



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

DRAFT

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**INDEPENDENT EVALUATION**

**UNIDO CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION  
IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

Project ID: 102080

Prepared by  
Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight  
**Independent Evaluation Division**

July 2019

# Contents

- I. Background and overview ..... 3**
  - 1. Related project(s) factsheet .....3
  - 2. Background and context .....4
  - 3. CIIC-ITPO Russian Federation: Objective and structure .....5
  - 4. Implementation and execution arrangements .....6
  - 5. Budget information .....6
  - 6. Previous evaluation findings relevant to CIIC-ITPO .....7
- II. Purpose and scope of the evaluation..... 8**
- III. Evaluation approach and methodology ..... 9**
- IV. Evaluation parameters..... 10**
- V. Evaluation team composition ..... 12**
- VI. Timing, Deliverables and Reporting..... 12**
- VII. Quality assurance ..... 13**
- ANNEXES ..... 13**
- Annex 1. Job descriptions ..... 14**
- Annex 2: Project results framework ..... 20**
- Annex 3: Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and programmes ..... 21**
- Annex 4: Outline of an in-depth evaluation report ..... 23**
- Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality ..... 25**
- Annex 6: Rating tables ..... 26**
- Annex 7: List of references..... 27**

## I. Background and overview

### 1. Related project(s) factsheet

**[Project manager to complete as appropriate]**

<b>Project title</b>	UNIDO Centre for International Industrial Cooperation in the Russian Federation
<b>UNIDO project No. and/or project ID</b>	102080
<b>Region</b>	GLOBAL
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Russian Federation
<b>Implementing agency(ies)</b>	UNIDO
<b>Executing partner(s)</b>	<b>Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation</b>
<b>Donor(s):</b>	Russian Federation
<b>Actual implementation end date</b>	<b>31 December 2019</b>
<b>Planned terminal evaluation date</b>	<b>August to October 2019</b>

(Source: Project document)<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Project information data throughout these TOR are to be verified during the evaluation inception phase.

## 2. Background and context

In 1986, UNIDO introduced the first investment promotion services, which would become the UNIDO network of investment and technology promotion offices (ITPOs). At present, there are nine<sup>2</sup> ITPOs operating worldwide that have in common that they contribute to reducing development imbalances by brokering investment and technology agreements between developed, developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Located in both hemispheres, the specialized network of UNIDO ITPOs opens up opportunities for investors and technology suppliers to identify potential partners and offer unique services to both entrepreneurs and business institutions.

In general, ITPOs guide potential investors from their host countries and from developing countries at each stage of the investment cycle, from project identification through appraisal to implementation. In doing so, ITPOs offer a package of up-to-date information on screened and validated investment opportunities, including manufacturing facilities, and technology supply sources. ITPOs also provide first-hand knowledge on how to do business in local environments, including legal and economic aspects.

Within this programme, ITPOs host officials from developing countries and economies in transition to give them hands-on training in investment promotion techniques so that delegates are able to promote portfolios of screened investment and technology opportunities from their own countries. Thereafter, delegates act as contact points between their countries and potential foreign partners.

ITPOs benefit from intra-organizational linkages with other UNIDO networks that operate worldwide and that include, among other the UNIDO International Technology Centres (ITCs), the Subcontracting and Partnership Exchange (SPX) Centres, the numerous Export Consortia, and the joint UNIDO/UNEP National Cleaner Production Centres. They all have in common that they provide value-added services to clients and partners. Furthermore, through the AfriPanet operations and the UNIDO Investment and Technology Promotion Programme for Africa, the ITPOs enjoy strong partnerships with numerous national investment promotion agencies in African countries. More broadly, ITPOs regularly interact with both, public and private entities that foster international business cooperation and partnerships.

### **The UNIDO Center for International Industrial Cooperation in the Russian Federation<sup>3</sup>**

The UNIDO Center for International Industrial Cooperation (referred as CIIC or CIIC-ITPO) in the Russian Federation was established pursuant to an Agreement signed between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and UNIDO in November 1989 followed by a Trust Fund agreement of the same date. A new Trust Fund Agreement signed in 1992 between UNIDO and the Russian Federation superseded previous Agreements and Exchange of Letters between the government and UNIDO and became from there on the new basis for CIIC's operations. The CIIC is headed by a Director who is to be appointed by UNIDO and is to direct and manage the operations under the overall supervision of the UNIDO ITPO Coordination Unit in UNIDO Headquarters. UNIDO is to provide access to its established network of ITPOs worldwide, as well as its methodology and software to carry out feasibility analysis of investment projects.

As per 1992 agreement (article 4): *“The primary purpose of the Centre shall be to promote international cooperation in the economic, technological, industrial and scientific spheres between Russian enterprises, associations and organizations and State enterprises, joint sotkc*

---

<sup>2</sup> ITPO offices are operational in Bahrain, China (Beijing and Shanghai), Germany (Bonn), Italy (Rome), Japan (Tokyo), Nigeria (Lagos), Republic of Korea (Seoul), Russian Federation (Moscow)

<sup>3</sup> Source: Trust Fund Agreement between UNIDO and the Government of the Russian Federation, and project document (December 2008)

*companies, cooperatives and other undertaking organizations and firms from developed and developing countries.”*

According to the CIIC project document, the main objective of the CIIC is “... to facilitate inward investment and technology flows as well as to promote joint business initiatives focusing on thematic priorities between entrepreneurs in the Russian Federation and foreign industrial counterparts”.

The CIIC project document foresees regular monitoring, however, contains no provision for evaluation. In 2013, UNIDO conducted an independent country evaluation in the Russian Federation. This evaluation assessed UNIDO’s interventions in the country and paid particular attention to the role of the CIIC. Further details can be obtained from the UNIDO independent country evaluation report (published 2014).

### **3. CIIC-ITPO Russian Federation<sup>4</sup>: Objective and structure**

Following the Agreement between UNIDO and the Russian Government, the CIIC is to provide the following services:

- A. Access to investment information, government and private business institutions and contacts in other countries through the UNIDO worldwide network;
- B. Direct communication with and access to entrepreneurs worldwide;
- C. Participation in UNIDO-sponsored and/or organized investment and technology promotion events;
- D. Upgrading skills of local staff of investment-related institutions by using UNIDO investment promotion methodologies and tools, e.g., project identification, screening, evaluation and promotion, building strategic business alliances;

Major target beneficiaries are industrial small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the Russian Federation interested in cooperation with foreign partners. The target beneficiaries are private enterprises, institutions and governments in developing countries and countries with economies in transition that will be rendered increased possibilities to enter into different forms of partnerships with industrial enterprises in the Russian Federation.

In addition, the project aims at benefitting Russian institutions involved in investment promotion by upgrading skills of staff of these institutions investment promotion tools and methodologies and by expanding coverage of their activities.

The CIIC also aims at contributing to an expansion of the UNIDO ITPO/Investment Promotion Unit (IPU) Network in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries and selected regions of the Russian Federation.

The following components have been developed to achieve the objectives, in addition to project management: **[Project manager to complete as appropriate]**

**Project component 1:**

**Project component 2:**

**Project component 3:**

---

<sup>4</sup> Referred to as CIIC-ITPO

The following are, in brief, some of the expected results of the project: **[Project manager to complete as appropriate]**

- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...
- ...

Expected outcomes

As project outcomes, it has been expected that the project will contribute to a substantial increase of the number of industrial cooperation projects with foreign participation that are implemented in the Russian Federation, and to opening up new markets for potential Russian investors in developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

Furthermore, it has been expected that the project will help SMEs in the Russian Federation enhance their knowledge and experience on how to establish cooperation with foreign partners in other countries. Resulting from this, an increase in the number of investment and cooperation projects promoted through the UNIDO ITPO Network was expected.

**4. Implementation and execution arrangements**

**[Project manager to complete/complement: Key stakeholders’ roles and responsibilities]**

**UNIDO:** In close cooperation with the Russian Ministry of Education and Science, UNIDO is responsible for the functioning of the CIIC. The CIIC operates under the rules governing the ITPO network and under the guidance of the ITPO Coordinator at UNIDO Headquarters.

**XXXX:** [Role + responsibilities, in short]

**XXXX:** [Role + responsibilities, in short]

[.....]

**5. Budget information**

**[IMPORTANT: Please provide below information for each of the individual projects, including project ID 102080]**

**[Project manager to complete as appropriate]**

Project outcomes	Donor(s)	UNIDO contribution (in USD)	Co-Financing (in USD)	Total (in USD)
1.				
2.				
3.				
Project Management				

Monitoring				
Evaluation				
<b>Total USD</b>				

(Source: Project document and approvals)

Expected co-financing source breakdown was as follows: **[Project manager to complete as appropriate]** - *[IMPORTANT: Please provide below information for each of the individual projects, including project ID 102080]*

Name of Co-financier (Source)	Classification	Type (Specify Cash or In-kind)	Total (in USD)
UNIDO	Implementing Agency	Cash	
	National Government	In-kind	
	National Government	In-kind	
	Private Sector	In-kind	
		Cash	
	Foundation	In-kind	
<b>Other (please specify)</b>			
<b>Total Co-financing (in USD)</b>			

(Source: Project document)

## 6. Previous evaluation findings relevant to CIIC-ITPO

The main findings and some of the key recommendations relating to the CIIC from the UNIDO independent country evaluation of Russia (2014) can be summarized as follows:

- The evaluation found that UNIDO's technical assistance to the Russian Federation has been relevant to Government policies, priorities and challenges and, particularly with regard to environmental management.
- The UNIDO technical cooperation (TC) portfolio in the Russian Federation has grown considerably over the past few years and further growth, especially in GEF-funded environmental projects can be expected. The CIIC was established as part of the UNIDO ITPO network at a time when the project portfolio was much smaller and the Russian Industrial Development Fund (IDF) did not exist. Currently, the CIIC operates as a de-facto Country Office/Project implementation office. Despite its overall good performance, it has not been adequately adapted to the new reality (see under point xx, below) and is at risk of not coping with the increasing project portfolio and technical demands.

- The evaluation recommended among other that CIIC-ITPO had two choices (a) to work with the Russian Government to identify meaningful investment promotion, and conduct private sector competitiveness activities in-line with its original objectives; or (b) revise its objectives and bring them in line with the current focus on investment for improved industrial environmental management. In response, this recommendation was accepted by both, UNIDO ITPO Coordination Unit and by the Director, CIIC. It was further stated that the CIIC, in close cooperation with the Russian Government, would continue to work in both directions, namely environment/energy and non-environmental investment promotion. As regards impact and sustainability, it was recommended that the CIIC and UNIDO Headquarters should seek to further promote and replicate the experiences of the supply-chain projects in Russia and the surrounding region (e.g., Central Asia). This recommendation also found full acceptance and it was stated that CIIC Russia would continue to explore opportunities for developing and upgrading supply chains.<sup>5</sup>

Further details can be obtained from the UNIDO independent country evaluation report (2014).

## II. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

The independent evaluation will cover the period from 2014 until May 2019. It will assess the CIIC-ITPO against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. The evaluation will also address to the extent meaningful other standing evaluation criteria singled out in UNIDO's Evaluation Policy, such as management, gender mainstreaming, environmental sustainability, alignment with and the potential to promote the UNIDO inclusive and sustainable industrial development (ISID) agenda, and with the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

It will also assess the role and function of ITPO-CIIC, and as such UNIDO's representation in the Russian Federation and its role and interactions with the UNIDO ITPO network.

To the extent possible, the evaluation will also take into account the General Assembly adopted resolution 72/2796 (May 2018) on the "Repositioning of the United Nations Development System", initiating a comprehensive UN reform process to better support countries in achieving the 2030 Agenda.

The evaluation further has the purpose to draw lessons and to offer recommendations to UNIDO and to CIIC takeholders and partners that can be used in the upcoming phase and, at the same time, might help enhance the design and implementation of other ITPOs and related activities (e.g., in ITPO network countries). Findings, lessons learned and recommendations will also provide an important input to the thematic evaluation of the ITPO network that is planned to be initiated in late 2019.

The evaluation should provide an analysis of the attainment of ITPO-CIIC objective(s) and the corresponding technical components or outputs. Through its assessments, the evaluation should enable the Government (and donor), the national counterparts, other donors, UNIDO and other stakeholders and partners to verify prospects for development impact and for promoting sustainability the positioning of ITPO-CIIC in the context of the ongoing UN reform, and for the management of risks. The assessment will also include a re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and other elements of project design according to the evaluation criteria defined in this TOR.

---

<sup>5</sup> Management response sheet: UNIDO independent country evaluation in the Russian Federation (2013)

<sup>6</sup> United Nations General Assembly, A/RES/72/279, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 31 May 2108



In its assessment, the evaluation will consider, among others, the relevant findings of the independent UNIDO country evaluation (2014). It will also review the status of implementation of recommendations that were issued as part of the country evaluation and consider the findings of other evaluations that are of relevance for this evaluation.

The more specific scope of the evaluation will be defined during the inception phase.

### III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The independent evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Charter of the Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight<sup>7</sup>, the UNIDO Evaluation Policy<sup>8</sup> and with the Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle<sup>9</sup>.

The evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluation team, and will be carried out as an independent in-depth evaluation using a participatory and forward-looking approach whereby all key stakeholders are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The evaluation team will liaise with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, under the Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight, on the conduct of the evaluation and on 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 team to assess causality through quantitative means but also to provide reasons for why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The specific mixed methodological approach will be described in the inception report.

The evaluation methodology will consider a combination of the following tools and methods:

1. Desk review of project documents, including, but not limited to:
  - (a) The relevant agreements, project documents, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNIDO and to donor(s)/partners, annual project implementation reports, progress reports, output reports (case studies, action plans), 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. Available models of (or reconstruct if necessary) log-frame or theory of change for the CIIC-ITPO interventions (enabling, capacity, investment). The validity of these models will be examined through specific questions in interviews and consultation with stakeholders.

---

<sup>7</sup> UNIDO (2019). Director General's Bulletin: Charter of the Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight (DGB/2019/07, 26 March 2019)

<sup>8</sup> UNIDO. (2018). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (DGB/2018/08, 1 June 2018)

<sup>9</sup> 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)

3. Interviews with project management and technical support staff and management at UNIDO Headquarters (HQ) and in CIIC (Russia Federation) and – if necessary - staff associated with the project’s financial administration and procurement.
4. Interviews with key project partners and stakeholders, including, among others, government counterparts, project stakeholders, representative(s) of the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to UNIDO in Vienna, Austria, and (if applicable) co-financing partners as shown in the corresponding sections of the project documents.
5. On-site observation of results achieved by the ITPO-CIIC, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of the interventions.
6. Interviews and telephone interviews with intended users of the project outputs and other stakeholders involved in the project.
7. Interviews with other relevant UNIDO Field Office(s) to the extent that it was involved in CIIC-ITPO activities, and the related project’s management members and the various national and sub-regional authorities, as necessary.
8. Other interviews, surveys or document reviews will be organized for triangulation purposes as deemed necessary by the evaluation team.

The inception report will provide details on the methodology that will be applied by the evaluation team and include an evaluation matrix.

#### **IV. Evaluation parameters**

. The evaluation parameters and specific question are based on the criteria and key evaluation questions provided in the UNIDO Evaluation Manual - Annex 2. The following guiding specific questions will be reviewed and adjusted as needed during the evaluation inception phase.

##### **Ownership and relevance**

The extent to which:

- (a) The ITPO project is aligned to partner countries’ priorities and investment and technology needs, and contribute to strengthening capacities of partner institutions,
- (b) The project is relevant to Russian industry vis-à-vis other investment/technology promotion institutions and coordinates with them.
- (c) The project is in line with Russian policies and strategies, including strategies for development cooperation.
- (d) The private sector and private sector institutions, in Russia and abroad, are using the ITPO and find its services to be in line with their needs.
- (e) The objectives of the project and the ITPO concept remain valid and the project document represents and meets the needs of main stakeholders.
- (f) There are linkages to UNIDO programmes and thematic priorities.
- (g) A strategic vision with programmatic, geographical, and thematic priorities exists and is relevant.

##### **ITPO Project design**

The extent to which:

- (a) The project document design is appropriate and coherent (existence of a log frame, clear objectives and indicators).

- (b) the outputs as formulated in the project document are necessary and sufficient to achieve the outcomes.
- (c) The work programme reflects lessons learned and recommendations from past evaluations.

### **Efficiency of implementation**

The extent to which:

- (a) UNIDO and Government/counterpart inputs, including funding, have been provided as planned and were of a quality and quantity to adequately meet requirements, and were provided in a timely and cost-effective manner.
- (b) A strategy to overcome possible budget constraints was implemented, e.g. mobilization of extra-budgetary resources, co-financing of activities from the TC programmes' budget, prioritization of outputs, revision of project outcomes and objectives.
- (c) A clear communication strategy enhanced the visibility and outreach of the ITPO, e.g. ITPO website, publications and events such as seminars and workshops.
- (d) The project was integrated into UNIDO's ITPO Network and UNIDO Technical Cooperation activities for enhanced synergies and impact.
- (e) A clear strategy for investment and technology promotion exists.

### **Effectiveness**

The extent to which:

- (a) Investment projects have been generated or linkages developed between Italian investors and technology suppliers and partners in developing countries.
- (b) The envisaged outcomes and outputs were achieved.
- (c) The project promoted industrial development in the targeted developing countries (investment volume; jobs created; but also wider benefits related to competitiveness of companies; technology and know-how transfer; etc).
- (d) The project contributed to strengthened capacity of investment-related agencies and industry associations in the targeted countries, in particular through the delegates programme.
- (e) Women and men benefitted equally.

### **Impact and sustainability**

- (a) Identification of the long term developmental changes or benefits (economic, environmental, social and developmental) that have occurred or are likely to occur as a result of the project.
- (b) Assessment of the likelihood that changes and benefits will be maintained for a long period of time.
- (c) Assessment of contribution to SDGs
- (d) Assessment of the extent to which the reduced funding of current work programme and subsequent reduction in staff impacted project results and office performance.

### **Project coordination and management**

The extent to which:

- (a) The administrative status of the ITPO is conducive to its role and function.
- (b) The national management and field coordination mechanisms of the project have been efficient and effective.
- (c) The UNIDO HQ based management, coordination, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient and effective.
- (d) Reporting and monitoring procedures were adhered to.

- (e) Monitoring and reporting were carried out and based on indicators for outputs and outcomes and there was monitoring of promoted investment projects.
- (f) Collaboration and cooperation with other UNIDO ITPOs and other UNIDO projects have occurred .
- (g) The project was flexible and responsive and incorporated project revisions appropriately

In addition to the qualitative assessment based on the evidence gathered in the evaluation, the evaluation team will rate the related project on the basis of the rating criteria for the parameters described in Annex Vi.

## V. Evaluation team composition

The independent evaluation will be conducted by one senior international evaluation consultant and one national consultant who will be working under the guidance of the responsible staff in the Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight, Independent Evaluation Division (EIO/IED), who would also be part of the evaluation team. The evaluation team members' job descriptions are contained in annex 1.

The evaluation team will carry out the process in coordination with the key stakeholders (ITPO Programme Manager in UNIDO, staff at the ITPO-CIIC and stakeholders in the Russian Federation, and the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation in Vienna, Austria).

## VI. Timing, Deliverables and Reporting

The independent evaluation is scheduled to take place during June to October 2019. An evaluation field mission will be arranged during the evaluation conduct.

At the end of the evaluation field mission, a local debriefing should be conducted inviting local stakeholders (incl. government and parties involved in the evaluation). After the evaluation mission, a debriefing and presentation of the evaluation preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations will be conducted at UNIDO HQ. The draft evaluation report will be submitted two to four weeks after the end of the field mission.

### Inception report

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 EIO/IED.

The inception report will focus on the following elements: preliminary project theory of change 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; field mission plan, including places to be visited, stakeholders to be interviewed and possible surveys to be conducted and a debriefing and reporting timetable<sup>10</sup>.

### Evaluation report and review procedures

---

<sup>10</sup> The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

The draft evaluation report is to be shared with stakeholders (incl. the UNIDO ITPO Programme manager, EIO/IED, Permanent Mission in Vienna, CIIC Staff and relevant stakeholders) for factual validation and feedback.

The evaluation team is expected to revise the draft evaluation report based on the comments received, translate the executive summary to Russian, and submit the final version of the evaluation report in accordance with UNIDO evaluation standards.

The evaluation report shall be written in English<sup>11</sup> and follow the outline given in annex 4.

### **Evaluation time schedule**

The evaluation schedule is planned as follows:

- |   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| 1. Desk review and briefing at UNIDO HQ     | (July 2019)      |
| 2. Inception report                         | (August 2019)    |
| 3. Evaluation field mission                 | (August 2019)    |
| 4. Debriefing in the field and at UNIDO HQ. | (September 2019) |
| 5. Draft terminal evaluation report         | (October 2019)   |
| 6. Final evaluation report                  | (October 2019)   |

## **VII. Quality assurance**

All UNIDO 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. This includes, inter alia, the briefing of consultants on methodology and process, providing inputs regarding findings, recommendations and lessons learned from other UNIDO evaluations, the review of the inception and evaluation reports, and ensuring that the draft report has been factually validated by stakeholders.

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 5. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO's evaluation policy and these terms of reference. The draft and final evaluation reports are reviewed by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division. The final evaluation report will be circulated by EIO/IED within UNIDO together with a management response sheet and uploaded on the UNIDO intra- and internet sites.

## **ANNEXES**

Annex 1: Job descriptions

Annex 2: Project results framework

Annex 3: Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and programmes

Annex 4: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report

Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Annex 6: Rating tables

Annex 7: List of references

---

<sup>11</sup> The executive summary will be translated into Russian and form part of the evaluation report.



**UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION**

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

<b>Title:</b>	Senior international evaluation consultant and evaluation team leader
<b>Main duty station and location:</b>	Home-based
<b>Mission(s) to</b>	Vienna, Austria (UNIDO HQ) and to the Russian Federation
<b>Start of contract:</b>	August 2019
<b>End of contract:</b>	October 2019
<b>Number of working days:</b>	30 working days (spread over a 4/5-month period)

**ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT**

The Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight, and its UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (EIO/IED) 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. EIO/IED is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

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

**MAIN DUTIES**

The international senior evaluation consultant who will also be the team leader of this evaluation will work under the supervision of the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and in collaboration with a national evaluation consultant. S/he will evaluate the project according to the evaluation terms of reference and is expected to conduct the following duties:

<b>Main Duties</b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration (in w/d)</b>	<b>Location</b>
<p><b>Desk review</b></p> <p>Review project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); determine key data to be collect in the field and, if needed, adjust the key data collection instrument accordingly;</p> <p>Assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework relevant to the project's activities and analyze other background info.</p>	Desk review	7	Home-based

Main Duties	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration (in w/d)	Location
Preparation of interview tool(s), interviewee list and evaluation mission plan	Work plan, and interviews and mission plan completed with the support of UNIDO		
Preparation of draft inception report: The report to contain work plan, key findings of desk review, methodology, sampling technique and evaluation tools such as interview guidelines (coordinate translation requirements with national evaluation consultant)	Inception report integrating (but not limited to) above items		
Briefing at UNIDO HQ, includes: preparatory meetings with EIO/IED and project manager; discussion of draft inception report and finalization of mission plan; appointments and logistical support for evaluation field mission ensured	Briefing mission completed	2	UNIDO HQ
Undertake field mission to the Russian Federation: briefing/training of the national evaluation consultant on interview techniques (possible testing of evaluation tools, field visit, field research, interviews, observation, questionnaires, etc.); interview key stakeholders, including beneficiaries, presentation of preliminary evaluation findings to stakeholders in the field	Mission report; and information/data collected	7	Russian Federation (Moscow) and other local travel as appropriate
Detailed analysis of field results	Preliminary findings	3	Home-based
Conduct additional phone interviews/stakeholders	Notes on interviews		
Debriefing of the evaluation (Presentation of preliminary findings)	Presentation to Project Manager and project team and other staff and to representatives of the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation	2	UNIDO HQ
Preparation of first draft evaluation report and submission for UNIDO feedback	Draft report	5	Home-based
Additional data collection and analyses of information collected, preparation of the draft evaluation report and circulation, within UNIDO for comments			
Finalization of report upon receipt of stakeholders' feedback	Final report	2	
Preparation of evaluation information brief (2 pages) following sample formats provided by EIO/IED	Evaluation info brief	2	Home-based
<b>Total</b>		<b>30 days</b>	

## REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

- Long-term experience in the area of evaluation of projects, programmes and thematic issues;
- Experience working in organizational development, capacity and institutional building;
- Knowledge of international institutions/organizations working on skills development;

## MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

**Education:** Advanced university degree in business administration, economics, social science, environmental science or related field. Knowledge of evaluation and excellent drafting skills. In depth knowledge of UNIDO and technical cooperation.

**Technical and functional experience:** A minimum of 15 years experience in the field of development and evaluation, including experience at the international level involving technical cooperation in developing countries. Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.

**Languages:** Fluency in written and spoken English is required. Knowledge of Russian an advantage.

## 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

*Managerial competencies:*

1. Strategy and direction
2. Judgement and decision making

### **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 program/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 for this evaluation.





**UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION**

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

Title:	National evaluation consultant
Main Duty Station and Location:	Home-based
Mission/s to:	Local travel as appropriate
Start of contract	August 2019
End of contract:	October 2019
Number of working days:	28 working days (spread over the period of four months)

**ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT**

The national evaluation consultant will participate and contribute to the project evaluation according to the evaluation terms of reference. S/he will be a member of the evaluation team, work under the supervision of the international evaluation consultant/team leader and carry out the tasks assigned to him/her by the international evaluation consultant and in accordance with the standards of the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (EIO/IED).

**PROJECT CONTEXT**

As described in the evaluation TOR. Under the leadership of the international evaluation consultant/team leader, s/he will perform the following tasks:

<b>MAIN DUTIES</b>	<b>Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Days</b>	<b>Location</b>
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 be 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 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.	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 Brief assessment of the adequacy of the country’s legislative and regulatory framework.	7	Home-based
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	Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions. Division of evaluation tasks with the Team Leader.	6	Home-based (telephone interviews)

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ measurable Outputs to be achieved	Days	Location
organize and lead local 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.	Inception Report.		
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.	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.	6	Russian Federation (Moscow) and other local travel as appropriate
Prepare inputs and analysis to the evaluation report according to TOR and as agreed with Team Leader	Draft evaluation report.	4	Home-based
Revise the draft project evaluation reports based on comments from the UNIDO Office of Independent Evaluation and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	Final evaluation report.	2	Home-based
Review on the basis of the English version the external translation of the evaluation report (in part, i.e., executive summary or the whole evaluation report)	Russian version of the final evaluation report (in part or the whole report) reviewed for correctness	2	Home-based
Preparation of inputs to the evaluation information brief (2 pages) following sample formats provided by ODG/EIO/IED	Evaluation info brief	0.5	Home-based
Preparation of inputs to the evaluation information graphic (1 to 2 pages) following sample formats provided by ODG/EIO/IED	Evaluation info graphic	0.5	Home-based
<b>Total</b>		<b>28</b>	

#### REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

##### **Core values:**

Integrity  
Professionalism  
Respect for diversity

##### **Core competencies:**

Results orientation and accountability  
Planning and organizing  
Communication and trust  
Team orientation  
Client orientation  
Organizational development and innovation

**Managerial competencies** (as applicable):

Strategy and direction

Managing people and performance

Judgement and decision making

Conflict resolution

**MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**Education:** Advanced university degree in science, engineering or other relevant discipline like developmental studies or business administration.

**Technical and functional experience:**

A minimum of five years professional experience, including experience involving technical cooperation in developing countries. Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries. Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.

**Languages:** Fluency in written and spoken English and Russian is required.

**Absence of Conflict of Interest:**

According to the 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 program/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 for this evaluation.

## Annex 2: Project results framework

[See annex III in prodoc]

## Annex 3: 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 evaluation.

#### 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 4: Outline of an in-depth evaluation report

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### Executive summary (in English and Russian)

- 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 not exceed 3-4 pages in length

#### I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process

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

#### II. Countries and project background

- Brief countries context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project 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. Assessment

This is the key chapter of the report and should address all evaluation criteria and questions outlined in the TOR. Assessment must be based on factual evidence collected and analysed from different sources. The evaluators' assessment can be broken into the following sections:

- A. Relevance (Report on the relevance of project towards countries and beneficiaries)
- 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. Sustainability of Project Outcomes (Report on the risks and vulnerability of the project, considering the likely effects of socio political and institutional changes in partner countries, and its impact on continuation of benefits after the project ends, specifically the financial, socio political, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks)
- D. Project coordination and management (Report project management conditions and achievements, and partner countries commitment)

At the end of this chapter, the rating tables should be presented as required in annex 6.

## 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 a few (max. five) key recommendations, which will be followed up under the management response system. Sub-recommendations are to be avoided. Recommendations 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
- Take into account resource requirements

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:

- UNIDO
- Government and/or counterpart organizations
- Donor

For additional information on the formulation of recommendations, please refer to section 3.10 in the UNIDO Evaluation Manual.

### C. Lessons learned

UNIDO evaluation lessons learned contain information about the context, challenges, causal factors, target users and success/failure.<sup>12</sup>

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

---

<sup>12</sup> The evaluator will be provided with a guidance document on lessons learned (includes a checklist on lessons learned quality prepared by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division).



## Annex 5: Checklist on evaluation report quality

### Independent evaluation of UNIDO project

**Project Title:**

**UNIDO Project No./ID:**

**Evaluation team leader:**

**Quality review done by:**

**Date:**

Report quality criteria		UNIDO ODG/EIO/IED assessment notes	Rating
<b>A.</b>	Was the report well-structured and properly written? (Clear language, correct grammar, clear and logical structure)		
<b>B.</b>	Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?		
<b>C.</b>	Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?		
<b>D.</b>	Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?		
<b>E.</b>	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)		
<b>F.</b>	Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?		
<b>G.</b>	Did the report include the actual project costs (total, per activity, per source)?		
<b>H.</b>	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?		
<b>I.</b>	Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
<b>J.</b>	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?		
<b>K.</b>	Are the main cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights and environment, appropriately covered?		
<b>L.</b>	Was the report delivered in a timely manner? (Observance of deadlines)		
<p><u>Rating system for quality of evaluation reports</u>            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.</p>			

## Annex 6: Rating tables

#	Evaluation criteria	Mandatory rating
<b>A</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Project design</b>	<b>Yes</b>
1	• Overall design	Yes
2	• Logframe	Yes
<b>C</b>	<b>Project performance</b>	<b>Yes</b>
1	• Relevance	Yes
2	• Effectiveness	Yes
3	• Efficiency	Yes
4	• Sustainability of benefits	Yes
<b>D</b>	<b>Cross-cutting performance criteria</b>	
1	• Gender mainstreaming	Yes
2	• M&E: ✓ M&E design ✓ M&E implementation	Yes
3	• Results-based Management (RBM)	Yes
<b>E</b>	<b>Performance of partners</b>	
1	• UNIDO	Yes
2	• National counterparts	Yes
3	• Donor	Yes
<b>F</b>	<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>Yes</b>

### Rating system

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

Table 1. Project rating criteria

Score		Definition
6	Highly satisfactory	Level of achievement clearly exceeds expectations and there is no shortcoming.
5	Satisfactory	Level of achievement meets expectations (indicatively, over 80-95 per cent) and there is no or minor shortcoming.
4	Moderately satisfactory	Level of achievement more or less meets expectations (indicatively, 60 to 80 per cent) and there are some shortcomings.
3	Moderately unsatisfactory	Level of achievement is somewhat lower than expected (indicatively, less than 60 per cent) and there are significant shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory	Level of achievement is substantially lower than expected and there are major shortcomings.
1	Highly unsatisfactory	Level of achievement is negligible and there are severe shortcomings.

## Annex 7: List of references

UNIDO (2019). Director General's Bulletin: Charter of the Office of Evaluation and Internal Oversight (DGB/2019/07, 26 March 2019)

UNIDO. (2018). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (DGB/2018/08, 1 June 2018)

UNIDO (2017). Medium-term programme framework, 2018-2021 (IDB.45/8/Add.2)

UNIDO (2014). Independent UNIDO country evaluation. RUSSIAN FEDERATION

UNIDO (2013). Independent thematic evaluation. UNIDO's public private partnerships

UNIDO (2013). Independent evaluation. ITPO Tokyo. UNIDO Service in Japan for the promotion of industrial developing countries

UNIDO (2012). Independent evaluation. ITPO Italy. UNIDO Investment and Technology Promotions Office Italy

UNIDO (2010). Independent thematic evaluation. ITPO Network

UNIDO (2010). Independent evaluation. ITPO Tokyo. UNIDO Service in Japan for the promotion of industrial developing countries

UNIDO (2010). Thematic evaluation of UNIDO's International Technology Centres

UNIDO (2009). Project document: Establishment of a UNIDO Investment and Technology Promotion Office (ITPO) Network in EurAsEC member states (US/RER/10/002, US/RER/09/001)

UNIDO (2008). Trust Fund Agreement between UNIDO and the Government of the Russian Federation, and project document - UNIDO Centre for International Industrial Cooperation in the Russian Federation (UNIDO project Nos. TF/GLO/07/0127 and TF/GLO/07/B27 – 102080)

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)

AGREEMENT UNIDO-RUSSIA (1992). Agreement on the UNIDO Center for international industrial co-operation in the Russian Federation.