



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

OCCASION

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



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

DISCLAIMER

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

FAIR USE POLICY

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

CONTACT

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

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



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Independent terminal evaluation of the UNIDO project:

**Implementing integrated measures for minimizing mercury releases from
artisanal gold mining**

UNIDO Project number: GFRLA12003

UNIDO SAP ID: 100271

GEF ID: 4799

MAY 2016

CONTENTS

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW	3
II.	SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	8
III.	EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	8
IV.	EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION	9
V.	TIME SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES	10
VI.	PROJECT EVALUATION PARAMETERS.....	10
VII.	DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING	16
VIII.	QUALITY ASSURANCE	17
	Annex 1 - Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report	18
	Annex 2 - Rating tables	20
	Annex 3 - GEF Minimum requirements for M&E	23
	Annex 4 - Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and programmes	24
	Annex 5. Checklist on terminal evaluation report quality	26
	Annex 6 – Required project identification and financial data	28
	Annex 7 – Job descriptions	30
	Annex 8 – Project results framework	37

I. Project background and overview

1. Project factsheet

Project Title	Implementing integrated measures for minimizing mercury releases from artisanal gold mini
UNIDO project No. and/or SAP ID	GFRLA12003 / SAP ID: 100271
GEF project ID	4799
Region	Latin America
Country(ies)	Ecuador, Peru
GEF focal area(s) and operational programme	Multi focal area (Chemicals – POPs and International Waters)
GEF implementing agency(ies)	UNIDO
GEF executing partner(s)	National Geologic, Mining and metallurgy Research Institute (INIGEMM) – Ecuador Ministry of Environment - Peru
Project size (FSP, MSP, EA)	MSP
Project CEO endorsement / Approval date	19 March 2012
Project implementation start date (First PAD issuance date)	18 June 2012
Original expected implementation end date (indicated in CEO endorsement/Approval document)	18 March 2015
Revised expected implementation end date (if applicable)	31 August 2016
Actual implementation end date	31 August 2016
GEF project grant (excluding PPG, in USD)	999,900
GEF PPG (if applicable, in USD)	
UNIDO co-financing (in USD)	50,000 (in kind)
Total co-financing at CEO endorsement (in USD)	2,676,764 (cash+in-kind)
Materialized co-financing at project completion (in USD)	
Total project cost (excluding PPG and agency support cost, in USD; i.e., GEF project grant + total co-financing at CEO endorsement)	3,726,664
Mid-term review date	
Planned terminal evaluation date	July-August 2016

(Source: Project document)¹

2. Project background and context

The project started in 2012. It is being implemented in the Puyango-Tumbes river basin located in the south of Ecuador and north of Peru. Ecuador and Peru have a long withstanding cooperation in their border region through the Binational Plan, which was signed in 1998. Given its past success, the cooperation has recently been extended till 2014. The plan has several programs currently underway, including in the areas of environmental management. The plan demonstrates the countries willingness and ability to cooperate in the areas of mutual interest in order to strengthen the development of this region. The project aimed to strengthen the national capacity of both Ecuador and Peru to effectively manage mercury in the artisanal and small-scale gold mining sector.

In Peru, the Tumbes river basin was targeted as it is the direct receptor of any contaminating activities upstream; however, the primary technology transfer, training and awareness raising activities were to be conducted in the department of Piura, also in the north of Peru, as artisanal and small scale gold mining (ASGM) is practiced in this area, whereas the Tumbes area does not mine gold.

Small-scale artisanal gold mining is a major cause of mercury (extraction chemical) releases and environmental pollution. The propensity for water transport of mercury, its chemical transformation and bioaccumulation, and its easy transport in often transboundary rivers and aquifers, makes it a threat not only to the health of miners and of ecosystems at the local level, but to the environmental health of the global community. Currently, ASGM is one of the largest anthropogenic sources of mercury emission to the environment. UNIDO estimates that nearly 100% of all mercury used in ASGM is released into the environment. Total releases are estimated at 1,000 tonnes of mercury per year, which is equivalent to about 30% of total anthropogenic mercury emissions.

This project aimed to reduce substantial (>40%) mercury releases, more cost-effective gold recovery and income enhancement, by applying an integrated series of measures including capacity building, technology transfer and policy/legal reforms. By achieving a reduction in the releases of mercury and strengthening capacities for the implementation of vigilance and monitoring programs, the project would have a beneficial impact on easing tension in the region; and the benefits from increased gold recovery and income enhancement will give sustainability to the initiative. Both countries have a strong tradition in gold mining and have demonstrated a strong commitment to action, including legislative, to respond to the environmental issues raised by ASGM.

A large part of the technology transfer activities were to be focused in Ecuador, as this is where the mercury emissions affecting the transboundary water system originate. Special attention was to be given to working with the communities in the Puyango River water basin in order to promote the adoption of clean techniques and technologies which reduce mercury use and emissions. However, lessons learned from the techniques and technologies that are developed and transferred were also to be shared with the mining communities in Peru. Both countries were to receive extensive training and awareness-raising.

The project is funded through a GEF grant, amounting to USD 999,900, a UNIDO contribution of USD 50,000 (in kind); and the counterparts' co-financing of USD 2,626,764 (in kind), which amount to total project budget of USD 3,726,664.

The project implementation started in **June 2012** and the initial project end date was in **March 2015**. The same was revised and the new expected implementation end date is **31 August 2016**.

¹ Project information data throughout these TOR are to be verified during the inception phase.

3. Project objective and structure

The main objective of the project is to protect human health and the environment by implementing integrated measures aimed at minimizing mercury releases (>40%) from artisanal gold mining activities affecting the Puyango River basin in Ecuador and the Tumbes River basin in Peru.

The project's technical components, in addition to project management, are as follows:

PC-1: Design of strategies for minimization of mercury releases and enhancement of gold recovery and income (Mercury minimization strategies and reduction targets endorsed by stakeholders in both countries)

PC-2: Implementation of Mercury Releases Minimization Strategies in the Puyango-Tumbes River basins. (Reduction in mercury use and emissions in the targeted mining communities, through a) local development and adoption of alternative mining technologies, b) increased awareness of mining communities, national & local authorities on dangers on mercury, c) adoption of policies or programmes supporting the formalization of miners and promoting innovative financial mechanism)

PC-3: Implementation of Communication, Dissemination and Replication (CDR) Strategies (Project objectives and results are communicated / disseminated to achieve replication at a national, regional and international level)

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

- Design strategies for minimization of mercury releases and enhancement of gold recovery
- Develop a characterization and diagnostic analysis, describing the baseline socio-economic, environmental and human health conditions, as well as the organization and political structure of the ASGM communities
- Establish targets for release reductions, with the development of accompanying indicators of success
- Training of miners on improved technologies and best practices to reduce mercury use and emissions, while enhancing gold recovery and incomes
- Training of miners, national and local authorities, as well as the general public, particularly women and youth, on the dangers of mercury.
- Conduct a mercury monitoring programme in the Puyango-Tumbes river basin
- Develop programs to prompt the use of financial tools for miners, policy/legislative reforms and the formalization of the ASGM sector
- The communication strategy will successfully disseminate the project achievements, which in turn will lead to a replication of the best practices at a national, regional and international level.

4. Project implementation and execution arrangements

UNIDO: GEF implementation agency and responsible for overall monitoring and evaluation of the project, as well as reporting progress to the donor.

UNEP: Liaise with UNIDO through the Global Mercury Partnership on policies development, basin level action plans and national strategic action plans

INIGEMM: formalization and capacity building of miners in Ecuador (establishment of the International Training Center for Artisanal Mining – ITCAM), educating the local communities and strengthening the legal framework

Peruvian Ministry of Environment: implementing agency in Peru

Project Coordination Unit (PCU): was to be established in Ecuador, and to comprise:

Regional Project Coordinator (RPC): responsible for overall coordination of project activities, day-to-day implementation of the project in Ecuador and coordinate activities with the National Coordinator in Peru.

National Coordinator (NC): in Peru.

5. Budget information

The project is funded through a GEF grant, amounting to USD 999,900, a UNIDO contribution of USD 50,000 (in kind); and the counterparts' co-financing of USD 2,626,764 (in kind), which amount to total project budget of USD 3,726,664.

Some financial details are shown below:

Project outcomes	Donor (GEF/other) (\$)	Co-Financing (\$)	Total (\$)
1. Mercury minimization strategies and reduction targets endorsed by stakeholders in both countries	40,000	290,000	330,000.00
2. Reduction in mercury use and emissions in the targeted mining communities	769,000	2,100,000	2,869,000.00
3. Project objectives and results are communicated / disseminated to achieve replication at a national, regional and international level.	100,000	52,000	152,000.00
Project management	90,900	234,764	325,664.00
Total (\$)	999,900	2,676,764	3,676,664

Source: CEO endorsement document

Co-financing Source Breakdown is as follows:

Co-financing Source		Type	Total Co-financing
INIGEMM	National Government	Grant	540,000
INIGEMM	National Government	In-kind	1,419,600
University of Machala, Ecuador	Other	In-kind	150,000
US State Department	National Government	Grant	242,000
Ministry of Environment, Peru	National Government	In-kind	275,164
UNIDO	IA	In-kind	50,000
Total Co-financing			2,676,764

Source: CEO Endorsement document

UNIDO GEF-grant disbursement breakdown:

Item	Disbursement (expenditure, incl. commitment) in 2012	Disbursement in 2013	Disbursement in 2014	Disbursement in 2015	Disbursement in 2016	Total disbursement (in USD) (2012-present) (12 May 2016)
Staff & Intern Consu	6,423.60	16,671.00	1,132.00	64,322.00	12,600.00	101,148.60
Local travel	7,816.41	5,530.47	4,912.19	17,528.14	8,344.97	44,132.18
Staff Travel		254.73		68.62		323.35
Nat.Consult./Staff		47,234.11	80,105.91	63,784.77	41,238.28	232,363.07
Contractual Services		102,083.33	191,000.00	77,933.34		371,016.67
Train/Fellowship/Stu		14,461.78	174.73	-659.76		13,976.75
International Meetin	15,583.06	7,799.16	25,900.49	-133.35	98.27	49,247.63
Equipment		2,581.93	590.65	-691.23	17,856.00	20,337.35
Other Direct Costs	1,439.87	6,255.60	5,721.14	5,542.66	12,553.14	31,512.41
Total (in USD)	31,262.94	202,872.11	309,537.11	227,695.19	92,690.66	864,058.01

Source: SAP database, 12 May 2016

II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date in **June 2012** to the estimated completion date in **December 2016**. It will assess project performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

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

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

The key question of the terminal evaluation is whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve the main objective of the project which is to protect human health and the environment by implementing integrated measures aimed at minimizing mercury releases (>40%) from artisanal gold mining activities affecting the Puyango River basin in Ecuador and the Tumbes River basin in Peru.

III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The terminal evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy², the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle³, the GEF Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations⁴, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy⁵ and the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies⁶.

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

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

² UNIDO. (2015). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (UNIDO/DGB/(M).98/Rev.1)

³ UNIDO. (2006). Director-General's Administrative Instruction No. 17/Rev.1: Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle (DGAI.17/Rev.1, 24 August 2006)

⁴ GEF. (2008). Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations (Evaluation Office, Evaluation Document No. 3, 2008)

⁵ GEF. (2010) The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (Evaluation Office, November 2010)

⁶ GEF. (2011). GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards: Separation of Implementation and Execution Functions in GEF Partner Agencies (GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01, 3 November 2011, prepared by the Trustee)

reliability of findings. The specific mixed methodological approach will be described in the inception report.

The evaluation team will develop interview guidelines. Field interviews can take place either in the form of focus-group discussions or one-to-one consultations.

The methodology will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNIDO and UNIDO-GEF annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)), mid-term review (MTR) report, output reports (case studies, action plans, sub-regional strategies, etc.), back-to-office mission report(s), end-of-contract report(s) and relevant correspondence.
 - (b) If applicable, notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project (e.g. approval and steering committees).
 - (c) Other project-related material produced by the project.
2. The evaluation team will use available models of (or reconstruct if necessary) theory of change for the different types of intervention (enabling, capacity, investment, demonstration). The validity of the theory of change will be examined through specific questions in interviews and possibly through a survey of stakeholders.
3. Counterfactual information: In those cases where baseline information for relevant indicators is not available, the evaluation team will aim at establishing a proxy-baseline through recall and secondary information.
4. Interviews with project management and technical support including staff and management at UNIDO HQ and in the field and – if necessary - staff associated with the project's financial administration and procurement.
5. Interviews with project partners and stakeholders, including, among others, government counterparts, GEF OFP, project stakeholders, and co-financing partners as shown in the corresponding sections of the project documents.
6. On-site observation of results achieved by demonstration projects, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies.
7. Interviews and telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved in the project. The evaluation team shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of any donor agency(ies) or other organizations.
8. Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Field Office in Colombia (which covers Ecuador and Peru), to the extent that it was involved in the project, and members of the project management team and the various national and sub-regional authorities dealing with project activities as necessary. If deemed necessary, the evaluation team shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.
9. Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluation team and/or UNIDO, ODG/EVQ/IEV for triangulation purposes.
10. The inception report will provide details on the methodology used by the evaluation team and include an evaluation matrix.

IV. Evaluation team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluation consultant acting as the team leader and one national consultant(s). The consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions annexed to these terms of reference.

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

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

The UNIDO project manager and the project teams in the participating countries will support the evaluation team. The UNIDO GEF Coordinator and the GEF OFP will be briefed on the evaluation and provide support to its conduct. GEF OFP will, where applicable and feasible, also be briefed and debriefed at the start and end of the evaluation mission.

V. Time schedule and deliverables

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from **1 September 2016 to 31 October 2016**. The evaluation mission is planned for **20 to 27 September 2016**. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of the preliminary findings for all stakeholders involved in this project/programme in the participating country.

At the end of the evaluation field mission, a debriefing should also be conducted inviting local stakeholders (incl. government and parties involved in the evaluation). After the evaluation mission, the international evaluation consultant will come to UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of the preliminary findings of the terminal evaluation.

The draft TE report will be submitted 4 to 6 weeks after the end of the mission. The draft TE report is to be shared with the UNIDO PM, ODG/EVQ/IEV, the UNIDO GEF Coordinator and the GEF OFP and other relevant stakeholders for receipt of comments. The ET is expected to revise the draft TE report based on the comments received, edit the language and form and submit the final version of the TE report in accordance with UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV standards.

VI. Project evaluation parameters

The evaluation team will assess the project performance guided by the parameters and evaluations questions provided in this section. In addition to the qualitative assessment based on the evidence gathered in the evaluation, the evaluation team will rate the project on the basis of the **rating criteria for the parameters described in the following sub-chapters, A to I**.

Ratings will be presented in the form of tables with each of the criteria / aspects rated separately and with **brief justifications for the rating** based on the findings and the main analyses (see Table 1 to Table 3) in **Error! Reference source not found.. Error! Reference source not found.** in **Error! Reference source not found.** presents the template for summarizing the overall ratings.

For GEF projects: As per the GEF's requirements, the evaluation report should also provide information on project identification, time frame, actual expenditures, and co-financing in the format in **Error! Reference source not found.**, which is modeled after the GEF's project identification form (PIF).

A. Project identification and design

Project identification assessment criteria derived from the logical framework approach (LFA) methodology, establishing the process and set up of steps and analyses required to design a project in a systematic and structured way, e.g. situation, stakeholder, problem and objective analyses.

The aspects to be addressed by the evaluation include inter alia the extent to which:

- a) The situation, problem, need / gap was clearly identified, analysed and documented (evidence, references). The project design was based on a needs assessment
- b) Stakeholder analysis was adequate (e.g. clear identification of end-users, beneficiaries, sponsors, partners, and clearly defined roles and responsibilities in the project(s)).
- c) The project took into account and reflects national and local priorities and strategies
- d) ISID-related issues and priorities were considered when designing the project
- e) Relevant country representatives (from government, industries, gender groups, custom officers and civil society - including the GEF OFP for GEF projects), were appropriately involved and participated in the identification of critical problem areas and the development of technical cooperation strategies.

Project design quality assessment criteria derive from the logical framework approach (LFA) methodology, leading to the establishment of LogFrame Matrix (LFM) and the main elements of the project, i.e. overall objective, outcomes, outputs, to defining their causal relationship, as well as indicators, their means of verification and the assumptions. The evaluation will examine the extent to which:

- f) The project's design were adequate to address the problems at hand;
- g) The project had a clear thematically focused development objective;
- h) The project outcome was clear, realistic, relevant, addressed the problem identified and provided a clear description of the benefit or improvement that will be achieved after project completion;
- i) Outputs were clear, realistic, adequately leading to the achievement of the outcome;
- j) The attainment of overall development objective, outcome and outputs can be determined by a set of SMART verifiable indicators;
- k) The results hierarchy in the LFM, from activities to outputs, outcome and overall objective, is logical and consistent.
- l) Verification and Assumptions were adequate, identifying important external factors and risks;
- m) All GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects have incorporated relevant environmental and social considerations into the project design / GEF-6 projects have followed the provisions specified in UNIDO/DGAI.23: UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP).

B. Implementation Performance

Implementation assessment criteria to be applied are shown below and correspond to DAC criteria, as well as to good programme/project management practices.

a) Relevance and ownership

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

- i. National development and environmental priorities and strategies of the Government and the population, and regional and international agreements. See possible evaluation questions under "Country ownership/drivenness" below.
- ii. 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.).
- iii. GEF's focal areas/operational programme strategies: In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the GEF focal area(s)/operational program strategies? Ascertain the likely nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the wider portfolio of POPs.
- iv. Does the project remain relevant taking into account the changing environment?

b) Effectiveness

- i. Achievement of expected outcomes:
 - o What outputs and outcomes has the project achieved so far (both qualitative and quantitative results)?
 - o To what extent have the expected outcomes, outputs and long-term objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved?
 - o Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions?
 - o Have there been any unplanned effects?
 - o Are the project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives?
 - o If the original or modified expected results were described as merely outputs/inputs, were there any real outcomes of the project and, if so, were these commensurate with realistic expectations from the project?
 - o If there was a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country and operational context, were such modifications properly documented?
- ii. How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of outputs? Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached?
- iii. Longer-term impact: 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.
- iv. Catalytic or replication effects: 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.

c) Efficiency

The extent to which:

- i. The project cost was effective? Was the project using the most cost-efficient options?
- ii. 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?
- iii. Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet the requirements? Was the quality of UNIDO inputs and services as planned and timely?
- iv. Was there coordination with other UNIDO and other donors' projects, and did possible synergy effects happen?
- v. Were there delays in project implementation and if so, what were their causes?

d) Assessment of risks to sustainability of project outcomes

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

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

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

- ii. **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?
- iii. **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?
- iv. **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 have adverse environmental impacts, 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.

e) Assessment of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems

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

f) Monitoring of long-term changes

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

- i. Did the project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?
- ii. What were the accomplishments and shortcomings in establishment of this system?

- iii. Is the system sustainable — that is, is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and does it have financing? How likely is it that this system continues operating upon project completion?
- iv. Is the information generated by this system being used as originally intended?

g) Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results

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

- i. **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?
- ii. **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 relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in the project? Was the GEF OFP involved in the project design and implementation? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government—or governments in the case of multi-country projects—approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives?
- iii. **Stakeholder involvement and consultation.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through continuous information sharing and consultation? Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes involved in a participatory and consultative manner? Which stakeholders were involved in the project (e.g., NGOs, private sector, other UN Agencies) 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?
- iv. **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.
- v. **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?

- vi. **Co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability.** Did the project manage to mobilize the co-financing amount expected at the time of CEO Endorsement? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and the co-financing actually mobilized, what were the reasons for the variance? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?
- vii. **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?
- viii. **Implementation and execution approach.** Is the implementation and execution approach chosen different from other implementation approaches applied by UNIDO and other agencies? Does the approach comply with the principles of the Paris Declaration? Is the implementation and execution approach in line with the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards: Separation of Implementation and Execution Functions in GEF Partner Agencies (GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01) and the relevant UNIDO regulations (DGAI.20 and Procurement Manual)? Does the approach promote local ownership and capacity building? Does the approach involve significant risks? In cases where Execution was done by third parties, i.e. Executing Partners, based on a contractual arrangement with UNIDO was this done in accordance with the contractual arrangement concluded with UNIDO in an effective and efficient manner?
- ix. **Environmental and Social Safeguards.** If a GEF-5 project, has the project incorporated relevant environmental and social risk considerations into the project design? What impact did these risks have on the achievement of project results?

h) Project coordination and management

The extent to which:

- i. 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)?
- ii. The UNIDO HQ-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (e.g. problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)?

i) Assessment of gender mainstreaming

Gender mainstreaming assessment criteria are provided in the table below. Guidance on integrating gender is included in Annex 4.

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

- Did the project/programme design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? If so, how (at the level of project outcome, output or activity)?
- Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)?
- How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?

- Have women and men benefited equally from the project's interventions? Do the results affect women and men differently? If so, why and how? How are the results likely to affect gender relations (e.g., division of labour, decision-making authority)?
- Are women/gender-focused groups, associations or gender units in partner organizations consulted/included in the project?
- To what extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?

VII. Deliverables and Reporting

Inception report

These terms of reference (TOR) provide some information on the evaluation methodology, but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager, the evaluation team will prepare a short inception report that will operationalize the TOR relating to the evaluation questions and provide information on what type of and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). It will be discussed with and approved by the responsible in the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

The inception report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory model(s); elaboration of evaluation methodology including quantitative and qualitative approaches through an evaluation framework ("evaluation matrix"); division of work between the international evaluation consultants; mission plan, including places to be visited, people to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable⁷.

Evaluation report format and review procedures

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

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

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

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

⁷ The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

Evaluation work plan and deliverables

The "Evaluation Work Plan" includes the following main products/deliverables:

INCEPTION PHASE:

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 of departure to the field mission, all the received material has been reviewed and consolidated into the Inception report.

FIELD MISSION:

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.

REPORTING:

5. Data analysis/collation of the data/information collected
6. A draft terminal evaluation report will be forwarded electronically to the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and circulated to main stakeholders.
7. Final terminal evaluation report will incorporate comments received.

VIII. Quality assurance

All UNIDO terminal evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on methodology and process by the UNIDO, ODG/EVQ/IEV, providing inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report and evaluation report by UNIDO, ODG/EVQ/IEV). 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, ODG/EVQ/IEV 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 terminal evaluation report are reviewed by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, which will submit the final report to the GEF Evaluation Office and circulate it within UNIDO together with a management response sheet.

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

Executive summary

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

I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process

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

II. Country and project background

- Brief country context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project⁸ and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
 - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
 - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
 - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
 - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of Government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
 - Counterpart organization(s)

III. Project assessment

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

- A. Project identification and formulation
- B. Project design
- C. Implementation performance
 - a) Relevance and ownership (report on the relevance of project towards countries and beneficiaries, country ownership, stakeholder involvement)
 - b) Effectiveness (the extent to which the development intervention's objectives and deliverables were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance)
 - c) Efficiency (report on the overall cost-benefit of the project and partner countries' contribution to the achievement of project objectives)
 - d) Likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes (report on the risks and vulnerability of the project, considering the likely effects of sociopolitical and institutional changes in partner countries, and its impact on continuation of benefits after the GEF project ends, specifically the financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks)
 - e) Project coordination and management (Report on the project management conditions and achievements, and partner countries' commitment)
 - f) Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems (report on M&E design, M&E plan implementation, and budgeting and funding for M&E activities)
 - g) Monitoring of long-term changes

⁸ Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g., relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives)

- h) Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results (report on preparation and readiness / quality at entry, country ownership, stakeholder involvement, financial planning, UNIDO support, co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability, delays of project outcomes and sustainability, and implementation approach)
- D. Gender mainstreaming

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

IV. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

A. Conclusions

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

B. Recommendations

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

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

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:

- UNIDO
- Government and/or counterpart organizations
- Donor

C. Lessons learned

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

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

Annex 2 - Rating tables

Ratings will be presented in the form of tables with each of the criteria / aspects rated separately and with **brief justifications for the rating** based on the findings and the main analyses (see Table 1 to Table 3) below. **Error! Reference source not found.** presents the template for summarizing the overall ratings.

Table 1. Rating criteria for Quality of project identification and formulation process (LFA Process)

Evaluation issue	Evaluator's comments	Ratings
1. Extent to which the situation, problem, need / gap is clearly identified, analysed and documented (evidence, references).		
2. Adequacy and clarity of the stakeholder analysis (clear identification of end-users, beneficiaries, sponsors, partners, and clearly defined roles and responsibilities in the project(s)).		
3. Adequacy of project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) design.		
4. Overall LFA design process.		

Table 2. Quality of project design (LFM)

Evaluation issue	Evaluator's comments	Rating
1. Clarity and adequacy of outcome (clear, realistic, relevant, addressing the problem identified). Does it provide a clear description of the benefit or improvement that will be achieved after project completion?		
2. Clarity and adequacy of outputs (realistic, measurable, adequate for leading to the achievement of the outcome).		
3. Clarity, consistency and logic of the objective tree , and its reflexion in the LFM results hierarchy from activities to outputs , to outcome and to overall objective .		
4. Indicators are SMART for Outcome and Output levels.		
5. Adequacy of Means of Verification and Assumptions (including important external factors and risks).		
6. Overall LFM design quality.		

Table 3. Quality of project implementation performance

Evaluation criteria	Rating	
7. Ownership and relevance		
8. Effectiveness		
9. Efficiency		
10. Impact		
11. Likelihood of/ risks to sustainability		
12. Project management		
13. M&E		

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

RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

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

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

RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

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

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

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

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

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

RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

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

The Project M&E system will be rated on M&E design, M&E plan implementation and budgeting and funding for M&E activities as follows:

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

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

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

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

Annex 3 - GEF Minimum requirements for M&E⁹

Minimum requirement 1: Project design of M&E

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

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

Minimum requirement 2: Application of project M&E

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

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

⁹ http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/ME_Policy_2010.pdf

Annex 4 - Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and programmes

A. Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Gender responsive evaluation questions

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

B.1 Design

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

- If the project/programme promotes gender equality and/or women's empowerment, was gender equality reflected in its objective/s? To what extent are output/outcome indicators gender disaggregated?

B.2 Implementation management

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

B.3 Results

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

Annex 5. Checklist on terminal evaluation report quality

Independent terminal evaluation of UNIDO-GEF project:

Project Title:

UNIDO Project NO:

UNIDO SAP ID:

GEF ID:

Evaluation team leader:

Quality review done by:

Date:

CHECKLIST ON EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
A. Was the report well-structured and properly written? (Clear language, correct grammar, clear and logical structure)		
B. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?		
C. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?		
D. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?		
E. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes or did it explain why this is not (yet) possible? (Including assessment of assumptions, risks and impact drivers)		
F. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?		
G. Did the report include the actual project costs (total, per activity, per source)?		
H. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of both the M&E plan at entry and the system used during the implementation? Was the M&E sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation?		
I. Quality of the lessons: were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
J. Quality of the recommendations: did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can these be immediately implemented with current resources?		
K. Are the main cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights and environment, appropriately		

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
covered?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner? (Observance of deadlines)		

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

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

Annex 6 – Required project identification and financial data

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

I. Dates

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

II. Project framework

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

Activity types are:

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

III. Co-financing

Source of co-financing (name of specific co-financiers)	Type of co-financier (e.g. government, GEF agency(ies), Bilateral and aid agency (ies), multilateral agency(ies), private sector, NGO/CSOs, other)	Type of co-financing	Project preparation – CEO endorsement/ approval stage (in USD)		Project implementation stage (in USD)		Total (in USD)	
			Expected	Actual	Expected	Actual	Expected	Actual
	...							
Total co-financing (in USD)								

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

Annex 7 – Job descriptions



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	International evaluation consultant, team leader
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Missions:	Missions to Vienna, Austria; Portovelo-Zaruma, Ecuador and Suyo, Peru
Start of Contract (EOD):	20 June 2016
End of Contract (COB):	20 August 2016
Number of Working Days:	30 working days spread over 2 months

1. ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

2. PROJECT CONTEXT

Small-scale artisanal gold mining is a major cause of mercury (extraction chemical) releases and environmental pollution. The propensity for water transport of mercury, its chemical transformation and bioaccumulation, and its easy transport in often transboundary rivers and aquifers, makes it a threat not only to the health of miners and of ecosystems at the local level, but to the environmental health of the global community. Currently, artisanal and small scale gold mining (ASGM) is one of the largest anthropogenic sources of mercury emission to the environment. UNIDO estimates that nearly 100% of all mercury used in ASGM is released into the environment. Total releases are estimated at 1,000 tonnes of mercury per year, which is equivalent to about 30% of total anthropogenic mercury emissions.

This project aimed to reduce substantial (>40%) mercury releases, more cost-effective gold recovery and income enhancement by applying an integrated series of measures including capacity building, technology transfer and policy/legal reforms. By achieving a reduction in the releases of mercury and strengthening capacities for the implementation of vigilance and monitoring programs, the project would have a beneficial impact on easing tension in the region; and the benefits from increased gold recovery and income enhancement will give sustainability to the initiative. Both countries, Ecuador and Peru, have a strong tradition in gold mining and have demonstrated a strong commitment to action, including legislative, to respond to the environmental issues raised by ASGM.

The main objective of the project is to protect human health and the environment by implementing integrated measures aimed at minimizing mercury releases (>40%) from

artisanal gold mining activities affecting the Puyango River basin in Ecuador and the Tumbes River basin in Peru.

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

3. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
<p>1. Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to collect in the field and adjust the key data collection instrument of 3A accordingly (if needed);</p> <p>Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project's activities and analyze other background info.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjust table of evaluation questions, depending on country specific context; • Draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions; • Brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework. 	6 days	Home-based
<p>2. Briefing with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, project managers and other key stakeholders at UNIDO HQ.</p> <p>Preparation of the Inception Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed evaluation schedule with tentative mission agenda (incl. list of stakeholders to interview and site visits); mission planning; • Division of evaluation tasks with the National Consultant. • Inception Report 	1 day	Vienna, Austria
<p>3. Conduct field mission to Ecuador and Peru in July 2016¹⁰.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP), etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; • Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; • Evaluation presentation of the evaluation's initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country, including the GEF OFP, at the end of the mission. 	12 days	Ecuador and Peru
<p>4. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After field mission(s): Presentation slides, 	2 days	Vienna, Austria

¹⁰ The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
at UNIDO HQ	feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed		
5. Prepare the evaluation report, with inputs from the National Consultant, according to the TOR; Coordinate the inputs from the National Consultant and combine with her/his own inputs into the draft evaluation report. Share the evaluation report with UNIDO HQ and national stakeholders for feedback and comments.	• Draft evaluation report.	6 days	Home-based
6. Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	• Final evaluation report.	3 days	Home-based
	TOTAL	305 days	

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education:

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

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 7 years' experience in environmental project management and/or evaluation (of development projects)
- Strong experience in environment and/or earth sciences (geology, mineralogy, etc.), as well as knowledge about GEF operational programs and strategies and about relevant GEF policies such as those on project life cycle, M&E, incremental costs, and fiduciary standards
- Experience in the evaluation of GEF projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset
- Knowledge about multilateral technical cooperation and the UN, international development priorities and frameworks
- Working experience in developing countries

Languages:

Fluency in written and spoken English is required. Working knowledge in Spanish is required.

Reporting and deliverables

- 1) At the beginning of the assignment the Consultant will submit a concise Inception Report that will outline the general methodology and presents a concept Table of Contents;
- 2) The country assignment will have the following deliverables:
 - Presentation of initial findings of the mission to key national stakeholders;
 - Draft report;

- Final report, comprising of executive summary, findings regarding design, implementation and results, conclusions and recommendations.

3) Debriefing at UNIDO HQ:

- Presentation and discussion of findings;
- Concise summary and comparative analysis of the main results of the evaluation report.

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

Absence of conflict of interest:

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



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

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

Title:	National evaluation consultant
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	Travel to potential sites within Ecuador and Peru
Start of Contract:	20 June 2016
End of Contract:	20 August 2016
Number of Working Days:	25 days spread over 2 months

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

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

PROJECT CONTEXT

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

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); in cooperation with the Team Leader: determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in both English and local language (questionnaires, logic models) to collect these data through interviews and/or surveys during and prior to the field missions; Coordinate and lead interviews/surveys in local language and assist the team leader with translation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of detailed evaluation questions to be clarified; questionnaires/interview guide; logic models; list of key data to collect, draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions Drafting and presentation of brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory framework in the context of the project. 	7 days	Home-based

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration	Location
<p>where necessary; Analyze and assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework, specifically in the context of the project's objectives and targets; provide analysis and advice to the team leader on existing and appropriate policies for input to the team leader.</p>			
<p>Review all project outputs/publications/feedback; Briefing with the evaluation team leader, UNIDO project managers and other key stakeholders. Coordinate the evaluation mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with the Project Management Unit. Assist and provide detailed analysis and inputs to the team leader in the preparation of the inception report.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. • Division of evaluation tasks with the Team Leader. • Inception Report. 	3 days	Home-based (telephone interviews)
<p>Coordinate and conduct the field mission with the team leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required; Consult with the team leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission. • Agreement with the Team Leader on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks. 	10 days (including travel days)	Ecuador/ Peru tbd
<p>Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with the Team Leader.</p>	<p>Draft evaluation report prepared.</p>	3 days	Home-based
<p>Revise the draft project evaluation report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.</p>	<p>Final evaluation report prepared.</p>	2 days	Home-based
TOTAL		25 days	

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Core values:

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

Core competencies:

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

Managerial competencies (as applicable):

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

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education: Advanced university degree in science, engineering or and/or other relevant discipline like developmental studies.

Technical and functional experience:

- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.
- Experience in the field of environment and energy, including evaluation of development cooperation in developing countries is an asset

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

Absence of conflict of interest:

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

Annex 8 – Project results framework

	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Development goal/impact <i>What the target group achieves (benefit)</i>	Protect human health and the environment by implementing integrated measures aimed at minimizing mercury releases from artisanal gold mining activities affecting the Puyango River basin in Ecuador and the Tumbes River basin in Peru.	- 40% reduction in levels of mercury released into the Puyango -Tumbes river basin		
Outcome(s)/ immediate objective(s)/ <i>What the target group does differently (change in behaviour)</i>	<p>1. Mercury minimization strategies and reduction targets endorsed by stakeholders in both countries</p> <p>2. Reduction in mercury use and emissions in the targeted mining communities, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) local development and adoption of mining alternative technologies/ techniques; ii) increased awareness of mining communities, national & local authorities and general public, particularly women and youth, of dangers of mercury use; iii) adoption of policies or programmes that support the formalization of miners and promote innovative financial mechanism. <p>3. Project objectives and results are communicated / disseminated to achieve replication at a national, regional and international level.</p>	<p>Strategies and reduction targets endorsed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % reduction in mercury levels in rivers - % reduction in mercury levels among targeted miners - % of stakeholders report increased awareness of mercury danger after training - % of miners that adopt alternative techniques - No. of miners formalized - No. of miners that undertake new financial mechanisms <p>- Project presents results at Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC)</p> <p>- Project results are shared with other mining communities in each country.</p>	<p>Project progress report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Laboratory results of the monitoring programme - Survey of stakeholders - Training assessment - Final evaluation <p>- Project progress report</p> <p>- Minutes of the INC meeting(s)</p>	<p>- Continued Government commitment</p> <p>- The ASGM community is open to adopting new technologies/ techniques</p> <p>- Other mining communities are receptive to results from demonstration ASGM communities.</p>

Outputs (results) <i>What the project achieves (create a potential)</i>	<p>1.1 Design strategies for minimization of mercury releases and enhancement of gold recovery</p> <p>1.2 Develop a characterization and diagnostic analysis describing the baseline socio-economic, environmental and human health conditions, as well as the organizational and political structure of the ASGM communities</p> <p>1.3 Establish targets for release reductions, with the development of accompanying indicators of success.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparation of strategies and targets for mercury reductions - Preparation of baseline analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project progress report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient information is available for baseline and relevant stakeholders share the information.
	<p>2.1 Training of miners on improved technologies and best practices to reduce mercury use and emissions, while enhancing gold recovery and incomes.</p> <p>2.2 Training of miners, national and local authorities, as well as the general public, particularly women and youth, on the dangers of mercury</p> <p>2.3 Develop programs to promote the use of financial tools for miners, policy/ legislative reforms and the formalization of the ASGM sector.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % reduction in mercury levels in miners and environment by end of project - Results from evaluations conducted after training sessions - Number of policies / guidance documents developed to promote formalization of sector - Number of miners that adopt new financial mechanisms by end of project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results of the monitoring programme - Final report - Final evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Miners are receptive to new technologies and practices - Miners have the capacity to adopt new financial tools - Continued Gov. support to formalize ASGM sector.
	<p>3.1 The communication strategy will successfully disseminate the project achievements, which in turn will lead to a replication of best practices at a national, regional and international level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Active participation of both countries in the INC meetings - Number of awareness raising events held or promotional material distributed. - Number of participatory workshops /demonstration events conducted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minutes of the INC (reflecting presentation of project, stand or number of interventions) - Promotional material - Final report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government support of INC and dissemination of results