil, Coriander, Dill, Sage, Mint, etc.	Kajiado Nakuru
	Chilies- capsicum	Busia Kajiado
Nuts	Macadamia	Embu Bungoma
	Groundnuts	Busia Siaya Homabay

3. Project Objective and Expected Outcomes

Project Objective

The main objective of the project is to contribute to the economic development of Kenya by increasing the value of both extra- and intra-regional agricultural exports in horticulture sectors.

The following project components, outcomes and outputs have been developed, in addition to project management, to achieve the project objective:

Component 1: POLICY, TECHNICAL REGULATION AND STANDARDS FRAMEWORK IN PRIORITY SECTORS

Output 1: Strengthened national Quality Infrastructure's regulatory framework and capacities

This component aims to review and update policy and legal frameworks for quality and SPS controls (phyto-sanitary and food safety) at national level and to harmonize them at the regional and international levels.

The most relevant activities include: improvement of the legal and regulatory framework and services for SPS management and control; support to Agriculture and Food Authority (AFA) directorates and Kenya Bureau of Standards (KEBS) to better regulate the sectors and clarify attributions of Kenyan institutions and actors; support to the implementation of residue and contaminant monitoring and surveillance plans and systems; development and implementing of farm inspection guidelines in priority sectors; support in addressing issues of risk assessment and traceability in technical regulations and policies; and support in drafting and implementing horticulture standards.

The aim is also to support Competent Authorities in the horticulture industry to organise strategy meetings with policymakers to discuss policies pertaining to horticulture, and inform them of emerging issues in the sector to get their support. Other policies addressed include the horticulture crops acts, and nuts and oil acts. Further, strategy meetings with policymakers are to provide update on the current state of play in the sector regarding standards in the priority value chains.

Component 2: Market and Skills Market Access

Output 2: Sector smallholders, cooperatives and enterprises supported and integrated into export-oriented value chains

This component aims to improve compliance with market requirements in at least 10 counties in priority horticultural sectors. The most relevant activities include: establishment of cooperation agreement with Agricultural Training Centres; train the trainers in target counties in priority sectors to provide combined classroom and on-the-job training; job training to farmers and producers in target counties on good agricultural practices in priority sectors, protected cultivation, harvesting, post-harvesting practices and use of technology; supporting the establishment/upgrading of skills in common facility centres at county level for handling, packaging, and distribution of products, including incorporating renewal energy and energy sufficient technologies for storage and packing. Emphasis will be on self-regulation.

The aim is further to improve market access for champion producers in priority horticultural sectors. The most relevant activities include the selection of at least 10 pilot “champion” producers -one in each county- and coaching them to have improved market access at national, regional and international levels.

Component 3: Awareness and Information Dissemination

Output 3: Visibility and outreach on key quality and safety issues in horticultural sectors

The aim of this component is to increase visibility and outreach on key quality and safety issues in horticultural sectors. The most relevant activities include organisation of an awareness campaign for value chain stakeholders, including producers, exporters and local consumers on the benefits of internationally recognized market requirements; conducting awareness sessions with policy makers and journalists; producing publications and a documentary.

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

- a) 10% increase in regional, international trade volume (USD) for mangos, passion fruits, nuts, spices etc. of targeted farmers and enterprises in selected value chains;
- b) 10% increase in number of domestic companies certified against relevant food safety standards;
- c) 30% increase in average annual income of smallholders (Global Gap registered) vs randomized group;
- d) 30% change in behavior regarding food safety;
- e) 30% increase in total Quantities exported in regional and international markets in selected value chains;
- f) 50% reduction in No. of EU RASFF alerts for products of plant origin/year;
- g) 50% reduction of No. of Europhyte interceptions on quarantine pests;
- h) 1500 increase in number of GLOBAL GAP farmers registered and being part of certified companies’ supply chains (disaggregated by gender and age);
- i) 500 extension officers trained;
- j) 10% increase in producers/exporters having signed supply agreement with national, regional or international customers and implemented quality protocols.

4. Project implementation arrangements

UNIDO is the implementing agency of this project. The Project Management structure, tools and procedures are designed to guarantee a smooth implementation of all activities and a successful delivery of outputs, in full compliance with the EU Project Cycle Management (PCM) manual, the LogFrame approach and EU visibility guidelines. The day-to-day running of the project is handled by the MARKUP Project Team headed by the National Project Coordination while the Project Technical Committee monitors the implementation of the project. The Project Technical Committee reports progress of the implementation of the project to the Regional Project Steering Committee.



5. Main findings of the Mid-term Review (MTR)

The Mid-term evaluation was undertaken for both the Kenya Window and EAC Window. The evaluation indicated that progress in implementation of the project was slow, as implementation started in the last quarter of 2019 and was negatively affected by the ban on domestic traveling during the COVID-19 lockdown in 2020. Nine out of the twelve target counties had been visited by the MARKUP team by then. Activities that were directed towards enhancing capacities included: training of extension officers to be started once the identification of officers has been completed; training for trainers of selected farmers, which is ongoing; and, at a slow pace, training for auditors and inspectors.

The evaluation indicated that training directed to farmers of MARKUP products was not covered by GLOBAL G.A.P. – a Trademark and Set of Standards for Good Agricultural Practices (such as herbs, spices, chilies, French beans & peas) and laboratories. The Kenya Accreditation Service (KENAS) will conduct in-person training (capacity building exercises for 75 laboratory staff) on various aspects/tops linked to ISO17025, which were expected to support labs in enhancing their scope of accreditation.

The Kenya Bureau of Standards (KEBS) received Certified Reference Materials (CRMs) for laboratories that will be used in proficiency testing schemes regionally as well as locally in an endeavour to build and strengthen the capacity of the testing facilities. SMEs receiving

equipment for moisture measurement showed improvements in increased quality and processing standards.

The evaluation further revealed that support had been provided to the drafting subsector value chains strategies for fruit and vegetables, spices, culinary herbs, and nuts, including a market study; and to an impact regulatory assessment of Phyto-sanitary Regulations on harmful organisms/pests for selected commodities and preparatory work for the establishment by KEPHIS of pest-free areas. Furthermore, technical regulations on food safety and quality were under review for alignment with regional and international requirements.

The main challenges identified during the evaluation included the following:

- a) Political support to the institutional framework on food safety: UNIDO to work closely with the government to address related issues in order to capitalise on the available technical expertise (e.g., on inspections, controls, market access) and ensure the needed progress at the level of the regulatory frameworks.

Findings

- a) With regard to Relevance, the evaluation concluded that MARKUP has been and remains highly appropriate for the implementation of the broader Eastern Africa Regional Integration Strategy Paper (RISP 2018-2022);
- b) Concerning Effectiveness, overall, the programme has so far seen the advancement in targeted reforms and implemented activities.
- c) In terms of Efficiency, the answers to the specific evaluation questions pointed to weaknesses in the current synergy and coordination of the activities across the different components and country windows.

6. Budget information

Table 1. Financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown

Project outcomes/components	Donor (€)	Co-Financing (€)	Total (€)
Project Preparation			
Outcome 1	963,500		963,500
Outcome 2	1,155,000		1,155,000
Outcome 3	315,946		315,946
Outcome 4	1,004,806	46,729	1,051,535
Indirect Costs	240,748	3,271	244,019
Total (€)	3,680,000	50,000	3,730,000

Source: Project document

Table 2. Co-Financing source breakdown

Name of Co-financier (source)	In-kind	Cash	Total Amount (€)
TF Germany Grant	N/A	50,000	50,000
Total Co-financing (€)	N/A	50,000	50,000

Source : Project document

Table 3. UNIDO budget allocation and expenditure by budget line

Budget line	Items by budget line	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 & 5	Total expenditure (at completion)		Total allocation (at approval)	
						(EUR)	%	(EUR)	%
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	219,700	255,300	255,300	219,700	821,298.24	23.50	950,000	25.47
1500	Local Travel	10,700	16,300	16,300	10,700	151,321.15	4.33	54,000	1.45
1600	Staff Travel	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	11,587.68	0.33	64,000	1.72
1700	Nat. Consult./Staff	96,996	151,994	141,994	106,996	929,053.08	26.59	497,980	13.35
2100	Contractual Services	100,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	484,604.81	13.87	550,000	14.75
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	136,000	195,000	195,000	133,000	632,865.63	18.11	659,000	17.67
4500	Equipment	120,080	135,120	135,120	90,080	111,193.93	3.18	480,400	12.88
5100	Other Direct Costs	47,480	68,584	68,584	45,953	123,883.20	3.54	230,601	6.18
	Indirect Costs / Support Costs (7%)					228,606.54	6.54	244,019	6.54
	Total					3,494,414.26	93.68	3,730,000	100.00

Source: Project document and UNIDO Project Management ERP database as of 29/05/2023

Table 4. UNIDO budget allocation and expenditure by component

#	Project components	Total allocation (at approval)		Total expenditure (at completion)	
		Euro	%	Euro	%
1	Strengthened National Quality Infrastructure's Regulatory Framework and Capacities	1,161,239.73	31.13	1,135,659.10	32.50
2	Support Sector Smallholders, Cooperatives and Enterprises better integrate into Export-Oriented Value Chains	942,169.31	25.26	882,191.93	25.25
3	Visibility and Outreach on Key Quality and Safety Issues in Horticultural Sectors	445,238.68	11.94	384,804.55	11.01
4	Project Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation	937,333.62	25.13	863,152.14	24.70
5	Indirect Costs / Support Costs (7%)	244,018.69	6.54	228,606.54	6.54
6	Rounding Figure	(0.03)	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	3,730,000.00	100.00	3,494,414.26	93.68

Source: Project document and UNIDO Project Management ERP database as of 29/05/2023

II. SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation is to independently assess the project to help UNIDO improve performance and results of ongoing and future programmes and projects. The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in 02/2019 to the estimated completion date in 09/2023.

The evaluation has two specific objectives:

- (a) Assess the project performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence, and progress to impact; and
- (b) Develop a series of findings, lessons and recommendations for enhancing the design of new and implementation of ongoing projects by UNIDO.

The evaluation will be expected to determine the following as a result of the MARKUP interventions:

- i. Whether there has been an increase in capacity of producers/farmers, disaggregated by gender;
- ii. Whether the project has strengthened the capacity of regulatory institutions;
- iii. Whether the project has strengthened the capacity of County Extension Officers and Standard Experts;
- iv. Whether there has been an increase in the production of prioritized commodities in the targeted Counties;
- v. Whether there has been a change in consumer behavior in relation to food safety;
- vi. Whether there has been an increase in exports of the targeted commodities.

III. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The TE will be conducted in accordance with the Charter of the Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight, the Evaluation Policy, the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle, and UNIDO Evaluation Manual. The evaluation will be carried out as an independent in-depth exercise using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project will be informed and consulted throughout the process. The evaluation team leader will liaise with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit (EIO/IEU) on the conduct of the evaluation and methodological approaches.

The evaluation will use a theory of change approach and mixed methods to collect data and information from a range of sources and informants. The evaluation will pay attention to triangulating the data and information collected before assessment. This is essential to ensure an evidence-based and credible evaluation, with robust analytical underpinning. The evaluation team will review the project logframe, assess its validity and, if necessary, reconstruct a theory of change, to identify the causal and transformational pathways from the outputs to outcomes and longer-term impacts. In addition, the team will identify drivers as well as barriers to achieving the intended results/outcomes. The findings from this analysis will be useful for the design of

future projects so that the management team can effectively use the theory of change to manage project based on results.

1. Data collection methods

Below 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, midterm review report, technical 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 and focus group discussions. Key stakeholders to be interviewed include:
 - UNIDO Management and staff involved in the project; and
 - Representatives of donors, counterparts and other stakeholders.
- (c) Field work in the twelve Counties.
 - On-site observation of results achieved by the project, including interviews of actual and potential project beneficiaries.
 - Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Country Office(s) representative to the extent that he/she was involved in the project, and the project's management members and the various national [and sub-regional] authorities dealing with project activities as necessary.
- (d) Online data collection methods will be used to the extent possible.

2. Key evaluation questions and criteria

The key evaluation questions include the following:

- a) How well has the project performed in terms of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and progress to impact?
- b) What are the project's key results (outputs, outcomes)? To what extent have the expected results been achieved or are likely to be achieved?
- c) To what extent does the project generate or is expected to generate higher-level effects (impact)?
- d) To what extent will the achieved results and benefits be sustained after completion of the project (sustainability)?
- e) What are the key drivers and barriers to achieve the long-term objectives of the project? To what extent has the project helped put in place the conditions likely to address the drivers, overcome barriers and contribute to the long term, transformational objectives?

- f) What are the key risks (in terms of financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental risks) and how may these risks affect the continuation of results after the project ends?
- g) Has the project addressed cross-cutting criteria (gender equality, environmental and social safeguards, human rights, and disability)?
- h) What lessons can be drawn from the successful and unsuccessful practices in designing, implementing and managing the project?

The Evaluation Team will further revise the evaluation questions and develop an evaluation matrix in the inception report.

The table below provides the key evaluation criteria to be assessed by the evaluation. The detailed questions to assess each evaluation criterion are in annex 2 of UNIDO [Evaluation Manual](#).

Table 5. Project evaluation criteria

#	<u>Evaluation criteria</u>	<u>Mandatory rating</u>
A	Progress to Impact	Yes
B	Project design	Yes
1	• Overall design	Yes
2	• Project results framework/log frame	Yes
C	Project performance and progress towards results	Yes
1	• Relevance	Yes
2	• Coherence	Yes
3	• Effectiveness	Yes
4	• Efficiency	Yes
5	• Sustainability of benefits	Yes
D	Gender mainstreaming	Yes
E	Project implementation management	Yes
1	• Results-based management (RBM)	Yes
2	• Monitoring and Evaluation, Reporting	Yes
F	Performance of partners	
1	• UNIDO	Yes
2	• National counterparts	Yes
3	• Implementing partner (if applicable)	Yes
4	• Donor	Yes
G	Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS), Disability and Human Rights	Yes
1	• Environmental Safeguards	Yes
2	• Social Safeguards, Disability and Human Rights	Yes
H	Overall Assessment	Yes

3. Rating system

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

Table 6. 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 2023 to September 2023. The evaluation will be implemented in five phases, which are not strictly sequential, but in many cases iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping:

- a) Inception phase: The evaluation team will prepare the inception report providing details on the evaluation methodology and include an evaluation matrix with specific issues for the evaluation to address; the specific site visits will be determined during the inception phase, taking into consideration the findings and recommendations of the mid-term review;
- b) Desk review and data analysis;
- c) Interviews in the Counties, survey and literature review;
- d) Data analysis, report writing and debriefing to UNIDO staff at the Headquarters; and

- e) Final report issuance and distribution with management response sheet, and publication of the final evaluation report in UNIDO website.

V. TIME SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES

Table 7. Tentative timelines

Timelines	Tasks
August 2023	Inception meeting with MARK UP /UNIDO Team. Desk review and writing of inception report
Beginning of September 2023	Online briefing with UNIDO project manager and the project team based in Vienna.
18/09/2023 – 30/09/2023	Field visit to the twelve Counties by the M&E
01/10/2023- 20/10/2023	Online debriefing for HQ Preparation of first draft evaluation report
October 2023	Internal peer review of the report by UNIDO’s Independent Evaluation Unit and other stakeholder comments to draft evaluation report
Beginning of November 2023	Final evaluation report

VI. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluation consultant acting as the team leader and one national evaluation consultant. The evaluation team members will possess a mixed skill set and experience including evaluation, relevant technical expertise, social and environmental safeguards and gender. Both consultants will be contracted by UNIDO.

The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions annexed 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 Project Manager and the project management team in Kenya will support the evaluation team.

An evaluation manager from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit will provide technical 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 evaluation manager.

VII. REPORTING

a) Inception report

The evaluation team will be expected to review the project documents to enable the team understand the MARKUP Project. The documents to be reviewed include the following: Markup annual reports; KAP Baseline Survey Report; KAP Final Survey Report; and Value Chain Studies Report among other project documents. After reviewing the project documentation and initial

interviews with the project manager, the Team Leader will prepare a short inception report that will operationalize the ToR relating to the evaluation questions and provide information on what type 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 team members; field work plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted, and a debriefing and reporting.

b) Evaluation report format and review procedures

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit and circulated to UNIDO staff and key 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 will be sent to UNIDO Project Team for collation and onward transmission to the evaluation team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. Based on this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

The evaluation team 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. An online presentation of preliminary findings will be given to UNIDO HQ afterwards.

The evaluation report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, 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.

VIII. QUALITY ASSURANCE

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

The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used

as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit 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 Unit, which will circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.

ANNEX 1: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

	Result chain	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Sources / means of verification	Assumptions
Overall Objective: Impact	<p>Contribution to the economic development of Kenya by increasing the value of both extra and intra-regional agricultural exports in horticulture sectors (focus on green beans and peas in pods, mangoes, passion fruits, spices and herbs)</p>	<p>1. Increase of regional, international trade volume (USD) for mangos passion fruits, nuts, spices etc. of targeted farmers and enterprises in selected value chains</p> <p>2. Access to EU for Kenya fresh mangos</p> <p>3. Average annual income of smallholders (Global Gap registered) vs randomized group</p> <p>4. Change behaviour regarding food safety</p>	<p>Global Market share</p> <p>-Mango 0.7%</p> <p>-Beans/peas 4.6%</p> <p>-Chillies (fresh) 0.01%</p> <p>-Nuts 0.5%</p> <p>-Passion fruit- 0.1</p> <p>-Herbs (leafy/aromatic) -0.1%</p> <p>-Spices (dried red chillies) - 0.1%</p> <p>NO</p> <p>NA</p> <p>To be defined in baseline</p>	<p>10% increase</p> <p>YES</p> <p>30% Increase</p> <p>30%</p>	<p>Trade flow statistics UNCOMTRADE</p> <p>KEPHIS reports</p> <p>Baseline study on target counties and impact assessment following the intervention.</p> <p>Communication Strategy and Media reports</p> <p>Gender and youth assessment</p>	<p>Political stability</p> <p>Commitment and cooperation of project stakeholders</p> <p>The programme is sufficiently focused to create a critical mass of change.</p>
Purpose	<p>An improved institutional and regulatory framework for</p>			<p>Approved technical regulations for all</p>		

	Result chain	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Sources / means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>better conformity assessment</p> <p>Services in Kenya's horticultural sector.</p> <p>Smallholders and export-oriented enterprises have increased capacities to access regional and global markets for horticulture products.</p>	<p>4. Regulatory framework and standards upgraded and accepted by main Stakeholders</p> <p>5. Increase in total Quantities exported in regional and international market by % from baseline plus total quantities sold to national retailers of targeted farmers and enterprises in selected value chains.</p>	<p>Fragmented regulatory framework</p> <p>Exported quantities (2014-2018)</p> <p>+5% (Q) mango</p> <p>-9% (Q) beans/peas</p> <p>-25% (Q) chillies (fresh)</p> <p>+8% (Q) nuts</p> <p>-18% (Q) passion fruit</p> <p>+17% (Q) herbs (leafy/aromatic)</p> <p>+2% (\$) Spices (dried red chillies)</p> <p>Baseline for Quantities sold to national retailers to be developed</p>	<p>relevant value chains.</p> <p>30% Increase</p>	<p>KEBS, KEPHIS, AFA reports</p> <p>Trade flow statistics</p> <p>UNCOMTRADE</p> <p>Global GAP Database</p> <p>Baseline study on trade</p> <p>capacity in 10 target counties and impact assessment study</p>	<p>Effective cooperation with other donor funded initiatives</p> <p>Programme design and selection of participants from institutions, producers, and private sector associations ensure relevance and match of delivery with demand/needs.</p>
Results: Direct outputs	<p>OUTPUT 1. Strengthened national Quality Infrastructure's regulatory framework and capacities.</p> <p>1.1 Policy, Technical Regulations, and standards Framework in priority sectors</p>	<p>6. % reduction in No. of EU RASFF alerts for products of plant origin/year</p> <p>7.% reduction of No. of Europhyte interceptions on quarantine pests</p> <p>8. Availability of appropriate quality policy and SPS related policies</p>	<p>2 in 2018</p> <p>33 in 2018</p> <p>NO</p>	<p>50% reduction (no critical graded RASFF alerts)</p> <p>50% reduction (only document related)</p> <p>Approved and implemented policies (1 Quality Policy.</p>	<p>DG SANCO</p> <p>KEPHIS, AFA reports</p> <p>KEPHIS, AFA reports</p> <p>MARKUP Reports</p>	<p>There is a quality policy in place leading Quality Infrastructure services addressing specific market access needs along the value chains.</p> <p>Letter of intents are signed with KEBS, KEPHIS, AFA</p>

	Result chain	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Sources / means of verification	Assumptions
	1.2 Quality infrastructure services enhanced in relation to priority horticultural sectors	9. TBT and SPS related strategies to address current regional and international market access challenges 10. % increase in the scope of accreditation of public sector regulatory authority labs to address Maximum Residues Levels (MRL), aflatoxin & Heavy Metals as per market requirements	NO Upgrading of 2 Laboratories against ISO 17025 (KEBS and KEPHIS); and 3 inspectorates against ISO 17020 and 17065 (AFA, KEPHIS, KEBS)	1 Food Safety Policy 1 Phytosanitary Policy Approved and implemented strategies (3 subsector strategies: Fruits & Vegetables; Herbs & Spices; Nuts All pesticides, aflatoxins, HM linked to market requirements in priority value chains can be tested in Kenyan accredited labs	KEBS, AFA, HCD, KEPHIS reports KENAS KEBS, KEPHIS, AFA reports MARKUP Laboratory assessment	
Results: Direct outputs	Output 2- Support sector smallholders, cooperatives, and enterprises to better integrate into export-oriented value chains. 2.1. Improved skills for compliance with market requirements in 10 counties in priority horticultural sectors	11. % increase of number of establishments GLOBAL GAP compliant and potentially able to access EU and regional markets 12. Increased number of GLOBAL GAP farmers registered and being part of certified companies supply chains (disaggregated by gender and age)	300 28000 farmers	5% +1500 farmers	Global GAP database Global GAP database	Letter of intents are signed with FPEAK, FPC and Other relevant private sector operators.

	Result chain	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Sources / means of verification	Assumptions
	2.2 Improved market access for champion producers in priority horticultural sectors	<p>13. Number of extension officers trained</p> <p>14. % of trained farmers/ producers able to become Farmer Assurers under Global GAP scheme</p> <p>15. % increase of producer/exporters having signed supply agreement with national, regional, or international customers and implemented quality protocols.</p> <p>16. Number of SMEs/producers/farmers groups having developed concrete strategies to implement added value activities for products to access EU and regional markets</p>	<p>0</p> <p>NA</p> <p>180 producers/exporters Detailed Baseline will be established during project implementation.</p>	<p>500</p> <p>40%</p> <p>+10%</p>	<p>Gender and Youth Assessment</p> <p>AFA, MARKUP reports Global GAP database</p>	<p>Counties continue to support MARKUP project.</p>
Results: Direct outputs	Output 3: Visibility and outreach on key quality and safety issues in horticultural sectors	<p>17. Communication and visibility indicators</p> <p>Number of press articles, blogs</p> <p>Number of interviews (radio, TV)</p> <p>KPIs on social media</p>	NA	<p>Monthly</p> <p>Quarterly</p> <p>To be defined</p>	<p>Communication Strategy and Media reports</p>	<p>Good cooperation with Communication officials from project stakeholders</p>

	Result chain	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Sources / means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>3.1 Communication on quality and SPS matters</p> <p>3.2 Visibility of MARKUP Programme</p>	18. Increased awareness about food safety in particular among youth and women		Communication material produced and target population reached per county (disaggregated by women and youth)	Communication Strategy and Media reports	

ANNEX 2: JOB DESCRIPTIONS



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	Senior evaluation consultant, team leader
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Missions:	Travel to Kenya
Start of Contract (EOD):	1 August 2023
End of Contract (COB):	30 October 2023
Number of Working Days:	35 working days spread over the above mentioned period

1. ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit (EIO/IEU) is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides evidence-based analysis and assessment on result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Independent evaluations provide credible, reliable and useful assessment that enables the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. EIO/IEU is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

2. PROJECT CONTEXT

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

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

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
<p>1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data). Define technical issues and questions to be addressed by the national technical evaluator prior to the field visit. Determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument if needed. In coordination with the project manager, the project management team and the national technical evaluator, determine the suitable sites to be visited and stakeholders to be interviewed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjusted table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. Identify issues and questions to be addressed by the local technical expert 	4 days	Home-based
<p>2. 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, confirm the evaluation methodology, draft theory of change, and tentative agenda for fieldwork. Provide guidance to the national evaluator to prepare initial draft of output analysis and review technical inputs prepared by national evaluator, prior to field mission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft theory of change and Evaluation framework to submit to the Evaluation Manager for clearance. Guidance to the national evaluator to prepare output analysis and technical reports 	2 days	Home based
<p>3. Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ (included is preparation of presentation).</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 National Consultant. 	1 day	Via Skype/Zoom
<p>4. Conduct field mission to Kenya ²</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct meetings with relevant project 	12 days	12 counties

² The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
	stakeholders, beneficiaries, , etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; • Evaluation presentation of the evaluation’s preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country, , at the end of the mission. 		in Kenya (specific project site to be identified at inception phase)
5. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed. 	1 day	Via Skype/zoom
6. Prepare the evaluation report, with inputs from the National Consultant, according to the TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the National Consultant and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report. Share the evaluation report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft evaluation report. 	12 days	Home-based
7. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final evaluation report. 	3 days	Home-based

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education:

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

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 15-20 years' experience in evaluation of development projects and programmes
- Good working knowledge [in Kenya]
- Experience in the evaluation of projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks
- Familiarity with gender analysis tools and methodologies an asset
- Working experience in developing countries

Languages:

Fluency in written and spoken English is required. 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 Unit.

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

WE LIVE AND ACT WITH INTEGRITY: work honestly, openly and impartially.

WE SHOW PROFESSIONALISM: work hard and competently in a committed and responsible manner.

WE RESPECT DIVERSITY: work together effectively, respectfully and inclusively, regardless of our differences in culture and perspective.

Core competencies:

WE FOCUS ON PEOPLE: cooperate to fully reach our potential –and this is true for our colleagues as well as our clients. Emotional intelligence and receptiveness are vital parts of our UNIDO identity.

WE FOCUS ON RESULTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES: focus on planning, organizing and managing our work effectively and efficiently. We are responsible and accountable for achieving our results and meeting our performance standards. This accountability does not end with our colleagues and supervisors, but we also owe it to those we serve and who have trusted us to contribute to a better, safer and healthier world.

WE COMMUNICATE AND EARN TRUST: communicate effectively with one another and build an environment of trust where we can all excel in our work.

WE THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX AND INNOVATE: To stay relevant, we continuously improve, support innovation, share our knowledge and skills, and learn from one another.



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	National Evaluation Consultant
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	Travel to potential sites within Kenya
Start of Contract:	1 August 2023
End of Contract:	30 October 2023
Number of Working Days:	30 days spread over the above mentioned period

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit (EIO/IEU) is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides evidence-based analysis and assessment on result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Independent evaluations provide credible, reliable and useful assessment that enables the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. EIO/IEU 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 evaluation consultant 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
Desk review Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information; in cooperation with the team leader, determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key	Evaluation questions, questionnaires/interview guide, logic models adjusted to ensure understanding in the national context;	4 days	Home-based

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
<p>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>A stakeholder mapping, in coordination with the project team.</p>		
<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 the present extent of achievement of project outputs • Brief analysis of conditions relevant to the project 	6 days	Home-based
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed evaluation schedule. • List of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. 	2 days	Home-based
<p>Coordinate and conduct the field mission 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. 	12 days (including travel days)	Field
<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 Unit and stakeholders and proof read the final version.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation report prepared. 	6 days	Home-based

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree in Economics, Statistics, Agricultural Economics, or other relevant discipline like developmental studies with a specialization in industrial energy efficiency and/or climate change.

Technical and functional experience:

- Excellent knowledge and competency in the field of monitoring and evaluation.
- Evaluation experience, including evaluation of development cooperation in developing countries is an asset.
- Exposure to the development needs, conditions and challenges in their country and region.
- Familiarity with agricultural sector in Kenya
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.

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

Absence of conflict of interest:

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 Unit.

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

- WE LIVE AND ACT WITH INTEGRITY:** work honestly, openly and impartially.
- WE SHOW PROFESSIONALISM:** work hard and competently in a committed and responsible manner.
- WE RESPECT DIVERSITY:** work together effectively, respectfully and inclusively, regardless of our differences in culture and perspective.

Core competencies:

- WE FOCUS ON PEOPLE:** cooperate to fully reach our potential –and this is true for our colleagues as well as our clients. Emotional intelligence and receptiveness are vital parts of our UNIDO identity.
- WE FOCUS ON RESULTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES:** focus on planning, organizing and managing our work effectively and efficiently. We are responsible and accountable for achieving our results and meeting our performance standards. This accountability does not end with our colleagues and supervisors, but we also owe it to those we serve and who have trusted us to contribute to a better, safer and healthier world.
- WE COMMUNICATE AND EARN TRUST:** communicate effectively with one another and build an environment of trust where we can all excel in our work.
- WE THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX AND INNOVATE:** To stay relevant, we continuously improve, support innovation, share our knowledge and skills, and learn from one another.

ANNEX 3: OUTLINE OF AN IN-DEPTH PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

Abstract

Contents

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations and acronyms

Executive summary

1. Introduction
 - 1.1 Evaluation purpose
 - 1.2 Evaluation objectives and scope
 - 1.3 Theory of change
 - 1.4 Methodology
 - 1.5 Limitations
2. Project background and context
3. Findings
 - 3.1 Relevance
 - 3.2 Coherence
 - 3.3 Effectiveness
 - 3.4 Efficiency
 - 3.5 Sustainability
 - 3.6 Progress to impact
 - 3.7 Gender mainstreaming
 - 3.8 Environmental impacts
 - 3.9 Human rights
 - 3.10 Performance of partners
 - 3.11 Results-based Management
 - 3.12 Monitoring & Reporting
4. Conclusions and recommendations
 - 4.1 Conclusions
 - 4.2 Recommendations and Management Response
5. Lessons learned
6. Annexes
 - Annex 1: Evaluation terms of reference
 - Annex 2: Evaluation framework /matrix
 - Annex 3: List of documentation reviewed
 - Annex 4: List of stakeholders consulted
 - Annex 5: Project Theory of Change/Logframe
 - Annex 6: Primary data collection instruments
 - Annex 7: Survey/questionnaire
 - Annex 8: Statistical data from evaluation survey/questionnaire analysis

ANNEX 4: QUALITY CHECKLIST

Quality criteria		UNIDO EIO/IEU assessment notes	Rating
1	The inception report is wellstructured, logical, clear, and complete.		
2	The evaluation report is well-structured, logical, clear, concise, complete and timely.		
3	The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation.		
4	The evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope are fully explained.		
5	The report presents a transparent description of the evaluation methodology and clearly explains how the evaluation was designed and implemented.		
6	Findings are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis, and they respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions.		
7	Conclusions are based on findings and substantiated by evidence and provide insights pertinent to the object of the evaluation.		
8	Recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation, supported by evidence and conclusions, and developed with the involvement of relevant stakeholders.		
9	Lessons learned are relevant, linked to specific findings, and replicable in the organizational context.		
10	The report illustrates the extent to which the evaluation addressed issues pertaining to a) gender mainstreaming, b) human rights, and c) environmental impact.		
<p><u>Rating system for quality of evaluation reports</u></p> <p>A number rating 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.</p>			