



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

Terms of Reference

**Independent mid-term Evaluation (MTE)
of the UNIDO project:**

**Malawi: Market access and trade-capacity building support for agro-
industrial products (MATCB)**

UNIDO Project Number: 106075

NORAD Funding: (excl. psc) EUR 1,769,912

Duration: July 2013 to December 2017

June 2016

CONTENTS

I.	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW	3
II.	SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	8
III.	EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	9
IV.	PROJECT EVALUATION PARAMETERS.....	10
V.	EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION	16
VI.	TIME SCHEDULE	16
VII.	DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING	17
VIII.	QUALITY ASSURANCE	20
	Annex 1 - Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report	21
	Annex 2 - – Guidance on integrating gender in evaluations of UNIDO projects and programmes.....	25
	Annex 3 - – Checklist on terminal evaluation report quality.....	27
	Annex 4 - – Job descriptions	29
	Annex 5 - – Project results framework	37

I. Project background and overview

1. Project factsheet

Project Title	Malawi: Market access and trade-capacity building support for agro-industrial products” (MATCB).
UNIDO project No. and/or SAP ID	Project No. SAP ID: 106075
Region	Eastern Africa
Country(ies)	Malawi
Implementing agency(ies)	UNIDO
Executing partner(s)	
Project size (FSP, MSP, EA)	
Project implementation start date (First PAD issuance date)	July 2013
Original implementation end date	July 2017
Revised expected implementation end date (if applicable)	Dec 2017
Donor(s):	NORAD
Actual implementation end date	July 2017
Project Budget	Euro 1,769,912 (NORAD inputs 836,000)
PA or PPG (if applicable)	
UNIDO co-financing	Cash: In-kind:
Total co-financing at design (cash and in-kind)	Cash: In-kind:
Materialized co-financing at project completion (cash and in-kind)	
Planned Mid-term evaluation date	Sept/Oct 2016
Planned terminal evaluation date	Nov/Dec 2017

(Source: Project document)¹

PA or PPG (if applicable)	
UNIDO co-financing	Cash: In-kind:
Total co-financing at design (cash and in-kind)	Cash: In-kind:
Materialized co-financing at project completion (cash and in-kind)	
Mid-term evaluation date	
Planned terminal evaluation date	Nov/Dec 20167

2. Project background and context

Background:

Trade is an engine for growth that may lift many Malawians out of poverty. Currently, Malawi is unable to significantly penetrate foreign markets due to limited quality infrastructure and the absence of an internationally recognized accreditation body. Conformity assessment activities (testing, calibration, certification and inspection) require accreditation to ensure the country's growth in exports. The Malawi Bureau of Standards (MBS) sets and implements standards and conducts conformity tests on selected imports and exports. However, certificates from MBS are not widely recognized and exporters incur high costs to obtain certification overseas.

Context project:

Developmental partners have recognized the importance of coordinated interventions and technical assistance to provide Malawi with the support to overcome supply-side constraints and to upgrade its industrial base. The "Malawi: Market access and trade-capacity building support for agro-industrial products" (MATCB) project was developed in close consultation with stakeholders in Malawi in consideration of the requirement for a large scale project to reform and strengthen institutional and national capacities related to Standards, Metrology, Testing and Quality (SMTQ), in order to reduce technical barriers to trade that hampers exports and market access. UNIDO has signed an Administrative Agreement with Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) for the implementation of the MATCB Project in Malawi. This project, being implemented in conjunction with the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Private Sector Development, Malawi (MoIT) aims to enhance Malawi's capacity for product certification, which is critical for the promotion of exports in line with the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS II).

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

In 2012 and 2013, Malawi embarked on two projects: the EU/UNDP-funded SQAM Project and the MATCB Project. Both projects are targeted interventions to reform the NQI and are complementary to each other. The MATCB Project focuses on legal metrology and quality improvement amongst smallholder farmers whilst the SQAM Project addresses the policy and regulatory landscape, the institutional reform of the MBS, the accreditation of conformity assessment services and quality improvement initiatives amongst small and medium enterprises. Upon successful implementation of the MATCB Project, the MBS will be equipped with a physical infrastructure and technical expertise to ensure that their certification of goods and services are recognized and accepted in markets beyond the Southern African Development Community and the Eastern and Southern African region.

The project, given its complementarities with the other programmes, as outlined earlier, will contribute towards Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 1 on reducing poverty and MDG 7 on ensuring environmental sustainability through increased export opportunities, economic growth and employment following the reform of the legislative framework and the improvement of the quality infrastructure. The project is also in line with the aims of MDG 8 on instigating a global partnership for development, internationally recognized transparency and quality systems being the backbone for the sustainability of these goals.

Project implementation started in July 2013 and the initial project end date was July 2017. The same was revised to December 2017. Actual implementation end date is December 2017. The project document foresees regular monitoring, as well as an independent mid-term evaluation (MTE) and a terminal evaluation (TE). An independent MTE will be carried out in September 2016 – October 2016, and will include a field mission to Malawi in September – October 2016.

3. Project objective and structure

The objective of the MATCB project is to increase the volume of safe and certified Malawian products that access regional and global markets, in order to reduce poverty in the country. It will achieve this by strengthening the national quality conformity assessment infrastructure and integrating it with the international quality infrastructure with a specific focus on the legal metrology infrastructure in order to improve fair trade, product safety and quality, to improve competitiveness, and to increase consumer protection so as to fully realize Malawi's global market opportunities. In addition, the project will assist selected micro enterprises and their related associations to improve their quality so that they will be able to access regional and international markets.

Development of standardization, quality assurance, accreditation and metrology (SQAM) infrastructure in Malawi Project is implemented by UNDP (financial and management oversight) and UNIDO (technical support). Both Malawi programmes's components - SQAM and MATCB are complementary to each other and strongly interlinked. Formally, MATCB is dealing with legal metrology, while SQAM with industrial metrology. Also the role of MBS is different under both components: in MATCB MBS is the beneficiary, while in SQAM – the counterpart.

The project will focus on the much needed modernization, strengthening and international recognition of the legal metrology functions of the MBS from the current, limited trade metrology functions and, in doing so, will provide a sound foundation for the development of the MBS's industrial and legal metrology, as well as testing services, by the complementary

SQAM Project of the European Union and the UNDP². The approach adopted recognizes the need to ensure that the outcomes are sustainable. By the end of the project, MBS will have the required knowledge and skills to maintain and further develop the SMTQ infrastructure and eventually broaden the scope of accredited calibration and testing services. The ultimate acceptance by trade partners of certificates and test reports would be the best measure of the project's effectiveness. This would determine the capability of the Malawi conformity assessment systems to support international trade. In order to implement the component that supports the processing industry, a step-by-step approach to food safety and quality improvement for a number of processing facilities operated by local NASFAM associations will be used.

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

- Output 1.1** National Quality Policy and Metrology Law reviewed.
- Output 1.2** Technical Assistance provided in design of the new buildings and laboratories.
- Output 2.1** Detailed analysis of scope of regulations requiring legal metrology services.
- Output 2.2** Legal metrology infrastructure built-up and metrology equipment commissioned.
- Output 2.3** Type approval and verification services enhanced.
- Output 3.1** Define scope of calibration services for accreditation.
- Output 3.2** Legal metrology center capacity enhanced and accredited.
- Output 4.1** Equipment supplied to achieve food safety provided and staff trained, on-demand advisory service provided.
- Output 4.2** Food quality system underlying HACCP certification is implemented.
- Output 5.1** Project coordination unit functioning with appropriate staff.
- Output 5.2** Inception report finalized and approved by Steering Committee
- Output 5.3** Project governance system established and regular reporting/monitoring takes place

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

1. The Government of Malawi commits to a quality culture and to supporting the MBS services by providing a strengthened legislative and institutional environment in support of the national metrology infrastructure.
2. The Legal Metrology Department of the MBS-National Metrology Institute (MBS-NMI) is recognized nationally, regionally and internationally, and is upgraded; and type approval and verification services are enhanced for consumer protection
3. Certificates issued by MBS of calibration services performed in support of legal metrology services are accepted nationally, regionally and internationally
4. NASFAM processing associations have improved access to local, regional and foreign markets through strengthened testing and export certification, and a quality system implemented in selected value chains
5. Governance and monitoring systems are established for local ownership and project sustainability.

² The Development of a robust Standardization, Quality Assurance, Accreditation and Metrology (SQAM) Infrastructure in Malawi Project", hereafter referred to as "the SQAM project" primarily funded by the European Union (EU) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is implemented in terms of a Contribution Agreement with the UNDP that was signed on 31 August 2012. The overall objective of the project is to enhance the ability to export goods from Malawi by reducing the need for re-testing, re-inspection, recertification abroad through acceptance of measurements, tests, conformity assessment results issued in Malawi.

4. Project implementation and execution arrangements

The project is implemented jointly by UNIDO and through the project management unit. The project is overseen by the Steering Committee (SC), which provides oversight of project implementation by the Donor (NORAD), the Government of Malawi (MIT) and the implementation agency (UNIDO). This Committee is chaired by the MIT. The SC meets at the beginning of the project and thereafter biannually and reviews the technical progress and recommend improvements in the implementation strategies. An inception report was tabled at the first biannual meeting of this committee and biannual reports are tabled at each SC meeting. The final report will be prepared at the completion of the project. Based on the information collected during the inception phase, the level of support and the equipment and training required is being determined and implemented. A detailed monitoring system is set in place as the project was initiated to provide real time tracking of the progress of the planned project activities.

UNIDO:

The daily implementation of the project is managed by the UNIDO project manager from PTC/TII/STF Division (former TCB Branch), the CTA and the National Project Coordinator with the administrative support in the field (Administrative Assistant, hired as of May 2016) and in very close collaboration with the project counterparts. The UNIDO project manager monitors the implementation progress with a results-based management approach. The implementation team is responsible for reviewing and updating work plans and implementing the project in accordance with UNIDO rules and procedures. Both Malawi programmes's components - SQAM and MATCB are complementary to each other and strongly interlinked. Therefore, both project managers and Junior Consultants assigned to each of the components are closely cooperating in the Headquarters. The CTA has a thorough knowledge of the SMTQ situation in Malawi and the SADC region. The CTA interacts regularly with the key stakeholders of the project and devise corrective measures on the implementation, as needed, in consultation with the project manager. International experts are providing technical support for developing advanced testing methodologies and the verification of the same. National expertise is utilized as much as possible alongside the international experts, thereby providing the international experts with much needed local knowledge and at the same time transferring international knowledge to local experts.

5. Relevant project reports/documents

During the process of developing the inception report, performance indicators were finalized and project milestones were clearly defined. Work plans were defined by the CTA in line with the project agreement and the decisions of the project SC. The project will be subject to independent review processes organized by the UNIDO Evaluation Group (mid-term and final). Progress reports were prepared on bi-annual basis relating to each main project objectives and targeted outputs; specifying the results achieved to date, as well as presenting the work plan for the next six month period and presented to the SC meetings and donor meetings. At each meeting UNIDO presents specific problems encountered and constraints faced in project implementation, and provide technical guidance on how best these challenges can be addressed. Further details can be obtained from mission report undertaken by international experts and project management throughout the implementation.

The detailed definition of the scope of legal metrology services were provided by MBS and concluded during the inception phase as well as the scope of the calibration services to be accredited in support of these services. Baseline indicators were finalized during this inception

phase, supported by a detailed baseline study updated in the logic framework. For the component which supports market access and trade facilitation, interested farmer associations (NSAFAM) were screened during the inception phase, including their members and their average, income in order to: (a) determine in detail the support they require as compared to what NSAFAM is doing; and to (b) generate sufficient baseline information for assessing project impact at a later stage.

6. Budget information

Some financial details are shown below:

Budget Line	Description	Budget Euro
11-00	International experts:	499,000
17-00	National experts:	185,800
15-00	Project travel:	32,600
16-00	Mission cost:	30,000
21-00	Subcontracts:	257,000
32-00	Study tours	30,000
33-00	In-service training:	74,560
34-00	Group training	45,000
45-00	Equipment:	487,000
51-00	Counterpart travel:	22,600
51-00	Miscellaneous:	66,352
82-00	Evaluation (National, International Consultants & Evaluation Staff Travel)	40,000
	Total:	1,769,912
	Support costs: (13%):	230,088
	Grand Total:	2,000,000

(Source: Project document)

II. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

The independent mid-term evaluation (MTE) will cover the duration of the project from its starting date in July 2013 to October 2016 (with field visit expected to be conducted in September 2016 – October 2016). It will assess project performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Later on, an independent final evaluation (terminal evaluation – TR) expected to take place at the estimated completion date of the project in December 2017.

The MTE has an additional purpose of drawing lessons and developing recommendations for UNIDO and the project stakeholders and partners, 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 MTE report should include examples of good practices for other projects in the focal area, country, or region.

The MTE 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 counterparts, the donors, UNIDO and other stakeholders and partners to verify prospects for development impact and promoting sustainability, providing an analysis of the attainment 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 this ToR.

The key questions of the MTE is whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective and to what extent the project has also considered sustainability and scaling-up factors for increasing contribution to sustainable results and further impact.

III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The MTE will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy³, the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle⁴.

The evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluation team, and It will be carried out as an independent in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The evaluation team 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 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 Donor(s)/Partners, annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)), progress reports, 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).

³ UNIDO. (2015). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (UNIDO/DGB/(M).98/Rev.1)

⁴ 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)

- (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, 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(s) to the extent that it was involved in the project, and the project's management members and the various national and sub-regional authorities dealing with project activities as necessary.
- 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. Project evaluation parameters

The evaluation team will assess the project performance, achievement of outputs, likelihood of outcome(s) and of attainment of results (long term outcomes, impact) guided by the parameters and evaluations questions provided in this section.

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) 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;
- a) The project had a clear thematically focused development objective;
- b) 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;
- c) Outputs were clear, realistic, adequately leading to the achievement of the outcome;
- d) The attainment of overall development objective, outcome and outputs can be determined by a set of SMART verifiable indicators;
- e) The results hierarchy in the LFM, from activities to outputs, outcome and overall objective, is logical and consistent.
- f) Verification and Assumptions were adequate, identifying important external factors and risks;

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. Focal areas/operational programme strategies: In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the Donor's programmes/strategies (e.g. NORAD focal area(s)/operational program strategies?) Ascertain the likely nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the specific Donor focal area/programme.
- iv. Does the project remain relevant taking into account the changing environment?
- v. A participatory project identification process and broad consultation including all main stakeholder groups (e.g. the national counterpart and target beneficiaries) was instrumental in selecting problem areas and counterparts requiring technical cooperation support.

b) Effectiveness

The evaluation will assess to what extent results at various levels, including outcomes and outputs, have been achieved or are likely to be achieved. The following issues will be assessed:

- i. Delivery of outputs: How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of outputs? Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached?
- ii. Likelihood for achievement of expected outcomes:
 - To what extent have the expected outcomes, outputs and long-term objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved?
 - Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions?
 - Have there been any unplanned effects?
 - Are the project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives?
 - If the original or modified expected results 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?
 - 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?

c) Efficiency

The extent to which:

- i. The project cost was effective: Was the project using the most cost-efficient options?
- ii. Outputs and outcomes: Has the project produced results 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. Were the project's activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and annual work plans? Were 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 project ends. Assessment of sustainability of outcomes will be given special attention but also technical, financial and organization sustainability will be reviewed. This assessment should explain how the risks to project outcomes will affect continuation of benefits after the project ends. It will include both exogenous and endogenous risks. The following four dimensions or aspects of risks to sustainability will be addressed:

- 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 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 **Error! Reference source not found.**).
- 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) 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? 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 design/formulation/approval? 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 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?

g) 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)?

C. Assessment of gender mainstreaming

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

- i. Did the project/programme design adequately consider the gender dimensions in its interventions? If so, was gender considered at the level of project outcome, output or activity?
- ii. Was a gender analysis included in a baseline study or needs assessment (if any)? Were there gender-related project indicators?
- iii. How gender-balanced was the composition of the project management team, the Steering Committee, experts and consultants and the beneficiaries?
- iv. 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)?
- v. Are women/gender-focused groups, associations or gender units in partner organizations consulted/included in the project?
- vi. To what extent were socioeconomic benefits delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions?

Further guidance on integrating gender is included in Annex 2 –.

V. 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 in Annex 4 - 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 donors/partners 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 country/-ies, **Malawi** will support the evaluation team.

VI. Time schedule

The evaluation is scheduled to take place in **3rd Quarter 2016**. 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, 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 2 to 4 weeks after the end of the mission.

The draft **MTE report** is to be shared with stakeholders (e.g. the UNIDO PM, ODG/EVQ/IEV and other relevant stakeholders). The ET is expected to revise the draft **MTE report** based on the comments received, edit the language and form and submit the final version of the **MTE report** in accordance with UNIDO Evaluation standards.

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 timetable⁵.

Evaluation report and review procedures

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (the suggested report outline is in

⁵ The evaluator will be provided with a Guide on how to prepare an evaluation inception report prepared by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

Annex 1 and circulated to relevant UNIDO staff and national stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to the evaluation team (c.c. ODG/EVQ/IEV) for their consideration and 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 MTE report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated, and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

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

Annex 1.

Evaluation work plan and deliverables

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

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.
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 key findings, conclusions and recommendations would be prepared (preferably in Power point slides) and presented in the field and at UNIDO Headquarters.
5. A draft mid-term evaluation report will be submitted electronically to the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and circulated to main stakeholders. For feedback and factual validation
6. Final Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) report: considering/incorporating comments/feedback received.

Evaluation phases	Deliverables
Desk review	Inception evaluation report, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development/fine-tuning of methodology approach and evaluation tools • Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during field mission
Briefing with UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, Project Managers and other key stakeholder at HQ	
Data analysis	
Field mission	Presentation of key findings to key stakeholders in the field.
Present preliminary findings and recommendations to key stakeholders in the field	

Debriefing at UNIDO HQ	Presentation of key preliminary findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ (Additional interviews and analysis as needed)
Further Analysis of the data collected and report drafting	Draft MTE report
Report finalization (on the basis of feedback/comment received from stakeholders)	Final MTE report

VIII. 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 (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 2 -. 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 MTE report are reviewed by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division 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 project⁶ 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:

⁶ 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)

- 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 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
 - 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 **Error! Reference source not found.** The overall rating table required 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 - – 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 3 - – Checklist on mid-term evaluation report quality

Independent mid-term evaluation of UNIDO project:

Project Title:

UNIDO Project NO:

UNIDO SAP 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		

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
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 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 4 - – 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 and Malawi
Start of Contract (EOD):	September 1, 2016
End of Contract (COB):	October 31, 2016
Number of Working Days:	28/33 working days spread over 3 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

UNIDO, through funding from Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) is providing development assistance to Malawi through the “Malawi: Market access and trade-capacity building support for agro-industrial products” (MATCB) project. This project, being implemented

in conjunction with the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Private Sector Development, Malawi (MoIT) since July 2013 aims to enhance Malawi's capacity for product certification, which is critical for the promotion of exports in line with the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS II).

The overall objective of the project is to strengthen the overall national quality conformity assessment infrastructure in the country. Thus, integrate it with the international quality infrastructure in order to improve product safety and quality features, improve competitiveness and increase consumer protection in order to fully realize global market opportunities. In an exemplary way the project will assist agro-based producer organizations to achieve relevant certification for selected products, thus leading directly to the stabilizing of smallholder farmer incomes. Through close consultation with stakeholders in Malawi the project has been developed to address the requirement for a large scale project to reform and strengthen institutional and national capacities related to standards, metrology, testing and quality.

Detailed background information of the project can be found the terms of reference (TOR) for the Mid-term Evaluation (MTE).

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 	2 days	Vienna, Austria

MAIN DUTIES	Concrete/ Measurable Outputs to be achieved	Working Days	Location
3. Conduct field mission to Malawi in September 2016 ⁷ .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct meetings with relevant project stakeholders, beneficiaries, etc. for the collection of data and clarifications; • Agreement with the National Consultant on the structure and content of the evaluation report and the distribution of writing tasks; • Evaluation presentation of the evaluation's initial findings prepared, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders in the country at the end of the mission. 	10/12	Malawi
4. Present overall findings and recommendations to the stakeholders at UNIDO HQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After field mission(s): Presentation slides, feedback from stakeholders obtained and discussed 	2	Vienna, Austria
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft evaluation report. 	6/8	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final evaluation report. 	3/5	Home-based
	TOTAL (in days)	28/33	

⁷ The exact mission dates will be decided in agreement with the Consultant, UNIDO HQ, and the country counterparts.

MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Education:

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

Technical and functional experience:

- Minimum of 10 years' experience in project management and/or evaluation (of development projects)
- Experience in the evaluation of UNIDO 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.

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 Malawi
Start of Contract:	1 September 2016
End of Contract:	31 October 2016
Number of Working Days:	25/30 days spread over 3 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

UNIDO, through funding from Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) is providing development assistance to Malawi through the "Malawi: Market access and trade-capacity building support for agro-industrial products" (MATCB) project. This project, being implemented in conjunction with the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Private Sector Development, Malawi (MoIT) since July 2013 aims to enhance Malawi's capacity for product certification, which is

critical for the promotion of exports in line with the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS II).

The overall objective of the project is to strengthen the overall national quality conformity assessment infrastructure in the country. Thus, integrate it with the international quality infrastructure in order to improve product safety and quality features, improve competitiveness and increase consumer protection in order to fully realize global market opportunities. In an exemplary way the project will assist agro-based producer organizations to achieve relevant certification for selected products, thus leading directly to the stabilizing of smallholder farmer incomes. Through close consultation with stakeholders in Malawi the project has been developed to address the requirement for a large scale project to reform and strengthen institutional and national capacities related to standards, metrology, testing and quality.

Detailed background information of the project can be found the terms of reference (TOR) for the Mid-term Evaluation (MTE).

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 (in days)	Location
<p>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;</p> <p>Coordinate and lead interviews/surveys in local language and assist the team leader with translation where necessary;</p> <p>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>	<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. 	5/6	Home-based

<u>MAIN DUTIES</u>	Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved	Expected duration (in days)	Location
<p>Review all project outputs/publications/feedback; Briefing with the evaluation team leader, UNIDO project managers and other key stakeholders.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. 	4/5	Home-based (telephone interviews)
<p>Coordinate and conduct the field mission with the team leader in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required;</p> <p>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. 	10/12 (including travel days)	Malawi
<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>	4/6	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	Home-based
TOTAL (in days)		25/30	

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 engineering or other relevant discipline like developmental studies with a specialization in quality infrastructure development.

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 Chichewa 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 5 - – Project results framework

	Intervention Logic	Baseline Indicators	Objective Verifiable Indicators	Sources and Means of Verification	Assumptions
Objective	To increase the volume of safe and certified Malawian products that access regional and global markets, in order to reduce poverty in the country with increased consumer protection with right quantity and quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: Baseline indicator data and the actual export figures of certified and uncertified products will be defined at the start of the project. Few certified agro-based export products. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase volume and number of agro-based certified export products. NASFAM, 5 to 10 associations increase regional trade by 3% by project end. 10-20 news articles on impact of legal metrology for consumer protection by media. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Economic Report NASFAM and MBS reports Consumers Associations Media Reports 	Risks - see p. 25
Outcome(s)					

<p>Outcome 1</p>	<p>The Government of Malawi commits to a quality culture and to supporting MBS services by providing a strengthened legislative and institutional environment in support of the national metrology infrastructure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outdated draft NQP and metrology law. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Quality Policy submitted to Cabinet • Metrology Law is approved. • Functional calibration laboratories • One legal metrology department at Blantyre. • Two district legal metrology centers established and provide services to customers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet documents • Physical laboratories at Blantyre, Lilongwe and Mzuzu. 	<p>Malawi Government remains committed to the creation of an appropriate policy and legislative environment for the national quality system and quality in Malawi and provides adequate resources for “national good” services to MBS.</p>
	<p>Intervention Logic</p>	<p>Baseline Indicators</p>	<p>Objective Verifiable Indicators</p>	<p>Sources and Means of Verification</p>	<p>Assumptions</p>

<p>Outcome 2</p>	<p>The Legal Metrology Department of the MBS-NMI (including the two regional centers) is recognized nationally (by the Government, industry and citizens), regionally (by SADC MEL) and internationally (by OIML), is upgraded and type approval and verification services are enhanced.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited testing capacity. • Inaccurate testing of bulk petroleum meters. • Inaccurate fuel pump/ dispenser testing facility. • Inaccurate length measures for ruler / tape verification. • Inaccurate heavy weighing instruments. • Zero pre-packaging inspection capacity. • No legal metrology capabilities other than basic trade metrology functions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certificates of type approval and verification services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBS records (number of reports, certificates). • Increase of customer base by 10 % by project end. • OIML website. 	<p>Government support (including financial) for sustainable legal metrology functions.</p>
-------------------------	--	---	--	--	--

Outcome 3	Certificates issued by MBS of calibration services performed in support of legal metrology services are accepted nationally, regionally and internationally.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero accredited calibration services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 accredited legal metrology service laboratories of MBS. • 2 district calibration laboratories (Lilongwe and Mzuzu). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBS records (number of reports, certificates). • OIML website. • ILAC website. 	Government support (including financial) for sustainable metrology functions and market acceptance of MBS as credible service provider of calibration services.
	Intervention Logic	Baseline Indicators	Objective Verifiable Indicators	Sources and Means of Verification	Assumptions

<p>Outcome 4</p>	<p>NASFAM processing associations have improved access to local, regional and foreign markets through strengthened testing and export certification and a quality system implemented in selected value chains.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of associations presently certified by MBS under Malawi standards. • No association certified for HACCP. • Supported processing units serve as model for micro- and small enterprise development with regards to food safety and product quality. • No association presently supported. 	<p>10 farmer associations working under the NASFAM umbrella achieve Malawi standards in food safety and product quality and quality standards comparable with HACCP.</p>	<p>NASFAM records on sale of supported products in Malawi and in export markets.</p>	<p>Rainfall conditions are stable during the project period so that the required raw material for processing can be obtained.</p>
-------------------------	--	---	--	--	---

Outcome 5	Governance and monitoring systems are established for local ownership and project sustainability.	Zero project monitoring mechanism.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee meeting report. • One independent project evaluation report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical records. • UNIDO reports. 	Timely project stakeholders contribution to project execution.
Outputs – Results	Intervention Logic	Objective Verifiable Indicators	Sources and Means of Verification	Assumptions	

<p>Output 1.1</p>	<p>National Quality Policy and Metrology Law reviewed with clear mandate for MBS National Metrology Institute (NMI) with Legal Metrology Department.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Quality Policy is reviewed, updated and submitted to Government for approval. • Metrology Law is reviewed from technical perspective and submitted to Government for approval. 	<p>Physical records of the NQP and the Metrology Law, including minutes of key meetings. Parliament of Government of Malawi</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malawi Government remains committed to the creation of an appropriate policy and legislative environment for the national quality system. • A draft of the NQP and the New Metrology Law is available and the process is supported by a national task team under the leadership of MBS. • Political support and will is required for this to be approved and accepted. • It is important to coordinate with UNDP programme where there are related elements in this regard.
<p>Output 1.2</p>	<p>Technical assistance provided in the design of the new buildings and laboratories of the MBS.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive specifications, designs and plans for new buildings in Blantyre, specifically laboratories. • Plans for the improvement of regional facilities in Lilongwe and Mzuzu. 	<p>Physical laboratory designs with MBS.</p>	<p>The infrastructure development project of the MBS is approved and supported by the Malawi Government and a budget allocated, and also for required professional services (e.g., architects, engineers, environmental assessment, etc.) which are not covered in this UNIDO proposal.</p>

Output 2.1	Detailed analysis of scope of regulations requiring legal metrology services.	Scope of legal metrology services and implementation plan accepted.	Physical records with MBS.	Access to information, availability of MBS experts and their active participation and contribution.
	Intervention Logic	Objective Verifiable Indicators	Sources and Means of Verification	Assumptions
Output 2.2	Legal metrology infrastructure built-up and metrology equipment commissioned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBS equipped to transport weights and test weighing bridges. • MBS equipped with laboratory equipment appropriate for mass, volume, length measurement and prepackaging. • Issuing of reports, certificates and customer services. • Frequency of legal metrology inspections increased. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 heavy purpose-built vehicle provided. • Equipment list • 2 vehicles provided, one each to regional offices, for improved and effective inspections. 	MBS supports maintenance and operation of mobile vehicles and equipment with suitable staff, including future calibration of such equipment, fuel for vehicles and general office operational costs.

Output 2.3	Type approval and verification services enhanced.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 Trained staff in verification services. • Improved work flow charts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality system in place • Training records. • Records of promotional efforts. 	Willingness and availability of qualified MBS staff who dedicate time and commitment to implementing systems and putting them into practice.
Output 3.1	Detailed analysis of scope of calibration services for accreditation.	Reports on scope of calibration services and implementation plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical records. • Quality manual in line with ISO 17025 standard. • Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). 	Legal metrology customers, such as shops, petrol stations and maintenance workshops pay much attention to calibration services to give consumer confidence on their services.
	Intervention Logic	Objective Verifiable Indicators	Sources and Means of Verification	Assumptions

<p>Output 3.2</p>	<p>Legal metrology center capacity enhanced and accredited.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBS Blantyre metrology laboratory ready for calibrations required for legal metrology (mass, volume, etc.). • Issuance of calibration certificates • 10 staff trained. • ISO17025 quality system implemented and maintained. • Quality manual written. • One application for accreditation to ILAC member. • Calibration certificates in mass and volume. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference standards and equipment list. • Office equipment list • Training records. • MBS records. • Application for accreditation to SNAS. • Accreditation certificate • ILAC (website) • Media reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MBS supports maintenance and operation of equipment with suitable staff, including future calibration of such equipment and general office operational costs. • Continuous improvement of quality system of laboratories for pre-assessment visit of SNAS assessors.
--------------------------	---	---	---	---

Output 4.1	<p>Equipment required to achieve food safety provided and staff trained to comply with Malawi standards for food safety and product quality. On-demand advisory service operational.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment procurement and commissioning list. • Management and operating staff trained on food safety, product quality and packaging and appropriate advice provided. • Center established and responsible officer trained (determine with NASFAM their present information system). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement documents and handing over certificates. • Training records. • Spot checks. • MBS certificate on food safety and product quality. • TOT training records. • NASFAM training records. • Product quality certificate. 	<p>NASFAM members perceive quality products as a means of earning higher income for agro products.</p>
	Intervention Logic	Objective Verifiable Indicators	Sources and Means of Verification	Assumptions
Output 4.2	<p>Food quality system underlying HACCP certification implemented.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant HACCP procedures implemented and staff trained. • 13 farmer associations representing 20,000 farm families are advised on certification according to Malawi standards for food safety and product quality (those already certified to be identified during inception) and on certification according to the standards underlying HACCP (against none at present). 	<p>Certificate of certification. Project records and MBS certificates.</p>	<p>Accredited HACCP certification services accessible.</p>

Activities
1.1.1 Review the draft national quality policy to ensure that the relationship of the quality infrastructure with the country's technical regulations is detailed.
1.1.2 Review the draft metrology law to ensure that the mandate of the MBS-NMI for the national measurement standards and legal metrology functions is adequately addressed, including review of the system of administrative sanctions for the legal metrology regime to be effective.
1.2.1 Visit selected national standards and metrology institutes in the region and identify lessons learned in construction, operation and maintenance of the facilities in general, with specific emphasis on the laboratories.
1.2.2 Provide technical assistance to the MBS in order to ensure that the detailed requirements for the new buildings in Blantyre are clearly defined and translated into comprehensive specifications, designs and plans.
1.2.3 Provide technical assistance to the MBS to define the plans to improve the current regional facilities in Lilongwe and Mzuzu in light of the legal metrology functions.
2.1.1 Compile a comprehensive and detailed scope of the legal metrology services to be provided and identify gaps at facilities in Blantyre, Lilongwe and Mzuzu.
2.1.2 Provide an implementation plan, prioritizing equipment and infrastructure needs in light of available project budget.
2.2.1 Provide heavy purpose-built vehicle for the transportation of weighbridge test equipment.
2.2.2 Provide equipment with test/calibration reports to replace old and obsolete equipment for mass, volume, length and prepackaging inspection and in additional areas identified during output 2.1.
2.2.3 Provide supporting equipment and consumable items (e.g. tools, seals).
2.2.4 Provide minimum office equipment (computers, printers, copiers, fax, furniture).
2.2.5 Upgrade the infrastructure (including environmental conditions).
2.2.6 Provide two suitable vehicles, one each to the regional offices, for improved and effective inspections.
2.3.1 Implement an appropriate quality system.
2.3.2 Identify training gaps, provide training.
2.3.3 Undertake awareness campaign
3.1.1 Compile a comprehensive and detailed scope of the calibration services offered by the MBS-NMI in Blantyre to be accredited in support of the legal metrology services.
3.1.2 Identify the specific gaps (equipment, infrastructure, technical training) in meeting accreditation requirements.
3.2.1 Provide reference standards and equipment with calibration certificates.
3.2.2 Provide supporting equipment and consumable items (e.g. tools, gloves, stickers).
3.2.3 Provide minimum office equipment (computers, printers, copiers, fax, furniture)
3.2.4 Upgrade infrastructure (including environmental conditions).
3.2.5 Identify training gaps and provide training.
3.2.6 Provide copies of the UNIDO practical guidebook for complying with ISO17025 to all MBS staff concerned.

3.2.7 Implement a quality management system.
3.2.8 Provide calibrated reference standards and equipment in order to address all traceability requirements.
3.2.9 Validate methods and conduct comparisons.
3.2.10 Undertake at least one audit and review cycle.
3.2.11 Submit a detailed application for accreditation to SADCAS.
3.2.12 Provide technical assistance to address corrective actions in order to obtain accreditation.
4.1.1 Select associations and commodities during inception phase.
4.1.2 Assess the production and quality status of selected micro-enterprises.
4.1.3 Provide equipment needed to achieve required quality standards.
4.1.4 Provide training for operators on equipment and procedures.
4.1.5 Provide basic management and business training.
4.1.6 Provide advice on packaging.
4.1.7 Provide advice and inputs on effluent management.
4.1.8 Provide training for NASFAM (and other interested party) trainers on required product quality to train members in issues like the choice of crop variety, fertilizers, plant protection, harvesting, storage and transportation.
4.2.1 Provide advice on the implementation of a food safety system.
4.2.2 Certification according to Malawi standards (MS21) for product quality.
4.2.3 Certification according to the standards underlying HACCP.
5.1.1 Recruit Chief Technical Advisor (part time, regional).
5.1.2 Recruit full time national project coordinator.
5.1.3 Recruit administrative support assistant.
5.1.4 Procure office equipment (computers, printer, ICT, etc).
5.1.5 Procure a project vehicle.
5.1.6 Establish operational and administrative processes and systems.
5.1.7 Phase out project and wrap up.
5.2.1 Conduct a project baseline study.
5.2.2 Confirm project logic framework with specific attention to indicators, risks and assumptions.
5.2.3 Compile an inception report for approval by project Steering Committee.
5.3.1 Establish project Steering Committee.
5.3.2 Report.
5.3.3 Evaluate and Monitor.