



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

OCCASION

This publication has been made available to the public on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation.



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

DISCLAIMER

This document has been produced without formal United Nations editing. The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries, or its economic system or degree of development. Designations such as “developed”, “industrialized” and “developing” are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily express a judgment about the stage reached by a particular country or area in the development process. Mention of firm names or commercial products does not constitute an endorsement by UNIDO.

FAIR USE POLICY

Any part of this publication may be quoted and referenced for educational and research purposes without additional permission from UNIDO. However, those who make use of quoting and referencing this publication are requested to follow the Fair Use Policy of giving due credit to UNIDO.

CONTACT

Please contact publications@unido.org for further information concerning UNIDO publications.

For more information about UNIDO, please visit us at www.unido.org



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent terminal evaluation of UNIDO project:

**Improve the Health and Environment of Artisanal and Gold mining
Communities in the Philippines by Reducing Mercury Emissions**

**UNIDO SAP ID: 120016
GEF Project number: 5216**

24 JULY 2015

CONTENTS

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW	3
II.	SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	9
III.	EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	9
IV.	EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION	10
V.	TIME SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES	11
VI.	PROJECT EVALUATION PARAMETERS	11
VII.	REPORTING	17
VIII.	QUALITY ASSURANCE	18
	Annex 1 - Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report	19
	Annex 2 - Overall ratings table	21
	Annex 3 - GEF Minimum requirements for M&E	23
	Annex 4 - Checklist on evaluation report quality	24
	Annex 5 – Required project identification and financial data	25
	Annex 6 – Job descriptions	26
	Annex 7 – Project results framework	33

I. Project background and overview

1. Project factsheet

Project Title	Improve the Health and Environment of Artisanal and Gold mining Communities in the Philippines by Reducing Mercury Emissions
GEF ID	5216
UNIDO project No. (SAP ID)	120016
Region	Asia and the Pacific
Country	Philippines
GEF Focal area(s) and operational programme	POPs
GEF Agencies (implementing agency)	UNIDO
Project executing partners	Republic of Philippines Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Department of Health (DOH) and Ban Toxics (BT)
Project size (FSP, MSP, EA)	MSP
Project CEO endorsement/Approval date	18 December 2012
Project implementation start date (PAD issuance date)	19 March 2013
Original expected implementation end date (indicated in CEO endorsement/Approval document)	31 December 2014
Revised expected implementation end date (if any)	31 December 2015 (extension requested in FY2015 PIR)
Actual implementation end date	End of 2015
GEF Grant (USD)	550,000
GEF PPG (USD) (if any)	
UNIDO inputs (USD)	50,000 (cash)
Co-financing (USD) at CEO Endorsement	1,081,070 (cash+in-kind)
Total project cost (USD) (GEF Grant + Co-financing at CEO Endorsement)	1,631,070
Mid-term review date	N/A
Planned terminal evaluation date	October - December 2015

(Source: Project document)

2. Project summary

The Philippine islands are located in Southeastern Asia, east of Vietnam. Philippines has a population of around 107.6 million, with 90% of the population being below 55 years of age (almost 53% of the population being below 25 years of age). Population growth rate is 1.81% (2014). Literacy rate of total population is 95.4%. Over one quarter of the population (26.9%) lives below the poverty line. Unemployment is at 7.2%; youth unemployment is at 16.3%.

Philippines has a GDP of USD 289.7 billion (official exchange rate, 2014) and a GDP real growth rate of 6.2% (2014). Services constitute the highest contribution to GDP with 57.8%, followed by industry at 31.5% and finally agriculture with 10.7%. However, agriculture sector engages around one third of the labour force (32%); the smallest share of the labour force being engaged in industry (15%) and the highest (53%) in services.

Agricultural products are plenty, such as sugarcane, coconuts, rice, corn, bananas, cassava (manioc, tapioca), pineapples, mangoes, pork, eggs, beef and fish. Industries are in the following sectors: electronics assembly, garments, footwear, pharmaceuticals, chemicals, wood products, food processing, petroleum refining and fishing. Growth rate of industrial production is estimated to be at 7.5% (2014).

Current environmental issues are uncontrolled deforestation especially in watershed areas, soil erosion, air and water pollution in major urban centers, coral reef degradation, increasing pollution of coastal mangrove swamps that are important fish breeding grounds. Philippines is party to various environmental international agreements, such as Biodiversity, Climate Change, Climate Change-Kyoto Protocol, Desertification, Endangered Species, Hazardous Wastes, Law of the Sea, Marine Dumping, Ozone Layer Protection, Ship Pollution, Tropical Timber 83, Tropical Timber 94, Wetlands, Whaling. Philippines signed the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in May 2001 and ratified it in February 2004.

Artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM) is particularly common in Southeast Asia, especially in the Philippines, where it has been traditional livelihood. ASGM is one of the most significant sources of mercury release into the environment in the developing world, and accounts for about 15% of the world's annual gold production. Mercury is often used in ASGM to help separate gold from sediments using rudimentary processing methods. Workers combine mercury with gold-laden silt to form an amalgam, which is heated, often in or near homes, to evaporate the mercury and leave gold. Mercury is released into the air, where it is directly inhaled by workers and their families. It is particularly threatening to children, pregnant women, and women of childbearing age. The emissions from ASGM can also travel long distances around the globe, contributing to global mercury pollution and contaminating the world's fisheries.

In the Philippines, ASGM occurs in more than 40 provinces, and provides important subsistence-level income for about 300,000 miners and their families. For the past five years, ASGM activities have been producing at least 80% of the Philippines yearly gold supply. With that comes the annual release of an estimated 70 to 140 metric tonnes of mercury, which is approximately 3.6-7.2% of the current estimated total anthropogenic mercury emissions worldwide at 1921 metric tonnes (Mercury Watch Database).

The project aims to introduce mercury-free technology in 2 small-scale mining areas and supplements this effort by providing health training of rural healthcare workers in the proper diagnosis of mercury poisoning.

The project is funded through a GEF grant, amounting to USD 550,000, a UNIDO contribution of USD 50,000 (cash); and the counterparts' co-financing of USD 1,031,070 (cash and in kind), which amount to total project budget of USD 1,081,070.

Project implementation started in March 2013 and the initial project end date was in December 2014. However, a no cost extension has been requested to the end of 2015.

Regular Monitoring is foreseen in the project document. The TE is scheduled to take place from October to December 2015.

3. Project objective

The project aims to introduce mercury-free technology in 2 small-scale mining areas and supplements this effort by providing health training of rural healthcare workers in the proper diagnosis of mercury poisoning. Specifically, it will assist the government to develop, implement and facilitate the demonstration and replication of mercury reduction/elimination projects, enable local and national stakeholders to receive health, techniques and technology trainings, and promote policy reforms based on the lessons learned to reduce mercury use, emission, and exposure in ASGM activities.

Following are the **2 components** of the project:

Component 1: Strengthen national capacity to effectively manage mercury by establishing a formal national institution and training of key stakeholders.

Component 2: Develop and deliver health education, techniques and technology training programs, including early recognition and identification of mercury poisoning at the community level, to reduce mercury in ASGM

Following **results** are expected:

- a) A national ASGM institution will be established to facilitate the process of mercury reduction/elimination. This will build on the momentum of the Philippine SAICM project, the Danish government/Dialogos/Ban Toxics non-mercury technique project, and the Ban Toxics/US Department of State mercury storage project.
- b) Health education, technique and technology programs and mercury poisoning surveillance program that can be later replicated nationwide will be developed and capacity increased through delivery of training programs.
- c) National and local stakeholders in the Philippines will be sensitized and able to replicate technical successes at other ASGM sites aiming to reduce overall mercury use, emissions and exposure in country; and important lessons learned will contribute and promote sound national management policies on mercury in the future.

4. Relevant project reports/documents

The project has so far improved understanding of the risks of mercury, mercury free technologies, challenges and concrete strategies for necessary reforms within the ASGM communities. Local governments of pilot demonstration sites fully recognize and gauge efforts to undertake holistic interventions for ASGM communities. The project has also increased consciousness of working with women in the ASGM community. The bio- and environmental monitoring that have been conducted through the project served as the basis for decision making and planned actions among ASGM communities and local government agencies. The ASGM communities themselves have also been empowered to establish multi-sectoral coordination bodies and actively participate in monitoring of mercury use, information dissemination and public awareness campaigns. The techniques and technology training programs provided to miners (including miner to miner trainings) are intended to increase the skills and knowledge of ASGM community on mercury free gravity concentration method through the provision of accessible mercury free training centers in the neighborhood. With improvement in knowledge, skills and expertise, the project will have a long term impact on the ASGM communities in country.

In the effort to strengthen coordination systems and provide holistic interventions in the pilot areas, the project has networked and built linkages with local government partners and civil society groups resulting into Ban Toxic's (BT) membership in the Municipal Solid Waste Management Board of Jose Panganiban (JP) and as well as with the Gender and Development Committee of JP. BT has also formally forged partnership with local government councils in

Labo, Camarines Norte and Pasil, Kalinga despite delays and unforeseen challenges. The project can now leverage on these gains while ensuring sustainability of efforts. Given the recognition to participate in local special bodies in ASGM areas, BT and partners are in a good position to negotiate and lobby for added support and provide advisory role in the local government's development direction for the mining area – ensuring that policies and projects fully align to the needs and aspirations of women and children in the community. In building a solid foundation for the establishment of a sub-national ASGM, the project has raised awareness, mobilized and increased efforts in working with local ASGM groups such as the women's council in Diwalwal; the children and youth in Camarines Norte through the formation of young toxics watch group. In Camarines Norte, the project also produced short films that provide a glimpse of how children in the area views daily living in an ASGM setting. Thus far, activities on the ground provided opportunities for local stakeholders to participate, be informed and advocate for lasting change and development in their local mining areas. In developing and delivering health education programs to the community, the project facilitated series of peer to peer learning sessions among trained Health Care Workers (HCWs) and miner trainers.

This skill building exercises improved confidence and direction to our local ASGM partners in raising consciousness, strengthening community solidarity and skills to adapt mercury free (Hg-free) methods in gold recovery. In building capacity and establishing alternative economically viable opportunities for miners, Peer Educators organized 22 community orientations among ballmill owners and miners (Male:434; Female:513) in Diwalwal. Moreover, under the guidance of a Mining Engineer Consultant from Canada, 10 Peer Educators in Diwalwal were trained on effectively using gravity concentration method with particular emphasis on proper grinding, concentrating and sluicing. The learning visit enabled miners in Diwalwal to learn and appreciate the benefits of optimizing simple but cost efficient techniques in grinding, concentrating and panning. In terms of capacitating ASGM miners to fully adapt Hg-free method, the project is now modeling a micro-financing scheme with 4 technical miners who are willing to adapt but do not have the funds to bring in added equipment or refurbish ballmill facility for a Hg-free operation. To date, around 4 one-on-one coaching sessions have been organized in the Hg-free facilities of the technical miners in the neighborhood of Diwalwal. This strategy complements well with the centralized Hg-free facility established in collaboration with Mt. Diwata local government. This pilot initiative provides Diwalwal miners with much more accessible learning center and peer to peer learning exchange. The project hopes to gain added insight from this pilot activity which will be replicated in other ASGM areas where miners have difficulty adapting and accepting different and new ways of doing. Lastly, in terms of broadening the project's reach and maximizing media publicity, there were many media hits in broadsheets and online news, as well as in the UN & UNIDO newsletters and commercial TV-5 radio program. In social media, ASGM related publicity were shared and discussed in social media (BAN Toxics' Facebook and Twitter).

5. Project implementation arrangements

UNIDO: the GEF implementing agency.

Ban Toxics: the main executing partner. It is an Asian sub-regional NGO based in the Philippines that has been working on environmental justice and toxic chemical pollution since 2006. Ban Toxics has been actively engaged in mercury issue at the local, subregional, and international levels since 2006.

Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR): is the GEF Operational Focal Point. It is to be involved in the national technical working group and inception workshop portion of the project, especially in the political aspects of implementing Philippines' National Strategic Plan to phase out mercury in the ASGM sector and in scaling up low- and non-mercury techniques and technologies training in priority and appropriate regions.

Philippine Department of Health (DOH): is to work closely with partner agencies in implementation of all health related activities for the project, especially on the planning,

formulation, delivery, and follow-up actions of the health education to national and local health specialists including referral and management of identified mercury poisoning cases.

Dialogos: a Danish medical NGO, is to provide technical expertise and guidance regarding the development of formal health education and awareness training programs.

A **Stakeholder Group** is to be convened at each of the selected pilot sites.

6. Budget information

The project is funded through a GEF grant, amounting to USD 550,000, a UNIDO contribution of USD 50,000 (cash); and the counterparts' co-financing of USD 1,031,070 (cash and in kind), which amount to total project budget of USD 1,081,070.

Project outcomes	GEF (\$)	Co-Financing (\$)	Total (\$)
1. Strengthen national capacity	90,000	243,070	333,070
2. Reduce mercury use, emissions and exposure	400,000	730,000	1,130,000
3. Monitoring and Evaluation	10,000	10,000	20,000
Total (\$)	500,000	983,070	1,483,070

Source: project document

Co-financing Source Breakdown is as follows:

Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Total Amount (\$)
National Government	Government	In-kind	150,000
UNIDO	IA	Cash	50,000
Ban Toxics (US Department of State Grant)	Others	Cash	356,070
		In-kind	25,000
Dialogos	Others	Cash	500,000
Total Co-Financing (\$)			1,081,070

Source: project document.

UNIDO budget execution:

Item	EXECUTED BUDGET in 2013	EXECUTED BUDGET in 2014	EXECUTED BUDGET in 2015	Total Expenditure (\$) (2011-present)
				(27 April 2015)
Contractual Services	489,970.64	-37.37	-80.00	489,853.27
Internat. Cons/Staff	9,056.00	8,851.16		17,907.16
Internat. meetings	2,274.95			2,274.95
Local Travel	2,091.17	816.30		2,907.47
Nat. Consult./Staff				0.00
Other Direct Costs	1,274.32	-34.97		1,239.35
Staff Travel	89.54			89.54
Total (\$)	504,756.62	9,595.12	-80.00	514,271.74

Source: SAP database, 27 April 2015.

II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in March 2013 to the estimated completion date in the end of 2015. It will assess project performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

The TE has the additional purpose of drawing lessons and developing recommendations for UNIDO and the GEF that may help for improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities in the country and on a global scale upon project completion. The TE report should include examples of good practices for other projects in the focal area, country, or region.

The evaluation team (ET) should provide an analysis of the attainment of the main objective and the corresponding technical components. Through its assessments, the ET should enable the Government, counterparts, the GEF, UNIDO and other stakeholders and donors to verify prospects for development impact and sustainability, providing an analysis of the attainment of global environmental objectives, project objectives, delivery and completion of project outputs/activities, and outcomes/impacts based on indicators. The assessment includes re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and other elements of project design according to the project evaluation parameters defined in chapter VI.

The key question of the TE is whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective of introducing mercury-free technology in 2 small-scale mining areas (as stated in the project document).

III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The TE will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects, the GEF's 2008 Guidelines for Implementing and Executing Agencies to Conduct Terminal Evaluations, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy from 2010 and the Recommended Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies.

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

The ET will be required to use different methods to ensure that data gathering and analysis deliver evidence-based qualitative and quantitative information, based on diverse sources, as necessary: desk studies and literature review, statistical analysis, individual interviews, focus group meetings, surveys and direct observation. This approach will not only enable the evaluation to assess causality through quantitative means but also to provide reasons for why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The concrete mixed methodological approach will be described in the inception report.

The ET will develop interview guidelines or survey questionnaires as required. Field interviews can take place either in the form of focus-group discussions or one-to-one consultations.

The methodology will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNIDO and GEF annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) reports), mid-term evaluation/review report, output reports (case studies, action plans, sub-regional strategies, etc.), BTOMR, end-of-contract report and relevant correspondence.

- (b) Notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project (e.g. approval and steering committees).
 - (c) Other project-related material produced by the project.
2. The evaluation team will use available models of (or reconstruct if necessary) theory of change for the different types of intervention (enabling, capacity, investment, demonstration). The validity of the theory of change will be examined through specific questions in interviews and possibly through a survey of stakeholders.
 3. Counterfactual information: In those cases where baseline information for relevant indicators is not available, the evaluation team will aim at establishing a proxy-baseline through recall and secondary information.
 4. Interviews with project management and technical support including staff and management at UNIDO HQ and in the field and – if necessary - staff associated with the project's financial administration and procurement.
 5. Interviews with project partners including Government counterparts, GEF focal points and partners that have been selected for co-financing as shown in the corresponding sections of the project documents.
 6. On-site observation of results achieved in demonstration projects, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies.
 7. Personal and telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project. The evaluation team shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of any donor agencies or other organisations.
 8. Interviews with the UNIDO Field Office in Philippines, and the project's management members and the various national and sub-regional authorities dealing with project activities as necessary. If deemed necessary, the evaluation team shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.
 9. Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluation team and/or UNIDO ODG/EVA.
 10. The inception report will provide details on the methodology used by the evaluation team and include an evaluation matrix.

IV. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluation consultant acting as a team leader and one national evaluation consultant.

The ET should be able to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including evaluation verification on request to the GEF partnership up to two years after completion of the evaluation.

Both consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions attached to these terms of reference.

Members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the programme/projects.

The Project Manager at UNIDO and the Project Team in Philippines will support the evaluation team. The UNIDO GEF Coordinator will be briefed on the evaluation and equally provide support to its conduct.

V. Time schedule and deliverables

The evaluation is scheduled to take place in the period from October to December 2015. The field mission is planned to take one week by early-November 2015. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project in Philippines.

After the field mission, the evaluation team leader will come to UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of the preliminary findings of the Terminal Evaluation. The draft TE report will be submitted 4-6 weeks after the end of the mission.

VI. Project evaluation parameters

The evaluation team will rate the projects. The ***ratings for the parameters described in the following sub-chapters A to J will be presented in the form of a table*** with each of the categories rated separately and with **brief justifications for the rating** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given.

A. Project design

The evaluation will examine the extent to which:

- the project's design is adequate to address the problems at hand;
- a participatory project identification process was instrumental in selecting problem areas and national counterparts;
- the project has a clear thematically focused development objective, the attainment of which can be determined by a set of verifiable indicators;
- the project was formulated based on the logical framework (project results framework) approach;
- the project was formulated with the participation of national counterpart and/or target beneficiaries;
- relevant country representatives (from government, industries and civil society) have been appropriately involved and were participating in the identification of critical problem areas and the development of technical cooperation strategies; and
- all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects have incorporated relevant environmental and social considerations into the project design / all GEF-6 projects are following the provisions specified in UNIDO/DGAI.23: UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP).

B. Project relevance

The evaluation will examine the extent to which the project is relevant to the:

- National development and environmental priorities and strategies of the Government and population of Philippines regional and international agreements. See possible evaluation questions under "Country ownership/drivenness" below.
- Target groups: relevance of the project's objectives, outcomes and outputs to the different target groups of the interventions (e.g. companies, civil society, beneficiaries of capacity building and training, etc.).
- GEF's focal areas/operational programme strategies: In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies of GEF? Ascertain the likely nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the wider portfolio of GEF's Focal area and Operational Program of POPs.
- UNIDO's thematic priorities: Were they in line with UNIDO's mandate, objectives and outcomes defined in the Programme & Budget and core competencies?

- Does the project remain relevant taking into account the changing environment? Is there a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country and operational context?

C. Effectiveness: objectives and planned final results at the end of the project

- The evaluation will assess to what extent results at various levels, including outcomes, have been achieved. In detail, the following issues will be assessed: To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and long-term objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved? Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?
- Are the project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? If the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs, the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and, if there were, determine whether these are commensurate with realistic expectations from the project.
- How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of outputs? Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached?
- What outputs and outcomes has the project achieved so far (both qualitative and quantitative results)? Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?
- Identify actual and/or potential longer-term impacts or at least indicate the steps taken to assess these (see also below “monitoring of long term changes”). Wherever possible, evaluators should indicate how findings on impacts will be reported in future.
- Describe any catalytic or replication effects: the evaluation will describe any catalytic or replication effect both within and outside the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the project’s catalytic role.

D. Efficiency

The extent to which:

- Was the project cost-effective? Was the project the least cost options?
- Has the project produced results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected time frame? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the costs incurred and the time taken to achieve outcomes with that for similar projects. Are the project’s activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and annual work plans? Are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with budgets?
- Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet requirements? Was the quality of UNIDO inputs and services as planned and timely?
- Was there coordination with other UNIDO and other donors’ projects, and did possible synergy effects happen?

E. Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes

Sustainability is understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends. Assessment of sustainability of outcomes will be given special attention but also technical, financial and organization sustainability will be reviewed. This assessment should explain how the risks to project outcomes will affect continuation of benefits after the GEF project ends. It will include both exogenous and endogenous risks. The following four dimensions or aspects of risks to sustainability will be addressed:

- **Financial risks.** Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF assistance ends? (Such resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors or income-generating activities; these

can also include trends that indicate the likelihood that, in future, there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project outcomes.) Was the project successful in identifying and leveraging co-financing?

- **Sociopolitical risks.** Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?
- **Institutional framework and governance risks.** Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?
- **Environmental risks.** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? Are there any environmental factors, positive or negative, that can influence the future flow of project benefits? Are there any project outputs or higher level results that are likely to affect the environment, which, in turn, might affect sustainability of project benefits? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

F. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems

- **M&E design.** Did the project have an M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for the application of the Project M&E plan (see Annex 3).
- **M&E plan implementation.** The evaluation should verify that an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete and accurate, with well-justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve performance and to adapt to changing needs; and the project had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure. Where monitoring and self-evaluation carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and impacts? Are there any annual work plans? Was any steering or advisory mechanism put in place? Did reporting and performance reviews take place regularly?
- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, the evaluators will determine whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted for at the project planning stage and whether M&E was adequately funded and in a timely manner during implementation.

G. Monitoring of long-term changes

The M&E of long-term changes is often incorporated in GEF-supported projects as a separate component and may include determination of environmental baselines; specification of indicators; and provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis, and use. This section of the evaluation report will describe project actions and accomplishments toward establishing a long-term monitoring system. The review will address the following questions:

- a. Did this project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?
- b. What were the accomplishments and shortcomings in establishment of this system?
- c. Is the system sustainable—that is, is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and does it have financing? How likely is it that this system continues operating upon project completion?
- d. Is the information generated by this system being used as originally intended?

H. Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results

Among other factors, when relevant, the evaluation will consider a number of issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. The assessment of these issues can be integrated into the analyses of project design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and management as the evaluators deem appropriate (it is not necessary, thus, to have a separate chapter on these aspects in the evaluation report). The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected project implementation and achievement of project results:

- a. **Preparation and readiness / Quality at entry.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable, and feasible within its time frame? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
- b. **Country ownership/drivenness.** Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country—or of participating countries, in the case of multi-country projects? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in the project? Was the GEF OFP involved in the project design and implementation? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government—or governments in the case of multi-country projects—approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives?
- c. **Stakeholder involvement and consultation.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through continuous information sharing and consultation? Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes properly involved in a participatory and consultative manner? Which stakeholders were involved in the project (i.e. NGOs, private sector, other UN Agencies, etc.) and what were their immediate tasks? Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, nongovernmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved?
- d. **Financial planning.** Did the project have appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds? Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Did promised co-financing materialize? Specifically, the evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing.
- e. **UNIDO's supervision and backstopping.** Did UNIDO staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Did UNIDO staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time, and restructure the project when needed? Did UNIDO provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the project?
- f. **Co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability.** Did the project manage to mobilize the co-financing amount expected at the time of CEO Endorsement? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and the co-financing actually

mobilized, what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

- g. **Delays and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, what were the reasons? Did the delays affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?
- h. **Implementation and execution approach.** Is the implementation and execution approach chosen different from other implementation approaches applied by UNIDO and other agencies? Does the approach comply with the principles of the Paris Declaration? Is the implementation and execution approach in line with the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards: Separation of Implementation and Execution Functions in GEF Partner Agencies (GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01) and the relevant UNIDO Regulations (DGAI.20 and Procurement Manual)? Does the approach promote local ownership and capacity building? Does the approach involve significant risks? If the execution was done by third parties, i.e. Executing Partners, based on a contractual arrangement with UNIDO, was this done in accordance with the contractual arrangement concluded with UNIDO in an effective and efficient manner?
- i. **Environmental and Social Safeguards.** If a GEF-4 or GEF-5 project, has the project incorporated relevant environmental and social risk considerations into the project design? What impact did these risks have on the achievement of project results? If a GEF-6 project, have the provisions specified in UNIDO/DGAI.23: UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP) tracking the relevant environmental and social (E&S) risks and applying appropriate E&S safeguards, established at the time of project design been followed? Have the identified E&S risks been appropriately mitigated?
- j. **Knowledge Management.** If a GEF-6 project, has the project incorporated a relevant knowledge management strategy, including plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share the knowledge, experiences and expertise generated by this project with the relevant stakeholders, UNIDO HQ, the GEF Sec and the broader GEF Network (i.e. GEF Agencies and other stakeholders)?

The evaluation team will rate the project performance as required by the GEF. The ratings will be given to four criteria: Project Results, Sustainability, Monitoring and Evaluation, and UNIDO related issues as specified in Annex 2. The ratings will be presented in a table with each of the categories rated separately and with brief justifications for the rating based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The rating system to be applied is specified in the same annex. As per the GEF's requirements, the report should also provide information on project identification, time frame, actual expenditures, and co-financing in the format in Annex 5, which is modeled after the GEF's project identification form (PIF).

I. Project coordination and management

The extent to which:

- The national management and overall coordination mechanisms have been efficient and effective? Did each partner have assigned roles and responsibilities from the beginning? Did each partner fulfil its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions...)?
- The UNIDO HQ-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits...)?
- The national management and overall coordination mechanisms were efficient and effective? Did each partner have specific roles and responsibilities from the beginning till the end? Did each partner fulfill its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions...)?

J. Assessment of gender mainstreaming

The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected gender mainstreaming in the project:

- How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?
- Have women and men benefited equally from the project's interventions? Do the results affect women and men differently? If so, why and how? How are the results likely to affect gender relations (e.g., division of labour, decision-making authority)?
- To what extent socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels included consideration of gender dimensions?

K. Procurement issues

The evaluation will consider the following evaluation questions that will feed in the Thematic Evaluation on Procurement:

- To what extent does the process provide adequate treatment to different types of procurement (e.g. by value, by category, by exception...)?
- Was the procurement timely? How long does the procurement process take (e.g. by value, by category, by exception...)?
- Did the good/item(s) arrive as planned or scheduled? If not, how long were the delays? If delay, what was the reason(s)?
- Were the procured good(s) acquired at a reasonable price?
- To what extent were the procured goods of the expected/needed quality and quantity?
- Were the transportation costs reasonable and within budget? If no, please elaborate.
- Was shipping/delivery timely and within budget?
- Who was responsible for the customs clearance? UNIDO? UNDP? Government? Other?
- Was the customs clearance handled professionally and in a timely manner? How many days did it take?
- How long time did it take to get approval from the government on import duty exemption?
- Which were the main bottlenecks / issues in the procurement process?
- Which good practices can be identified?
- To what extent roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders in the different procurement stages are established, adequate and clear?

- To what extent there is adequate segregation of duties across the procurement process and between the different roles and stakeholders?

VII. Reporting

Inception report

This Terms of Reference (ToR) provides some information on the evaluation methodology but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager, the International Evaluation Consultant will prepare, in collaboration with the national consultant, a short inception report that will operationalize the ToR relating to the evaluation questions and provide information on what type of and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). It will be discussed with and approved by the responsible UNIDO Evaluation Officer. The Inception Report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework (“evaluation matrix”); division of work between the International Evaluation Consultant and National Consultant; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable¹.

Evaluation report format and review procedures

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

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation–ODG/EVA (the suggested report outline is in Annex 1) and circulated to UNIDO staff, the GEF OFP and national stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or responses, or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to UNIDO OGD/EVA for collation and onward transmission to the project evaluation team who will be advised of any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report .

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

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in Annex 1.

Evaluation work plan

The “Evaluation Work Plan” includes the following main products:

1. Desk review, briefing by project manager and development of methodology: Following the receipt of all relevant documents, and consultation with the Project Manager about the documentation, including reaching an agreement on the Methodology, the desk review could be completed.

¹ The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation.

2. Inception report: At the time of departure to the field mission, the complete gamete of received materials have been reviewed and consolidated into the Inception report.
3. Field mission: The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNIDO. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field missions, coordinate with the Government. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of preliminary findings to the key stakeholders in the country where the project was implemented.
4. Preliminary findings from the field mission: Following the field mission, the main findings, conclusions and recommendations would be prepared and presented in the field and at UNIDO Headquarters.
5. A draft terminal evaluation report will be forwarded electronically to the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and circulated to main stakeholders.
6. Final terminal evaluation report will incorporate comments received.

Evaluation phases	Deliverables
Desk review	Development of methodology approach and evaluation tools
Briefing with UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation, Project Managers and other key stakeholder at HQ	Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during field mission
Data analysis	Inception Evaluation Report
Conduct of Field mission. Present preliminary findings and recommendations to key stakeholders in the field	Presentation of main findings to key stakeholders in the field.
Present preliminary findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ	Presentation slides
Analysis of the data collected	Draft Terminal Evaluation Report
Circulation of the draft report to UNIDO/relevant stakeholders and revision	Final Terminal Evaluation Report

VIII. Quality assurance

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on methodology and process of UNIDO's Office for Independent Evaluation, providing inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report and evaluation report by the Office for Independent Evaluation). The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality, attached as Annex 4. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO's Office for Independent Evaluation 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 Office for Independent Evaluation, which will submit the final report to the GEF Evaluation Office and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.

Annex 1 - Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report

Executive summary

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

I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process

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

II. Countries and project background

- Brief countries context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project² and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
 - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
 - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
 - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
 - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
 - Counterpart organization(s)

III. Project assessment

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

- A. Design
- B. Relevance (Report on the relevance of project towards countries and beneficiaries)
- C. Effectiveness (The extent to which the development intervention's objectives and deliverables were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance)
- D. Efficiency (Report on the overall cost-benefit of the project and partner Countries contribution to the achievement of project objectives)
- E. Sustainability of Project Outcomes (Report on the risks and vulnerability of the project, considering the likely effects of sociopolitical and institutional changes in partner countries, and its impact on continuation of benefits after the GEF project ends, specifically the financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks)
- F. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems (Report on M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and Budgeting and funding for M&E activities)
- G. Monitoring of long-term changes
- H. Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results (Report – either integrated into the analysis of previously mentioned assessment areas or in separate chapters as deemed appropriate by the ET – on preparation and readiness / quality at entry, country ownership, stakeholder involvement, financial

² Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g. relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives, etc.)

- planning, UNIDO support, co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability, delays of project outcomes and sustainability, and implementation approach)
- I. Project coordination and management (Report project management conditions and achievements, and partner countries commitment)
 - J. Gender mainstreaming
 - K. Procurement issues

At the end of this chapter, an overall project achievement rating should be developed as required in Annex 2. The overall rating table required by the GEF should be presented here.

IV. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

A. Conclusions

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

B. Recommendations

This section should be succinct and contain few key recommendations. They should:

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

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:

- UNIDO
- Government and/or Counterpart Organizations
- Donor

C. Lessons learned

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

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

Annex 2 - Overall ratings table

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating), sub criteria (below)		
Design		
Effectiveness		
Relevance		
Efficiency		
Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
Financial risks		
Sociopolitical risks		
Institutional framework and governance risks		
Environmental risks		
Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
M&E Design		
M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
Project management		
UNIDO specific ratings		
Quality at entry / Preparation and readiness		
Implementation approach		
UNIDO Supervision and backstopping		
Overall rating		

RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Please note: Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits beyond project completion. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes.

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

- Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project M&E system will be rated on 'M&E Design', 'M&E Plan Implementation' and 'Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities' as follows:

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

"M&E plan implementation" will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on "M&E plan implementation."

All other ratings will be on the GEF six point scale:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory	Excellent
S	= Satisfactory	Well above average
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory	Average
MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory	Below Average
U	= Unsatisfactory	Poor
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory	Very poor (Appalling)

Annex 3 - GEF Minimum requirements for M&E³

Minimum Requirement 1: Project Design of M&E

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

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

Minimum requirement 2: Application of Project M&E

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

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

³ http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf

Annex 4 - Checklist on evaluation report quality

Independent terminal evaluation of UNIDO-GEF project:

PROJECT TITLE:

PROJECT NUMBER:

CHECKLIST ON EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY

Report Quality Criteria	UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation Assessment notes	Rating
A. The terminal evaluation report presented an assessment of all relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable.		
B. The terminal evaluation report was consistent, the evidence presented was complete and convincing, and the ratings were well substantiated.		
C. The terminal evaluation report presented a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes.		
D. The lessons and recommendations listed in the terminal evaluation report are supported by the evidence presented and are relevant to the GEF portfolio and future projects.		
E. The terminal evaluation report included the actual project costs (totals, per activity, and per source) and actual co-financing used.		
F. The terminal evaluation report included an assessment of the quality of the M&E plan at entry, the operation of the M&E system used during implementation, and the extent M&E was sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation.		

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

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

Annex 5 – Required project identification and financial data

The evaluation report should provide information on project identification, time frame, actual expenditures, and co-financing in the following format, which is modeled after the project identification form (PIF).

I. Dates

Milestone	Expected Date	Actual Date
Project CEO endorsement/approval date		
Project implementation start date (PAD issuance date)		
Original expected implementation end date (indicated in CEO endorsement/approval document)		
Revised expected implementation end date (if any)		
Terminal evaluation completion		
Planned tracking tool date		

II. Project Framework

Project component	Activity type	GEF Financing (in USD)		Co-financing (in USD)	
		Approved	Actual	Promised	Actual
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6. Project management					
Total					

Activity types are:

- Experts, researches hired
- technical assistance, Workshop, Meetings or experts consultation scientific and technical analysis, experts researches hired
- Promised co-financing refers to the amount indicated on endorsement/approval.

III. Co-financing

Source of co-financing	Type	Project preparation		Project implementation		Total	
		Expected	Actual	Expected	Actual	Expected	Actual
Host gov't contribution							
GEF Agency(-ies)							
Bilateral aid agency(ies)							
Multilateral agency(ies)							
Private sector							
NGO							
Other							
Total cofinancing							

Expected amounts are those submitted by the GEF Agencies in the original project appraisal document. Co-financing types are grant, soft loan, hard loan, guarantee, in kind, or cash.

Annex 6 – Job descriptions



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	International evaluation consultant
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home based
Missions:	Missions to Vienna, Austria and Philippines
Start of Contract (EOD):	October 2015
End of Contract (COB):	December 2015
Number of Working Days:	25 to 30 working days spread over 3 months

1. ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

2. PROJECT CONTEXT

Artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM) is particularly common in Southeast Asia, especially in the Philippines, where it has been traditional livelihood. In the Philippines, ASGM occurs in more than 40 provinces, and provides important subsistence-level income for about 300,000 miners and their families. For the past five years, ASGM activities have been producing at least 80% of the Philippines yearly gold supply. With that comes the annual release of an estimated 70 to 140 metric tonnes of mercury, which is approximately 3.6-7.2% of the current estimated total anthropogenic mercury emissions worldwide at 1921 metric tonnes (Mercury Watch Database).

The project aims to introduce mercury-free technology in 2 small-scale mining areas and supplements this effort by providing health training of rural healthcare workers in the proper diagnosis of mercury poisoning.

Detailed background information of the project can be found the Terms of Reference (TORs) for the terminal evaluation.

3. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days ⁴	Location
1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument of 3A accordingly (if needed); Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project's activities and analyze other background info.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjust table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions; Brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework. 	5 days	HB
2. Briefing with the UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ. Preparation of the Inception Report	<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. Inception Report 	2 days	Vienna, Austria
3. Conduct field mission to Philippines in November 2015 ⁵ .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; Presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the missions. 	7 days	Philippines
4. 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 days	Vienna, Austria
5. Prepare the evaluation report according to TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the National Consultant and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft evaluation report. 	7 days	HB

⁴ Minimum number of working days, total number of working days will range from 25 to 30.

⁵The 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 ⁴	Location
report.			
6. Revise the draft project evaluation reports based on comments from UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation 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	HB
	TOTAL	25 days	

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education:

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

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum 10 years' experience in environmental projects
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks.
- Knowledge of and experience in environmental projects management and/or evaluation (of development projects)
- Working experience in developing countries
- Experience in evaluation of GEF energy projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset

Languages:

Fluency in written and spoken English is required.

Reporting and deliverables

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

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

Absence of conflict of interest:

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



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 Philippines
Start of Contract (EOD):	October 2015
End of Contract (COB):	December 2015
Number of Working Days:	30 working days spread over 3 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

PROJECT CONTEXT

The National Evaluation Consultant will evaluate the projects according to the Terms of Reference 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
Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); in cooperation with the Team Leader: determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in both English and local language (questionnaires, logic models) to collect these data through interviews and/or surveys during and prior to the field missions; Coordinate and lead interviews/surveys in local language and assist the Team Leader with translation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of detailed evaluation questions to be clarified; questionnaires/interview guide; logic models; list of key data to collect, draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions Drafting and presentation of brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework in the context of the project. 	8 days	Home-based

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
where necessary; Analyze and assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework in Philippines, specifically in the context of the project's objectives and targets; provide analysis and advice to the Team Leader on existing and appropriate policies for Philippines for input to the TE.			
Review all project outputs/publications/feedback; Briefing with the evaluation team leader, UNIDO project managers and other key stakeholders. 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 the Project Management Unit. Assist and provide detailed analysis and inputs to the Team Leader in the Preparation of the Inception Report.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. • Division of evaluation tasks with the Team Leader. • Inception Report. 	7 days	Home-based (telephone interviews)
Coordinate and conduct the field mission with the Team Leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required; Consult with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks.	<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. 	7 days (including travel days)	Philippines
Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the Team Leader.	Draft evaluation report prepared.	6 days	Home-based
Revise the draft project evaluation reports based on comments from UNIDO Office for Independent Evaluation and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	Final evaluation report prepared.	2 days	Home-based
TOTAL		30 days	

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:

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

Managerial competencies (as applicable):

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

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

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

Technical and functional experience:

- A minimum of five years practical experience in the field of environment and energy, including evaluation experience at the international level involving technical cooperation in developing countries.
- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project in the Ministry of Industry and Trade is desirable.

Languages: Fluency in written and spoken English 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 Office for Independent Evaluation.

Annex 7 – Project results framework

HIERARCHY OF OBJECTIVES	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS
<p>PROJECT DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE: Improve the health and environment of artisanal gold mining communities in the Philippines by reducing mercury emissions</p>	<p>Mercury exposure to miner and their communities is reduced by 50% at pilot sites</p>	<p>Monitoring reports (prepared by Executing Agency) on mercury use at pilot sites (resulting from Output 2.2)</p>	
OUTCOMES	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS
<p>1. National capacity is fostered to effectively manage mercury, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A formal national institution for the mining community in the Philippines is functional - Participating stakeholders able to manage mercury effectively (through awareness, technical skills, expertise, lessons and recommendations from the pilot sites) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ASGM institution is established, with staff, budget, status and premises in place - Increased awareness of the participating stakeholders (before/after the project) - % of key stakeholders agreeing with the statement that they have obtained new knowledge, skills and evidence in mercury management as a result of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Project progress and monitoring reports -Surveys of key stakeholders indicating changes in behavior/knowledge acquired through the project trainings 	<p>Political will and commitment of the stakeholders to address mercury use in ASGM will continue; funding and personnel to sustain the institution is made available; local and national stakeholders willing to take on roles and responsibilities</p>

2. Mercury use, emissions and exposure reduced at ASGM pilot sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mercury use reduced - Proper management of mercury at mining sites observed by executing agency and experts - % of trained miners apply the methods and technologies provided by the project - Mercury poisoning cases decreased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Project progress and monitoring reports -Surveys of miners indicating changes in behavior/knowledge acquired through trainings -Observations by project staff or experts who often visit the pilot sites 	Local and national stakeholders stay engaged and attend trainings; techniques/technologies introduced yield measurable reduction in mercury use
OUTPUTS	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS
1.1 A national institution for mining community (ASGM) is established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An assessment study to identify the ideal setting for the ASGM institution - Its structure, roles, functions, staffing, budget, and sustainability are agreed by national stakeholders 	Project progress report	Funding and personnel to sustain the institution is made available; local and national stakeholders willing to take on roles and responsibilities
1.2 Key stakeholders from Department of Environment and Nature Resources, Department of Health and ASGM institution are sensitized and trained to manage mercury effectively through active participation in the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No. of key stakeholders participate in project workshops and activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Project progress report -Observation from project staff -meeting minutes 	Political commitment from the national government and support from stakeholders
2.1 Training programs are developed and delivered at two	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No. of training programme - Availability of training 	-Training attendance records	Local mining communities stay

<p>pilot demonstration sites for government agencies, local NGOs, communities and other relevant stakeholders on: health risks of mercury and early recognition and identification of mercury poisoning</p>	<p>materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No. of miners trained (by gender) - No. of health and NGOs workers trained (by gender) - No. of community members trained (by gender and age) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Project progress and monitoring reports - Health monitoring reports 	<p>interested and engaged</p>
<p>2.2 Techniques and technology training programs for miners to reduce mercury in ASGM are developed and delivered at two pilot demonstration sites (e.g. low and/or non-mercury methods and how to make equipment using low-cost and locally available materials)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Number of miners trained (by gender) - No. of training workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Training attendance records -Project progress and monitoring reports including documentation of mercury use 	<p>Local communities willing to learn new techniques/technologies that reduce mercury use</p>