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# PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

## Project factsheet[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project title** |  |
| **UNIDO ID** |  |
| **GEF Project ID** |  |
| **Country(ies)** |  |
| **Project funding partner(s)** |  |
| **Project approval date/GEF CEO endorsement date** |  |
| **Planned project start date (as indicated in project document/or GEF CEO endorsement document)** |  |
| **Actual project start date (First PAD issuance date)** |  |
| **Planned project completion date (as indicated in project document/or GEF CEO endorsement document)** |  |
| **Actual project completion date (as indicated in UNIDO ERP system)** |  |
| **Project duration (year):** **Planned:** **Actual:**  |  |
| **GEF Focal Areas and Operational Programme** |  |
| **Implementing agency(ies)** |  |
| **Government coordinating agency**  |  |
| **Executing Partners** |  |
| **Donor funding** |  |
| **UNIDO input (in kind, USD)** |  |
| **Co-financing at CEO Endorsement, as applicable** |  |
| **Total project cost (USD), excluding support costs**  |  |
| **Gender Marker** |  |
| **Mid-term review date** |  |
| **Planned terminal evaluation date** |  |

(Source: Project document, UNIDO ERP system)

## Project context

|  |
| --- |
| This section provides basic information on the project/programme/entity to be evaluated, its context, objectives, design, and current status of implementation. The information derives mainly from internal databases, the project/programme document and progress reports.Relevant project information derived from the project document - Project history: When and why was the project/programme initiated? Need: What are the problems and opportunities addressed/tapped by the project/programme? Nature and magnitude of the issues addressed by the project/programme. Environmental and social considerations: What are the environmental and social benefits (both global and local) resulting from the project? |

## Project objective and expected outcomes

|  |
| --- |
| This section provides information on the project expected objectives and breakdown of components (the latter might not be applicable to all projects, please adjust as necessary).  |

The main objective of the proposed project is [main/ultimate goal of the project (from the project document)]

The following **project components** have been developed, in addition to project management, to achieve the project objectives:

**Component 1:** [Name the component + short description]

**Component 2:** [Name the component + short description]

**Component 3:** [Name the component + short description]

The following are, in brief, some of the expected results (outcome(s) and output(s)) of the project/programme:

* [List the expected results]
* …
* …
* …
* …

## Project implementation arrangements

|  |
| --- |
| This section provides information on the project implementation arrangements: key project stakeholders, roles and responsibilities, and project management structure (a diagram).  |

## Main findings of the Mid-term review (MTR)

|  |
| --- |
| This section summarizes the MTR’s main findings and recommendations and how the recommendations have been addressed.  |

## Budget information

**Table 1: UNIDO budget allocation at approval and expenditure**

|  |
| --- |
| Add or delete rows for results and budget lines and columns for years as applicable for the project. Add rows for components if relevant.  |

| **Result no./Budget line** | **Result/Items by budget line** | **Allocation (at approval) in ([currency])** | **Total expenditure (at completion)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Total**  |  |
| **([currency])** | **%**  | **([currency])** | **%**  |
| **Outcome 1:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 1.1:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1100 | Staff & International Consultants |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1500 | Local travel |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1700 | Nat. Consult./Staff |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2100 | Contractual Services |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3000 | Train/Fellowship/Study |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4300 | Premises |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4500 | Equipment |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5100 | Other Direct Costs |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **Output 1.2:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1100 | Staff & International Consultants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1500 | Local travel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1700 | Nat. Consult./Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2100 | Contractual Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3000 | Train/Fellowship/Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4300 | Premises |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4500 | Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5100 | Other Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 2.1:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1100 | Staff & International Consultants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1500 | Local travel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1700 | Nat. Consult./Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2100 | Contractual Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3000 | Train/Fellowship/Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4300 | Premises |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4500 | Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5100 | Other Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 2.2:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1100 | Staff & International Consultants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1500 | Local travel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1700 | Nat. Consult./Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2100 | Contractual Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3000 | Train/Fellowship/Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4300 | Premises |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4500 | Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5100 | Other Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3** | Project Management, M&E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 3.1** | Project Management, Monitoring and Self-evaluation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1100 | Staff & International Consultants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1500 | Local travel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1700 | Nat. Consult./Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2100 | Contractual Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3000 | Train/Fellowship/Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4300 | Premises |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4500 | Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5100 | Other Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 3.2** | Independent terminal evaluation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1100 | Staff & International Consultants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1500 | Local travel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1700 | Nat. Consult./Staff |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5100 | Other Direct Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Programme Support Cost ([xx] %)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **GRAND TOTAL** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Project document and UNIDO Project Management ERP database as of [dd/mm/yyyy]

**Table 2. Co-financing plan summary - Outcome breakdown**

| **Project outcomes/components** | **Funding partner (GEF/other)** **([currency])** | **Co-Financing ([currency])** | **Total ([currency])** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Preparation |  |  |  |
| Outcome 1 |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2 |  |  |  |
| Outcome 3 |  |  |  |
| **Total ([currency])** |  |  |  |

Source: Project document

**Table 3. Co-financing source breakdown**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Co-financier *(source)*** | **In-kind** | **Cash** | **Total Amount****([currency])** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Co-financing ([currency])** |  |  |  |  |

Source: Project document

# 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 [mm/yyyy] to the estimated completion date in [mm/yyyy].

The evaluation has two specific objectives:

Assess the project performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence, and progress to impact; and

Develop a series of findings, lessons and recommendations for enhancing the design of new and implementation of ongoing projects by UNIDO.

# Evaluation approach and methodology

The TE will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy[[2]](#footnote-2), the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Project and Project Cycle[[3]](#footnote-3), and UNIDO [Evaluation Manual](https://downloads.unido.org/ot/31/37/31371641/Evaluation%20Manual.pdf). In addition, the GEF Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies will be applied.

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 issues.

The evaluation will use a theory of change approach[[4]](#footnote-4) and mixed methods to collect data and information from a range of sources and informants. It will pay attention to triangulating the data and information collected before forming its assessment. This is essential to ensure an evidence-based and credible evaluation, with robust analytical underpinning.

The theory of change will depict the causal and transformational pathways from project outputs to outcomes and longer-term impacts. It also identifies the drivers and barriers to achieving results. Learning 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 the project based on results.

## Data collection methods

Following are the main instruments for data collection:

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

The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports, mid-term review report, 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.

**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 funding partners, counterparts, and other stakeholders.

**Field visit** to project sites in [XXX].

* On-site observation of results achieved by the project, including interviews of actual and potential project beneficiaries.
* Interviews with the relevant UN Resident Coordinator and UNIDO Country offices’ 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.

**Online data collection** methods will be used to the extent possible.

## Key evaluation questions and criteria

The key evaluation questions (corresponding to the six OECD/DAC criteria) are the following:

1. Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right things? To what extent do the project/programme’s objectives respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change?
2. Coherence: How well does the intervention fit? How compatible is the project/programme with other interventions in the country, sector or institution?
3. Effectiveness: Is the project/programme achieving its objectives?
4. Efficiency: How well are resources being used? Has the project/programme delivered results in an economic and timely manner?
5. Impact: What difference does the intervention make? To what extent has the project/programme generated significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects? Has the project/programme had transformative effects? To what extent did the project contribute to SDG(s), intended or unintended?
6. Sustainability: Will the benefits last? To what extent will the net benefits of the project/programme continue, or are likely to continue?

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](https://downloads.unido.org/ot/31/37/31371641/Evaluation%20Manual.pdf).

Table 5. Project evaluation criteria

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Evaluation criteria** | **Mandatory rating** |
| **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 | * Funding partner
 | Yes |
| **G** | **Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)**[[5]](#footnote-5)**, Disability and Human Rights** | Yes |
| **1** | * Environmental Safeguards
 | Yes |
| **2** | * Social Safeguards, Disability and Human Rights
 | Yes |
| **H** | **Overall Assessment** | Yes |

**Performance of partners**

|  |
| --- |
| Required by the GEF for GEF-funded projects, for non GEF projects this topic should be covered as applicable: |

The assessment of performance of partners will ***include*** the quality of implementation and execution of the GEF Agencies and project executing entities 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 implementing 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.

The terminal evaluation will assess the following topics, for which ***ratings are not required***:

|  |
| --- |
| Other assessments required by the GEF for GEF-funded projects, for non GEF projects these topics should be covered as applicable: |

1. **Need for follow-up**: e.g. in instances of financial mismanagement, unintended negative impacts or risks.
2. **Materialization of co-financing**: e.g. the extent to which the expected co-financing materialized, whether co-financing was administered by the project management or by some other organization; whether and how shortfall or excess in co-financing affected project results. At the terminal evaluation point, the Project Manager will update table 3 on co-financing and add two more columns to submit to the evaluation team: 1) Amount of co-financing materialized at mid-term review (MTR); and 2) Amount of co-financing materialized at terminal evaluation (TE).  The evaluation team has the responsibility to validate and verify the co-financing type and amount materialized. This table MUST BE included in the terminal evaluation report, as per requirement by the GEF.[[6]](#footnote-6)
3. **Updated Monitoring and Assessment tool of core-indicators:** The project management team will submit to the evaluation team the up-to-date core-indicators or tracking tool (for older projects) whereby all the information on the project results and benefits promised at approval and actually achieved at completion point must be presented. The evaluation team has the responsibility to validate and verify updated core-indicators during the evaluation process. This table MUST BE included in the terminal evaluation report, as per requirement by the GEF.
4. **Knowledge Management Approach:** Information on the project’s completed Knowledge Management Approach that was approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval.

## Rating system

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

Table 6. Project rating criteria

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

# Evaluation process

The evaluation will be conducted from [mm/yyyy] to [mm/yyyy]. The evaluation will be implemented in five phases, which are not strictly sequential, but in many cases iterative, conducted in parallel and partly overlapping:

1. 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.
2. Desk review and data analysis;
3. Interviews, survey and literature review;
4. Country visits (whenever possible) and debriefing to key relevant stakeholders in the field;
5. Data analysis, report writing and debriefing to UNIDO staff at the Headquarters; and
6. Final report issuance and distribution with management response sheet, and publication of the final evaluation report in UNIDO website.

# Time schedule and deliverables

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from [mm/yyyy] to [mm/yyyy]. The evaluation field mission is tentatively planned for [mm/yyyy]. At the end of the field mission, the evaluation team will present the preliminary findings for key relevant stakeholders involved in this project in the country. The tentative timelines are provided in the table below.

After the evaluation field mission, the evaluation team leader will arrange a virtual debriefing and presentation of the preliminary findings of the terminal evaluation with UNIDO Headquarters. 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 Project Manager (PM), UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit, the UNIDO GEF Coordinator and GEF OFP and other stakeholders for comments. The Evaluation team leader is expected to revise the draft TE report based on the comments received, edit the language and submit the final version of the TE report in accordance with UNIDO EIO/IEU standards.

Table 7. Tentative timelines

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Timelines** | **Tasks** |
|  | Desk review and writing of inception report |
|  | Online briefing with UNIDO project manager and the project team based in Vienna. |
|  | Field visit to [XXX]. |
|  | Debriefing in ViennaPreparation of first draft evaluation report  |
|  | Internal peer review of the report by UNIDO’s Independent Evaluation Unit and other stakeholder comments to draft evaluation report |
|  | Final evaluation report |

# Evaluation team composition

|  |
| --- |
| For more information on the evaluation team composition, see UNIDO [Evaluation Manual](https://downloads.unido.org/ot/31/37/31371641/Evaluation%20Manual.pdf). |

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. The evaluation team is required to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including terminal evaluation verification on request to the GEF partnership up to three years after completion of the terminal evaluation.

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

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 resource persons and provide support to the evaluation team and the evaluation manager.

# Reporting

**Inception report**

These Terms of Reference (TOR) provide 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 team member, 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”); Unit of work between the evaluation team members; field mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted; and a debriefing and reporting timetable[[7]](#footnote-7).

**Evaluation report format and review procedures**

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit (with a suggested report outline) 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’s Independent Evaluation Unit for collation and onward transmission to the evaluation team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

The 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. A presentation of preliminary findings will take place at 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. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit.

# 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 submit the final report to the GEF Evaluation Office and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.

## Annex 1: Project Logical Framework

|  |
| --- |
| Please insert the logical framework from the project document, or the latest version thereof, should it have been updated in the meanwhile, and indicate the source. |

## Annex 2: Job descriptions



**UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title: | [Insert **Senior** for P5- and D1-level, **Principal** for D2-level] **evaluation consultant, team leader** |
| Main Duty Station and Location: | Home-based  |
| Missions: | Missions to [country name] |
| Start of Contract (EOD): | [mm/yyyy] |
| End of Contract (COB): | [mm/yyyy] |
| Contract Type | WAE |
| Number of Working Days: | [28-35] working days spread over the above mentioned period |

1. **ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT**

The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) is the specialized agency of the United Nations that promotes industrial development for poverty reduction, inclusive globalization and environmental sustainability. The mission of UNIDO, as described in the Lima Declaration adopted at the fifteenth session of the UNIDO General Conference in 2013 as well as the Abu Dhabi Declaration adopted at the eighteenth session of UNIDO General Conference in 2019, is to promote and accelerate inclusive and sustainable industrial development (ISID) in Member States. The relevance of ISID as an integrated approach to all three pillars of sustainable development is recognized by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the related Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which will frame United Nations and country efforts towards sustainable development. UNIDO’s mandate is fully recognized in SDG-9, which calls to “Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation”. The relevance of ISID, however, applies in greater or lesser extent to all SDGs. Accordingly, the Organization’s programmatic focus is structured in four strategic priorities: Creating shared prosperity; Advancing economic competitiveness; Safeguarding the environment; and Strengthening knowledge and institutions.

Each of these programmatic fields of activity contains a number of individual programmes, which are implemented in a holistic manner to achieve effective outcomes and impacts through UNIDO’s four enabling functions: (i) technical cooperation; (ii) analytical and research functions and policy advisory services; (iii) normative functions and standards and quality-related activities; and (iv) convening and partnerships for knowledge transfer, networking and industrial cooperation. Such core functions are carried out in Departments/Offices in its Headquarters, Regional Offices and Hubs and Country Offices.

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.

1. **PROJECT CONTEXT**

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

The senior 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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Desk review & data analysis:**Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national/regional 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. | * Key evaluation questions and an evaluation matrix
* Data collection plan incl. draft list of stakeholders to be interviewed and sites to be visited
* Workplan and responsibilities for each team member
 | 5 days | Home-based |
| **Inception phase:**Based on consultations with the project management team and funding partner representatives, identify the key evaluation questions and prioritize evaluation criteria to be assessed in depth. Prepare an inception report summarizing these expectations and identify the methods to be used and data to be collected, confirm the evaluation methodology, draft a theory of change, and provide a tentative workplan. Provide guidance to the national technical evaluator to prepare initial draft of output analysis and review technical inputs prepared by national evaluator, prior to field mission. | * Draft inception report, incl. theory of change and evaluation framework for clearance by IEU
 | 5 days  | Home based |
| **Interviews, surveys and literature review, incl. field mission to country:**Conduct interviews online and in person, where feasible.Conduct survey, if deemed useful.Conduct additional literature review, if necessary. | * Report outline

  | 10 days | Home based, online, country visit(s) |
| **Data analysis & report writing**:Coordinate the inputs from the national technical evaluator and draft the evaluation report. Share the evaluation report with UNIDO project management team, funding partner representatives and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.Present overall findings, conclusions and recommendations to the stakeholders, including the GEF OFP, in a debriefing meeting. | * Draft evaluation report
* Debriefing meeting
 | [10-14] days | Home-based, online |
| **Report finalization and submission**:Revise the draft project evaluation report based on verifiable verbal and written comments from key evaluation stakeholders. Conduct final edit of language and formatting according to UNIDO standards and templates, and submit report to the IEU evaluation manager.  | * Final evaluation report
 | 3 days | Home-based |
| **Team leading**Coordinate and supervise the work of the evaluation team | * Team performance
 | Throughout | n/a |

**MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**Education:**

Advanced university degree (master’s or equivalent) in economics, environment, energy, engineering, sciences, agro-industries, development studies or other relevant discipline with specialization in [insert specialization, if required], is **required**.

**Technical and functional experience**:

* Minimum of [insert ten (10) for P5-level, twelve (12) for D1-level, fifteen (15) for D2-level] years’ experience in evaluation of development projects and programmes at international level, including [insert five (5) for P5- and D1-level, six (6) for D2-level] years at senior level is required.
* Experience in leading and conducting high-level, strategic or complex evaluations for UN organizations and international development banks/organizations.
* Good working knowledge in [country name]
* Knowledge about GEF operational programs and strategies and about relevant GEF policies such as those on project life cycle, M&E, incremental costs, and fiduciary standards.
* Experience in the evaluation of GEF projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset.
* Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks.
* Familiarity with gender analysis tools and methodologies an asset.
* Familiarity with social and environmental analysis, tools and methodologies is an asset.
* Experience in the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries is desirable.

**Languages**:

Fluency in written and spoken English and XY (depending on the country/region) 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 [country name] |
| Start of Contract: | [mm/yyyy] |
| End of Contract: | [mm/yyyy] |
| Contract type | WAE |
| Number of Working Days: | [28-35] days spread over the above mentioned period |

**ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT**

The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) is the specialized agency of the United Nations that promotes industrial development for poverty reduction, inclusive globalization and environmental sustainability. The mission of UNIDO, as described in the Lima Declaration adopted at the fifteenth session of the UNIDO General Conference in 2013 as well as the Abu Dhabi Declaration adopted at the eighteenth session of UNIDO General Conference in 2019, is to promote and accelerate inclusive and sustainable industrial development (ISID) in Member States. The relevance of ISID as an integrated approach to all three pillars of sustainable development is recognized by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the related Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which will frame United Nations and country efforts towards sustainable development. UNIDO’s mandate is fully recognized in SDG-9, which calls to “Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation”. The relevance of ISID, however, applies in greater or lesser extent to all SDGs. Accordingly, the Organization’s programmatic focus is structured in four strategic priorities: Creating shared prosperity; Advancing economic competitiveness; Safeguarding the environment; and Strengthening knowledge and institutions.

Each of these programmatic fields of activity contains a number of individual programmes, which are implemented in a holistic manner to achieve effective outcomes and impacts through UNIDO’s four enabling functions: (i) technical cooperation; (ii) analytical and research functions and policy advisory services; (iii) normative functions and standards and quality-related activities; and (iv) convening and partnerships for knowledge transfer, networking and industrial cooperation. Such core functions are carried out in Departments/Offices in its Headquarters, Regional Offices and Hubs and Country Offices.

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:

| **MAIN DUTIES** | **Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved** | **Expected duration** | **Location** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Desk review & data analysis**:Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national/regional policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data).Define technical issues and questions to be addressed from a national point of view and advise the team leader.Determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument, if needed. In coordination with the evaluation team leader, the project manager and her/his assistant, discuss and share responsibilities for online and in-person meetings and agree on a meeting schedule, and list of stakeholders to be interviewed and sites to be visited.  | * Draft list of stakeholders to be interviewed and sites to be visited
* Workplan and responsibilities for each team member
* List of key issues and questions for consideration by the team leader
 | 4 days | Home-based |
| **Inception phase**:Based on consultations with the project management team and funding partner representatives, provide inputs to team leader on key evaluation questions. Based on guidance from team leader prepare initial draft of output analysis.  | * Output analysis and technical inputs
 | 2 days  | Home based |
| **Interviews, surveys and literature review**:Conduct interviews online and in person, where feasible.Provide support, where needed, with the interview schedule. Support team leader where translation is required. | * Individual interview summaries
* Technical inputs and observations emanating from interviews
 | [10-14] days | Home-based, local travel |
| **Data analysis & report writing**:Follow up with stakeholders regarding additional information promised during interviews.Together with the team leader, present overall findings, conclusions and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ in a debriefing meeting. | * Inputs to draft evaluation report
* Debriefing meeting
 | 5 days | Home-based |

**MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**Education:** Advanced university degree (master’s or equivalent) in economics, engineering, sciences, agro-industries, environment, business administration, development studies or other relevant discipline with specialization in [insert specialization, if required], is **required**.

**Technical and functional experience**:

* At least [insert number of years: five (5) for P3-level, seven (7) for P5-level] years of professional experience in [insert specialization and/or evaluation of development projects at international level].
* Excellent knowledge and competency in the field of [insert specialization].
* Exposure to the development needs, conditions and challenges in their country and region.
* Familiarity with gender analysis tools and methodologies and asset.
* Familiarity with social and environmental analysis, tools and methodologies is an asset.
* Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.

**Languages**: Fluency in written and spoken English and in [local language] 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 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
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## Annex 4: Quality checklist

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality criteria** | **UNIDO EIO/IEU assessment notes** | **Rating** |
| **1** | The inception report is well-structured, 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.  |  |  |
| Rating system for quality of evaluation reportsAn ordinal scale is used for each criterion: Highly satisfactory = HS (6), Satisfactory = S (5), Moderately satisfactory = MS (4), Moderately unsatisfactory = US (3), Unsatisfactory = U (2), Highly unsatisfactory = HU (1), and unable to assess = 0. |

1. Data to be validated by the Consultant [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. UNIDO. (2021). Director General’s Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (UNIDO/DGB/2021/11). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For more information on Theory of Change, please see UNIDO [Evaluation Manual](https://downloads.unido.org/ot/31/37/31371641/Evaluation%20Manual.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Appropriate environmental and social safeguards were addressed in the project’s design and implementation, e.g. preventive or mitigation measures for any foreseeable adverse effects and/or harm to environment or to any stakeholder. Refer to [AI/2021/03 - UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures](https://intranet.unido.org/intranet/images/7/7f/AI_2021_03_UNIDO_ENVIRONMENTAL_AND_SOCIAL_SAFEGUARDS.pdf); <https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/gef_environmental_social_safeguards_policy.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. <https://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/documents/evaluations/program-evaluations-2023.pdf>, para. 44. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by UNIDO Independent Evaluation Unit. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)