OCCASION

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

DISCLAIMER

FAIR USE POLICY

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
Vienna International Centre, P.O. Box 300, 1400 Vienna, Austria
Tel: (+43-1) 26026-0 · www.unido.org · unido@unido.org

Independent terminal evaluation

UNIDO's Green Industry Initiative
Phase II
UNIDO project number
XP/GLO/12/008 – SAP ID 120107

UNITED NATIONS
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

Distr. GENERAL

ODG/EVA/15/R.33

May 2016

Original: English

This evaluation was managed
by the responsible UNIDO
project manager with
quality control by the
Independent Evaluation Division

Independent terminal evaluation

UNIDO's
Green Industry Initiative, Phase II
XP/GLO/12/008 – SPA ID 120107

With a focus on
Output 1: Establishment, maintenance and promotion of the Green Industry Platform

Evaluation report

May 2016

Frans Verspeek

Table of Contents

Executive summary

The Green Industry Platform (GIP) is a global platform that brings government, business and civil society leaders together in search of new and better ways to improve the environmental performance of industry. It is a practical framework for visibility, dialogue, and the exchange of best practice and having completed its pilot phase in 2015, has been proposed for evaluation.

UNIDO's leading approach at the moment - Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) – is based on two main pillars: the first is about creating shared prosperity for all, and the second focuses on safeguarding the environment. Its flagship horizontal initiative, the Green Industry Initiative (GII), helps to safeguard the environment and was regarded as the most appropriate place to host the GIP. The GIP in fact emerged from the GII as a main output for its second phase (GII-II).

There are two other outputs of GII-II, one focusing on demonstration projects to showcase best practices, and the other on research and awareness-raising. Both of these, as well as the outputs of any other project at UNIDO promoting industrial resource efficiency, feed into the GIP where their results can be disseminated widely.

At the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) in June 2012 the UNIDO-UNEP Green Industry Platform (GIP) was launched. This gave a strong impetus for GII-II, set to run 2012-2015. The GIP was established for a pilot period to cover the same four-year period. Whereas GII is a UNIDO action, GIP is a partnership between UNIDO and UNEP (with its own governance structure of an Executive Board and two advisory bodies: the Advisory Board and the Technical Expert Committee).

In its second phase, GII sought to position 'green industry' as a core pillar of 'green economy'. It set out to enable key stakeholders at national and regional levels to show consistent and concrete commitment to, as well as a heightened awareness and application of, core green industry policies and practices. Because of the relationship between GII-II and the GIP, the platform cannot be studied without also reviewing certain parts of GII-II which provides much of the operational context.

This evaluation was undertaken in July to December 2015 as the GIP was coming to the end of its pilot phase. The evaluation aimed to answer questions like: Should GIP continue? Is UNIDO the logical choice of host? Can GIP serve both UNIDO internal objectives (such as creating visibility for UNIDO outputs) as well as interest from external stakeholders?

This report provides the findings and recommendations of the evaluation of the Green Industry Platform looking at it both as an output of GII-II but also as a joint project with its implementing partner, UNEP.

Findings

The evaluation was based on an analysis of available documentation and on the perception of a broad range of stakeholders (implementers, contributors and beneficiaries of GIP actions). The entire GIP results chain was examined but particular focus was placed on certain pertinent issues such as management arrangements, sustainability, and the likelihood of GIP achieving its planned outcomes.

During the period (2012-2015), GII-II was seen as providing an excellent framework and umbrella for UNIDO's energy and environment work. The achievements of both GII-II and GIP were found by those interviewed during the evaluation to be 'reasonably adequate' at first sight, especially in light of their rather high ambitions. The need for such a mechanism as GIP, however, was confirmed.

The relevance and effectiveness of GIP was questioned by several interviewees who saw a lack of shared understanding between UNIDO and UNEP, within UNIDO, and between GIP implementing body and its external stakeholders and beneficiaries. The ambition of the country chapters, their purpose and function was also not clear. Were the GIP signatories meant to be 'champions'? Should there have been membership drives? Should GIP be creating visibility for UNIDO? Or providing incubator labs? Was the platform to focus on exchange or dialogue? There was no consensus on these issues amongst those interviewed.

Funding also emerged as an issue. The GIP had core funds of € 1 million an envisioned to supplement this from donors and explore membership contributions (financial and in kind), without success. The lack of a high and consistent level of funding, interlinkage with and clear added value compared to other parallel initiatives, prevented the GIP from being able to maintain and offer attractive services.

Being launched at the high profile event of Rio+20, GIP gained immediate visibility. The platform was started by a small team in UNIDO but it had no way of ensuring other branches of the organization would contribute, which was important for its success. Any collaborations were voluntary. It was somewhat isolated. Top management at UNIDO was undergoing changes and guidance was not received to direct or how to institutionalise the GIP. It was also not clear who should lead the platform and who should contribute what.

Some of the above confusion may have stemmed from the initial project design which had to be in place by the Rio deadline. Although a strong log frame existed for GII-II, of which GIP was a main output, the actual functions, governance, procedures and protocols specifically for GIP may have been formulated rather hurriedly. The design may also have been left broad and purposely vague to allow for manoeuvrability and development during the pilot stage. The evaluation found consensus in there being an initial lack of clarity, and in GIP ultimately being too ambitious given the absence of full management support and steady funding.

The general conclusion is that there has been a mismatch between the strategic importance of working on green industry promotion, which was not put into question by those interviewed during the evaluation, and the design and implementation of GIP. An unclear organizational framework, and staff changes, undermined operations so that by 2015 GIP suffered a kind of paralysis.

The private sector was relatively passive throughout the pilot period, looking to UNIDO and UNEP to take the lead. It remains reactive and is currently waiting for a proposal from UNIDO for any next steps. It is unlikely to pro-actively offer to co-create the next step with them and this reticence could be taken as a measure of the degree to which they 'bought in' to the pilot phase.

UNEP on the other hand have expressed an interest in continuing with UNIDO towards the objectives that the GIP tried to fulfil. However, they seek a stronger definition for GIP before committing to partner any joint initiative.

One year has now passed since there was any visible activity from GIP and the loss of momentum now adds to any existing problems facing a possible re-launch. This dormant period is being seen by some as a lack of commitment from both UNIDO and UNEP and long-term support for a GIP might be hard to resurrect.

Lessons learned

Examining the implementation mode of the GIP, its strengths and weaknesses, and comparing it to similar multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms elsewhere, it appears there are a number of pre-conditions necessary for success. These include:

- Clarity in the definition of the niche, stakeholder demand, and strategic and operational focus;
- Full political support internally and effective cooperation mechanisms;

- Professional management: strategic and operational plans, performance monitoring and reporting;
- Combination of internal resources and donor funding (or at least a mechanism to address volatility of donor funding);
- Focus on products rather than just events;
- Stakeholder involvement in co-production to build ownership;
- Balanced and steady communication, use of modern tools;
- Resources that are commensurate with specific objectives.

Most platforms aim for transparency, participation, and results in a setting that is less formal thus less exposed to negotiation failure. Knowledge-sharing platforms also try to work in conjunction with mechanisms to 'co-produce' knowledge, a key incentive for stakeholder involvement.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions and lessons learned, as described above, the following key recommendations are proposed.

1. UNIDO to take stock of lessons learned from other comparable networks and platforms that it is running and see how to create synergies and potentially align those initiatives.
2. Although GIP is relevant to the market, UNIDO should decide if its continuation would be relevant and realistically managed by UNIDO itself. The internal vision should be used as a basis for an internal review of what a Green Industry Platform should achieve in the short term and within 3-5 years (function, scope, services), before approaching external stakeholders.
3. In the event that UNIDO continues with the GIP:
    - its value proposition should be strengthened and its focus sharpened. The Platform needs to focus on easily and immediately achievable objectives, and offer concrete products and services in which quality (especially activities and members) takes precedence over quantity;
    - the business case for prospective and actual members should be made clearer. In order to increase government as well as private sector engagement, the Platform should clarify its core functions and offer clear incentives for participation;
    - based on a redefined focus, a proper definition of required resources (for coordination) and processes for inter-branch involvement should be formulated;

- UNIDO leadership for high-level external presence, and to secure cross-branch involvement, will be essential.

The strategic relevance of promoting Green Industry remains high and has been further strengthened with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals in September 2015. The importance of the GII for UNIDO is reflected in its mention in the conclusions of the annual UNIDO General Assembly meetings.

Options for GIP

There remains good stakeholder interest for a Green Industry Platform but should it continue in a similar manner? (*see* Recommendation 2). Four scenarios are given below to help UNIDO show the potential consequences of reviving the GIP or letting it close in its current form. They should assist when deciding how now to handle the GIP within GII-II, given its history and the recommendation to first revisit GIP objectives based on UNIDO's internal vision.

Scenario	Description	Consideration – potential risks
1. Phase out	Let the GIP phase out quietly – take no further action. Only smart communication towards direct involved stakeholders (AB and TEC) to explain the reasons.	Limited risk to UNIDO's reputation. But reputational damage has already occurred. Momentum and awareness of existing GIP almost lost.
2. Re-launch	Wake up the present GIP and design quick actions for 2016 – hitch to on other ongoing projects.	Risky, because too many weaknesses and flaws – and could raise expectations again that cannot be achieved.
	Design during 2016 a more robust implementation mode for 2017+.	Not easy to market if 'too similar to present GIP'
3. Re-develop	Start with fully redesigning a new GIP; based on lessons learnt, analysis of context and internal UNIDO-brainstorm on what and how to achieve.	Much better chance to regain external commitment. Rebrand the new model.
	Requires high-level commitment on where to position inside UNIDO (coordination) plus procedures for cross-branch involvement.	If designed properly it can become real flagship of UNIDO.
4. Hand over	If not all pre-conditions fulfilled - hand over the idea to another host and become involved purely as partner and not as main implementer.	Objectives can be achieved but less visibility for UNIDO.

Abbreviations

AB	Advisory Board
EMB	UNIDO Environmental Management Branch
ENV	UNIDO Environment Branch
GE	Green Economy
GEC	Green Economy Coalition
GEI	Green Economy Initiative
GGGI	Global Green Growth Institute
GGKP	Green Growth Knowledge Platform
GI	Green Industry
GII	Green Industry Initiative
GIP	Green Industry Platform
GIPCCO	GIP China Chapter
ILO	International Labour Organization
ISID	Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCPC	National Cleaner Production Centres
PAGE	Partnership for Action on Green Economy
PRM	UNIDO Programme Partnership and Results Monitoring Branch
PTC	UNIDO Programme Development and Technical Cooperation Division
RECP	Resource Efficiency and Cleaner Production
TEC	Technical Expert Committee
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research

1. Introduction

The launch of the UNIDO-UNEP Green Industry Platform at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) in June 2012 provided a key impulse to propel forward Phase II of UNIDO's flagship Green Industry Initiative (GII-II). The overall aim of Phase II was to effectively position 'green industry' as a core pillar of 'green economy' and to enable key stakeholders at the national and regional level to show consistent and concrete commitment, as well as a heightened awareness and application, of core green industry policies and practices.

As it drew to a close, an independent evaluation was initiated to provide an opportunity for UNIDO to review the Green Industry Platform (GIP), one of the main outputs of GII-II. This necessarily entailed some review of the GII activities and impact, its internal and external governance structure, and operational and financial management issues.

The Evaluation Team was led by Frans Verspeek who conducted the inception phase in July-August 2015 and the actual evaluation (desk research and interviews) resulting in the debrief in Vienna in December 2015. Angela Bularga contributed to desk research and interviews, especially regarding parallel initiatives, during the information gathering and analysis phase in November-December.

Objectives of this evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation was to review the GIP pilot phase (2012-2015) which was originally launched as part of the Green Industry Initiative Phase II (GII-II). It asks: "To what extent has the Green Industry Platform generated a consistent and sustainable approach to greening industry and enabling key stakeholders at national and regional levels to introduce policies, strategies and methodologies that promote environmental preservation." The evaluation also assessed to what extent the Platform had been established, maintained and promoted.

Based on an analysis of the findings, recommendations were drafted for determining if the GIP should continue and if so, how. They specifically focus on how to strengthen the value proposition of GIP and sharpen its focus to enlarge and upscale its impact; how to improve the organizational and managerial conditions; and how to attract potential donors to effectively and efficiently continue its implementation in the forthcoming years.

Evaluation approach and methodology

This Terminal Independent Evaluation is conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects. This covers the five standard evaluation criteria (project design, project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of project results) together with an 'assessment of processes

affecting achievements of project results', 'project coordination and management', and 'gender mainstreaming'.

The evaluation spans the GIP implementation period from the beginning in June 2012 to the end of its pilot phase in December 2015. The evaluation assessed the entire results chain (from project design to governance structure, actual outputs and post-project strategies) but focused on providing an analysis of pertinent issues such as management arrangements, assessing its sustainability and the likelihood of achieving planned impacts as perceived by different stakeholders.

The evaluation team used different methods to ensure that data gathering and analysis delivered evidence-based qualitative information from diverse sources. The use of different data and sources, and methods to gather it, ensures triangulation to validate the facts.

Information sources

1. **Desk review** of most relevant project documents (*see* Annex 3):
   (a) The original project document and related items (internal memos) on strategy and monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports);
   (b) Notes from the meetings of the Advisory Board (AB) and the Technical Expert Committee (TEC);
   (c) Output reports (case studies, guidelines, best practices overviews, action plans, etc.) and relevant correspondence;
   (d) Proceedings (including participant lists) of a selection of relevant conferences and events where GII/GIP was presented;
   (e) Key reports describing UNIDO's mandate and vision (especially with regard to ISID) and strategy and progress reports of relevant branches in UNIDO;
   (f) Key reports (strategy documents and progress reports) from relevant comparable global initiatives.
2. **Interviews** (*exact names and organizations listed in* Annex 4)
   - UNIDO and UNEP involved staff (and externals)
   - UNIDO management layers
   - AB and TEC members
   - Companies that signed up to the GIP
   - Parallel initiatives

Methodology

During the implementation of GII (and GIP), neither documented internal reviews and there were no formal evaluations, not at the end of Phase I nor during Phase II. The design of GII-II did, however, take into consideration the lessons learned from Phase I.

During the development of Phase II, an informal consultation gathered observations on experience in-house, and from stakeholders and Member States. The present evaluation checked to see to what extent the lessons learned had been properly incorporated and applied during the second phase.

Review comments were made during the 2nd Advisory Board meeting in October 2014 with an assessment of the performance and achievements of the GIP and accompanying recommendations to revise the strategy. This was taken on board during the current evaluation and used in crosschecking and validating, or otherwise, the 2014 analysis and recommendations.

This assessment is purely qualitative and focuses on the outcome of activities ('key stakeholders at national and regional levels show consistent concrete commitment toward, and awareness and application of, Green Industry principles and practices.').

During the project period a stakeholder survey of the global manufacturing industry was planned, to assess the needs related to green industry. It was even explicitly mentioned as a means of verification in the GII-II log frame. It was initiated but not properly completed. The pilot phase of the survey was conducted mid-2014 and was expanded to the main phase at the end of 2014. It continued into early 2015 but with very limited results. The survey partners contemplated that the sample size was insufficiently large to draw results and make recommendations.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that limited efforts were foreseen to monitor impact – as revealed in the logical framework, and this was in line with the pilot character of the intervention. Assessing the impact of GII-II and GIP 'interventions' would have been too complicated and time-consuming for this current evaluation due to the lack of data from a baseline and from a monitoring and evaluation system. There is also the difficulty of how to distinguish 'direct contribution' from 'attribution'.

2. Project background

Brief project context

The Green Industry Initiative serves as a toolkit for UNIDO to create awareness, knowledge and technical capacity to achieve green industry, putting sustainable industrial development at the forefront of the global development agenda. Undertaking work with governments helps support industrial institutions that in turn provide assistance to enterprises and entrepreneurs in the processes of greening of industry and creating green industries. GII uses a number of tools, including the provision of policy advice, research and reports, convening meetings between relevant parties, and knowledge networks and management.

GII began after the adoption of the Manila Declaration on Green Industry in September 2009, and since then UNIDO has been assisting signatory countries with national initiatives to encourage more sustainable patterns of development to create more awareness, and to disseminate knowledge relating to the greening of industry.

GII launched its Phase II, on the request of countries that attended the Tokyo Green Industry Conference in Japan, in November 2011. This was a follow-up conference to the Manila Green Industry Declaration and was requested by UNIDO Member States at UNIDO's 14th General Conference (28 November – 2 December 2011) in resolution GC.14/Res.4 'Strengthening UNIDO activities in energy and environment'.

One of the envisioned activities was the establishment of at least 3 national GIP chapters.

Logical framework - defined objective, outputs, outcomes and impacts

The **objective** of the GII was to generate a consistent and sustainable approach to greening industry and to enable key stakeholders at national and regional levels to introduce policies, strategies and methodologies that promote environmental preservation.

Outcome: Key stakeholders at national and regional levels show consistent concrete commitment toward, and awareness and application of, green industry principles and practices.

In order to achieve the project outcome, three types of **output** were defined according to activities ranging from policy related and strategic, institutional, and those on an operational level:

1. Establishment, maintenance and promotion of the GIP;
2. Demonstration projects to showcase best practices for greening existing industries and creating new green industries; and
3. Research and awareness-raising to promote adoption of Green Industry principles.

It is important to distinguish between the overarching GII and the GIP which is one of its outputs and implementation mechanisms.

Table 1 Green Industry Initiative compared with Green Industry Platform

	Green Industry Initiative (GII)	Green Industry Platform (GIP)
Definition	UNIDO's toolkit to create awareness, knowledge and technical capacity to achieve green industry, putting sustainable industrial development at the forefront of the global development agenda. The initiative uses a number of tools, namely giving policy advice, through research and reports, by convening meetings between relevant parties, and through knowledge networks and management.	Provide a common framework to bring together government, business and civil society leaders to identify and encourage diverse initiatives to improve the environmental performance of existing industry and support the creation of new industries delivering environmental goods and services
Nature	Content creation	Content dissemination
Mandate and its length	Open-ended mandate provided by two thematic conferences and UNIDO members at their 14th Conference in 2011	Three-year mandate ending in December 2015 arising from membership Statements signed during the launch in Rio (2012)
Members	All UNIDO members	Signatories of the Statement of Support
Governance	Not defined clearly	Defined in the Introductory Note. Amended during implementation
Geographic scope	Global	Global
Implementation responsibility	UNIDO	UNIDO-UNEP
Links between the two	Core initiative	Activity to implement GII

The establishment and operationalization of the GIP is largely as a mechanism to coordinate the dissemination of policy and strategy related material to signatories, to act as a convening forum, and to promote targeted green industry practices and principles to Member States and signatories to the platform. Feeding into these activities are demonstration projects, which build and showcase UNIDO's integrated corporate approach to green industry, as well as research and awareness-raising activities that provide inputs for the organization's publications and substantive outputs to promote the Green Industry Initiative.

The GIP itself can cover a number of inter-related activities and services (*see* Table 2). It appeared during the evaluation that from the initial set-up to the actual promotion of GIP, that the range of objectives and services was not mutually agreed and understood, not internally at UNIDO nor externally amongst stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Table 2 Objectives and services of the Green Industry Platform

Awareness Raising	▪ Profiles Green Industry objectives through events, engagement, actions at the enterprise, national and regional level
Convening	▪ Brings together members to discuss specific themes, approaches and issues ▪ Connects members to third parties on areas of mutual interest
Networking and Information Sharing	▪ Shares contact information between signatories ▪ Provides a web portal to exchange information amongst signatories ▪ Provides one-stop advisory services for signatories seeking specific information ▪ Provides an introductory and mediating role
Partnering	▪ Provides a framework for members to explore possible partnerships between different sectors and stakeholder groups ▪ Identifies and encourages synergies and partnerships between members ▪ Identifies possible partnerships with non-members such as in the supply chain context
Researching	▪ Identifies strengths and weaknesses of current Green Industry approaches and commissions research on relevant topics
Promotional	▪ Provides a framework in which members' actions in pursuance of Green Industrial policies and practices can be made public and promoted

Achievements

The period from July 2012 to September 2014 was broadly dedicated to momentum building. This was pursued primarily through the operationalization of the GIP, the recruitment of governments, businesses and organizations to sign the Platform's 'Statement of Support' and the profiling of a green industry approach to manufacturing at a series of high-profile global forum events.

By the end of 2015, 215 organizations had signed up as members to GIP thus reaching the target of 'at least 200 signatories'.

Table 3 Breakdown of the signatories to Green Industry Platform

Type	**Number**	**Proportion**	**Description**
Business	108	50%	30+ non-manufacturing entities (e.g. services, etc.) 40+ from EU-countries 40+ from Asia (amongst it 20 from China) 10 from Africa Rest from other regions (LAC, USA, Australia)
Governments	31	15%	29 countries (Costa Rica 3 signatories) 8 Asia & Pacific 6 Europe 6 Africa 5 LAC 3 NIS 1 Middle East
Organizations	76	35%	Variety of organizations – research institutes (15), business associations (25), NCPC's/RECP*net* members, NGO's Regional division: 25+ from Asia and 20+ from Europe Special to mention: EC-DG Environment, GEF, GGGI, GEC, ICC
Total	**215**	**100%**	

Several research, capacity building and cooperation activities were undertaken by UNIDO in conjunction with Platform members to produce concrete outputs which would help governments and enterprises understand and adopt green industry policies and practices, and mainstream and scale-up the green industry approach throughout global manufacturing.

Although the GIP is the main project output of GII-II, there were numerous others, like those described above. The China Chapter Office (GIPCCO), the first and only formal national GIP Chapter, was initiated in March 2014 at the School of Economics and Resource Management of Beijing Normal University (BNU), with support from the Chinese Ministry of Commerce and the Ministry for Industry and Information Technology. In November 2014, an MOU between UNIDO and BNU for cooperation in the development of the GIPCCO was signed. Several meetings and scoping missions have since taken place (the last one in July 2015) but currently GIPCCO is still at an early stage of establishment.

Outputs 2 and 3 of the GII are providing technical substance to the Platform. The output of any UNIDO project which promotes industrial resource efficiency is currently regarded under the umbrella nature of the GII, as an input to GIP for dissemination to members and a wider audience.

In the original design of the project it was foreseen that the majority of activities would take place before the end of 2014, and 2015 would be mainly used for evaluation and development of the next phase.

However, since October 2014, coinciding with the departure of the Director of the previous Environmental Management Branch, who also was the driving force and project manager of this project, GIP activities have slowed down drastically. By the end of 2014, the budget for this project had been depleted and no new funding was secured.

Management and governance

During the 2nd phase of GII, both GII and GIP were administered by UNIDO and (at least according to (informal) agreements) in coordination with UNEP (via non- regular meetings) and in consultation with the UN Global Compact.

GIP was governed by an Executive Board comprising the Director General of UNIDO and the Executive Director of UNEP, and was responsible for taking decisions on the overall direction, work plan, budget and governance of the Platform. It also had two advisory bodies: the Advisory Board and the Technical Expert Committee. The Advisory Board advised GIP conveners on how best to promote the Platform's objectives. It is consulted on all matters of direction and strategy. The Technical Expert Committee provided advice to the Advisory Board and conveners on more operational aspects of the GIP operations.

Terms of reference were drafted to define the profiles of the Advisory Board and Technical Expert Committee and, mainly based on UNIDO's internal staff suggestions and personal networks, members were approached and selected

This resulted in bodies who adequately represent the two target groups (governments and private sector) with a regional spreading, plus (especially in the TEC) sufficient content-related knowledge.

During the project period two meetings of each advisory body took place in 2013 and again 2014 but without full representation. Short meeting minutes are available plus background documents. In view of the funding situation, no meetings took place in 2015. Communication with members was limited to two newsletters and basic update messages.

UNIDO internal organization

Initially, the GII and GIP was managed by the Director of the Environmental Management Branch (EMB) and in his Office. From January 2013 onwards a new staff member was assigned to the Office of the Director of this branch to support GII and GIP activities. The portfolio of projects supporting GII included a large initiative, 'Partnership for Action on Green Economy' (PAGE) which was managed by the new staff member. GIP-related activities were managed by the Director himself with the full-time support of two or three junior consultants and one senior consultant. A small in-house task force was established to support GIP activities, which included one staff member and one consultant who served as focal point for private sector engagement. Unit heads in the Environmental Management Branch were involved as advisors to the Director on GII and GIP.

It was envisioned, as clearly defined in the official project document, that the coordinating Environmental Management Branch would set up a task force and include UNIDO's technical branches, in order to build cross-organizational support, and to apply GIP goals as widely as possible. In this way, links to ongoing projects and initiatives within UNIDO would be strengthened, and continued targeted, in-house cooperation would take place with the support of these branches. They included:

- Strategic Research, Quality Assurance and Advocacy Division
- Business, Investment and Technology Branch
- Energy and Climate Change Branch
- Montreal Protocol Branch
- UNIDO field offices and Technology Centres (where appropriate)
- UNIDO Institute for Capacity Development
- Gender Mainstreaming Committee

As a result of the abovementioned organizational changes in the Programme Development and Technical Cooperation Division (PTC) and more specifically at the Environmental Management Branch, the coordination of the GII and GIP has been moved to the Partnership and Results Monitoring Branch in 2015. This branch provides strategic advice to the Managing Director of the PTC, but also

coordinates the partnership country programmes that serve to operationalize UNIDO's overarching ISID initiative.

Context

During the project phase the internal and external context gradually changed. With the change of the Director General, there was a reformulation of the vision of UNIDO; the launch of the Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) initiative. ISID in principle embeds all reasons for and objectives of GII, and thereby did not alter the justification and relevance for the ongoing GII and its GIP. However, as a logical consequence of launching a new flagship initiative, external communications changed and GIP was less frequently mentioned to external stakeholders.

The GII and GIP are not the only global green initiatives around (green in the context of growth, economy, or industry). At the start of GIP, there were already comparable initiatives in the global context and in the spirit of the Rio+20 Conference more partnerships were launched, including some from UNIDO itself. In table 4 an overview is given of the most relevant policy level initiatives. Since Rio+20 the context became even more crowded via the launch of all kind of business related initiatives. When defining potential added value of the GIP it is important to take those other initiatives into consideration: are they comparable and thereby potentially 'competitors'? are the complementary and thereby potentially 'partners'? can lessons be learned from others? can synergy be achieved? etc.

And finally, two important developments in 2015 - the launch of the Sustainable Development Goals and the outcome of the COP-negotiations in December in Paris – changed the contextual setting and thereby will influence future added value of and interest by stakeholders in GII and GIP.

Table 4 Leading Global Green Initiatives

Initiative	Mission	Status	Activities	Comment
OECD Green Growth Strategy	To define 'green growth' and identify a policy framework for governmental actions to make economic and environmental policies mutually reinforcing	Developed in response to 2009 OECD Ministerial Council Meeting decision. A programme of the OECD Secretariat	Provides: Information, analysis, indicators, convene meetings (e.g. Green Growth and Sustainable Development Forum)	No private sector members. Private sector invited to participate in Forum. No specific industry focus.
UNEP Green Economy Initiative (GEI)	To provide analysis and policy support for investing in green sectors and in greening environmentally unfriendly sectors	First announced by UNEP in 2008. The GEI is an UNEP initiative designed to help governments move towards a green economy	Provides: information, research (e.g. the Green Economy Report) and advisory services to governments and other stakeholders	Broad economic framework and analysis. No specific focus. No private sector members.
Green Economy	To mobilize activity amongst	Started as a UNEP initiative for the	Provides: information and	Very limited private sector

Coalition	stakeholders; share experiences and policy practices across our global network; and influence key decision makers at the local, national and international levels.	private sector, when unsuccessful due to funding constraints, it became independent and now functions as an NGO run by a former UNEP staff/consultant.	advice on appropriate policies and programmes, coordinates multi-stakeholder national dialogues and lobby amongst key decision makers	members, mainly NGOs. No specific industry focus.
Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE)	To support up to 30 developing countries in building & implementing green economy strategies.	Launched in 2013 by UNEP, ILO, UNIDO and UNITAR (later also UNDP joined) as a mechanism for promoting the Rio+20 outcomes	Provides: Information and advice on appropriate policies and programmes	No private sector members. No specific industry focus.
Global Green Growth Institute (GGGI)	To promote a new model of economic growth ('green growth') in developing countries and emerging economies	Launched in 2010 as a think-tank; treaty-based since 2012. 20 member states & 3 non-state members, plus secretariat	Provides: Information, analysis, convening, etc. Programme activities in 18+ countries	No private sector members. No specific industry focus.
Green Growth Knowledge Platform (GGKP)	To identify and address major knowledge gaps in Green Growth theory and practical encourage collaboration and research to support the transition to a Green Economy	A global network of international organizations and (mainly think tank and academic) experts. Established by MoU between OECD, UNEP, World bank and GGGI in 2012	Provides: Information, research, analysis, guidelines and best practices materials	No private sector members. No specific industry focus.
United Nations Global Compact (UNGC)	To implement universal sustainability principles and to take steps to support UN goals	A voluntary, principle-based framework for businesses, launched in 2000, stating ten principles in the areas of human rights, labor, the environment and anti-corruption	Provides: Information, research, analysis, guidelines and best practices materials	World's largest corporate sustainability initiative with 13.000 corporate participants and other stakeholders over 170 countries
Green Industry Platform (GIP)	To encourage members to green the manufacturing sector using voluntary measures to promote cleaner, resource and energy efficient production	A public-private-partnership launched in 2012 by UNIDO and UNEP, together with private sector members	Provide: Information, research, analysis, guidelines and business case materials; convening (e.g. Green Industry events) share best practices	Specific industry focus. Private sector membership and governance role.
UNIDO / UNEP National Cleaner Production Centres (RECP) network (RECP*net*)	To establish a network of NCPC's in developing and transition countries to promote resource efficiency, waste and emission prevention and safe chemicals management.	Programme launched jointly by UNEP and UNIDO in 1994.	Provides: Support for network and information dissemination, capacity building, technical assistance, and policy advise	Institutions active in providing RECP services. But no direct private sector members.

3. Findings

In this chapter, the Evaluation Team's findings are presented. These findings are based on the results of the interviews carried out (*see* Annex 4) and programme and reporting assessment (*see* Annex 3).

The following dimensions were taken into account, in accordance with the evaluation issues and questions (*see* Annex 2), which include:

- Programme design
- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Impact and sustainability
- Governance and ownership
- Programme management
- Gender

Programme Design

Reading and assessing the formal programme design as described in the official programme document(s), it has to be concluded that the formulation is very generic with few details. There are no clearly defined requirements on capacities and resources. The log frame for the GII, where GIP was identified as one output, is mainly output oriented and lacks outcome and impact (neither indicators nor monitoring steps). Finally, the log frame does identify means of verification; mainly project progress reports, monitoring and evaluation system, web-site statistics and surveys.

One justification given for this 'weak' design is that this was done on purpose, merely a 'pilot' approach, with limited formal structures and procedures and a limited budget compared to the ambitious goals, to keep it aspirational. That is understandable for such an ambitious approach which, at that time, had never yet been tried. But it could also give a sense of 'rush development', as expressed by several interviewees, to showcase at Rio+20. By strengthening the intervention 'during the journey' it could become more robust. However, this would require further needs assessments and regular progress monitoring and reporting in order to adapt and sharpen the set-up. This has not been properly done.

Relevance

Almost all interviewed parties and relevant stakeholders saw the original objectives of GII and GIP as highly relevant. They were seen to properly address the needs of the private sector and perfectly utilizing the momentum (Rio+20 flow).

But this judgment of relevance strongly depends on the perception of the scope, goals and functions of the GIP. There appeared to be a substantial lack of common understanding over what functions the GIP should cover and what level of ambition it should have (*see* table 2), ranking from platform for exchange of

best practices (and creating visibility for UNIDO), clearing house function, multi-stakeholder dialogue, up to being an incubator platform for initiating more concrete, tangible outputs and even launch such on-the-ground activities.

With such broader definition, the relevance is harder to perceive. All interviewees strongly adhered to the relevance of GII but more doubts are given if a GIP will be relevant to fulfil GII's objectives and question the added value and business for prospective and actual members.

And the scope and functions of GIP will fully determine how effective so far the GIP-intervention is perceived.

Effectiveness

Everybody initially values the visibility of the first year and a half when green industry rose on the global (sustainability) agenda. However, there was a simultaneous perception that the topic was gradually disappearing, and some respondents even had the feeling that the GIP no longer existed.

There is a strong fluctuation amongst stakeholders and their view of GIP's effectiveness. Many see effectiveness as very slight, but others as moderate, and yet others said it was highly effective, all depending on their perception of the functions and ambition of GIP. The broad range in opinions does not reflect any pattern of internal (to UNIDO) versus external stakeholders but varies at random amongst all interviewees. Can a global GIP really be an effective mechanism and has UNIDO the capacity and capability to cover effectively that broad range of different services?

Some elements that have a particular effect on the final evaluation are worth pointing out:

- The only quantitative indicator for the establishment of the GIP given in the log frame, at least 200 signatories, was achieved[1]. The value of this achievement is another matter, however, as it is judged differently when taking into account the type of members (and regional spread), their level of engagement, and their level of performance (due diligence and progress);
- A process/protocol of due diligence to assess potential GIP-signatories was under development but still not in place, partially due to its complexity (different policies and procedures at UNIDO and UNEP on the

[1] *Regional representation: out of 215 – 73 from Asia (34%), and 66 from Europe (30%), or up to 40% from developed countries. Business representation: 50% of the signatories are classified as direct businesses plus 12% business associations. However, out of those 50% direct businesses 14% should be classified as non-manufacturing (service providers for businesses). The representation of businesses is a random mix – ranging from large global operating MNCs up to small purely at national scale operating SMEs in all kind of sectors. No specific evidence could be found that the signatories could be classified as 'champions' in their sector or country. However, it is also important to notice that most of these signatories already were partners/engaging with UNIDO and UNEP and/or have a portfolio of partnerships in sustainability. Many of these belonged to numerous partnerships, and are members of many and active in some.*

level of due diligence) and a lack of required capacity to implement it (both the in-take process as well as the monitoring of performance);

- Numerous outputs of research, capacity building and co-operation activities were 'taken on board'. However, this is not regarded as a result of GIP itself but rather a result of the collection process, that GIP provides for further dissemination – smart hitching and utilization of resources. At the same time several respondents stipulated that the linkage with programmes like RECP*net* were insufficiently and ineffectively exploited;
- Interviewees strongly felt that setting up country chapters could increase the effectiveness of GIP, bringing information and activities more closely to the beneficiaries and more tailored to their needs. The original design of the project proposed at least 3 chapters. However, at the moment only one exists and that is in China. It has a membership of 40+ and activities in the pipeline. The lack of achievements so far and non-clarity of the strategy – and limited attention till now to strengthen the China chapter – was felt by some respondents as 'risky' and 'confusing' if not soon followed by others; impression that GIP is downscaled and doubts if the China Chapter really can serve as an example.

Efficiency

The efficiency with which GII-II and GIP have implemented their activities is perceived as moderate at best. GII-II in principle has no direct donor resources. GIP had resources but mainly for hosting and participating in external meetings.

Most activities linked to GII-II, or to GIP, were in principle independent activities (initiated by others inside UNIDO and funded through different channels) brought under the GII/GIP umbrella.

It is not easy to assess if this was done efficiently. Despite the reference in the official project document to set up a task-force to build cross-organizational support for the initiative, no formal 'mandate' to influence other branches in UNIDO and initiate actions for GIP was prepared. In other words, GII-II and GIP were rather dependent on outputs from others. And it was more and more felt that the 'coordination' function and strengths were slipping away – certainly since the departure of the EM Branch Director (who was strongly leading the action) and the move of GIP from EM Branch to the PRM Branch. No clear documented evidence, nor oral information via the interviews, is found that this in-house cooperation has taken place in the envisioned intense way.

In addition, the partnership between UNIDO and UNEP was generally perceived as inadequate. UNEP's interest and engagement slipped gradually away because of a lack of mutually agreed objectives and function of the GIP. UNEP was also giving more attention towards other multi-stakeholder initiatives in which UNEP is involved, including the 10-Year Framework Programme on Sustainable Consumption and Production, and the PAGE initiative. This had implications on staff availability for GIP but at the same time could have generated interested synergies. However, no evidence was found that action had been taken to

redefine and re-enforce the plans for GIP and explore synergies with the other initiatives.

Impact and sustainability of project outcomes

According to the original set up it was envisioned that the interventions should contribute to 'scaling-up and mainstreaming' and a 'reduced environmental impact'. However, no attempt is made to assess this either during the project implementation or as part of this evaluation. In fact, it would not have been possible because there was no baseline status, nor a system in place to track changes.

Many respondents expressed doubts, based on their perception of the present 'status' of GIP, - on the sustainability of the GIP. They doubted if there was sufficient traction and pro-active and engaged interest from the private sector. There is no indication of any co-funding from the private sector for, GIP.

It was felt that due to the long phase of inactivity momentum has been lost. However, global the Sustainable Development Goals have recently been agreed and launched and provide a new impetus to greening industry with the inclusion of SDG9 – to build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and its COP21[2] in Paris closed 2015 with global attention on climate change. This was another powerful reminder that it is imperative to act to reduce polluting greenhouse gases. GII-II and GIP may gain more attention by the light of these two high-profile events. Anyway, 2016 offers a chance to relaunch GIP and to return to its original and urgent aim of helping to create change in industry as effectively as possible. If the essential lessons can be learned and past experience put toward a new project design, a resurrection of GIP may yet be possible. As a result of recent developments (SDG's, COP21) – giving high profile to 'green industry' - an opportunity to properly 'relaunch' a new effort has arisen. If essential lessons learnt were taken into consideration a resurrection of GIP may be possible.

Governance and ownership

It is important again to distinguish between GII as an internal UNIDO action, and GIP as a partnership between UNIDO and UNEP with its own specific governance structure (an Executive Board and two advisory bodies: the Advisory Board (AB) and the Technical Expert Committee (TEC).

The leading governing roles played by the Director General of UNIDO and the Executive Director of UNEP during the first years, was felt by all respondents to be highly beneficial in pushing the GIP forward. But this momentum gradually slipped away, and it mainly functioned for communication purposes. The top leadership began to not be felt at operational level, and day-to-day operations and strategic decisions were increasingly perceived to be taken almost on 'personal basis' in the ENV Branch, without much consultation with other branches in UNIDO or with UNEP. In the management structure it was foreseen

[2] 21st meeting of the Conference of the Parties

that GII/GIP would be administered by UNIDO in close co-operation with UNEP. However, an analysis of documents and perception from both sides shows the actual role of UNEP as rather weak and GIP was perceived as (almost) a pure UNIDO driven effort.

Co-ownership of the private sector, as one of the key stakeholders in the GIP, was never felt. Businesses signed up for GIP and participated in events, but no clear buy-in was realized. For different reasons a strict formal role for business representatives in the governance structure was not possible.

The parties involved felt the AB and TEC entities were adequate but not the most effective and efficient. Preparation for each meeting was done properly but the spin-off, and uptake of recommendations, was unclear. It was felt to be merely an annual consultation once but without continuity.

Project management

During the first year and a half there was a strong senior level engagement at UNIDO although actual staff allocation was scattered, resulting in insufficient coordination capacity and an over-reliance on a limited number of staff, especially at senior level. This meant there no critical mass was secured in a broader interest and engagement from other branches in UNIDO. The project seemed to be managed rather on an informal basis – with limited attention and consistency to proper documentation of achievements and operational and strategic discussions.

From the end of 2014 the intensity also slipped away – partially by design that 2015 would be less-resource intense but amplified by unexpected financial constraints and personnel changes as well as the managerial decision to change the host branch in UNIDO from ENV to PRM.

The budget – provided by 2 external donors (from SECO, Switzerland and AFD, France) and internal UNIDO-resources – has been mainly utilised for contracting external support staff for UNIDO, material costs for hosting AB and TEC-meetings and creating visibility for GIP (covering travel costs to present GIP at different events). Most of the funds were spent on engagement and outreach, as opposed to strategically building up core substance and fund raising in parallel. It was already foreseen that most of the budget would be utilised by the end of 2014. However, it appeared that the spending was even accelerated. When the funding ceased at the end of 2014 no further activities could be initiated to maintain GIP momentum into 2015. Throughout 2015, GIP was in a rather dormant stage. This was partly intentional as this independent evaluation was the main activity for 2015. However, due to lack of funds the evaluation was postponed for more than six months.

Gender mainstreaming

Women's empowerment is recognized as not only a normative right but also as an important economic and development strategy for ISID. The GIP also recognizes that the empowerment of women and green industry are mutually reinforcing goals. In 2014, a sub-chapter of the Platform, 'Women in Green

Industry Chapter, started featuring and profiling successful female green industry entrepreneurs. The Chapter closely cooperates with UNWOMEN, and in 2016 it is planned to jointly develop a project to enhance and empower women in green industry.

4. Conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations

The assessment observations described in the previous chapter form the basis for some overarching conclusions on the operation and performance of the GIP. Using these conclusions, and lessons learned from both this and other similar projects, and assuming the undisputed need for a global mechanism like GIP, recommendations have been developed for how to potentially 'revitalize or 'relaunch' GIP.

Overarching conclusions

The conceptual framework of the GII is solid and provides an excellent framework and umbrella for UNIDO's energy and environment work promoting SMEs, private sector and entrepreneurship development.

'Green industry', as a sector strategy of 'green economy', is an effective tool to support UNIDO's Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) programme and to address the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 9 (SDG9).

The achievements of both GII-II and GIP were found by those interviewed during the evaluation to be 'reasonably adequate' at first sight, especially in light of their rather high ambitions. The need for such a mechanism as GIP, however, was confirmed.

The relevance and effectiveness of GIP was questioned by several interviewees who saw a lack of shared understanding between UNIDO and UNEP, within UNIDO, and between GIP implementing body and its external stakeholders and beneficiaries. The ambition of the country chapters, their purpose and function was also not clear. Were the GIP signatories meant to be 'champions'? Should there have been membership drives? Should GIP be creating visibility for UNIDO? Or providing incubator labs? Was the platform to focus on exchange or dialogue? There was no consensus on these issues amongst those interviewed.

Funding also emerged as an issue. The GIP had core funds of € 1 million an envisioned to supplement this from donors and explore membership contributions (financial and in kind), without success. The lack of a high and consistent level of funding, interlinkage with and clear added value compared to other parallel initiatives, prevented the GIP from being able to maintain and offer attractive services.

Being launched at the high profile event of Rio+20, GIP gained immediate visibility. The platform was started by a small team in UNIDO but it had no way

of ensuring other branches of the organization would contribute, which was important for its success. Any collaborations were voluntary. It was somewhat isolated. Top management at UNIDO was undergoing changes and guidance was not received to direct or how to institutionalise the GIP. It was also not clear who should lead the platform and who should contribute what.

Some of the above confusion may have stemmed from the initial project design which had to be in place by the Rio deadline. Although a strong log frame existed for GII-II, of which GIP was a main output, the actual functions, governance, procedures and protocols specifically for GIP may have been formulated rather hurriedly. The design may also have been left broad and purposely vague to allow for manoeuvrability and development during the pilot stage. The evaluation found consensus in there being an initial lack of clarity, and in GIP ultimately being too ambitious given the absence of full management support and steady funding.

The general conclusion is that there has been a mismatch between the strategic importance of working on green industry promotion, which was not put into question by those interviewed during the evaluation, and the design and implementation of GIP. An unclear organizational framework, and staff changes, undermined operations so that by 2015 GIP suffered a kind of paralysis.

The private sector was relatively passive throughout the pilot period, looking to UNIDO and UNEP to take the lead. It remains reactive and is currently waiting for a proposal from UNIDO for any next steps. It is unlikely to pro-actively offer to co-create the next step with them and this reticence could be taken as a measure of the degree to which they 'bought in' to the pilot phase.

UNEP on the other hand have expressed an interest in continuing with UNIDO towards the objectives that the GIP tried to fulfil. However, they seek a stronger definition for GIP before committing to partner any joint initiative.

One year has now passed since there was any visible activity from GIP and the loss of momentum now adds to any existing problems facing a possible re-launch. This dormant period is being seen by some as a lack of commitment from both UNIDO and UNEP and long-term support for a GIP might be hard to resurrect.

Lessons learned

Based on analysis of the implementation mode of the Green Industry Platform and similar other exchange and multi-stakeholder dialogue platform the following lessons can be learned regarding strengths and weaknesses of platforms/networks; related to functions, services, structure, governance, business model, etc. Most relevant (pre) conditions for success are:

- Clarity in the definition of the niche, stakeholder demand, and strategic and operational focus;
- Full political support internally and effective cooperation mechanisms;

- Professional management: strategic and operational plans, performance monitoring and reporting;
- Combination of internal resources and donor funding (or at least a mechanism to address volatility of donor funding);
- Focus on products rather than just events;
- Stakeholder involvement in co-production to build ownership;
- Balanced and steady communication, use of modern tools;
- Resources that are commensurate with specific objectives.

Most platforms aim for transparency, participation, and results in a setting that is less formal thus less exposed to negotiation failure. Knowledge-sharing platforms also try to work in conjunction with mechanisms to 'co-produce' knowledge, a key incentive for stakeholder involvement.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions and lessons learned, as described above, the following key recommendations are proposed.

1. UNIDO to take stock of lessons learned from other comparable networks and platforms that it is running and see how to create synergies and potentially align those initiatives.
2. Although GIP is relevant to the market, UNIDO should decide if its continuation would be relevant and realistically managed by UNIDO itself. The internal vision should be used as a basis for an internal review of what a Green Industry Platform should achieve in the short term and within 3-5 years (function, scope, services), before approaching external stakeholders.
3. In the event that UNIDO continues with the GIP:
    - its value proposition should be strengthened and its focus sharpened. The Platform needs to focus on easily and immediately achievable objectives, and offer concrete products and services in which quality (especially activities and members) takes precedence over quantity;
    - the business case for prospective and actual members should be made clearer. In order to increase government as well as private sector engagement, the Platform should clarify its core functions and offer clear incentives for participation;
    - based on a redefined focus, a proper definition of required resources (for coordination) and processes for inter-branch involvement should be formulated;
    - UNIDO leadership for high-level external presence, and to secure cross-branch involvement, will be essential.

The strategic relevance of promoting Green Industry remains high and has been further strengthened with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals in

September 2015. The importance of the GII for UNIDO is reflected in its mention in the conclusions of the annual UNIDO General Assembly meetings.

Options for GIP

There remains good stakeholder interest for a Green Industry Platform but should it continue in a similar manner? (*see* Recommendation 2). Four scenarios are given below to help UNIDO show the potential consequences of reviving the GIP or letting it close in its current form. They should assist when deciding how now to handle the GIP within GII-II, given its history and the recommendation to first revisit GIP objectives based on UNIDO's internal vision.

Scenario	Description	Consideration – potential risks
1. Phase out	Let the GIP phase out quietly – take no further action. Only smart communication towards direct involved stakeholders (AB and TEC) to explain the reasons.	Limited risk to UNIDO's reputation. But reputational damage has already occurred. Momentum and awareness of existing GIP almost lost.
2. Re-launch	Wake up the present GIP and design quick actions for 2016 – hitch to on other ongoing projects.	Risky, because too many weaknesses and flaws – and could raise expectations again that cannot be achieved.
	Design during 2016 a more robust implementation mode for 2017+.	Not easy to market if 'too similar to present GIP'
3. Re-develop	Start with fully redesigning a new GIP; based on lessons learnt, analysis of context and internal UNIDO-brainstorm on what and how to achieve.	Much better chance to regain external commitment. Rebrand the new model.
	Requires high-level commitment on where to position inside UNIDO (coordination) plus procedures for cross-branch involvement.	If designed properly it can become real flagship of UNIDO.
4. Hand over	If not all pre-conditions fulfilled - hand over the idea to another host and become involved purely as partner and not as main implementer.	Objectives can be achieved but less visibility for UNIDO.

Annexes

1. Logical framework of the Green Industry Initiative
2. Evaluation framework
3. List of documents reviewed
4. List of interviewees
5. OECD work on Green Growth Promotion
6. Evaluation TOR

Annex 1 – Logical framework for Green Industry Initiative – Phase II

Results	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions and Risks
Development objective			
Generate a consistent and sustainable approach to greening industry and enable key stakeholders at national and regional levels to introduce policies, strategies and methodologies that promote environmental preservation.			
Outcome			
1. Key stakeholders at national and regional levels show consistent (concrete) commitment toward, and awareness and application of Green Industry principles and practices	• Number and relevance of signatories to the Green Industry Platform • Number of road-maps endorsed by national governments • At least 2 regional level roadmaps (e.g. ASEAN, SADC, COMESA, MERCOSUR, etc.) • National coordination and dialogue mechanisms to guide the implementation of green industry initiatives are operational in at least 5 participating countries. • Number and quality of projects launched by businesses through the Green Industry Platform collaboration • Declarations of strategic policy changes among non-governmental stakeholders • At least 5 governments, and various key institutions and enterprises in 5 selected countries, adopting Green Industry principles and practices	• Project progress reports • M&E system built into Platform • Invitee feedback	• Lack of awareness and adoption of Green Industry principles and practices

Results	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions and Risks
Outputs			
1. Establishment, maintenance and promotion of the Green Industry Platform	• UNIDO-internal secretariat established to administer the Green Industry Platform • Operational website, maintained at UNIDO HQ • Dissemination of policy toolkits through the Platform • At least 200 signatories to the Platform from governments, institutions and enterprises • Effective coordination of awareness-raising activities in-house as well as for Platform members, external partners and for Member States • Advocacy activities through social media platforms, press releases, news outlets, conferences and personal correspondence • Feedback on Platform from various stakeholders	• Project progress reports • The M&E system • Website usage statistics • Stakeholder surveys (internal/external, biennial) • Increased leadership role of UNIDO at the global level • A more consistent approach to greening industry within UNIDO, demonstrated in more cross-divisional collaboration	• Decline in participant interest • Inadequate resources for • Maintenance of the platform
2. Demonstration projects to showcase best practices for greening **existing industries** and **creating new green** industries	• Integrated corporate approach enabling UNIDO branches and integrated services (such as ITPOs, NCPCs, 3ADI and Field Offices) to promote green industries within a common framework • At least 1 national panel per region to develop road-maps (as a basis for demonstration projects in selected industrial sectors) • At least one Roadmap per geographical region (minimum target: 3 Road Maps) • Adoption by target groups of best practices in 3 sectors (to be identified in collaboration with selected NCPCs) • At least one industrial sector identified in each region to implement green practices and principles	• Project progress reports • A UNIDO corporate strategy focusing on UNIDO's integrated services • M&E system • Good housekeeping, input material change, better process control, equipment modification, technology change, on-site recovery and re-use, production of useful by-products and product modification in the 3 selected sectors • Green industries set up and under development for	• Funding available to produce baseline reports and project proposals • Cross-organizational cultural and structural fragmentation • In-house coordination as well as management support and guidance required to prepare for impact of Green Industry Initiative on established workflows • It is assumed that the project will collaborate, as necessary, with on-going projects (such as RECP, Montreal Protocol and the RE and EE projects).

Results	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions and Risks
		investment	
3. Research and awareness-raising to promote adoption of Green Industry principles	• At least 5 country reports on Green Growth through Green Industry development (one per geographical region) • At least 3 studies on Resource Efficiency Indicators for three selected manufacturing sectors • At least 3 Green Industry Toolkits (one per sector identified as per output 2) for capacity building • Contribution of research and expertise to international fora, such as the Green Industry Conference, the Vienna Energy Forum, the Global South-South Development Expo and ASEAN, amongst others	• Project progress reports • M&E system • Availability of toolkits and policy road-maps • Active participation in international forums and conferences • Collaboration with academic institutions on research projects	• It is assumed that the monitoring system would be adopted at the corporate level • Inadequate funding for research projects

Annex 2 - Evaluation Framework

Criteria / Issues	Questions	Sources of Information
Project design	• Was the project's design adequate to address the problems at hand? • Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? • Has there been a participatory project identification process instrumental in selecting problem areas and beneficiaries? • Was the project formulated based on the logical framework (project results framework) approach? • Had the project a clear objective, the attainment of which can be determined by a set of verifiable indicators? • Are the project's objectives and components clear, practicable, and feasible within its time frame? • Were the capacities of UNIDO's envisioned staff and counterparts (UNEP) properly considered when the project was designed? • Were adequate project (UNIDO-internal) management arrangements in place at project entry – to secure commitment and involvement of relevant branches? • Were the partnership arrangements (between UNIDO and UNEP) properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?	• Official project document (internal approved and as part of donor agreement), including reference documents on which the official project document is directly based (e.g. final report of Phase I as predecessor of project document Phase II) • UNIDO's resource person(s) involved in project preparation • Counterpart (UNEP) resource person involved in project preparation • Interviews with representatives of government and private sector (e.g. members of AB and TEC and selection of the signatories of GIP)
Relevance of objectives	• Were the project's objectives in line with UNIDO's mandate, objectives and outcomes defined in the Programme & Budget and core competencies? • How is the Green Industry Platform in line with the UNIDO's ISID agenda? Does the Green Industry Platform have potential to promote ISID? • Are the GII objectives relevant for national development and environmental priorities and strategies of governments (and regional and international agreements) – explicit focus on China, in relation to the China Chapter? • Is there a clear linkage and contribution from the GII towards achieving SDG's? • Are the GII objectives, outcomes and outputs relevant to the private sector (if necessary split into different type and/or sector of companies)?	• Official project documents • UNIDO's strategy on ISID • • Report / strategy on SDG's • Proceedings of relevant conferences • Background documents on the Chinese status (e.g. national policies and strategies).

	• Does the project remain relevant taking into account the changing environment? Especially taking into consideration the variety of other global initiatives with sometimes (partial) similar objectives? • Is there a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the operational context? • Should the project consider to stronger team up with other initiatives?	• Annual reports describing the status of green growth/economy/industry (e.g. progress reports prepared a.o. by UNEP, OECD,..) • Interviews with representatives of government and private sector (e.g. members of AB and TEC and selection of the signatories of GIP) • Interviews during field mission – for the Chinese situation • Interviews with representatives of other initiatives
Effectiveness: Output to Outcome And Outcome to Impact	Results: • What outputs and outcomes has the project achieved so far (both qualitative and quantitative results)? • To what extent did the GIP reach the expected performance (e.g. amount of member acquired in 3 years)? To what extent have the expected objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved? • Did the project generate any results that could lead to changes on the assisted institutions? • Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached? • How do the beneficiaries perceive the quality of outputs? • Does the GIP promote to the members the profiling of their activities/good practices throughout publications on the Platform? • How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of the GIP outputs/services? • What added value is the GIP offering to its members? • What role does the GIP play in terms of helping global businesses including SME's understand the SDG's? • How can the GIP be a tool for manufacturing sector's implementation of the SDG's? • Does the GIP include all types of business (e.g. SME's) in its activities (publications, guides, etc.?)?	• All output reports, including internal review memo's • List of signatories – including detailed information per member • Interviews with representatives of government and private sector (e.g. members of AB and TEC and selection of the signatories of GIP • Interviews during field mission – for the Chinese situation

	• Did the GIP develop activities/publications that incentivized the members? • Was the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country? • Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? • How does the GIP contribute to the formulation of the post-2015 development agenda? • To what extent did the project influence women's economic empowerment? Were women's professional skills improved? • Are the project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? • Have there been any unplanned effects? • Are there any actual and/or potential longer-term impacts? • If not yet, how to assess these in the long run? • Are there any catalytic or replication effects within and outside the project? Process: • Did the GIP receive and considered feedback from its members? • Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in the project? • How did the GIP measure the members' commitment/engagement to the Statement of Support? • Should baselines to measure progress be established?	
Efficiency: **Project implementation** **Organizational and procedural issues**	**Internal (UNIDO) governance structure:** • Who were actually involved in implementing the activities, and on a continue basis (or frequent changes)? • Were the right staffing levels involved, expertise and skill mix for the project? • Did UNIDO management provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time, and restructure the project when needed? • Did the involved direct staff identify problems in a timely fashion, accurately estimate their seriousness and escalate it in a proper way? • Will the Platform be affected by the internal branch restructuring/new management? • Should the Director General be more involved in activities and communications with stakeholders?	• Progress reports • Memo's of different internal meetings • Meeting minutes of AB and TEC-meetings • Interviews with involved staff • Interviews with representatives of different management levels • Interviews with UNEP-representatives • Interviews with representatives of government and private sector (e.g.

	External governance structure: • Did the other partners (UNEP, …) have assigned roles and responsibilities from the beginning? • Was the current partnership (UNIDO-UNEP) working together in order to deliver? • 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…)? • Should the partnership be reconsidered? • Should other partners be considered? • Should the Platforms conveners investigate the possibility of private sector secondments to the platform secretariat? • Was the selection process for the AB and TEC transparent? • Were the selected members of the AB and the TEC in line with the prepared ToR (and in accordance with the overall purpose)? • If there was a deviation between envisioned and actual composition of the governance bodies, what was the reason? And how dealt with the actual situation? • Did the governance structure function in it's original design way (frequency, presence of members, envisioned input, …)? • Should new members be included in the Advisory Board in order to increase resources (financial counselling, networking)? • Should new members be included on the Technical Expert Committee? **Planning:** • Are the project's activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and annual work plans? • Has the project produced the results (outputs and outcomes) within the expected time frame? • Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results? • 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? **Stakeholder involvement:** • Which stakeholders were involved in the project (i.e. NGOs, private sector, other	members of AB and TEC and selection of the signatories of GIP) • (Internal) financial reporting • Interview with SECO

	UN Agencies, etc.) and what were their immediate tasks? • Were the relevant powerful supporters and opponents of the processes properly involved? • 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? • Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation? • Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? **Financial systems:** • 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 the procurement process transparent and in line with internal (UNIDO) rules? • Was there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? • Did promised co-financing materialize? • If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and the co-financing actually realized, 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?	
Cost-effectiveness (inputs assessed in relation to outcomes)	• 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? • Are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with budgets? • Was the project cost effective? Was the project using the least cost options? • Was there coordination with other UNIDO and other donors' projects, and did possible synergy effects happen?	• Internal project progress memo's • Internal UNIDO-branch progress reports • Interviews with UNIDO-staff involved in the implementation of the project • Interviews with UNIDO-management from different divisions and branches
Sustainability of benefits	**Financial:** • Was the project successful in identifying and leveraging co-financing? • Does the platform have enough resources for administration and content-related activities? • How can the GIP increase resources? • Will the involvement of more partners increase the GIP financial resources? • Should it implement an institution fee for members?	• Proceedings of relevant conferences - • Background documents on the Chinese status (e.g. national policies and strategies). • Annual reports describing the status of

	• What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once assistance ends? • Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? **Socio-political:** • 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? • 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? **Institutional framework and governance:** • 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:** • 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?	green growth/economy/industry (e.g. progress reports prepared a.o. by UNEP, OECD,..) • Interviews UNIDO's resource person(s) and counterpart (UNEP) involved in project implementation • Interviews with representatives of government and private sector (e.g. members of AB and TEC and selection of the signatories of GIP) • Interviews with representatives of other initiatives

Annex 3 – Lists of documents reviewed

- Terms of Reference for Terminal Independent Evaluation of UNIDO Project: Green Industry Initiative, Phase II (XP/GLO/12/008 – SAP ID 120107), UNIDO, May 2015
- Project Document Green Industry Initiative, Phase II (XP/GLO/12/008 – SAP ID 120107), UNIDO
- Manila Declaration on Green Industry in Asia, Manila September 9, 2009
- UNIDO's Aide-Memoire International Conference on Green Industry Development, Tokyo, 16-18 November 2011
- Organizers' Summary Tokyo Green Industry Conference
- GIP - Introducing the Green Industry Platform
- GIP - How to Set-Up a Green Industry Platform Initiative in Your Country. A User Guide for Members
- GIP - Statement of Support
- GIP – Members' Newsletters
- GIP - Meeting Minutes UNIDO-UNEP Green Industry Platform, 10 September 2012
- GIP – draft Work Plan, 21 September 2012
- GIP - Strategy Document 2013 – 2015
- GIP – Report on Key Points, 1st Meeting of the Technical Expert Committee, Vienna 25 March 2013
- GIP – Report on Key Points, 1st Meeting of the Advisory Board, Paris, 3 April 2013
- GIP – Secretariat Work Plan Update 18 April 2013
- Executive Summary 'Green Industry Conference 2013', Guangzhou, 7-9 November 2013
- GIP – Progress Report January 2014
- GIP – Report on Key Points, 2nd Meeting of the Technical Expert Committee, Vienna, 26 June 2014
- GIP – Report on Key Points and Briefing Documents, 2nd Meeting of the Advisory Board, Paris, 22 September 2015
- Project Document 'Capacity Building for the Green Industry Platform in China' (SAP 120408)
- Work Summary of the Green Industry Platform China Chapter Office (GIP.CCO)
- UNIDO – Sustainable Industrial Development for Shared Prosperity" ISID Programme for Country Partnership

Annex 4 – Lists of organizations/persons contacted

UNIDO

Shichun Wang	Director ODG / ODG
Philippe Scholtes	Managing Director PTC
Celestin Monga	Managing Director PSM
Zou Ciyong	Director PTC/PRM
Heinz Leuenberger	Director PTC/EMB (till November 201)
Stephan Sicars	Director PTC/ENV
Pradeep Monga	Director PTC/ENE
Ludo Alcorta	Director PRF/ RSI
Rene van Berkel	Unit head in EMB (till March 2015)
Juergen Hierold	Unit head in PRM
Claudia Linke-Heep	Staff in PRM branch (previously in EMB)
Rana Fakhoury	Staff in PRM-branch
Hassan Mehdi	Staff in ENV branch (previously in EMB)
Charles Arthur	Communications and Advocacy
Christophe Yvetot	Head UNIDO-liaison office EU
Ralph Luken	
Edward Clarence-Smith	Previously UR China, now UR SE-Asia
Paul Hohnen	External consultant for UNIDO for a.o. GII and GIP

UNEP

Arab Hoballah	Chief SCP Branch
Garrette Clark	Staff the SCP Branch involved in GII/GIP activities
Elisa Tonda	Head of Business & Industry Unit

Advisory Board Members

Claus Stig Pedersen	Head of Corporate Sustainability at Novozymes
Louise Kantrow	Permanent Representative to UN of CC
David Hasanat	Chairman and CEO of VylellaTex Group

Technical Expert Committee Members

Mohamed Tawfic Ahmed	Professor at Suez Canal University
Jigar V. Shah	ED of the Institute for Industrial Productivity
Chettiyappan Visvanathan	President of AIT
George Varughese	President of Development Alternatives
Saul Weisleder	Ambassador at UN of the Government of Costa Rica
Michikazu Kojima	Director of the Institute of Developing Economies
Vered Blass	Lecturer at Tel Aviv University
Chunhong Chen	Chairwoman and CEO of Yiyuan Environmental Group
Stefan Giljum	Head Research Group at Vienna University
Anthony Shun Fung Chiu	Professor at De La Salle University

GIP signatories

Claus Stig Pedersen	Head of Corporate Sustainability at Novozymes
Louise Kantrow	Permanent Representative to UN of ICC
David Hasanat	Chairman and CEO of ViyellaTex Group
Chunhong Chen	Chairwoman and CEO of Yiyuan Environmental Group

Other stakeholders

Hans-Peter Egler	SECO (till mid 2014)
Kumi Kitamori	OECD

Annex 5 – OECD's work on Green Growth promotion

OECD work on green growth promotion – an example of successful internal mainstreaming

The OECD's work on green growth, launched in 2009 following the adopting of a Ministerial Declaration has primarily been a mainstreaming work. One key preoccupation of OECD has been to make its advice coherent across all policy areas. The practical ways that were adopted and results of this work have a clear demonstration value for similar inter-governmental and government-level initiatives. Several elements of success could be highlighted, including high-level leadership, ownership of key substantive units within the organization, clear coordination mechanisms involving directorates and committees, an operational unit to facilitate day-to-day work, and a knowledge sharing and visibility mechanism.

Strategic direction on green growth work is provided by one of the OECD's Deputy Secretary-General. Oversight is shared between the OECD Chief Economist, who helps drive integration of green growth objectives into the Organization's broader economic policy advice, and the Environment Director. Operational support is provided by a **Green Growth Co-ordinator** (an official at Head of Division level), who monitors and helps integrate green growth work across OECD committees, supported by a **Green Growth Unit**. The Unit is located in the Environment Directorate, but it takes its working directions from a **Green Growth Core Group** comprising senior representatives from the four main directorates leading green growth – the Economics Department, the Directorate for Science, Technology and Innovation, the Statistics Directorate and the Environment Directorate. Representatives from other directorates are added as needed. The Group meets two to three times a year to help guide the Organization's green growth work and ensure its coherence. A senior economist in the Economics Department is dedicated full-time to coordinating and mainstreaming green growth into the Department's core economic policy advice to countries. Another senior economist works for both the Economics Department and the Environment Directorate, to bridge work undertaken across the two directorates on environmental policies and determinants of growth. An informal grouping of interested OECD permanent representatives from delegations provides guidance on coordinating the Organization's work from a country-delegate perspective. The "**Friends of Green Growth**" convenes on an ad hoc basis, in person or by email, as required to support direction of the green growth work programme. They are an important link with countries to help develop a whole-of-government view on relevant issues.

Knowledge sharing and visibility is ensured by an annual organization of the **Green Growth and Sustainable Development** (GGSD) Forum. Held annually since 2012, the Forum addresses a different topic each year, convening experts from across policy areas on a subject-specific basis. On a day-to-day basis, knowledge is shared via the **Green Growth Knowledge Platform**. The OECD is one of its four founding partners and a member of GGKP's Steering Committee.

Green Growth Knowledge Platform

The Green Growth Knowledge Platform (GGKP) is a global network of international organizations and experts that identify and addresses major knowledge gaps in green growth theory and practice. The GGKP was established in January 2012 by the Global Green Growth Institute, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Bank. The GGKP's three work areas are: generating, managing and sharing knowledge. UNIDO is one of GGKP's 40 knowledge partners.

Together, the four founding partners form the Steering Committee, which is responsible for approving GGKP's strategy and overall work programme. Its decisions are taken by consensus. The platform's day-to-day operations are jointly managed by GGGI and UNEP. Both organizations provide dedicated staff and consultants to the initiative. This management Team provides regular progress updates and status reports to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee has also appointed an independent Advisory Committee made up of experts from around the world with deep technical or policy experience related to green growth research and practice. The Advisory Committee offers strategic advice and guidance on GGKP research programmes.

In 2014, the GGKP had four Research Committees on: Metrics and Indicators, Trade and Competitiveness, Technology and Innovation and Fiscal Instruments. Each of the committees is made up of individual experts from across the GGKP partner organizations and the Advisory Committee. More recently, three other committees were established.

The GGKP convenes Annual Conferences and commissions studies as background papers for these Conferences. By 2014, the GGKP has produced 23 papers on a range of green growth and green economy topics.

The Platform runs a regularly updated website that helps managing knowledge, issues annual reports and newsletters with a variable frequency (every one-two months). Webinars are also used to share information.

The GGKP has a small (four people) Secretariat whose members are not in one location though officially the GGKP office is located in Geneva.

Annex 6 – Evaluation TOR

UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

Terms of Reference
for Terminal Independent Evaluation of UNIDO Project:

Green Industry Initiative, Phase II
XP/GLO/12/008 - SAP ID 120107

With a focus on
Output 1: Establishment, maintenance and promotion of the Green Industry Platform

Budget: € 1,000,000
Period covered: 06.2012 (launched pilot phase) – 12.2015 (end of pilot phase)

MAY 2015

1. Background and Context

The launch of the UNIDO-UNEP Green Industry Platform at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) in June 2012 provided a key impulse to propel forward Phase II of UNIDO's flagship Green Industry initiative. The overall aim of Phase II has been to effectively position Green Industry as a core pillar of a Green Economy and to enable key stakeholders at the national and regional level to show consistent and concrete commitment, as well as a heightened awareness and application, of core Green Industry policies and practices.

The Green Industry Platform launch was in response to a number of ministerial level intergovernmental calls for a more targeted and participative global effort to transition to a more sustainable model of industrial production. These included the 2009 Manila Declaration on Green Industry in Asia and the 2011 Green Industry Conference in Tokyo. It was designed as a voluntary, high-level, global multi-stakeholder partnership to catalyze, mobilize and mainstream long-term action on Green Industry around the world. Through the Platform's Statement of Support document, which all participants are required to sign, the Platform provides a common framework to bring together government, business and civil society leaders to identify and encourage diverse initiatives to improve the environmental performance of existing industry and support the creation of new industries delivering environmental goods and services.

The Platform is administered by UNIDO, in close coordination with UNEP and in consultation with the UN Global Compact. The Platform is governed by an Executive Board comprising the Director General of UNIDO and the Executive Director of UNEP, and is responsible for taking decisions on the overall direction, work plan, budget and governance of the Platform. The Platform additionally has two advisory bodies: the Advisory Board and the Technical Expert Committee. The Advisory Board informs the Platform's convenors on how best to promote the Platform's objectives and is consulted on all matters of direction and strategy, while the Technical Expert Committee provides advice to the Advisory Board and convenors on more operational aspects of the Platform's operations. The period 2012-2015 has been identified as a pilot phase.

The period from July 2012 to September 2014 has broadly been dedicated to momentum-building. This was pursued primarily through the operationalization of the Green Industry Platform, the recruitment of governments, businesses and organizations to sign the Platform's "Statement of Support" and the profiling of a Green Industry approach to manufacturing at a series of high-profile global forum events. In addition, several research, capacity building and cooperation activities were undertaken by UNIDO, in conjunction with Platform members, to produce concrete outputs which would help governments and enterprises understand and adopt Green Industry policies and practices, and mainstream and scale up the Green Industry approach throughout global manufacturing.

Since October 2014, coinciding with the departure of the Director of the previous Environmental Management Branch, who also was the driving force and project manager of this project, and the drying up of project funding, Platform activities have been slow and the conceptual framework, which the Green Industry Initiative has provided to the activities of the Environmental Management Branch, has been in question. Coordination of the Green Industry Initiative and Platform has been moved to the Partnership and Results Monitoring Branch of UNIDO, which provides strategic advice to the Managing Director of the Programme Development and Technical Cooperation Division of UNIDO, but also coordinates UNIDO's overarching Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) initiative and vision.

Therefore, the timing of this independent evaluation is excellent as it provides an opportunity for UNIDO to review the Platform's activities and impact, its internal and external governance structure as well as operational and financial management issues.

Focus on the Green Industry Platform (output 1)

The Green Industry Platform is the dominant project output under the Green Industry Initiative Phase II project. Outputs 2 and 3 are providing technical substance to the Platform. The outcome of any UNIDO project, which promotes industrial resource efficiency, would be seen under the current thinking of the umbrella nature of the Green Industry Initiative, as an input to the Green Industry Platform for dissemination to members and a wider audience. Hence, the Initiative and Platform are closely linked to, and dependent on, the technical work undertaken in the line branches of UNIDO's PTC division such as the Environment and the Energy branches but also the Strategic Industrial Policy, Research and Statistics branch.

For UNIDO's Management Green Industry is a brand and the Platform a flagship initiative, which gives visibility and provides an outreach channel to UNIDO's constituency. Supporting activities include the Green Industry Conference, which is organised biennially, as well as the Green Industry Summer Course, organised annually in Budapest.

The challenge ahead for the Green Industry Platform has been summarised very clearly and concisely by the Green Industry Platform Advisory Board at its most recent meeting in September 2014 as follows:

Enhancing Outreach, Uptake and Impact
In the Board's assessment of the optimal strategies and approaches to reach target audiences, respond to member needs, and deepen awareness and engagement in Green Industry policies and practices, the following recommendations were made:

- *The Green Industry Platform needed to strengthen its value proposition and sharpen its focus. As such, the Platform needs to focus on easily and immediately achievable objectives, and offer concrete products and outputs in which quality (of products and services) takes precedence over quantity (of activities and members).*
- *The business case for prospective and actual members needs to be clearer. In order to increase government as well as private sector engagement, the Platform should clarify its core functions and offer clear incentives for participation.*
- *Value-chain and sector-level events showcasing industry best practice should be organized to engage stakeholders in a more targeted manner, position the Platform as a framework for practical solutions.*
- *The Green Industry Platform's brand identity could be strengthened through the establishment of an awards or certification scheme, recognizing the most successful solutions in the Green Industry space.*
- *Platform activities should be geared towards SMEs, and take a value-chain approach. Proposed activities include renewable energy promotion and technology promotion.*
- *The establishment of national and/or regional hubs and chapters for Green Industry should be encouraged to facilitate greater engagement by government, business and civil society stakeholders.*

- *The Platform should also facilitate access to finance, by for instance cataloguing existing national, regional or global administrative solutions, and also certifying projects to fast-track relevant funding.*

The Road Beyond 2015

Taking into account the emerging international policy and regulatory environment arising from the formulation of the post-2015 development agenda, including the UN Sustainable Development Goals and the UNFCCC climate negotiations, the Board made the following recommendations regarding the Platform's potential role and activities:

- *The role and ambition of the Platform should be reassessed, so as to help balance emerging country- level environmental and economic goals, for instance by helping African economies make pivotal 'green' industrial development choices.*
- *Post-2015, the Platform could play an invaluable role in helping global business, including SMEs, understand the meaning of the Sustainable Development Goals and their relevance and implications for business.*
- *In this context, the Platform should help 'translate' relevant goals and targets for global industry, in particular SMEs, to clarify what the inherent requirements and opportunities might be and emphasize that 'greening' operations is not optional and should be undertaken beyond just the business case.*
- *The framework of the Platform's Statement of Support should be used to coordinate efforts and investments along value chains and amongst stakeholders to realize potential resource efficiency gains and transition to a circular economy in line with compatible policies and regulations.*
- *At the country level, enable strategic policy shifts towards Green Industry by providing advisory services, building capacity, convening stakeholders, developing roadmaps and fostering regulatory change.*
- *Building on momentum, develop concrete multi-stakeholder partnerships, including South-South cooperation cases, based on technology sharing, capacity building and trade facilitation, for the delivery of transformative Green Growth.*
- *Develop national Green Industry strategies amongst government members of the Platform, and measure performance over time.*
- *Contribute, where possible, to the formulation of the post-2015 development agenda and the shaping of conducive policy environments for Green Industry development.*

Management

On the issue of management, the following recommendations were made by the Board with respect to the Platform's possible future management, financing and administrative arrangements:

- *Conduct comprehensive review of Platform activities and progress in 2015 to more sharply define mission and mandate for period post-2015.*
- *The Platform's convenors should improve reporting on progress and increase transparency on projected programme of work.*
- *Given current resource levels, a choice had to be made between an emphasis on global policy advocacy, or on concrete activities (e.g. convening events, profiling best practices) on the ground.*
- *Increase the Platform's capacity and resources through, for example, institution of a fee structure for members, or a blend of public and private financing based on initial public patronage aimed at leveraging greater business support.*

- *Convenor organizations should provide dedicated resources to administer the Platform and drive its activities.*
- *UNIDO affirmed that it would continue pursuit of its Green Industry suite of projects from available human and financial resources.*

It was noted that these and other recommendations would be taken into account by UNIDO and UNEP in framing the review to be undertaken in 2015 of the Platform's pilot phase, and in improving its outreach and impact in the period beyond 2015. Specific recommendations would be brought to the Board's next meeting.

This terminal independent evaluation will be led by UNIDO and closely coordinated with UNEP and UNGC.

2. Project Description

The Green Industry Initiative Phase II project has three outputs, which are closely inter-linked and where outputs 2 and 3 feed output 1.

Outputs:

1. Establishment, maintenance and promotion of the Green Industry Platform;
2. Demonstration projects to showcase best practices for greening existing industries and creating new green industries;
3. Research and awareness-raising to promote adoption of Green Industry principles.

Below more information is provided on the Green Industry Platform (output 1) as well as examples of activities undertaken under outputs 2 and 3.

Green Industry Platform (output 1)
Following the creation of the Green Industry Initiative in 2009, through the adoption of the ministerial-level Manila Declaration on Green Industry in Asia, and the solidification of the Green Industry concept and call for an international Green Industry framework, at the subsequent Green Industry conference held in Tokyo, Japan, in 2011, the **establishment, maintenance and promotion of the Green Industry Platform** became the primary focus of the Phase II of the Green Industry Initiative project.

The Platform's development since its inception in 2012 can be seen in three phases:

- Launch of the Platform (2012/2013) - preparatory meetings and official launch of the Platform at Rio+20; recruitment of first 70 government, business and civil society signatories; governance and administrative structure established.

- Promoting Platform awareness and engagement (2013) – events were held in New York, San Jose, Seoul, Nairobi, London and Brussels to familiarize the government and private sectors with Platform's mission and offerings. A high-level Paris Forum and the 3rd Green Industry Conference in Guangzhou in 2013 helped deepen international policy commitment to the Green Industry agenda.

- Developing concrete offerings and activities (2014) - knowledge products such as a series of publications on greening industrial value chains (food and beverages, agro- industries) were developed, as well as a global

survey carried out on Green Industry implementation opportunities and barriers. Member-oriented projects, such as a water footprint measurement tool and an optimized textiles wet processing methodology are furthermore being developed and promoted in partnership with Platform members. Additional work is also being undertaken with Platform members on sector-level resource efficiency benchmarking and e-waste management in Africa. All relevant materials are freely available on the Platform's website.

Some achievements to date:
The Green Industry Platform has successfully been rendered operational, with a de facto secretariat established at UNIDO headquarters in Vienna. The key points achieved in this respect are:

- **Day-to-day administration of the Green Industry Platform** conducted by UNIDO, in cooperation with UNEP and in with support from UNGC;
- **Platform's governance structure in place and operational**, consisting of an Executive Board comprising the UNIDO and UNEP chief executives; an Advisory Board consisting of high-level representatives of select Platform members, and a Technical Expert Committee comprising working-level experts in the field of sustainability. Annual meetings of the Advisory Board and the Technical Expert Committee were held in March (TEC-Vienna) and April (AB-Paris) 2013 and June (TEC-Vienna) and September (AB-New York) 2014.
- **Continuous growth of Platform membership**. Currently 210 members (31 governments, 102 businesses and 75 organizations), with the Platform on the cusp of greater expansion to be achieved through a targeted invitations campaign from the Executive Board to previously-identified top performing businesses in the field of sustainability, academic and research institutions, as well as corporate foundations and philanthropic organizations.
- **Information dissemination mechanism for members established**. Periodic letters from the Executive Board as well as regularly-issued news bulletins have been sent out since the Platform's launch to keep members apprised of latest developments and opportunities. Additionally, a Platform "user's guide" and a member survey have also been issued to ensure that UNIDO's approach towards member relations remains responsive to member needs. Two-way communication is enabled, with members being encouraged to provide feedback through a dedicated Green Industry Platform email address.
- **Official website, Facebook account and Twitter feed established, maintained and developed**. A website featuring background information, member listing and a knowledge repository, amongst other things, has been established to help disseminate relevant information to members and interested parties alike. Furthermore, the website and social media channels are being used to issue news updates and disseminate relevant material in a rapid and effective manner. This online effort has been complemented by the **issuance of print media articles and press releases** promoting the Green Industry Platform and the Green Industry concept.
- The Platform's official website also features a "Knowledge Center" through which **Green Industry publications, reports, toolkits, best practices guides,**

policy documents, and other research, project and promotional materials are systematically collected and published.

Showcasing best practice through demonstration projects (output 2)
Replicable and scalable cooperation activities between UNIDO and external entities, in particular members of the Green Industry Platform, are integral to ensuring the global uptake of a Green Industry approach to manufacturing. UNIDO is conducting activities encouraging and enabling the enterprise-, sectoral-, national and regional levels to adopt Green Industry policies and practices. As such, the development of **demonstration projects to showcase best practices for greening existing industries and creating new green industries** are a core aspect of Phase II of the Green Industry Initiative.

Key achievements in this area include:

- **Integrated corporate approach being refined**, following the Lima Declaration adopted at the fifteenth session of the UNIDO General Conference, to fully reflect the priority of Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development (ISID) and to maximize the delivery potential of UNIDO's technical cooperation activities under the Green Industry umbrella. This ongoing activity has been influenced by an internal organisational restructuring, which followed the departure of the director of the previous Environmental Management Branch, who was the key driver of UNIDO's Green Industry Initiative and Platform as well as the project manager of this project. In January 2015, project management responsibilities were moved away from the Environment Branch towards the Partnership and Results Monitoring Branch in an attempt to better align the Green Industry Initiative and Platform with other ongoing partnership programmes such as the ISID operationalisation programme of UNIDO.

- **Formulating a country-wide Green Industry policy framework** for inclusion in the national Green Growth strategy for Viet Nam. A holistic assessment of opportunities and constraints for solving some of Viet Nam's most pressing industrial environmental problems was conducted, paying due attention to their socioeconomic context. These served to inform and guide the development of a policy framework for wide scale deployment of Green Industry approaches to ultimately achieve Green Growth in Viet Nam. The overarching policy framework suggested for adoption combines the setting of guiding quantitative goals for the improvement of resource productivity and environmental performance, with specific initiatives to improve policy coherence at the national and sub-national levels, improve availability and access to appropriate technologies, provide customized business advisory services, and mainstream Green Industry into sectoral strategies.

- In early 2013, the Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE) was officially launched, of which UNIDO is a partner organization, together with UNDP, UNEP, the ILO and UNITAR. UNIDO's work through PAGE will **support 20 countries over the next seven years in building national green economy strategies (including Green Industry policy frameworks/roadmaps)** that will generate new jobs and skills, promote clean technologies, and reduce environmental risks and poverty.

- UNIDO and DNV Business Assurance (a Green Industry Platform member) will **develop and implement joint projects in the field of water footprint measurement and promotion of best practices in water management, with a particular emphasis on Africa**. A memorandum of understanding was signed to this end in late December 2013.

- UNIDO's cooperation with Microsoft Corporation (an Advisory Board member of the Green Industry Platform) on the "Greener IT" initiative seeks to **disseminate best practices - by means of the Green Industry Platform and the UNIDO-UNEP global RECP network - related to acquiring, using and disposing of electronics and in particular personal computers**. This is accomplished by supporting the development, understanding and capacity building related to the use of environmental standards.

- **Additional resource efficiency projects** through the UNIDO-UNEP RECPnet in rice and coffee processing, as well as emerging Green Chemistry projects in bio-degradable plastics and enzyme use in textile industry **are currently under development**.

- In consultation with the Green Industry Platform's Technical Expert Committee, UNIDO has identified the **food and beverages sector and the textiles sector for implementation of Green Industry policies and practices in 2013 and 2014**, respectively. Two publications in a series of three on greening the food and beverage value chains, methodologies for greening the meat, fruit processing and soft drink sub-sectors and associated value chains were released, with a view toward producing an actionable guide of use to Platform members and affected industries at large.

- In order to increase the uptake of Green Industry policies and practices by global industry, **targeted capacity-building activities have been undertaken**, such as the summer course on "Green Industry: Pathways Towards the Industry of the Future" organized by UNIDO with the Central European University (CEU), the University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Northwestern Switzerland and the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs of Switzerland (SECO), for over 150 participants in three consecutive years 2013/14 and 15. The course was expanded to Bahrain in 2014.

- Sponsorship of the 2013 and 2014 SEED Gender Equality Awards, aimed at recognizing and supporting the most promising women-led environmental start-up enterprises in developing countries. After successfully co-sponsoring the SEED Gender Equality Awards with UN Women in 2013, UNIDO played a stronger partnership role in the 2014 SEED Awards, expanding the scope of its participation to include capacity building and technical cooperation activities for the winners, in addition to the advocacy and outreach activities already being undertaken. UNIDO's involvement in the SEED Awards is also closely linked to the initiative on "Women in Green Industry" which the participants at the 2013 Green Industry Conference, held in Guangzhou, China requested as a concrete conference outcome.

Awareness raising and outreach (output 3)
The successful scaling up and mainstreaming of Green Industry on a global level depends to a large part on a foundation of solid empirical evidence to support a Green Industry approach and the dissemination of this data to a wide audience. Therefore, **research and awareness-raising to promote the adoption of Green Industry policies and practices** forms another component of the Green Industry Initiative's Phase II.

Current achievements in this area include:

- **Establishment of the China Chapter**: Chapter of the Green Industry Platform established at Beijing Normal University to help facilitate and catalyze the participation of Chinese businesses in the Platform's mission and activities. Project document is currently being finalized for a two-year Chinese funded project to support upscaling of Green Industry policies and practices in China. Currently, the China Chapter has some 30 members.

- **Women in Green Industry Ch**apter: In 2014, the sub-chapter of the Platform started featuring and profiling successful female green industry entrepreneurs. The Chapter closely cooperates with UNWOMEN, and in 2015 it is planned to jointly develop a project to enhance and empower women in green industry.

- **Development of country reports on green growth through Green Industry for:**
    - China - in close co-operation with the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (MIIT) in China a national Green Industry strategy is being developed;
    - Mexico - a first draft of a Green Industry policy study was completed in mid-2013 and is under review;
    - In the context of PAGE country activities UNIDO is leading the sector focus on industry, where green industry assessments will result in strategies and action plans in Senegal, Ghana, Peru, Mongolia, Mauritius and Burkina Faso.

- **Publication of book** entitled: "Green growth – From labour to resource productivity - Best practice examples, initiatives and policy options", in English and French. This publication provides policy-makers with best practice options in select manufacturing sectors to help Green Industry.

- **Issuance of working document** on "Resource Use & Resource Productivity of Economic Sectors – A Pilot Analysis of direct and indirect CO2 emissions, energy and raw material use of selected industrial sectors" . This study, undertaken together with the Sustainable Europe Research Institute, will present concrete resource efficiency indicators in select manufacturing sectors for specific geographical regions. The final report will be published in early 2014.

- **Publication of report** "Greening Food and Beverage Value Chains – The Case of the Meat Processing Industry". This report marks the first in a series of three dedicated to presenting best practice options for greening the food and beverage value chains.

- A **toolkit for the assessment and development of Sustainable Agro Value Chains is currently under development** by UNIDO as a joint undertaking between the Organization's Green Industry Initiative and the Accelerated Agribusiness and Agro-industries Development Initiative (3ADI). A comprehensive discussion paper was issued in November 2013, with a view towards holding an Expert Group Meeting in Vienna in the first quarter of 2014 to continue the development of the toolkit.

- Additionally, **multi-language versions have been produced of core Green Industry documents** (UNIDO Green Industry Initiative for Sustainable Industrial Development, Introduction to the Green Industry Platform, Green Industry Platform Statement of Support) and promotional material (Green Industry Project Suite, Green Industry Platform flyer) have been developed to help promote the global uptake of the Green Industry concept.

- In response to recommendations from both the Green Industry Platform's Advisory Board and Technical Expert Committee, UNIDO, together with the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), with the support of Tel Aviv University, Faculty of Management and the University of Gothenburg, Department of Political Science, **developed a survey of the global manufacturing industry to assess the needs related to the topic of Green Industry**. A pilot phase of the survey was conducted mid-2014. The main phase of circulation was started at the end of 2014 until early 2015 with unfortunately very limited results. The survey partners are contemplating whether the sample size is sufficiently large to draw results and make recommendations.

- In order to promote the understanding and uptake of the concept of Green Industry and to ensure an adequate level of exposure for the Green Industry Platform amongst a variety of actual and potential stakeholders, **the following global forum events have either been organized by UNIDO, or have benefitted from the contribution of research and expertise** in the area of Green Industry:

From	To	Title	Location
03 May 2012		First Interim Advisory Board Meeting of the Green Industry Platform	Vienna, Austria
14 Jun 2012		United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) - Launch of the Green Industry Platform	Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
24 Sep 2012	- 28 Sep 2012	Energy Efficiency Week	Quito, Ecuador
21 Nov 2012		Fortieth Session of the UNIDO Industrial Development Board - Side Event on the Green Industry Platform	Vienna, Austria
06 Mar 2013		High-Level Working Group on Environment and Green Industry for the High-Level Conference on Middle Income Countries	New York, USA
25 Mar 2013		Green Industry Platform - First Technical Expert Committee Meeting	Paris, France

03 Apr 2013			Green Industry Platform - First Advisory Board Meeting	Paris, France
03 Apr 2013			Green Growth Knowledge Platform Annual Conference	Paris, France
04 Apr 2013			Paris Forum - Towards a Sustainable Economic Paradigm: From Labour to Resource Productivity	Paris, France
24 Apr 2013	-	25 Apr 2013	United Nations System Private Sector Focal Points Meeting	Geneva, Switzerland
28 May 2013	-	30 May 2013	Vienna Energy Forum 2013 - Plenary 2: Energy and Green Growth	Vienna, Austria
10 Jun 2013	-	14 Jun 2013	High-Level Conference on Middle-Income Countries - Presentation of the Green Industry Platform; High-Level Dialogue on Sustainability and Industrial Development	San Jose, Costa Rica
02 Sep 2013	-	06 Sep 2013	3rd Global Network Conference on Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production (RECP)	Montreux, Switzerland
19 Sep 2013	-	20 Sep 2013	Fourth United Nations Global Compact Leaders Summit 2013 - Green Industry Platform Side Event	New York, USA
18 Oct 2013			Joint International Conference on Green Industry and Energy Efficiency	Seoul, ROK
28 Oct 2013	-	01 Nov 2013	United Nations Global South-South Development Expo 2013 - Solution Forum 2: Clean Technology and Green Industry	Nairobi, Kenya
31 Oct 2013			Green in the City: The Business Case for the Green Economy: What Can/Should the UK Learn from a United Nations Approach?	London, UK
07 Nov 2013	-	09 Nov 2013	Third Green Industry Conference	Guangzhou, China
26 Nov 2013	-	27 Nov 2013	European Development Days 2013 - Moving towards green industry: Mobilizing the private sector for environmental sustainability	Brussels, Belgium
02 Dec 2013	-	06 Dec 2013	15th Session of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization General Conference - Plenary 4 / Interregional Debate 2: Green Industry and Sustainable Development	Lima, Peru
09 Dec 2013	-	10 Dec 2013	Resource Efficient and Cleaner Production for sustainable industrial development and Green Growth	Lima, Peru
7-9 Nov 2013			Green Industry Conference 2013	Guangzhou, China
26-27 Nov-2013			EU Development Days 2013	Brussels, Belgium
2-6 Dec 2013			UNIDO General Conference 15th Session	Lima, Peru
9-10 Dec 2013			Green Growth Conference	Lima, Peru
4-5 Mar 2014			PAGE Conference	Dubai, UAE
10 Apr 2014			General Assembly - Partnering for Efficient Resource Management	New York, USA
8-9 May 2014			Vinyl Sustainability Forum	Rome, Italy
27 May 2014			GEF Assembly	Cancun, Mexico
3-5 Jun 2014			Green Week 2014 – Eco-Industrial Parks	Brussels, Belgium
23-25 Jun 2014			UNIDO ISID Forum	Vienna, Austria
25-26 Jun 2014			Green Industry Platform TEC Meeting	Vienna, Austria
26 Jun 2014			GreenCo Summit	Chennai, India

26 Jun 2014	Caring for Climate Summit 2014	Beijing, China
10-14 Aug 2014	American Chemical Society Annual Meeting	San Francisco, USA
16 Sep 2014	Innovative Manufacturing in Industrial Sustainability	Cambridge, UK
17-18 Sep 2014	International Conference On Sustainable Development Practice	New York, USA
22 Sep 2014	Green Industry Platform AB Meeting	New York, USA
23 Sep 2014	UN Climate Summit 2014	New York, USA
3-5 Nov 2014	EcoChem 2014	Basel, Switzerland
4-5 Nov 2014	UNIDO ISID Partnership Forum	Vienna, Austria
3 Nov 2014	Chemical Industrial Parks EGM	Basel, Switzerland
17-20 Nov 2014	Going Green - CARE Innovation 2014	Vienna, Austria

- Furthermore, UNIDO **provided specialized inputs to several United Nations system initiatives and bodies**, to ensure that the Green Industry Initiative was optimally positioned in global efforts to address the sustainable development. This included brokering roles as a partner in the Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE) together with UNDP, UNEP, ILO, and UNITAR; the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)'s sustainability initiative WIPO GREEN; the Green Growth Knowledge Platform (GGKP) run by UNEP and the World Bank; and the Green Economy Coalition (GEC) headed by UNEP. UNIDO additionally provided inputs to UN-wide consultations, such as the Post-2015/SDGs process, in order to develop and foster effective synergies with global efforts.

Summary of project Objective, Outcome and Outputs as stated in the Project Logframe:

Development objective: Generate a consistent and sustainable approach to greening industry and enable key stakeholders at national and regional levels to introduce policies, strategies and methodologies that promote environmental preservation.
Project outcome: Key stakeholders at national and regional levels show consistent (concrete) commitment toward, and awareness and application of Green Industry principles and practices
Outputs: 1. Establishment, maintenance and promotion of the Green Industry Platform. 2. Demonstration projects to showcase best practices for greening existing industries and creating new green industries. 3. Research and awareness-raising to promote adoption of Green Industry principles.

Project Stakeholders

The immediate beneficiaries are:

- Private and state-owned industries
- Business associations including SME and women associations;
- Multinational companies involved in supply chains;
- Ministries of industry, environment, trade
- Financial and investment institutes
- Chambers of commerce
- International and national NGOs active in the environment area.

Budget information

Project budget

Green Industry Platform – securing commitments/action to support GI agenda - € 300,000
Greening existing industries - € 350,000
Creating and supporting the start-up of green industries - € 350,000

Funds received

GEF $100,000
France €200,000 (incl. 13% sc)
Switzerland €150,000 (incl. 13% sc)
UNIDO XP €500,000

3. Purpose of the Terminal Independent Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to review the Green Industry Platform pilot phase (2012-2015) which was launched as part of the Green Industry Initiative phase II, i.e. to what extent has the Green Industry Platform generated a consistent and sustainable approach to greening industry and enable key stakeholders at national and regional levels to introduce policies, strategies and methodologies that promote environmental preservation. Furthermore, the evaluation will assess to which extent has the Green Industry Platform been established, maintained and promoted. (Project Document in Annex 4).

It was recommended by the Advisory Board to undertake a revision of the Platform's achievements, in order to more sharply define mission and mandate for period post-2015.

Additionally, this terminal evaluation will collect lessons learned with a forward looking approach that gives operational and practical recommendations into future project implementation and activities.

The report will be of interest to concerned UNIDO and UNEP staff and donors.

4. Scope and Focus of the Terminal Evaluation

The evaluation will span the Green Industry Platform process from the beginning in June 2012 to end of its pilot phase in December 2015. The evaluation is intended to assess the entire results chain, but will focus on providing an analysis of pertinent issues such

as management arrangements, assessing its sustainability and the likelihood of achieving planned impacts. More specifically, recommendations for an improved

5. Evaluation Issues and Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluation consultants will be expected to prepare a more targeted and specific set of questions and to design related survey questionnaires as part of the Inception Report, and in line with the above evaluation purpose and focus descriptions.

The evaluation team will assess the project performance and likelihood of attainment of results, guided by the following criteria and evaluation questions:

Project design

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; and
- 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.

Project relevance

The extent to which the project is relevant to the:

- National development and environmental priorities and strategies of the Governments and population of the countries, and regional and international agreements.
- 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.).
- 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?

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.

Efficiency

The extent to which:

- The project cost was effective? Was the project using 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?

Sustainability of project results

Sustainability is understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the 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 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 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.

- Will the involvement of more partners increase the Green Industry Platform financial resources?
- Does the platform have enough resources for administration activities? How can the GIP increase resources? Should it implement an institution fee for members?
- What is the prospect for technical, organizational and financial sustainability

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 find them fit The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected project implementation and achievement of project results:

- **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?

- **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? 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?

- **Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through 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? 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?
- **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.
- **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?
- **Co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and the co-financing actually realized, 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?
- **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?
- **Implementation approach[3].** Is the implementation approach chosen different from other implementation approaches applied by UNIDO and other agencies? Does the approach comply with the principles of the Paris Declaration? Does the approach promote local ownership and capacity building? Does the approach involve significant risks?

[3] Implementation approach refers to the concrete manifestation of cooperation between UNIDO, Government counterparts and local implementing partners. Usually POPs projects apply a combination of agency execution (direct provision of services by UNIDO) with elements of national execution through sub-contracts.

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…)?

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:

- To which extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?

Project Specific questions

- Can the Green Industry Platform members, Technical Experts Committee and Advisory Board expectations be delivered?
- What type of internal and external structure is needed in order to deliver expectations? What internal arrangements need to be done?
- Is the current partnership working together in order to deliver? Should the partnership be reconsidered? Should other partners be considered? Should the Platforms convenors investigate the possibility of private sector secondments to the platform secretariat?
- Should the Director General be more involved in activities and communications with stakeholders?
- Will the Platform be affected by the internal branch restructuring/new management?
- Should new members be included in the Advisory Board in order to increase resources (financial counselling, networking)?
- Should new members be included on the Technical Expert Committee?
- To what extent did the Green Industry Platform reach the expected performance (e.g. amount of member acquired in 3 years)? To what extent have the expected objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved?
- Did the project generate any results that could lead to changes on the assisted institutions? Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached?

Direction and Strategy of the Green Industry Platform

- How is the Green Industry Platform in line with UNIDO's ISID agenda? Does the Green Industry Platform have potential to promote ISID?

- What is the link between Green Industry Initiative and SDG's?
- How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of the Green Industry Platform outputs/services? What added value is the Green Industry Platform offering to its members?
- Did the Green Industry Platform develop activities/publications that incentivized the members? Did the Green Industry Platform receive and considered feedback from its members?
- How is the Green Industry Platform measuring the members commitment/engagement to the Statement of Support? Should baselines to measure progress be stablished?
- Does the Green Industry Platform include all types of business (e.g. SME's) in its activities (publications, guides, etc.?)
- Does the Green Industry Platform promote to the members the profiling of their activities/good practices throughout publications on the Platform?
- To what extent did the project influence women's economic empowerment? Were women's professional skills improved?
- What role does the Green Industry Platform play in terms of helping global businesses including SME's understand the SDG's?
- How does the Green Industry Platform contribute to the formulation of the post-2015 development agenda?
- How can the Platform be a tool for manufacturing sector's implementation of the SDG's?

6. Terminal Independent Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The Terminal Independent Evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy and the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programmes and Projects.

It will be carried out using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The lead evaluation consultant will liaise with the Project Manager on the conduct of the evaluation and methodological issues.

The lead evaluation consultant 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. The lead evaluation consultant will develop interview guidelines.

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, output reports (case studies, action plans, etc.) and relevant correspondence.
    b. Notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project
    c. Other project-related material produced by the project.
2. Interviews with project management and technical support including staff and management at UNIDO HQs and – if necessary - staff associated with the project's financial administration and procurement.
3. Interviews with project partners shown in the corresponding sections of the project documents.

4. Interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project. The evaluator shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of any donor agencies or other organizations.
5. Interviews with the UNIDO's project management, Advisory Board and Technical Expert Committee.
6. Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the lead evaluator and/or UNIDO ODG/EVA.

7. Evaluation Team Composition

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of 2 independent international evaluation consultants who will be working under the guidance of the UNIDO Evaluation Officer in ODG/EVA in coordination with the Project Manager and project team. In case an evaluation field mission is agreed (e.g. China), a national consultant will also be hired to support locally the evaluation team.

The evaluation consultants must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the projects.

8. 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.
2. Inception report: At the time for 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. (**Tentatively**) 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

9. 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 circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.

10. Annexes

1. Evaluation Report Outline
2. Evaluation Quality Assurance Checklist
3. JDs for Evaluation Team members
4. Project logframe