

## Draft Terms of Reference

### Mid-term evaluation of the IOMC Toolbox for decision making in chemicals management – Phase III: From design to action

17.10.2019

#### Background

1. The IOMC Toolbox project (the “project”) for Decision Making in Chemicals Management was designed to assist countries and (sub) regions in developing countries and countries with economies in transition worldwide with identifying the most relevant, efficient and appropriate national actions to respond to chemicals management problems. The intended impact is to strengthen the sound management of chemicals in many developing countries and countries with economies in transition.
2. The project has completed two phases already. Phase I focussed on the development of a proof-of-concept version of the Toolbox itself. During Phase II the Toolbox was pilot-tested, further developed and its functionalities were improved. At the end of Phase II, the Toolbox was promoted to over 3,000 policy makers worldwide but focussing on developing countries and countries with economies in transition. The objective of Phase III, from design to action, is to continue improving functionalities and broadening the scope and application of the Toolbox. In addition, Phase III includes a strong capacity building component to broaden awareness of the Toolbox and enable countries to implement the tools available in the Toolbox. This will be achieved by conducting a series of webinars and face-to-face capacity building workshops for relevant policy makers and professionals.
3. All activities of the project are truly targeted at developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Today, much of the scientific know-how, technical insights and practical experience regarding the development and implementation of chemical management systems lie with developed countries especially the OECD member states. The Toolbox wants to provide a way to transfer this knowledge while addressing the needs and capacities of the recipient countries.
4. For the development and implementation of the Toolbox, the IOMC brought together nine intergovernmental organisations actively involved in chemical safety: WHO, FAO, ILO, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR, the World Bank and OECD. As such the IOMC aims to strengthen international cooperation in the field of chemicals management.

#### Purpose of the evaluation

5. Phase III of the project calls for an independent, external evaluation to be undertaken after the phase’s **mid-point**. The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to assess progress towards achieving the project’s planned results. The midterm evaluation should in particular take account of initial action results and assess the **relevance and effectiveness criteria**. Furthermore, the evaluation should provide an overall conclusion at mid-term and reveal recommendations for improving implementation for months 18-36. The final evaluation, to be undertaken upon the completion of

the project, will review relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability, and identify lessons from action implementation with a view to contribute to learning and informed decision-making. In addition, the final evaluation will aim to include narrative case studies to enable in-depth analysis of the effectiveness of the action on country and (sub) regional levels.<sup>1</sup>

### **Scope of the evaluation**

6. The mid-term evaluation will cover the period from the start of Phase III of the project, 1 January 2018 to 30 September 2019. The evaluation will cover both country and (sub)regional project outputs and progress towards the expected outcomes, as indicated in the project logical framework (see Annex A). Progress of actions will be assessed against the Indicative Action Plan (see Annex B). The mid-term evaluation is designed as a light evaluation.

### **Evaluation criteria**

7. The evaluation will assess project relevance and effectiveness, project performance against the indicators and measures of the logframe, the implementation of the recommendations issued from the Phase II evaluation and address partnership modalities.
  - Relevance: Is the project reaching its intended users and relevant to the targeted global and country specific needs and priorities?
  - Effectiveness: To what extent is the project producing planned outputs and making progress towards attainment of outcomes?

### **Principal evaluation questions**

8. The questions below are suggested to guide the mid-term evaluation. The focus lies on relevance and effectiveness as per project document and the most important questions are in bold print.

#### **Relevance**

- a) **Is the project reaching its intended users (policy makers and decision-makers as well as technical professionals particularly in developing countries and countries with economies in transition as primary beneficiaries and users of chemicals as final beneficiaries)?**
- b) **How relevant are the Toolbox and the toolkits to the targeted users' specific country needs?**
- c) **To what extent does the project support the implementation of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)?**
- d) How relevant is the project to supporting the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and more specifically helping Member States to achieve Goal 12 amongst others?
- e) To what extent is the project aligned with the European Union strategic objectives?
- f) To what extent has the project been relevant for advancing gender equality and the empowerment of women and meeting the needs of other groups made vulnerable?

#### **Effectiveness**

---

<sup>1</sup> The terms of reference of the final evaluation will take into consideration whether a subsequent phase of the project is being planned.

- a) **Has the guidance material for chemicals management been effective to support implementation of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)?**
  - b) **To what extent are the Toolbox and the toolkits being used by its targeted user groups?**
  - c) **To what extent has use of the Toolbox and the toolkits contributed to addressing national chemicals management challenges?**
  - d) **To what extent did the enhanced functionality of the Toolbox and the extra entry points and availability of new tools succeed in broadening reach and use of the Toolbox amongst intended users?**
  - e) To what extent have the Toolbox and the toolkits **promotion events** been successful to broaden reach and use of the Toolbox?
  - f) Has **awareness** on the Toolbox and the toolkits and its purposes and functionalities increased among the targeted user groups in comparison to the previous Phase?
  - g) To what extent have national and regional **capacity building activities** contributed to increased capacities to use the tools and the identification of actions needed, in comparison to Phase II?
  - h) To what extent are a human rights-based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy incorporated in the design and roll-out of the toolbox and the toolkits?
  - i) To what extent are Toolbox and the toolkits users sharing their experience with other stakeholders in their region and as such multiply impact beyond single users or countries?
  - j) How effective are the Toolbox and the toolkits as a mechanism for accessing and managing information?
9. The midterm evaluation will also review project performance against the indicators and measures of the logframe, the implementation of the recommendations issued from the [Phase II evaluation](#) and address partnership modalities of the project, including the effectiveness and efficiency of implementing partners, if any.

### **Evaluation Approach and Methods**

10. The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the [UNITAR Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework](#) and the [Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group](#). The evaluation will be undertaken by a supplier or an international consultant (the “evaluator”) under the overall responsibility of the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Director (PPME).
11. The evaluation shall follow a participatory approach and engage a range of network stakeholders in the process. Data collection should be triangulated to the extent possible to ensure validity and reliability of findings and draw on the following methods: comprehensive desk review, including a stakeholder analysis; surveys; key informant interviews (remotely); and focus groups (remotely). These data collection tools are discussed below.
12. The evaluator should engage in quantitative and qualitative analysis in responding to the principal evaluation questions and present the findings qualitatively or quantitatively as most appropriate.

#### **Data collection methods:**

*Comprehensive desk review*

The evaluator will review the online Toolbox (<http://iomctoolbox.oecd.org>) if available and key project-related documents, including the grant application and logical framework, project management group minutes and reports, guidance material, web statistics, results from self-evaluations undertaken by the IOMC participating organizations following promotion, training or other events, and other documents.

#### *Stakeholder analysis*

The evaluator will identify the different stakeholder groups. Key stakeholders include the various partners involved in development and implementation of the Toolbox, policy makers and professionals in developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

#### *Survey(s)*

With a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of project stakeholders, the consultant shall develop and deploy a survey(s) following the comprehensive desk study to provide an initial set of findings and allow the evaluator to easily probe during the key informant interviews (remotely).

#### *Key informant interviews*

Based on stakeholder identification, the evaluator will identify and interview key informants. The list of global focal points is available in Annex C. In preparation for the interviews with key informants, the consultant will define interview protocols to determine the questions and modalities with flexibility to adapt to the particularities of the different informants. Interviews will be done by using remote technology.

#### *Focus groups*

Focus groups should be organized with selected project stakeholders to complement/triangulate findings from other collection tools.

## **Gender and human rights**

13. The evaluator should incorporate human rights, gender<sup>2</sup> and equity perspectives in the evaluation process and findings, particularly by involving women and other disadvantaged groups subject to discrimination. All key data collected shall be disaggregated by sex, age grouping and disability and be included in the draft and final evaluation report.<sup>3</sup> This could involve developing dedicated evaluation questions addressing these issues, including gender consideration in data collection and analysis.

---

<sup>2</sup> in 2012, the United Nations Chiefs Executive Board for Coordination (CEB) endorsed the UN System-wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women as the UN's accountability framework to accelerate gender equality and the empowerment of women. UN-SWAP includes 15 unified performance indicators against which UN entities report. The SWAP 2.0 now includes 17 performance indicators.

<sup>3</sup> The UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards indicate that "The evaluation design should include considerations of the extent to which the United Nations system's commitment to the human-rights based approach and gender mainstreaming strategy was incorporated in the design of the evaluation subject." (Standard 4.7 <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914> )

14. The guiding principles for the evaluation should respect transparency, engage stakeholders and beneficiaries; ensure confidentiality of data and anonymity of responses; and follow ethical and professional standards.

**Timeframe, work plan, deliverables and review**

15. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from November 2019 (initial desk review and data collection) to February 2020 (submission of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.

16. The consultant shall submit a brief evaluation design/question matrix following the comprehensive desk study, stakeholder analysis and initial key informant interviews. The evaluation design/question matrix should include a discussion on the evaluation objectives, methods and, if required, revisions to the suggested evaluation questions or data collection methods. The Evaluation design/question matrix should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the evaluation exercise.

17. Following data collection and analysis, the consultant shall submit a zero draft of the evaluation report to the evaluation manager and revise the draft based on comments made by the evaluation manager.

18. The draft evaluation report should follow the structure presented under Annex C. The report should state the purpose of the evaluation and the methods used and include a discussion on the limitations to the evaluation. The report should present evidence-based and balanced findings, including strengths and weaknesses, consequent conclusions and recommendations, and lessons to be learned. The length of the report should be approximately 20-30 pages, excluding annexes.

19. Following the submission of the zero draft, a draft report will then be submitted to the Project’s management team to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex D by 3 of February 2020. Within one week of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 28 February 2020.

**Indicative timeframe: November 2019 – February 2020**

Activity	November	December	January	February
Evaluator selected and recruited				
Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis				
Evaluation design/question matrix				
Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews and focus groups (remotely)				
Zero draft report submitted to UNITAR				

Draft evaluation report consulted with UNITAR evaluation manager and submitted to the Project management team				
Project management team reviews draft evaluation report and shares comments and recommendations				
Evaluation report finalized and validated by the Project Management team				

### **Summary of evaluation deliverables and indicative schedule**

<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	29 November 2019
Comments on evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluation manager/ Project management Group	Evaluator	6 December 2019
Zero draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	20 January 2020
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	27 January 2020
Draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager/ Project management Group	3 February 2020
Comments on draft report	Project management Group	Evaluation manager	17 February 2020
Final report	Evaluation manager	Evaluation manager/ Project management Group	28 February 2020

Note: The above timeframe is indicative and pending confirmation by the Project Management Group.

### **Communication/dissemination of results**

20. The final evaluation report shall be written in English. The final report will be shared with all partners, the European Union and the WHO evaluation Office. The report will furthermore be posted on an online repository of evaluation reports open to the public.

### **Professional requirements**

21. UNITAR's Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit will undertake the mid-term evaluation. If required, the Unit will seek external support by recruiting an evaluator with the following qualifications:

- MA degree or equivalent in international relations, political science, development or a related discipline. Training and/or experience in the area of chemical management would be a clear advantage.
- At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of capacity building.
- Technical knowledge of the focal area including the evaluation of learning.
- Field work experience in developing countries.
- Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches.
- Excellent writing skills.

- Strong communication and presentation skills.
- Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.
- Availability to travel.
- Fluency in English. Other languages are an advantage.

### **Contractual arrangements**

22. The evaluator/evaluators will be under UNITAR contract and will report directly to the Manager of the Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit ('evaluation manager'). The evaluator(s) should consult with the evaluation manager on any procedural or methodological matter requiring attention. The evaluator is responsible for planning any meetings, organizing online surveys and undertaking administrative arrangements for any travel that may be required (e.g. accommodation, visas, etc.). The travel arrangements will be in accordance with the UN rules and regulations for consultants.

23. The evaluation manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR, and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR. According to UNITAR's Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, PPME formulates annual corporate evaluation plans within the established budgetary appropriations in due consultation with the Executive Director and Management and conducts and/or manages corporate evaluations at the request of the Executive Director and/or programmes and other Institute divisional entities. Moreover, in due consultation with the Executive Director and Management, PPME issues and discloses final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions. In managing mandated, independent project evaluations, PPME may access the expenditure account within the ledger account of the relevant project and raise obligations for expenditure. This builds the foundations of UNITAR's evaluation function's independence and ability to better support learning and accountability.

### **Evaluator Ethics**

24. The evaluator(s) selected should not have participated in the project's design or implementation or have a conflict of interest with project-related activities. The evaluator(s) shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct under Annex F prior to initiating the assignment.

### **Annexes:**

- A: Project logical framework**
- B: List of documents and data to be reviewed**
- C: List of Contact Points**
- D: Structure of evaluation report**
- E: Audit trail**
- F: Evaluator code of conduct**
- G: List of events**

## Annex A: Project Logical Framework

	Intervention logic	Indicators	Baselines (incl. reference year)	Targets (incl. reference year)	Sources and means of information	Assumptions
Overall objective: Impact	Countries implement SAICM	Chemicals risk assessment and risk reduction through the use of best practices – Progress in the adoption of tools and guidance developed by IOMC Participating Organizations	8% average increase of stakeholders using selected IOMC tools during 2011-2013 (see ICCM4, Doc. SAICM/ICCM.4/3)	10-15% average increase of stakeholders using selected IOMC tools during 2017-2012.	Progress reports on the implementation of SAICM; country survey	SAICM Secretariat prepares a third and fourth report for the periods 2014-2106 and 2017-2019 (see ICCM4, Doc. SAICM/ICCM.4/3)
Specific objective: Outcome	Toolbox provides an effective mechanism for accessing guidance	# of downloads from the IOMC Toolbox web site	# of downloads at the end of Phase II (Oct 2017)	10-15% increase per year in 2018, 2019 and by Oct 2020	Web statistics	Countries have immediate, tangible, policy-related objectives or problems to address.
	Countries use and implement guidance provided through the Toolbox	# of countries having implemented or are in the process implementing IOMC Tools	# of countries at the end of Phase II (Oct 2017)	20 countries	Meeting reports	
	Countries are able to initiate process to resolve chemicals management issues using Toolbox materials	Level of being able to manage chemicals in countries by using IOMC Tools (at a scale from 1 to 5)	NA	75% at level 4 and above	Survey and case studies	
Outputs	New IOMC Toolbox design	Level of user satisfaction (on a scale from 1 to 5).	NA	75% at level 4 and above.	Online evaluation questionnaire	Design of Toolbox will change.
	Target audience is aware of Toolbox	# of visits to IOMC Toolbox	# of visits at the end of Phase II of the Project (Oct 2017)	10-15% increase per year in 2018, 2019 and by Oct 2020	Web statistics	Toolbox visitors reply to evaluation questionnaire.

		Background of online visitors	NA	At least 50% of visitors replying to online questionnaire from within target audience	Online evaluation questionnaire	
		# of persons to whom the Toolbox is promoted and trained.	4000 (Oct 2017)	6000 (i.e. 4000 (2017) plus 2000) (Oct 2020)	Meeting reports	
		Background of persons to whom the Toolbox is promoted and trained.	NA	More than 70% of persons from within the target audience	Meeting reports/1	
	Target audience is trained on the use of selected tools	# of capacity building events (face-to-face)	0	20	Reports	Participants in capacity building events have an active role in their countries concerning the management of chemicals. Participation in the event prepares them to implement the necessary tools to strengthen the management systems.
		# of capacity building events (webinars)	0	20	Reports	
		# of participants attending capacity building events (face-to-face)	0	300 ( by Oct 2020)	Reports	
		# of participants attending capacity building events (webinars)	0	300 (by Oct 2020)	Webinar statistics	
		Level of preparedness to implement identified tools following training events (on a scale from 1 to 5).	NA	75% at level 4 and above	Evaluation questionnaire	

## Annex B: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- Project document: Grant Application Form, Thematic Programme for Environment and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources. “IOMC Toolbox for decision making in chemicals management – Phase III: From design to action”
- Logical framework
- Agreements
- 1st Progress Report by WHO in collaboration with FAO, ILO, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR, and OECD, covering the period 1 January – 31 December 2018
- First annual financial statement covering the period 1 January – 31 December 2018
- The evaluation reports of Phase I and II
- IOMC. IOMC Toolbox for Decision Making in Chemicals Management. <http://iomctoolbox.oecd.org> (including introductory video, promotion material and tutorial; key functionalities; and management schemes).
- FAO Pesticide Registration Toolkit. <http://www.fao.org/pesticide-registration-toolkit/en/>
- UNIDO Chemical Leasing Toolkit. <http://chemicalleasing-toolkit.org/>
- OECD Environmental Risk Assessment Toolkit. <http://envriskassessmenttoolkit.oecd.org/>
- WHO Human Health Risk Assessment Toolkit
- UNIDO Toolkit on innovative approaches to sound management of chemicals and chemical wastes
- IOMC. IOMC Toolbox for Decision Making in Chemicals Management. Project Management Group Meeting Minutes (various).
- IOMC. Training on the IOMC Toolbox for Decision Making in Chemicals Management. Training Guidelines.
- Promotion and Training Event Questionnaires
- Feedback Survey and Training Event Follow-up Questionnaire on IOMC Toolbox Training events
- Data from IOMC Toolbox website
- Content from face-to-face events
- Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation

## **Annex C: List of Contact Points**

### **Participating Organizations (PO)**

Emina Alic, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, e.alic@unido.org

Manal Azzi, International Labour Organization, azzi@ilo.org

Giulia Calcagnini, Food and Agriculture Organization, Giulia.Calcagnini@fao.org

Andrea Cararo, United Nations Institute for Training and Research, andrea.cararo@unitar.org

Nils Decker, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, N.DECKER@unido.org

Jose Demesa, United Nations Environment, jose.DEMESA@unep.org

Bob Diderich, Bob.DIDERICH@oecd.org

Valerie Frison, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Valerie.FRISON@oecd.org

Halshka Graczyk, International Labour Organization, graczyk@ilo.org

Beatrice Grenier, Food and Agriculture Organization, Beatrice.Grenier@fao.org

Baogen Gu, Food and Agriculture Organization, Baogen.Gu@fao.org

Kersten Gutschmidt, World Health Organization, gutschmidtk@who.int

Krystle Innes, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, K.INNES@unido.org

Frithjof Laubinger, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development,  
Frithjof.LAUBINGER@oecd.org

Sylvie Poret, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Sylvie.PORET@oecd.org

Pierre Quiblier, United Nations Environment, pierre.quiblier@unep.org

Petra Schwager, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, p.schwager@unido.org

Brandon Turner, United Nations Institute for Training and Research, brandon.turner@unitar.org

Susanne Styrski, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, S.STYRSKY@unido.org

Luis Humberto Umanzor Hernandez, United Nations Industrial Development Organization,  
L.UMANZORHERNANDEZ@unido.org

Harry van der Wulp, Food and Agriculture Organization, harold.vdvalk@gmail.com

Carolyn Vickers, World Health Organization, vickersc@who.int

### **Partner countries and other partners**

[To be added]

This list will be updated based on other contacts provided by the PMG.

## Annex D: Structure of evaluation report

- i. Title page
- ii. Executive summary
- iii. Acronyms and abbreviations
1. Introduction
2. Project description, objectives and development context
3. Theory of change/project design logic
4. Methodology and limitations
5. Evaluation findings based on criteria/principal evaluation questions
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations
8. Lessons
9. Annexes
  - a. Case studies
  - b. Terms of reference
  - c. Survey/questionnaires deployed
  - d. Interview protocol
  - e. List of persons interviewed
  - f. List of documents reviewed
  - g. Evaluation question matrix
  - h. Evaluation consultant agreement form



**Annex F: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form**

**The evaluator:**

- 1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- 2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- 3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- 4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- 5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
- 6. Is responsible for his/her performance and his/her product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
- 7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

<b>Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>4</sup></b>
<b>Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System</b>
<b>Name of Consultant:</b> _____
<b>Name of Consultancy Organization</b> (where relevant): _____
<b>I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation and I declare that any past experience, of myself, my immediate family or close friends or associates, does not give rise to a potential conflict of interest.</b>
Signed at <i>place</i> on <i>date</i>
Signature: _____

<sup>4</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## **Annex G: List of events**

[To be added]