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# Executive Summary

The present evaluation assesses general results and achievements of the UNDP Ghana Country Programme Document (CPD) 2012-2017.

The 2012-2017 CPD is derived from the 2012-2017 United National Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The UNDAF 2012-2017 encapsulates the collective results the UN system in Ghana in collaboration with development partnership seek to achieve, in support of the key development priorities of the Government as outlined in its medium term national development agenda (Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (GSGDA 1 and 11).

the CPD 2012-2017 focused on making the most effective use of an expanded resource base to advance equitable development and consolidation of Ghana’s transformational gains. The key areas of focus are: Sustainable Human Development; Inclusive Growth; Democratic Governance and Consolidation of Peace.

The exercise is aimed, among others, at generating lessons for informing UNDP’s continued support to Ghana as a middle income country, and at presenting forward-looking recommendations to shape the design of the next phase of the programme.

**Relevance.** UNDP has demonstrated an astute understanding of the development challenges by engaging in interventions that are timely in addressing pressing gaps that are also aligned with the national priorities. This is reflected by respondents in the two partnership surveys conducted in 2012 and 2015 and also corroborated in all the independent project evaluations undertaken over the CPD period. UNDP’s intensive consultative approach in formulation of projects and programs as well as its provision of technical assistance in the project/programs has shown to be responsive and appropriate to its partners in government and civil society. UNDP staff have a very intimate knowledge of the development context, as well as of the people. This has helped in establishing a good rapport between implementing partners and the office.

Though UNDP has implemented some reforms emanating from the larger UN Reforms as prescribed in the QCPR, including the implementation of IPSAS and Delivery as One (DaO), none of the reforms can be said to have influenced the choice of interventions in Ghana as an LMIC. There have been gradual shift in focus from downstream interventions to more upstream.

**Effectiveness.** Overall, results of the CPD are satisfactory, with best performances registered at the Sustainable Development Cluster, whose most strategic result is the contribution to the establishment of a solid policy framework on climate change. Many of the implemented actions have successfully contributed to enhanced policies and strategies, and to the strengthening of organisational and planning capacities of target partners. In many cases, the Programme has enhanced cooperation among relevant stakeholders and has introduced new tools which – when properly adapted and divulged – might effectively contribute to the achievement of CPD outcomes. In the governance sector, major achievements are to be recorded in the consolidation of peace architecture in the country, in the support to peaceful elections, in the contribution to streamlining gender policies. Notable results in the inclusive growth thematic area are related to the continued support to Ghana’s capacities in addressing poverty and inequality issues, through enhancement of data collection and processing, and through the support to SADA in addressing the Northern dimension of national economic and social development. The added value of UNDP is largely recognised among project partners; more should be done to properly market the still partially unfolded potential of UNDP among development partners.

Management and programming modalities are highly differentiated across clusters, thus limiting objective assessment and monitoring at UNDP general management level. Limited capacities of IPs and large number of partners in some projects have impacted on the effectiveness of actions envisaged. Also, the scattered character of some projects – which only in few cases were designed along longer term strategies and presented coherent linkages among themselves over time - has hindered the achievement of more durable and tangible results.

In general, there is still a need to further capacitate not only state stakeholders, but also the civil society, to monitor and influence the delivery of services. In the case of civil society stakeholders, there should be continuous commitment from the UNDP to empower them in participating in the dialogues with the GoG on citizens’ rights, and in contributing to policy making.

**Efficiency.** In terms of efficiency UNDP has received kudos from development partners who provide financing or co-finance projects and programs. It has chalked accolades with regards to the efficient management of such funds in terms of due diligence and accountability. UNDP has not performed so well in its own timing of disbursement of funds, which has resulted in some programs having to be fast tracked due to late disbursement, or have activities reduced where there are shortfalls. This in some cases has lessened the impact of project interventions. UNDP adheres to value for money principles in the procurement of goods and services. Though there is a robust monitoring system as part of all UNDP projects, the evaluation of programs is not systemic. With regards to project/program evaluation, over the last five years there have been only 5 project evaluations – all from one cluster - and these can be said to be due to the external funding nature of those projects. UNDP’s programming makes provision for monitoring activities but is weak on making provision for evaluations. Given the high number of project being undertaken by UNDP and the limited number of Programme staff it provides challenges on their ability to do substantive technical support and develop knowledge products for policy advice, since most of their time is occupied with project administration and project management work.

 **Sustainability**. Enhanced focus on durability of results achieved in the CPD implementation should be part of the programming process. Sustainability is not part of the reporting format, nor of the design template. Projects under the three CPD outcomes project did not include an exit strategy, which would be recommended, among others, to test Governments’ willingness to further sustain and fund some project results which are considered particular relevant for the country. Ownership was relatively good, thanks to the continuous dialogue of UNDP with constituents and to the alignment of the projects with national priorities and areas of cooperation. It would be advisable to narrow down the project themes and agree on one-two priorities to be dealt within each CPD Outcome in the next Programme period, in order to achieve a long-term strategic focus and developing actions aimed at more durable results.

**Partnership and Coordination.** A snapshot of UNDP partners who have collaborated on projects/programs over the CPD period shows a glaring disparity in the nature of its intervention partners. It can be observed that, apart from rare exceptions, UNDP has only been using government institutions as implementing partners. The civil society is consulted as part of stakeholders throughout design and implementation of projects, but rarely are they made the key implementing partners. Civil Society also has not got the full benefit of UNDP collaboration since in most cases it is an add-on to projects with government. More effort should be undertaken to build the capacity of civil society.

Also partnership with the private sector is negligible. With the exception of MTN and Mondelez over the five year period, no other private sector company was partnered, in a well thought of and structured manner.

Partnership with government - though healthy and friendly due in part to the long history of partnership with the same IPs - also has its demerits. Currently among the demerits is that the government focal points are not challenged to be innovative in thinking up strategic, catalytic interventions but resigned to more of the same. This was exemplified in the planning for the 2017 AWPs.

**Horizontal Issues**. Human rights: Despite rights-based approach (RBA) is a consistent part of UNDP set of guidelines on strategic programming, at CPD implementation level this issue does not seem sufficiently addressed. RBA is not part of the ROAR, with consequent limited interest of the parties to devise and implement measures at enhancing this key element. More effort should be put by IPs and RPs in taking RBA into appropriate consideration; the role of UNDP staff might be strengthened. Gender equality: UNDP is committed in enshrining Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE) principles, and in general the actions implemented under the CPD well respect those principles. More efforts need however to be put in place to ensure gender is effectively mainstreamed throughout the programme cycle as well as placing importance on the building of the capacity of the staff and IPs to mainstream gender to ensure a proper monitoring and further pursuing of such approaches. The following table concisely provides the overall assessment of the CPD.

Table : Overall assessment table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **PERFORMANCE RATING** |
| **CRITERIA** | **POOR** | **LOW** | **AVERAGE** | **GOOD** | **HIGH** |
| **Relevance** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Efficiency** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partnership & Coordination** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Human Rights** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Gender Equality** |  |  |  |  |  |

**Lessons learnt**

Key lessons deduced from evaluation include the notion that UNDP’s potential and comparative advantages is not fully unfolded, not sufficiently marketed among development partners. Also that projects have been more successful where they were carried out in synchrony with sector reforms and legislative developments. Uneven management and coordination, has hampered programme thus impaired a proper and objective assessment of benefits and gaps. In projects where there was a combination of weak capacities of IPs, high quantity of activities and number of stakeholders diminished the positive effects and results impact. Lastly that more attention should be paid on M&E and sustainability issues which are not adequately addressed at design stage.

**Recommendations**

In light of this evaluation’s observations and finding it is recommended that UNDP

1. should have a smaller number of projects/programs with a narrower focus.
2. should re-think the structure of projects/programs i.e. UNDP should possibly reduce number of activities per project, reduce the number of stakeholders per project etc.
3. should implement the Programme and Project Management (PPM) reforms across board
4. supports IPs and RPs to make much more use of knowledge resources
5. focuses on institutional sustainability, to ensure as much as possible that training material and knowledge resources are duly embedded in the beneficiary institutions
6. inserts sustainability (exit strategy) section in all projects’ templates including reporting and in the CPD
7. undertake a conscious outreach to DPs for collaborations while internally institutionalise regular programme meetings that cut across clusters.
8. supports intensified efforts to ensure that Rights-Based Approach(RBA) is practiced and implemented across activities
9. sensitize IPs and RPs on gender equality needs and concerns.

# Introduction

Ghana is a lower middle income country (2012 GDP per capita EUR 1,200). Its economy is driven by services (49.1% of GDP); the contribution of agriculture (22.9%), which is composed of mainly crops, forestry and livestock activities has been falling but it is still very important for employment; and the industrial sector (28%), which encompasses manufacturing, mining and quarrying (which includes gold and other mining but also oil and gas) and construction activities plays an important role.[[1]](#footnote-2)

The recent coming on stream of oil production, the development of the gas energy infrastructure and of the petro-chemical industry, have the potential to contribute to transforming the economy, value chains and helping to build a more diversified agro-industrial base. Inclusive structural transformation is a priority that is yet to be achieved. One of the key challenges has been ensuring stable macroeconomic fundamentals.

In a (West Africa) region that has seen significant political instability, rising threats of terrorism, as well as maritime security threats and increased economic organized crime, Ghana has remained a relatively peaceful and stable country according to the Global Peace Index (GPI). In 2010 Ghana moved above the World Bank’s lower threshold for Lower Middle Income (GNI per capita from $976-3,855), due in large part to significant growth rates, a GDP re-basing exercise and additional revenues from oil that started flowing from the first major field as well as anticipated revenues from gas which was expected to contribute to GDP growth of 15-20% in 2011 and 8% in 2012[[2]](#footnote-3).

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) (2012-2017), signed at the end of 2011 between the Government of Ghana and the UN System, presented a coherent vision and collective program results which the UN system seeks to achieve in support of key priorities of the national development agenda. The UNDAF implementation revolves around four foundational pillars, known as thematic areas – food security and nutrition; sustainable environment, energy and human settlement; human development and productive capacity for improved social services; and transparent and accountable governance.

Using the UNDAF as its source and guiding document, UNDP Ghana developed its Country Program Document (CPD). Against the backdrop of Ghana’s recent rise to LMIC status, the 2012-2017 CDP recognized that despite the discovery of the oil the country still faced a number of development challenges that were typical of low income economies: widespread poverty and widening inequalities along with significant regional disparities and gender inequity; low educational achievement and limited health coverage; and significant but declining aid dependence [[3]](#footnote-4)and weak institutions. The CPD (2012-2017) focused on contributing to assisting Ghana with making the most effective use of an expanded resource base to advance equitable development and consolidation of Ghana’s transformational gains. Thus, the key areas of focus were: Sustainable Human Development; Inclusive Growth; Democratic Governance and Consolidation of Peace.

Having undertaken the implementation of its CPD over the period 2012-2017, in line with its policies UNDP Ghana requires independent consultancy services to undertake an evaluation of the CPD. The CPD evaluation is being conducted in tandem with the UNDAF evaluation and other assessments. The evaluation seeks among others to generate lessons learnt for Ghana as a middle income country and present forward-looking recommendations to shape the design of the next phase of the programme.

# Purpose of Evaluation

The objective of the evaluation is, as per the terms of reference: To assess the impact of UNDP’s development assistance across the major thematic and cross cutting areas of Governance, Sustainable Development and Inclusive Growth. Focus is on the 3 selected UNDAF outcomes to capture evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the current programme of UNDP. As the ToRs specify, the results of the evaluation would be used to strengthen existing programmes and to set the stage for the preparation of the new Country Programme Document (CPD).

Main tasks related to the evaluation objectives will be, as per ToRs:

* *Strategic Positioning, Concept and Design*: the Evaluation Team will assess the concept and design of the CPD and UNDP’s overall intervention, including an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives.
* *Monitoring,* *Evaluation and Risk Management*: A further focus of the evaluation will be on the extent to which adequate monitoring was undertaken throughout the period, and the extent to which evaluation systems were adequate to capture significant developments and inform responsive management. The evaluation will assess how Lessons Learned have been captured and operationalized throughout the period under investigation.

**Scope**

This evaluation covers the period 2012-2016 of the CPD implementation, with a view to enhancing programmes while providing strategic direction and inputs to the preparation of the next UNDP country programme and the next UNDAF, both scheduled to start in last quarter of 2016.

**Primary intended use**

This evaluation is commissioned as:

* a summative (backwards looking) perspective, to support enhanced accountability for development effectiveness and learning from experience;
* A formative (forward-looking) evaluation to support the UNDP and national stakeholders’ strategic learning and decision-making for the next programming phase.

**Deliverables**

The following reports and deliverables are required for the evaluation:

* Inception report
* Draft CDP Evaluation Report
* Presentation at the validation workshop with key stakeholders, (partners and beneficiaries)
* Final CPD Evaluation report and a separate Lesson learned report extracted from the full report.

# Methodology

## Evaluation approach and methodology

The guiding principle in conducting the evaluation exercise has been wherever possible the use of participatory approaches, where relevant stakeholders are involved in the identification of main issues to be evaluated, which will constitute the evaluation foci. The presentation of the report to relevant stakeholders- to be due at the end of the mission - will be a useful tool to promote discussion and reach consensus on the report’s main findings.

**Data Sources**

The sources of information utilised for this report has been:

* National Policy documents;
* UN and UNDP programming documents, strategies;
* Ghana policy and strategy documents, including NPSPS;
* programme and project documents;
* interviews with programme and projects’ staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries;
* Interviews with key stakeholders

The national documents have provided for an overview and analysis of national policies. UN documents have offered the desired information on the degree of relevance of the CPD in relation to expected objectives. The programme and project documents provided the background for the team’s assessment of effectiveness and efficiency of single actions under the programme. Interviews with Government and civil society stakeholders, including the academia, have provided additional information for the analysis of effectiveness and sustainability. Finally, interviews with project staff and implementing partners (IP) have been helpful in providing to the team additional relevant information on the efficiency and effectiveness of single projects. The complete list of documents consulted is presented in Annex 3.

**Sample and sampling frame**

UNDP in consultation with the consultants agreed on the list of projects that were implemented during the period under review and to form the basis of the assessment. The majority of interviews held by the team were with state stakeholders, with additional inputs from project staff, UN agencies, experts, implementing partners. The team also held discussions with other development partners and civil society representatives engaged in similar sectors of intervention.

## Evaluation Questions

The original questions presented in the ToRs are 28 – an excessive number. Also, the team noted that some of them were a mere repetition of other questions, or were falling under other questions as sub-questions. The team revised them and proposed a list of evaluation questions (EQs), which were discussed and agreed with the UNDP staff in the inception phase.

In the evaluation, each key question is presented together with a rationale where the hypotheses to be fulfilled are explained, and sub-questions and corresponding indicators that have been used to answer them are presented. Evaluation criteria, data sources, methods for data collection and analysis are specified for each question including possible limitations and risks concerning data collection and data quality. All this information are included in the evaluation matrix, presented under Annex 2.

## Data collection procedures and instruments

The mission was held in Ghana from 22nd November to 23rd December 2016 by a team of two experts, Ms Donata Maccelli and Mr Daniel Andoh. A second mission from 8 to 12 January 2017 was requested for the team to finalise the presentation of the report to relevant stakeholders.

#### Literature Review

The evaluation team analysed the CPD 2012-2017, available project documents under the specific context of the programme, a number of national strategies and policies to assess the relevance of the CPD to the main Ghana’s strategic objectives.

#### Semi-structured interviews

Interviews took place with UN and UNDP staff and with stakeholders. The purposes of the interviews were: to include relevant UNDP and partner agencies stakeholders in the preparation of the evaluation, explore stakeholders’ commitment and attitudes; verify country’ priorities; collect information on the results of the various areas of intervention; assess the outcomes at final beneficiaries’ level.

In all over 18 direct interviews in the field were conducted with the parties involved in the programming and implementation of the CPD as actors or stakeholders (see Annex 5: List of persons interviewed). The objective of the interviews was to gather in-depth information, including views, perceptions and factual information that addressed the evaluation questions. The interviews were semi-structured in nature and were designed to obtain qualitative feedback from a range of respondents. Interviews were conducted in the official language of the participant’s choice and were as much as possible conducted in person (depending on availability).

#### UNDP Annual Planning Retreats

The team had the opportunity to participate in two of the three Annual Planning Retreats organised annually by the UNDP with the stakeholders of CPD in view of the preparation of the 2017 AWPs. These were held from 27th to 28th November for the Governance cluster, and from 29th to 30th November for the Sustainable Development cluster. The retreats provided an invaluable opportunity, as the team could arrange and hold meetings with the main partners through both individual and group meetings.

#### Field Visit

The team undertook numerous visits to implementation and responsible partner offices. The team undertook a field visit to Tamale where it met other UNDP project partners and stakeholders. Among those engaged in Tamale were the SADA office, the National Peace Council and the Renewable energy project.

#### Data analysis

Data for analysis have been triangulated through a mixed methods approach that included desk review, consultation with all main stakeholders, and an independent assessment of development effectiveness. The latest made use of a difference-based approach, to identify expected and unexpected changes.

***Questionnaires***

The team prepared and distributed two questionnaires, one for UNDP programme staff – distributed to 5 persons - and the second one for project partners - distributed to 46 persons. One response was received from UNDP programme staff and no response from project partners.

## Stakeholders engagement

Given the pre-electoral period, the forthcoming festivities, the fact that many projects have been finalised some time ago so that some relevant staff had left their positions, and the busy schedule of all stakeholders due to the end of year period, the degree of engagement of stakeholders in this mission was relatively satisfactory.

## Limitations of the Evaluation

The limits of the evaluation research and analysis are closely related to the quantity and quality of the information and data collected through the content analysis of the project material made available to the evaluators, and the ensuing field interviews with the direct stakeholders.

Timing of data collection was inopportune mainly due to two main factors: the upcoming elections and the other being the end of year rounding up of most AWPs. The effect on the evaluation was that most of the program officers and government focal points attention was more focused on their imminent deadlines and deliverables (development of new AWPS, year-end closure activities at ministries departments and agencies etc.)

The electoral period with consequent unavailability of several stakeholders, the large number of projects and issues to be explored, and some difficulties in meeting some of the key stakeholders have to some extent posed a limitation in the implementation of this approach.

The paucity of suitable reporting or monitoring data at sector level confined the use of data to exploratory information collected by a single method and source, involving discussions with the stakeholders.

Not to discount UNDP’s value addition it must however be acknowledged that most projects supported by the UNDP CPD are funded by other development partners, and practically is a component of broader activities/programmes of implementing partners, it is therefore not always feasible to attribute the success of outcomes achieved specifically to the UNDP Programmes.

Finally, results within the institution and capacity development stream may appear far down-stream from the intervention and this can complicate attempts to attribute results. While evaluators were able to attribute immediate results (such as providing funds and capacity building) to specific interventions, intermediate and longer-term outcomes posed greater attribution challenges. That said, all evaluations of comprehensive country programmes such as the CPD face similar attribution issues.

The evaluation mission faced some challenges in accessing key project documents and reports. Project documentation and filing systems were not institutionalized within UNDP. The current Atlas system in use did not seem to have regular updates and had a few holdover old projects not closed in the system.

Due to the high mobility of public servants reflected by periodic transfer of staff within the public service, not all members of AWP implementation teams could be contacted.

* + 1. **Mitigation Measures**

The mitigation measures undertaken by the team have been focused around maximum interaction with current staff and extensive collection of project documentation at UNDP and IPs’ level. Also, the team has focused its evaluation on programme, than project, level and has tried to identify general outcomes and results instead of assessing single actions, which are referred to in case it is necessary to provide examples for answering specific questions.

# Context of Implementation

Below is the key country developmental context extracted from the ROAR from 2012 to 2016 the period within which the UNDP Ghana office implemented the CPD.

##  2012

At the onset of the CPD in 2011 the major issues were with regards to governance. In preparing for the December 2012 presidential and general elections, intense political debates took place around the biometric voter registration and subsequent voter verification system; and the creation of new constituencies. There was evidence of factionalism within political parties. In the midst of all, the then President of the Republic died (12 July 2012). What could have led to a potential political crisis was dealt with swiftly. In accordance with the Constitution, the Vice President was sworn in as new President 48 hours after the President’s death. In addition, other conflictual issues were resolved with consensus building measures led by the Electoral Commission. These developments showed that Ghana's political system and its institutions in particular have developed a degree of resilience and capacity to absorb potentially damaging shocks. A further milestone in Ghana's democratic development was reached with the conduct of free, fair and peaceful elections. Though the final result of the presidential election was contested in the Supreme Court of Ghana, the fact that lawlessness and violence did not erupt, further amplify Ghana's maturity in democratic elections, underpinned by UNDP's support through the National Peace Council and other platforms.

## 2013

In 2013 despite strong economic growth and rising per capita income, Ghana still faced some challenges which threatened it from achieving all the MDGs and which potentially could reverse hard-won development and economic gains. These included the rising disparities and inequalities between Ghana’s regions, social exclusion, and economic and financial vulnerabilities constituting a serious threat to sustainable development, social cohesion and peace, and stood the risk of jeopardizing Ghana’s status as a Middle Income Country (MIC), erratic nationwide power supply termed “dumsor” starts. On the flipside the elections petition’s verdict was pronounced in august is accepted by opposition, also with UNDP assistance, Ghana started the transition to a green economy. It adopted a national Climate Change Policy and integrated provisions for “greening” across its national development plan.

## 2014

In 2014, imbalances in Ghana’s macroeconomic fundamentals posed significant constraints for the financing and implementation of its development agenda. Following a series of attempts at building national consensus, a National Economic Forum (NEF 2014) was held in May to agree on the way forward (Senchi Consensus) and the crafting of a ‘home-grown’ policy framework to address the challenges, i.e. Ghana Economic and Financial Policies for the Medium Term, 2014-2017’, the Government formally approached the IMF for support on 8 Aug 2014 for a 3-year programme that will start in the 1st Quarter of 2015. Ghana’s current account and fiscal deficits both widened coupled with relatively stagnant domestic revenues. Once statutory obligations were fulfilled, three items (i.e., public sector wages and emoluments, debt repayment and interest on domestic debt, and arrears) consumed most of the remainder. Wages and emoluments accounted for 37% of domestic revenues, and debt service (interest) soared to 32% in 2014. This left very little fiscal space for spending on services and development programs, worst still the cost of living, producing and investing also soared rapidly. Fuel and utility subsidies were removed. The rate of inflation soared to double digits with the year-on-year inflation in ex-factory prices of goods and services settling at 37.5% by Nov. 2014. The Ghanaian cedi, one of the worst performers in 2014, depreciated by over 40% in nominal terms over the first 9 months of the year compared to 4.12% same period in 2013. The continued growth in the budget deficit resulted in a public debt build up to 60.8% of GDP by Sept. 2014. Ghana’s growth rate, while still enviable, experienced considerable stress on account of the above trends. Extensive power outages hit manufacturing, in particular, hard and the rapid depreciation of the cedi and falling global prices for gold, after a decade long commodity super-cycle, and for oil, which Ghana exports as well as imports, had significant impacts.

## 2015

In 2015, three major developments that had an outsized impact on the development landscape in Ghana: (i) an intensification of the energy crisis in the first three quarters of the year; (ii) a worsening of Ghana’s macroeconomic fundamentals leading it to sign up for an ambitious IMF programme; and (iii) political contestation and strikes in light of the challenging economic situation and upcoming elections in 2016. Ghana faced prolonged power cuts, a continuation of the energy crisis over the past 3 years. The “dumsor” (lights on, lights off) resulted in higher costs of living and doing business, decreases in production and job losses particularly for small enterprises, in an economy where 41.9% of employed persons, 15 years and older, were in the private informal non-agriculture sector. Ghana macroeconomic difficulties spilled into 2015 as well as new challenges. Crude oil prices fell to a low of US$45 per barrel compared to benchmark revenue projection of US$99.38 per barrel in Ghana’s 2015 Budget. The Ghanaian cedi continued to come under stress and had depreciated by 21% by September, 2015. On 3 April 2015, Ghana signed onto a 3-year Extended Credit Facility (ECF) arrangement with a view to stabilizing the economy. The Minister of Finance’s budget statement for 2016 to parliament in November 2015 indicated that Ghana’s home-grown policies and the IMF programme related fiscal consolidation measures appeared to be having a positive impact. The fiscal consolidation measures and the various levies and taxes which are part of government’s revenue mobilization, come on top of the higher energy costs, The Public Utility Regulatory Commission (PURC) increased electricity tariff by 59.2 % and water tariff by 67.2%, a rise in the policy interest rate to 25% in September 2015, an inflation rate that has hovered around 16-17% for much of the year, and the depreciation in the cedi. There was also the adverse global environment on account of the slowdown of growth in China and Europe, which are Ghana’s main trading partners, and a further fall in oil prices. In the lead up to the 2016 elections, there was growing polarization and contestation on both economic and political issues. There were public demonstrations and protests on the credibility of the current voter register leading from the major opposition party, the New Patriotic Party’s (NPP) demand for a new register. Further, there were’ a number of “high profile corruptions scandals relating to key governance institutions, notably, the Judiciary, the Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAJ), the Ministry of Power and the Ministry of Transportation. Public perceptions about corruption continue to be high with 76% of respondents in Ghana reporting that they felt that political parties were corrupt/extremely corrupt, 71% felt that judiciary was corrupt/extremely corrupt and 92% felt that that police were corrupt/extremely corrupt in 2014. However, Ghana was doing well on broad continent-wide rankings, e.g. Transparency International’s (TI) Corruption Perception Index (CPI) for 2014 points to the country moving up to 61st place from 63th in 2013.

## 2016

In the lead up to the December 2016 Elections, evidence of cumulative dissatisfaction with the delivery of public services such as electricity, healthcare, education, water and sanitation, and road maintenance was palpable.[[4]](#footnote-5) The recent history of fiscal slippages, rising debt levels and depreciating currency (although these had been brought more under control with the home grown economic policies and IMF programme[[5]](#footnote-6)), the closely contested 2012 election and constitutional petition at the Supreme Court thereafter, the frequent energy shortages resulting in sustained power cuts over the previous few years, growing strikes and civil society activism for better governance – all fed into the mix. There was growing polarization of the political landscape and contestation given the impending high stakes national elections in 2016.

Additional elements of the economic situation: the growth rate slowed for the 4th consecutive year, the various levies and taxes which were part of government’s revenue mobilization efforts and the continued high cost of credit were challenging for both for ordinary people and for both domestic and external investors. Further, the weak global demand, the continued low commodity prices (principally oil), technical disruptions in the production of oil and gas (due to technical problems with the FPSO at the Jubilee oil field) coupled with the impacts of Ghana’s tight credit stance and fiscal consolidation efforts limited the space of what government could do. Public revenues were significantly impacted and had knock-on impacts on investment and development expenditures and counterpart funding.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| National Priority or Goal | UNDAF OUTCOMES | CPD Strategic priorities  | CPD INDICATORS AND BASELINE | INDICATIVE OUTPUTS | INDICATIVE RESOURCES (US$) |
| Adapting to the impacts of and reducing vulnerability to climate variability and change as part of the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (2010-2013). | UNDAF OUTCOME 3; .National systems and existing institutional arrangements for climate change mitigation and adaptation and for disaster risk reduction, as defined in the Hyogo Framework for Action at the district, regional and national level are functional | UNDP will assist with outcome level assessment, policy analysis and capacity development to address climate change and DRR. Particular attention will be paid to gender targets at the outcome level. | **Indicator:** An operational framework of key policies, institutions and investments that address climate change and DRR **Baseline:** A relatively early stage of action of climate change; significant progress on DRR since 2007**Target:** Fully functional Climate Change Committee; climate change and DRR integrated into 4 key sectors; scalable models for access to renewable energy identified | Capacity assessments and targeted actions completed to enable the Climate Change Committee to fulfill its mandate; analysis and policy proposals on the integration of low carbon growth, sustainable management of natural resources and DRR completed for 4 key sectors, and broad agreement reached by stakeholders; scalable initiatives on climate change and DRR tested and documented in selected districts and, where appropriate, at national level. | Regular:US$ 3.099 millionOther:US$ 22 million |
| Empower State and non-state institutions in governance as part of the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda | UNDAF OUTCOME 10: Key national institutions of democracy are effective, accountable, gender responsive and promote peace, inclusive governance, human security with focus on vulnerable groups, by 2016. | UNDP will pursue policy analysis and advocacy, assist with capacity development, and foster methods and platforms for dialogue. | **Indicator:** Selected judicial and conflict management institutions operational.**Baseline:** absence of a Ghana Prosecution Service (GPS); peace architecture law tabled**Target:** Justice sector automated; agreement on the establishment of a GPS; Peace Councils operational in 50% ‘hot spots’. | Proposals for policy, institutional and operational reform in the justice sector formulated and actions taken to build consensus among stakeholders.Institutional development plans prepared, financed and rolled-out to enable Peace Councils in ‘hot spots’ to reach operational status. | Regular:US$ 15 millionOther:US$ 18 million |
| To ensure and sustain macroeconomic stability and enhancing private sector competitiveness as part of the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (2010-2013). | Ministries, Department Agencies, (MDAs) Local Governments and CSOs have effectively developed, funded, coordinated, implemented, monitored and evaluated national and sectoral policies, plans and programmes aimed at reducing poverty and inequalities,and promoting inclusive socioeconomic growth by 2016. | UNDP will provide institutional capacity building support in policy formulation, planning, and advisory services at all levels | **Indicator**: Number of analytical studies HDRs, policy papers conducted to inform national and local development policies, and frameworks.**Target:** All development policies and plans informed by quality disaggregated data; functional Advisory Committee, and other structures for LED in place in selected districts; a functioning Commodities Exchange Commission for Ghana. | Policy advocacy, advice, and programme implementation informed by analytical work, and key national institutions able to conduct economic planning, management and M&E using quality data. Systems and frameworks strengthened for efficient aid management. Capacities of at least 25% of LED institutions and critical affiliates in selected districts developed to meet minimum operational and effectiveness standards. Technical design, feasibility analysis, consensus- building and start-up planning for a Commodities Exchange Commission completed. | RegularUS$ 11 millionOther:US$ 10.5 million |

Table : Projects/Programs undertaken during CPD Period

|  | **PROJECTS/PROGRAMS** | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | Total (USD) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE | Governance |  |
| Regional Small Arms And Light Weapons Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,586.102.45 |
| Consolidating Peace In Ghana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,477,423.78  |
| Joint Party Support And Strengthening Project (J-Pass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  890,862.12 |
| Transparency and Accountability |  |
| Consolidating Transparency & Accountability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  4,422,733.50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Representation and Participation |  |
| Consolidating Representation & Participation In Ghana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  5,134,272.26 |
|  |  |  |  |
| SUSTAINABLE DVELOPMENT | Hydro chlorofluorocarbon Phase-Out Management Plan  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,073,075(Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol, Italy) |
| Pilot Demonstration Project On ODS Waste Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 198,000 (Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol) |
| UN CC Learn Initiative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 150,000 (Switzerland – UNITAR) |
| INDC Support  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 150,000 (EU) |
| Institutional Strengthening on ODS (Phases 9-12)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  595,348(Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol) |
| Environmental Sustainability and Policy for Cocoa Production in Ghana (Phase I) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,700,000(Mondelez) |
| Environmental Sustainability and Policy for Cocoa Production in Ghana (Phase II) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,850,000 (Mondelez) |
| Promoting Energy Efficiency and Transformation of the Refrigerating Appliances Market in Ghana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,150,000 (GEF + TRAC) |
| Institutional Support to Integrate Climate Change and DRR into Development Plans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 700,000 (TRAC) |
| Sustainable Energy for All |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 75,000 |
| Institutional Support to the Implementation of the SE4ALL Action Plan – 2013-2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,700,000 (TRAC) |
| China- Ghana South-South Cooperation on Renewable Energy Technology Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,720,000 (Denmark) |
| Community Resilience through Early Warning (CREW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,162,667 (Norway) |
| Advocacy and capacity building for disaster risk reduction and preparedness in Ghana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500,000 (World Bank) |
| Enhanced Coordination for Floods |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100,000 (TRAC) |
| Africa Adaptation Programme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,700,000 (Japan) |
| Increased Resilience to Climate Change in Northern Ghana through the management of Water Resources and Diversification of Livelihoods |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,293,972 (Adaptation Fund) |
| Water, Sanitation and Hygiene in Disaster Prone Communities in Northern Ghana |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 600,000 (Canada) |
| Ebola response support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100,000 |
| Green Climate Fund (GCF) Readiness Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 853,345 (Germany) |
| Low Emission Capacity Building Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 942,000 (Germany, Australia, EU) |
| Support for Green Economy Joint Programme Phase 2 Work in Ghana: Integrating green economy into Ghana’s medium-term development plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50,000 |
| Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 75,000 (UNDP) |
| Africa Regional Healthcare Waste project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,625,000 (GEF) |
|  |  |  |  |
| INCLUSIVE GROWTH | Promoting Inclusive Growth and Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,786,395.43 |
| **TOTAL** |  | 58,361,196.54 |

# Reconstruction of the intervention logic

Below is the reconstructed intervention logic which aims to present the causal pathway and articulate the ultimate big picture outcome of how and why UNDP expect the desired outcomes to come about.

Figure : .Reconstruction of the intervention logic
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# Findings

This Chapter is structured in accordance with the OECD DAC requirements for evaluations and is in line with EU evaluation guidelines. In Section 6.1, we discuss the CPD’s design and its relevance to national priorities and UNDP country priorities and strategies. Section 6.2 discusses the programme’s effectiveness, in particular the contribution of the results achieved to achieving the immediate objective (outcome). Section 6.3 follows with a discussion of efficiency, including the conversion of resources (financial and human) into results. Section 6.4 discusses the sustainability over time of interventions implemented under the CPD. Section 6.5 deals with the extent to which CPD interventions have built relevant partnerships and have been coordinated with other donors’ interventions. Finally, Section 6.6 discusses horizontal themes of human rights and gender equality and how these have been ensured in the implementation of projects.

## Relevance

This section analyses the extent to which the objectives of the action were consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and UN/UNDP strategies and policies.

How relevant has been the UNDP intervention to national policies and strategies?

Feedback from focal points of implementing partners and responsible partners be it government agencies, civil society or academic institutions all attest to the relevance of the support provided by UNDP and its alignment with national priorities as it takes its roots from the GSGDA I and II.

Of the few independent project evaluations undertaken, despite some adverse findings, a running theme is the emphasis of the high relevance and appropriateness of interventions. To quote an evaluation finding of a GEF sponsored project *“This was a good project, because it was the right project at the right time, focused on the right parties in the right context. Simply being the right project in a country that welcomed and embraced its objectives sets this project apart from many other GEF projects.[[6]](#footnote-7)”*

From discussions with the implementing/responsible partners, it is evident that UNDP support over the period of the CPD has assisted directly to fill developmental gaps within the national governance policy (economic, environmental etc.) framework, service delivery of public sector, and capacity improvement in civil society. Supporting MDAs to effectively deliver on their mandates (e.g.) as intended by the constitution. It has also to a lesser extent indirectly impacted the private sector.

Of the two partnership surveys that were conducted during the period of implementation of the CPD (2012 and 2015) both scored highly regarding the question of the relevance of the UNDP Ghana country office. In 2012 UNDP Ghana office had a favoured partner rating of 86 % which was approximately the average rating for al UNDP agencies worldwide and RBA. In 2015 UNDP Ghana office exceeded the average favoured partner rating of all UNDP officer and that of RBA which were both at 86 % with Ghana having 95 %. It however must be noted that there was no diversity in the respondents to Ghana’s questionnaire in both cases of 20112 and 2015 all respondents were government officials.

The current extension of the CPD such that it is aligned with the government’s national planning cycle evidences the strong consultation and coordination of UNDP with government to ensure interventions are in synch with national policies and strategies.

To what extent is UNDP’s selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?

The evaluation discovered that there was a general consensus with all UNDP partners that not only was conducting above average level of consultation and contribution in the formulation of project interventions and components prior to sign off on AWPs. But they were also “on the ground with you” when it came to implementation with UNDP Ghana walking the path with you.

UNDP staff have a very intimate knowledge of the context, as well as of the people. This has helped establish a good rapport and trust between implementing partners and the office. UNDP also has an approach that is versatile and responsive in being able to quickly adapt to the situation.

To what extent have UN reforms influenced the relevance of UNDP support to the Government of Ghana as a LMIC?

The main normative instrument for reforming the UN development system is the Quadrennial comprehensive policy review (QCPR). The applicable QCPR during the implementation of the CPD was adopted in December 2012.[[10]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reform_of_the_United_Nations#cite_note-10)

From 2012, on request from the Government, the UN System in Ghana was to adopt the Delivering as One (DAO) reform. This was to be exemplified by, one, leader, one Programme, One budget, communicating as one and operating as one

“Operating as one” allows for taking cognizance or strike a balance between flexibility and standardization in order to be applicable and useful in a wide variety of country contexts, such as low-income or least developed countries and middle-income countries, each with its specific development challenges, normative settings, institutional capacities and UN presence.

A revelation of this evaluation is that as DAO country UNDP has taken minor strides in the first phase of delivering as one where from the UN system planning together to delivering together, with a clear focus on simplification and streamlining of processes and instruments. This is reflected in the UNDAF development and the ability to implement some joint programming such as specifically the WASH project which was a conscious joint program. The EBOLA intervention however had more of a regional character, and the UN System in Ghana played mainly a clearinghouse and operational facilitation role to support the Ebola affected countries in the region.

Regarding financial reforms, since 2012 UNDP Ghana has adopted the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS). These are a set of accounting standards issued by the IPSAS Board for use by public sector entities around the world in the preparation of financial statements. These standards are based on International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB). IPSAS aims to improve the quality of general purpose financial reporting by public sector entities, leading to better informed assessments of the resource allocation decisions made by governments, thereby increasing transparency and accountability.

The adoption of IPSAS, which emanated from UN HQ, has made the office more efficient and now better able to track accruals information (formerly this was done on cash basis). IPSAS has also aligned UNDP Ghana with government accounting which also uses IPSAS.

Though UNDP, Ghana has adopted some reforms emanating from UN HQ over the CPD period. Its actions reflect point 136 of the 2012 QCPR, which reaffirms that the “no one size fits all” approach and the principle of the voluntary adoption of “Delivering as one” should be maintained. In this way, the United Nations system can tailor its approach to partnership with individual programme countries in a way that best suits their national needs, realities, priorities and planning modalities, as well as their achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, other internationally agreed development goals and the United Nations development agenda beyond 2015. The reforms adopted have been relevant in terms of UNDP support to the Government of Ghana, however these reforms adopted cannot said to have been directly influenced by Ghana’s LMIC status or to have cause- effect relationship.

## Effectiveness

The effectiveness analysis in this evaluation context considers how successful actions under the CPD have been in achieving or progressing towards its objectives, and analyses the determining factors of the successful or unsuccessful implementation, aiming to draw useful lessons for future programming.

What are the main contributions to development for which UNDP is recognized in the Country?

UNDP is one of the historical development partners of Ghana. During the late 1990s, UNDP positioned itself as a key player in coordinating aid in the country. UNDP’s coordination role was at that time more focused on interventions at local level, mainly around issues of decentralised development[[7]](#footnote-8). In the following decade, efforts were seemingly re-directed to the central level, with actions aimed at strengthening the capacities of government in policy making. Renewed efforts were put in aligning UNDP interventions with national strategies, such as the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy I in 2003. The progressive alignment with specific country policy and sectorial strategies is now one of the major drivers of the effectiveness of UNDP in the country.

In addition to that, UNDP has introduced new priorities which had been identified at global level – such as environment, climate change, gender issues – and has contributed to the acknowledgement at country level of the need for addressing those issues in national policy and strategy documents. In this way, UNDP operated on both the supply and the demand side, integrating national and global needs in a structured development agenda.

These two-fold efforts were strengthened by the fact that UNDP has traditionally represented for country stakeholders one of the most reliable development cooperation institutions in Ghana. Interviews held by the team confirmed this judgment:

‘*UNDP is always there and is not subject to change of priorities, as bilateral donors aid is; they will not leave the country’*. (Rev Thaddeus-Board Member of National Peace Council.)

Also, the organisation is perceived by local stakeholders as more accessible and open to discussion and revisions of plans than other development partners. The fact that UNDP has a permanent office since decades, and that all staff has developed amicable working relationships with recipients, IPs and RPs is considered of key importance to feel comfortable and to establish a peer dialogue. This has contributed to enhance the discourse, both at strategic level - on thematic areas’ needs and priorities, and at operational level - on project implementation aspects.

The level of knowledge of country’s specificities and of the numerous cultural, social and historical factors which constitute the context in which development interventions must operate in Ghana is undoubtedly another merit of UNDP, and is widely recognised by Ghanaian partners.

This privileged positioning seems to remain, despite the increasing number of development partners active in Ghana, and despite funding constraints that considerably limit the capacity of UNDP to devise and implement comprehensive interventions, as we will explore in the following section. More efforts might be spent in marketing the comparative advantages of UNDP among development partners.

* + 1. UNDP added value

A variety of factors make UNDP an attractive partner compared to other sources of international expertise: the fact that it is a conduit and window to the UN; its access to international expertise; its transparency and impartiality; the UNDP imprimatur; its guaranteed multi-year funding and quicker administrative procedures.

The main aspects which distinguish UNDP interventions in Ghana can be summarized as follows:

Bearer of the UN flag. UNDP is the embodiment of the UN and a conduit as well as a window to the UN system. UNDP’s country presence and interaction symbolize a spirit of national engagement with the human development principles and values of the UN.

Impartiality. The fact that UNDP has no hidden agenda (unlike some bilateral aid donors or private sector firms) make it a natural choice in many sensitive areas where advisory assistance is sought.

Wealth of global experience. UNDP can assess and relate to national issues based on its experience worldwide. This two-way channel draws in global standards of excellence and yields valuable experience that builds upon and can potentially benefit other countries.

Access to the UN’s specialized expertise. Involving UNDP is an expedient and affordable way to access the services of UN specialized agencies that do not have a country presence.

Transparency. The relative transparency of UNDP’s operations (including compliance with international auditing standards, coupled with administrative and financial procedures that are sometimes more efficient than those of national development projects) make the organization an attractive partner.

Demand-driven nature of the programme: the continuous dialogue and participatory approaches utilised by UNDP in the identification of programmes on one side, and the management modalities which are left to the country’s IPs on the other side, surely contribute to a stronger sense of national ownership of UNDP-supported projects, compared to other development partners.

#### Roles played by UNDP

Process facilitation: UNDP adds value in terms of process when it acts as a facilitator for a UN agency or supplies goods or consultants faster than though government channels. This typically occurs in projects where UNDP plays mainly an administrative-financial role. It includes such aspects as speed; audits according to international standards; access to additional or ‘free’ budgetary resources to the beneficiary; continuity of budgetary resources for multiyear programmes, etc.

Catalyst for additional resources: in many cases, UNDP played a decisive role in the identification of gaps and pioneered funding of key institutions, thus opening the path to support from other development partners. This has been the case of SADA, which experienced a massive withdrawal of the donors’ community after allegations of corruption in 2014. Following an important restructuring of the organisation, UNDP decided to resume support in 2015 to help the new management rebuild the institution and undertake critical technical analysis to guide its work going forward. This was considered as a positive endorsement of SADA’s renewed commitment to transparent management, and shortly after that other development partners reopened their collaboration with the organisation. In the case of the consolidation of peace project, UNDP was the first organisation which started cooperating with the Electoral Commission, followed by other donors who recognised the key role of the EC. Such achievements were mainly due to UNDP’s unique capacity to recognise and identify the positive potential of institutions.

Technical support: UNDP is pro-actively engaged in providing technical expertise, usually to fill a capacity gap or to provide substantive inputs (this could mean, for example, drawing up lists of consultants and recommendations; contributing to the content of terms of reference; and reviewing studies from a technical perspective, directly providing technical advice in specific areas or helping partners to leverage technical support). In such a role, UNDP can have a major contribution as regards the substantive aspects of project design and implementation.

Adding the UNDP dimensions: the difference between UNDP and other possible service providers, be they private sector consulting companies or management firms, is UNDP focus on human development, human rights and gender equality, and more in general its holistic approach and its attention to the needs of vulnerable groups which is undisputedly one of the *foci* of UNDP programming. This can comprise supporting national ownership, capacity development and gender equality and ensuring a coordinated approach.

How has the programme achieved expected outcomes?

The following tables recapitulate CPD overall objectives, outputs, indicators for each of the three thematic areas identified. They will constitute the basis of the analysis.

Table : Thematic Area 1: Governance

|  |
| --- |
| NATIONAL PRIORITY OR GOAL: Empower State and non-state institutions in governance as part of the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda |
| UNDAF OUTCOME 10: Key national institutions supporting democratic governance are effective, accountable and gender responsive.Outcome indicator: The level of representation of women and vulnerable groups participating in governance processes; quality of and confidence in justice delivery especially to the vulnerable; efficiency and effectiveness of conflict prevention and management mechanisms. |
| INDICATIVE COUNTRYPROGRAMME OUTPUTS | **UNDP CONTRIBUTION** | **INDICATOR(S), BASELINES AND TARGET(S) FOR UNDP CONTRIBUTIONS** | **INDICATIVE RESOURCES BY****OUTCOME (US$)** |
| Proposals for policy, institutional and operational reform in the justice sector formulated and actions taken to build consensus among stakeholders.Institutional development plans prepared, financed and rolled-out to enable Peace Councils in ‘hot spots’ to reach operational status. | UNDP will pursue policy analysis and advocacy, assist with capacity development, and foster methods and platforms for dialogue. | Indicator: Selected judicial and conflict management institutions operational.Baseline: absence of a Ghana Prosecution Service (GPS); peacearchitecture law tabled Target: Justice sector automated; agreement on the establishment of a GPS; Peace Councils operational in50% ‘hot spots’. | Regular:US$ 15 millionOther:US$ 18 million |

The implementation of the CPD considerably expanded the envisaged outputs. Four projects were implemented during the CPD programming cycle (Consolidating Peace, J-PASS, Transparency and Accountability, Representation and Participation)., A very large number of responsible parties were engaged in the projects’ implementation (to count some of them, 6 + CSOs for Transparency and Accountability, and 16 + CSOs for Representation and Participation).

Activities were not limited to support to the justice sector and to Peace Councils as indicated in the CPD, but were extended to other institutions and actors equally relevant to the cluster and embraced areas such as decentralisation, security, youth, corruption, complaint mechanisms, people with disabilities.

Typologies of activity ranged from training to awareness, support to the creation of national platforms, support to the drafting of legislation, support to the elaboration of strategic plans, development of action plans, development of communication policies and gender policies.

Among the most significant achievements in the area, the following is worthwhile noticing. The selection of projects has been made taking into consideration availability of information and interviews held. The programming staff can decide whether to insert other projects Consolidation of Peace: the bulk of interventions were focused on the strengthening of the National Peace Council. This included the establishment of nine regional peace councils; the development of a 5 year strategic plan for the NPC; the drafting of a public relations/communications strategy of the NPC; the organisation of numerous dialogue sessions; training models for traditional religious leaders; preparation of a conflict mediation strategy manual; a study on capacity needs assessment of Ghana’s peace architecture on the topic “Capacity needs assessment of Ghana’s Peace Architecture, national, regional and district levels”. These activities, often implemented with a variety of national and local stakeholders, have surely contributed to strengthen national capacities of manage and prevent conflicts. An evidence of that is provided by the success of project-related institutions in their contributions to the peaceful 2016election process, where the decisive role of UNDP was unanimously recognised by all country stakeholders.

UNDP has been a leading institution supporting the consolidation of the National Peace Architecture. The capacity of the peace actors and the NPC board were increased specifically in mediation and conflict analysis, leading to a successful intervention of the NPC in six of the most violent and active conflicts in the country.

One of the merits of UNDP in the election process was among others its support to the Electoral Commission, provided under the Representation and Participation project. Since March 2012, the EC had implemented a biometric system of registration for the electoral register prior to the 2012 elections, to prevent double registration and to eliminate ghost names in the old register. These efforts, supported by UNDP, had significantly contributed to the conduct of peaceful elections in December 2012. Further analysis conducted in the following years (2012 and 2013) revealed the persistence of administrative lapses in the collation, transmission and declaration of elections results by the EC as well as the capacity of EC's temporary staff, judiciary, civil society, media and candidates' polling agents. UNDP support therefore focused on those areas. Evidence of the UNDP success was provided after the recent elections, when the Electoral Commission officially and publically praised the organisation for its precious contribution to strengthening the EC capacities in contributing to a free and fair electoral process.

Apart from the EC, the R&P project has achieved highly satisfactory results in its gender component, where UNDP has supported the production of relevant policies, strategies and tools: the Impact Assessment of Gender Statistics and Sex Disaggregated Data Training; support to the drafting of the Affirmative Action Bill, including a series of workshops; gender reporting templates developed for quarterly reporting by Gender Focal Persons in main line Ministries, where 68 % of Gender focal Persons and Budget Officers received capacity building on gender mainstreaming and gender responsive budgeting; the development of a Five Years Draft Strategic Plan for the Ministry of Gender. All these activities have certainly raised the capacity of the country to put in place and implement gender equality policies, thus contributing to the alignment of Ghana with internationally recognised standards.

UNDP’s support for the advocacy and passage of the Ghana AIDS Commission bill has also yielded good results. The Ghana AIDS commission bill has been passed by parliament and provides the country with the needed framework to further strengthen HIV prevention efforts

R & P also supported citizens’ engagement with local government. With UNDP’s support, a National Policy Framework and Practitioner Manual on Popular Participation has been developed, validated, published and disseminated. A consultative process was used to facilitate effective engagement of local people towards stronger community cohesion and a shared development agenda through greater accountability and transparency. In connection with this the engagements between duty bearers and right holders in nineteen (19) districts across the country has improved significantly as a result of the activation of the Public Relations and Complaints Committee (PRCC)in these districts with UNDP’s support. Thus District assemblies across the country to now have a standardised guideline on engaging citizens at the local level in the governance process with the development, validation, publication and dissemination of the with support from UNDP

Participation of Marginalized groups in Local Governance was supported by UNDP throughvarious platforms of engagement which has led to an improvement in the participation of the Youth and Persons with Disability (PWDs). For example, 473(43% female) Persons with disabilities (PWDs), are effectively engaging district level officials to discuss their rights and welfare issues and 1640 youth (45% female) participated in the planning and budgeting processes within their respective districts.

86 Persons with Disabilities (PWD) were able to make their welfare related issues known to District Level Officials and Representatives of Political Parties to facilitate the integration of these issues into Party Manifestoes and medium term development plans of the district assemblies. This engagement become necessary as a UNDP sponsored assessment to determine the extent of their participation in local level decision making indicated low level of participation of the PWDs in the governance process at the local level.

Additionally, UNDP supported platforms for accountability such as the governance assessments in 80 districts across the country, the establishment and operations of Local accountability networks (LANEKs) in eight districts and the assessing the transparency and accountability of health care delivery in 12 districts across the country. The results of these included over 7,584 citizens in twelve districts who have had the opportunity to have direct interactions with their local government representatives and health service providers to demand for accountability and answers to their concerns in various areas of development, particularly public service delivery with focus on health. In addition, over 33,299 citizens have participated in platforms for accountability established in over 80 districts through governance assessments and regular interface meetings between duty bearers and right holders. Interface accountability platforms supported by UNDP enhanced rapport between citizens and MMDAs results in the addressing of some concerns raised by citizens in 8 districts

UNDP supported the constitutional review process, providing assistance to both the Constitutional Review Commission (CRC) and the Constitutional Review Implementation Committee (CRIC) to propose amendments, implement Government’s white paper response and finalize the amended entrenched and non-entrenched provisions as well as sensitized key stakeholders in the 10 region on the amended provisions and also disseminate the report of the Constitutional Review Commission disseminated to a wide range of institutions including braille versions to the visually Impaired.

In Ghana, the youth and persons with disability are among the group of people who are marginalised from participating fully in the governance process. To address this, UNDP supported the creation of platforms for engagement to enable them to engage with local government officials to address their needs and concerns as well as participate in planning and budgeting processes at the local level.

In 2015, 1500 youth (45% female) participated in the planning and budgeting processes within their respective districts due to their improved ability from training received and platforms created with UNDP Support. Additionally, over 600 female youth participated in the planning and budgeting processes within their respective districts as a result of training received and platforms created. (Youth Bridge Foundation annual report).

In the youth area, specific activities supported included: national platform for stakeholders created for mid-year performance review on improving frontiers for youth mobilization and engagement; research on available structures for engagement of youth at the local level completed; public discussion supporting call for improved structures and investment into youth organized; youth in media network established for sustained advocacy/publication on the importance of youth participation in the governance process. In 2016, advocacy through the engagements of key stakeholders on the provision of structures for the engagement of youth at the local level, resulted in the laying of the National Youth service bill, currently in the Parliament for passage. This legislation will allow the mainstreaming of youth activities into action plans of the district assembly. This is to be considered a significant achievement of the project.

It is not clear to the evaluators whether such results are still in place, i.e. whether youth and women are still participating in planning and budgeting processes.

Transparency and Accountability. The focus of the project is on enhancing mechanisms for fighting corruption and for enabling citizens to monitor accountability of MDAs. The most significant achievements have been the approval of the National Anti-Corruption Action Plan (NACAP), to which UNDP contributed by supporting CHRAJ to engage Parliament; and the strengthening of capacities of the CHRAJ’s ombudsman function as a result of trainings provided to its staff through different workshops.

UNDP has been supporting key legal and Justice Institutions, addressing comprehensively some of the key findings of the baseline study conducted in 2012. The study, which had been developed by the MoJAGD with support from UNDP through a consultative process, found key bottlenecks in the sector including a lack of communication and coordination among the justice sector institutions, delay in justice delivery, large numbers of remand prisoners without trail among others. Thus UNDP has since been supporting the implementation of the reform agenda by assisting with the establishment of a programme management unit with staff and necessary logistics, in addition to providing technical and financial support for the implementation of some of the key components of the reform. The main objective of the reform is for an efficient and effective justice delivery in Ghana. The implementation of the first phase of the reform started in August 2015. Thus far, support to the Legal and Justice Sector institutions enabled the institutions to work in a more transparent and standardized manner with the finalization and validation of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). Specialized training was also provided to staff in a more structured manner to fill the skills, knowledge and behavioural gaps through an assessment of training gaps and the development and validation of Training Plans. Increased commitment from sector institutions to change for the efficient and effective delivery of justice through the development, validation and implementation of a Change Management Strategy have been realised.

Support was also provided to the Legal Aid Scheme, resulting in increase of citizen’s awareness of the scheme and an increase in Legal Aid personnel from 40 to 70. The intervention helped in the development and initial implementation of a 5 year strategic plan, a personnel strategy, Legal Aid guide, a website, the development, printing and distribution of the over 70,000 brochures, and organization of legal aid clinics in across the country in ten out of the fifteen districts where Legal Aid offices have been opened with support from UNDP. Other significant results were: two bills drafted (conduct of public officers bill; Witness protection bill) and one existing bill amended (whistle blowers Amendment act); development of key documentation to build capacity of staff on ethics and integrity. The main challenges faced in the implementation process were reportedly linked to disruption of funds, which were reduced by approximately 90%, thus heavily impacting on the project’s results and achievement of objectives.

J-PASS: the objective of the intervention was promoting internal democracy, gender equality and election results among Ghana’s political parties, as key elements to improving public and political party confidence. The key result areas of the project were (i) strengthening internal democracy, (ii) women & youth empowerment, (iii) election results monitoring, and iv) development of a communication policy. V0 Development of a Gender policy. Achievements have been quite remarkable in areas ii), iii) and iv); in particular, the introduction of database software was generally highly praised by parties, which now can dispose of a sophisticated system to better understand their constituencies and are therefore enabled to take effective action to consolidate their electoral basis on one hand, and ensure that parties have comprehensive database that allows them to know and manage relationships and interactions with their members. It also to assist them mobilise resources from their members. Satisfaction has been expressed on this component by all parties. With regard to component ii), much has been done in providing gender equality strategies to political parties, and Gender Training was conducted across the country on a region-by-region basis. The development of gender policies for the five parties is also a good achievement under the project. More problematic has been the implementation of the first component, where some lack of communication was reported among operational and management levels in the supported parties, and where sometimes a certain tendency to centralise power has partly hindered the achievement of results.

 In general terms the management of the project was effective and efficient, reporting and communications were highly satisfactory and the good design of the project has favoured the achievement of objectives; failure in achievement was not due to internal design weaknesses but to structural factors, out of project controls. The evaluation team considers that the project constitutes a good example of well-structured design, clarity of objectives, logically articulated results, and reasonable number of beneficiaries: an example which might be taken into consideration for future actions.

As a conclusion, achievements under this cluster – although some of them are remarkable - have been in general satisfactory but rather uneven. The design of activities seems to suffer from an excessive number of stakeholders, which can result in inadequate control and monitoring over the implementation; and from an excessive number of activities, of which not all were designed in a strategic and focused way, with a view on tangible results. As a consequence many of those efforts seem not to have produced long- lasting results and the risk of dispersion can be high.

#### Thematic Area 2: Inclusive Growth

The following table encapsulates expected outputs of the CPD for the cluster.

Table : Thematic Area 2: Inclusive Growth

|  |
| --- |
| **NATIONAL PRIORITY OR GOAL**: To ensure and sustain macroeconomic stability and enhancing private sector competitiveness as part of the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (2010-2013).  |
| **UNDAF OUTCOME**: Ministries, Department Agencies, (MDAs), Local Governments and CSOs have effectively developed, funded, coordinated and implementedNational and sectoral policies, plans and programmes aimed at reducing poverty and inequalities, and promote inclusive socio-economic growth by 2016. *Outcome indicator: Number of development policies and plans informed by analytical studies, and disaggregated socio-economic data.*  |
| **INDICATIVE COUNTRY****PROGRAMME OUTPUTS** | **UNDP CONTRIBUTION** | **INDICATOR(S), BASELINES AND TARGET(S) FOR UNDP CONTRIBUTIONS** | **INDICATIVE RESOURCES BY****OUTCOME (US$)** |
| Policy advocacy, advice, and programme implementation informedBy analytical work, and key national institutions able to conduct economic planning, management and M&E using quality data. Systems and frameworks strengthened for efficient aid management. Capacities of at least 25% of LED institutions and critical affiliates in selected districts developed to meet minimum operational and effectiveness standards. Technical design, feasibility analysis, consensus building and start-up planning for a Commodities Exchange Commission completed. | UNDP will provide institutional capacity building support in policy formulation, planning, and advisory services at all levels | Indicator: Number of analytical studies HDRs, policy papers conducted to inform national and local development policies, and frameworks.Baseline: National policies, plans and frameworks and LED not informed by analytical studies and quality disaggregated data.Target: All development policies and plans informed by quality disaggregated data; functional Advisory Committee, and other structures for LED in place in selected districts; a functioning Commodities Exchange Commission for Ghana. | RegularUS$ 11 millionOther:US$ 10.5 million |

A single project is categorized under this cluster: Promoting Inclusive Growth and Development, thus effectiveness at cluster level is in this case equivalent to the implementation progress achieved at project level. Partner organisations were the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MOTI), Ghana Health Services (GHS), Ghana Statistical Service (GSS), University for Development Studies (UDS), National Development Planning Commission (NDPC), Savannah Accelerated Development Authority (SADA), Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources (MLNR). Office of the President (OoP), and University of Ghana at Legon and University of Development Studies at Tamale; the IP was the Ministry of Finance.

Funds for the implementation of the project comes almost entirely from TRAC funds, probably because the sector of inclusive growth – which was historically one of the classical priority areas of UNDP intervention - has limited capacity to mobilise external resources, which are channelled to areas considered more appealing by the donors’ community, such as governance and sustainable development/climate change. Within its core areas of focus, it should be noted that the cluster has however leveraged partnerships for activities and facilitated/implemented activities funded from other UN/UNDP budgets which were synergistic and served as complementary building blocks for project activities. These could be seen as helping to strengthen outcomes [[8]](#footnote-9)and focus areas even as the funds were not channelled through the inclusive growth project budget.

The main components envisaged in the concept note for 2015-2016 are the following:

1. *Enhancing the evidence base and strengthening capacities for development planning and management*, which foresees:

• Support to NDPC for coherent planning and M&E system for the poverty reduction and inclusivity; and the localisation of the SDGs in Ghana’s development planning

•Support Ghana Statistical Service to conduct selected surveys and strengthen the national accounting mechanisms.

2. *MDGs,* *Inequalities and promotion of structural transformation in the lead up to 2015,* under which support is envisaged to:

• Support to the production of Northern Savannah HDR;

• Support to MAF on maternal mortality in the lead up to the Post 2015 Development Agenda,

• Joint production of a National MDG Report in the lead up to 2015 Sustainable Development Summit,

• Support to an Africa wide meeting on tackling inequalities and promoting structural transformation (2014) and related follow-up and collaboration in support of Ghana moving forward with tackling inequalities in the context of the SDGs and long term development plan.

3*. Enhanced access to data*: explore open data repository and access to information

4. *Policy Options and support to Institutional Development Transformation*: activities include technical advisory support and development dialogues for a development transformation process as needed going forward

5*. Enhancing productive capacities for inclusive and sustainable growth,* which comprises:

• support the Ministry of Trade and Industry in the establishment and operationalization of the Ghana Commodities Exchange to provide a ready market and fair pricing for farming households,

•Studies and technical support for value-added in production: Identification of opportunities in support of value-added in manufacturing and value-added services – UNCT collaboration in support to inclusive access to ARVs, value added in agricultural value chains (with UNECA)

•Production of an analytical paper focused on enhancing human development, poverty reduction and creating resilience

6*. Development Dialogues and South –South Exchange:*

• Promoting development effectiveness principles and enhancing knowledge sharing

•Improve human and institutional capacity to accelerate implementation of service delivery and effective coordination of development results.

Main achievements under this thematic area can be resumed as follows.

SADA. UNDP support through SADA is aimed at institutional strengthening and provision of technical support with regard to reducing the historical poverty and inequality gaps between Ghana’s Northern zone and the more developed South and stimulating a socio-economic transformation within the Northern Savannah Ecological Zone (NSEZ) itself. Critical areas were identified: among others, full and productive employment (MDG 1B), equal share of women in non-agriculture wage employment, and women’s involvement in governance (MDG 3), reducing under-5 and child mortality (MDG 4), reducing maternal mortality (MDG 5), reversing environmental resource loss and improving sanitation (MDG 7)[[9]](#footnote-10). The main areas of UNDP support were:

i) The development of spatial geographic information system maps, showing the key socio-economic infrastructure, service delivery (health infrastructure) and natural resources endowments to inform spatial planning, prioritization and collaboration with partners. Support included capacity building to SADA staff to enable them using the GIS system for more coherent and integrated approach to the Northern development agenda. This intervention is reportedly also helped to inform the commercial agricultural atlas to attract agricultural investment from development partners and better position SADA equity financing, thus contributing to address inequality and gaps. ii) a ‘one-stop shop’/maps portal and related mechanisms, which – according to the 2015 ROAR - *has strategically positioned SADA to accelerate inclusive growth and transformation through strategic planning, resource mobilization for private sector, social and infrastructure investments, as well as through development coordination.*

GSS. UNDP support continued across the whole duration of the CPD, mainly aimed at enhancing the institutional and human capacities of the Ghana Statistical Service (GSS) for the production of high quality disaggregated data to inform evidence-base national development planning. The intervention produced some interesting achievements, such as training in complex multivariate data analysis – used in the production of the World Bank funded Ghana Poverty Mapping Report – and support to 2014 Ghana Demographic and Health Survey (GDHS), providing information on fertility, family planning, infant and child mortality, maternal and child health, and nutrition. GSS is a long standing recipient of UNDP support – since more than a decade - and is also the recipient of significant support from other development partners, first of all the World Bank which – besides a 30 M USD loan - is providing a grant amounting at 10 M USD, which seems focused on the same areas of intervention that UNDP is supporting. It is not clear, moreover, whether activities of training and support in data collection have actually tangibly contributed to the building of GSS internal capacities; the repetition of such activities throughout years raises doubts about the institution’s absorption capacity. Given this, it is to be asked whether UNDP contributions are still necessary, or whether it would be more appropriate to move cluster’s resources to other areas/institutions.

NDPC. UNDP supported the Commission in various ways: preparation of the Ghana’s Medium Term Development Framework (GSGDA II, 2014-2017), and the subsequent support to the preparation of a costing framework for the GSGDA II,[[10]](#footnote-11) identifying – among others - entry points for domestic resource mobilization and development cooperation. In 2015, NDPC also launched the process of developing a 40 Long Term National Development Plan (LTNDP), and UNDP supported the building blocks for the development of a national infrastructure plan, which was to be finalized in 2016[[11]](#footnote-12) as well as with regard to initiating the process of alignment and the mainstreaming the new 2030 Agenda for sustainable development into both annual plans and the LTNDP.

Synergies were achieved with the support to NDPC, since the GSGDA costing framework produced by NDPC with support from UNDP provided the basis upon which informed or evidence-based pro-Northern policy and programme decisions can be made.

Of recent, NDPC has been legislatively given the mandate of planning (which was removed from the erstwhile Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning). This amendment in legislation also makes the release of resources to the district incumbent on certification by NDPC. It is too early to assess how NDPC will use/assert its power to enhance its relevance in governance.

Other

Incubator support, south-south knowledge exchange and learning and the building blocks for Ghana’s first multi-commodity exchange platform – the Ghana Commodity Exchange (GCX) – were put in place with support from UNDP in partnership with the Ministry of Trade & Industry. [[12]](#footnote-13)

Other activities were more fragmented, especially during the first two years of CPD implementation. For example one of the initial components of the cluster was support to LED, which resulted in the development of a National LED Policy and implementation Action Plan completed with an Operational manual and ad hoc training for key staff of Regional Co-ordinating Councils and District Assemblies in Central and Western Regions. The component was however eliminated from the AWPs of subsequent years.

The same can be said for the component on provision of sustainable and affordable housing and skills development for women and youth as a means of restoring livelihoods in deprived communities in Northern Ghana. UNDP support led to some training for 86 community members were trained in brick-moulding, masonry, steel-bending and carpentry. This component was abandoned and taken over by UN HABITAT in the following years[[13]](#footnote-14).

In other areas the UNDP intervention was limited to supply: for example the Support for improved Emergency Maternal and Obstetric Care (EMOC) in deprived communities in northern Ghana, where UNDP facilitated the provision of medical supplies and ambulances for three health facilities in Northern and Upper West regions, or some actions on sanitation issues.

Finally, UNDP has been a key collaborator in the production of national MDG reports which represents a flagship product. These have been produced mostly biannually since 2004, including two which were produced within this project cycle (in 2010 and 2015). Among others, the 2015 MDG terminal monitoring report was produced and launched in September 2015 just before the global Sustainable Development Summit.

Fully demonstrable effectiveness of the inclusive growth cluster in achieving results is a challenge given in some cases the long gestation period before results are observed in their intervention area e.g. in terms of improving data quality where support is provided for surveys undertaken by GSS, the results are not available until the following year at the earliest, or as regards improved planning tools and institutional strengthening etc. where it is not just the production of a tool or technical support for the process but changes in institutional functioning and movement on related fronts which take time.

 Though quality knowledge products - such as the MDG reports and or the enhanced information portal with spatial information and SADA maps[[14]](#footnote-15) – are produced, and the decisive contribution to enhancing the credibility of SADA after a difficult period, with consequent resuming of funding activities from other development partners are observed impacts, certain activities seem sometimes to be repeated over time, and their real contribution to structural strengthening of target institutions and of national capacities to conduct economic planning, management and M&E is not obvious[[15]](#footnote-16); or have been rather scattered with limited significant impact. A question which may be asked is whether all activities are part of a structured, articulated and structured development strategy, or whether some of them are not properly inserted in a consistent strategy. These doubts arise from an analysis of activities over time, which gives the impression that there is a certain inertial tendency to repeat the same patterns, instead of a gradual strengthening of capacities based on a comprehensive needs assessment and on achieved results. [[16]](#footnote-17) This finding needs however to be situated against the very significant resource crunch of government which makes it difficult to devise just value added activities, when the government does not have funds to very basic activities. UNDP staff comment that the focus is how to help them do better, introduce innovation, provide technical assistance on quality or help institutions leverage and use resources more effectively, as with SADA.

A reflection might be perhaps initiated about the appropriateness of funding the same institutions across time; institutions that, as in the case of GSS, are already receiving abundant resources form other development partners. On the other side, the fact that some key products like the GHS, GLSS are funded by multiple partners can be considered positive in the absence of sufficient national funding: as a result, Ghana has much more quality and updated data than many other countries. With enhanced World Bank funding for NSSD, other niches are indeed opening up for UNDP and UN, including on open data and use of big data and development of a portal for the numerous SDG indicators.

In terms of institution strengthening, the work of the cluster has spanned incubation (e.g. GCX), focus on the introduction of innovation and/or value added support in the context of ongoing planning/provision of services, as well as with institutional turnaround/repositioning through early commitment, technical assistance and serving as a broker for technical or financial collaborations.

.

#### Sustainable Development

The following table recapitulates expected outputs of the CPD for the cluster.

Table : Expected Outputs of the CPD for the cluster

|  |
| --- |
| NATIONAL PRIORITY OR GOAL: Adapting to the impacts of and reducing vulnerability to climate variability and change as part of the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (2010-2013). |
| UNDAF OUTCOME 3: National systems and existing institutional arrangements for climate change mitigation and adaptation and for disaster risk reduction (DRR), as defined in the Hyogo framework for action at the district, regional and national levels are functional. Outcome indicator: Proportion of districts, regions and national agencies supporting the implementation of the national policy on climate change and DRR. |
| INDICATIVE COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTPUTS | **UNDP CONTRIBUTION** | **INDICATOR(S), BASELINES AND TARGET(S) FOR UNDP CONTRIBUTIONS** | **INDICATIVE RESOURCES BY OUTCOME (US$)** |
| Capacity assessments and targeted actions completed to enable the Climate Change Committee to fulfil its mandate; analysis and policy proposals on the integration of low carbon growth, sustainable management of natural resources and DRR completed for 4 key sectors, and broad agreement reached by stakeholders; scalable initiatives on climate change and DRR tested and documented in selected districts and, where appropriate, at national level. | UNDP will assist with outcome level assessment, policy analysis and capacity development to address climate change and DRR. Particular attention will be paid to gender targets at the outcome level. | Indicator: An operational framework of key policies, institutions and investments that address climate change and DRRBaseline: A relatively early stage of action of climate change; significant progress on DRR since 2007Target: Fully functional Climate Change Committee; climate change and DRR integrated into 4 key sectors; scalable models for access to renewable energy identified. | Regular:US$ 3.099 millionOther:US$ 22 million |

In general terms, programming in this cluster seems to be well strategically oriented. This seems due – among others – to the utilisation of management tools which have enabled the cluster staff to better identify overall gaps and achievements, and to timely provide adjustments and if needed remedial solutions based on evidence. Monitoring and reporting documentation follows a standardised format which allows for easy tracking of results. It is to be asked whether such methodology can be extended to other clusters; this would enormously facilitate a comprehensive, holistic management of the CPD and would allow for a unified approach to data handling and reporting, thus positively impacting on the overall significance and objectivity of ROARs and other reporting documents.

The cluster encompasses 18 projects, distributed across the key priority areas of climate change, disaster risk reduction, energy and biodiversity. UNDP’s targeted approach - mainly in the energy, disaster risk reduction and natural resource management (cocoa) sectors - combined with the clear Government commitment in these areas, have produced several positive achievements. In general terms, probably the biggest success – as commented by the programme staff - is how UNDP has contributed to mainstream climate change and disaster risk reduction into development planning, and to establish a solid policy framework for climate change.

Climate Change. The Government finalized the National Climate Change Policy Strategies in 2014; these are a set of concrete low emission and climate resilient programmes to implement the objectives of the National Climate Change Policy approved in 2013. UNDP has supported some of these strategies as follows.

In the area of mitigation, support was provided to the enforcement of the ban on importation of used refrigerators. This was realised through the project *Promoting of Appliance of Energy Efficiency and Transformation of the Refrigerating Appliances Market in Ghana*. This project - handled by the Energy Commission - has been particularly successful in promoting and implementing the transition to the use of appliances more respectful of environmental standards. A regulatory framework centred on the introduction by law of a standard and labelling regime, together with a complete ban on the importation of used refrigerators, was developed and is being enforced. One of the main components of the project was the “refrigerator turn-in and rebate scheme”, which provided incentives to consumers to return their old refrigerator in exchange for a discounted efficient one. Through those activities, energy efficient appliances are gradually replacing inefficient ones.

*Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) Initiative*: based on the UN Secretary-General focus on sustainable energy, and on the designation of 2012 as the International Year of Sustainable Energy for All, the initiative calls for private sector and national commitments and attract global attention to the importance of energy for development and poverty alleviation. Main components are: support the development of a participatory system for monitoring and evaluating energy access programmes in Ghana in ways that empower people at the grassroots to take appropriate action on a continuous basis; and development and set up of a system to enforce a regulatory framework for the improved cook stoves market in Ghana, to ensure that all cook stoves available on the market are efficient and also have low emission levels to take into consideration health concerns. Standards for improved cook stoves have been drafted and are expected to be gazetted in 2017; a Cook stove Testing and Expertise Lab was established at KNUST.

Impact of the initiative is not clear to date; interviews held by the team seem to evidence some communication gaps and persisting insufficient awareness of the importance of low emissions level for cook stoves used in the country.

The initiative also supported an interesting project on solar irrigation, which provided 4 communities with solar systems for irrigation: 1 million litres of water daily will benefit 61 farm families consisting of 550 persons, with the potential to irrigate up to 26 ha of land. The project has been very successful; it enabled farmers to double the harvest season and to diversify typologies of cultivation (from cereals to vegetables), thus increasing value of their production. The initiative has been exposed to many development partners and has inspired similar ideas in other countries in Africa.

In the area of adaptation, efforts to incorporate climate change considerations into health risk management at the national and district levels have reduced the spread of epidemics such as cholera in the targeted districts. The main initiatives under this area were:

*Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP) Supporting Integrated and Comprehensive Approaches to Climate Change Adaptation in Africa*: AAP Ghana worked on developing capacities and financing options for mainstreaming climate change adaptation into various policies, systems, and sectors in Ghana, with a focus on early-warning systems. The final evaluation of the project recognises that effectiveness was satisfactory, and was enhanced by a high level of country ownership, by the flexibility in changing outputs to make them more relevant to the needs – i.e. support to the development of the National Climate Change Policy - , which is a key framework document for climate change. Other significant achievement have been the development of a flood and drought hazard mapping in five AAP Pilot Districts in Ghana, providing NADMO with a methodology for providing effective disaster risk reduction (DRR) work in the districts; support to a study on Indigenous Knowledge on climate change in six districts, and of an Indigenous Knowledge Atlas on changes in climate in the 6 studied districts; 19 “Policy Advisory Series” documents on climate change and a Guide for Mainstreaming Climate Change and Disaster Risk into national development policies and planning.

*Integrating climate change into the management of priority health risks (Climate Change and Health):* The three major components of the project were: 1. Strengthen technical capacities to manage climate change-related health risks strengthened with a focus on malaria, diarrheal diseases, meningococcal meningitis, and some respiratory diseases like asthma. 2. Climate change health risks mainstreamed into decision making at local and national health policies. 3. Effective information management and dissemination of climate change health risk knowledge promoted. The final evaluation fates the project as “Moderately Satisfactory”: *a lot has been done in terms of knowledge production, training and awareness raising, but a lot remains to be done in order to ensure that the information produced and the tools tested are properly integrated into health management systems in Ghana, systematically replicated in all districts/regions of the country and that interactions with all relevant sectors into climate change and health issues are effective.*

On sustainable natural resource management, much was done in support of the cocoa production which constitutes the top of exported products in Ghana. The P*ublic-Private Partnership Ghana Cocoa Platform* stimulated dialogue among stakeholders and farmers at regional level; Technical Committees formed for problem identification, policy recommendations and action plans for the cocoa sector. The Ghana Cocoa Board has endorsed mainstreaming of the Platform into its organizational structure for sustainability. In 166 communities, sensitization of farmers on prevailing forest laws and tree registration process were organized, followed by the distribution of 263,000 economic tree seedlings to 3,160 farmers. This has resulted in the shade-tree planting in 1,200 ha of cocoa farms in 2014. The *Environmental Sustainability and Policy for Cocoa Production in Ghana* project addressed the risks of cocoa production due to by deforestation and other environmental concerns. In this regard, the project supports innovative environmental approaches by building institutional knowledge and incentivizing farmers to adopt sustainable environmentally friendly production practices throughout cocoa growing communities. Main results achieved in the CPD period are as follows: farmers from 36 communities were trained in good environmental practices and were sensitised to the benefits of trees on farms, and on the existing legislation that allows farmers to become owners of the trees they plant; 800,000 seedlings of timber tree species- bringing both environmental and economic benefits in the long term- were supplied to farmers for planting in cocoa landscapes to increase tree and carbon stock, as well as enhance the micro-climatic conditions on cocoa farms; a series of studies and recommendations was prepared and disseminated on land tenure and tree tenure; a Piloted Community Resource Management Area (CREMA) in Asunafo North cocoa growing landscape was developed (CREMA is a mechanism that allows communities to jointly manage the natural resources of a larger ecosystem together with relevant stakeholders).

In the area of ODS/ozone, UNDP has provided institutional strengthening support to enable the country meet its obligations under the Montreal Protocol in gradually phasing out ozone depleting substances. This was done, as an example, through the P*ilot Demonstration Project on ODS-Waste management* and through the *Institutional Strengthening project (Phase 9&10*), which provided support to the National Ozone Office in its mandate to plan, organize, direct and coordinate activities related to the implementation of Ghana's strategy in the Phase-out of Ozone Depleting Substances under the Montreal Protocol.

All in all, the initiatives funded under this cluster appear to be relevant to the overarching objectives of the thematic area, and are appropriately linked to existing policies or strategies. In any case, all of them are aimed at promoting innovative techniques or tools to enable authorities and citizens to tackle environmental, climate change or disaster – related concerns. Also, the needs of vulnerable communities are adequately taken into consideration. The team’s assessment is confirmed by the positive judgement contained in the 2014 ROAR which states, among others: *UNDP’s targeted approach, mainly in the energy, disaster risk reduction, and natural resource management (cocoa) sectors, has contributed to the efficient use of financial resources thus enabled the positive progress toward intended outcomes for the year[[17]](#footnote-18).* Finally, the high percentage of external resources allocated to the cluster proves the credibility, authority and high quality of UNDP actions in this thematic area.

What are the unexpected outcomes or consequences it yielded? What are their implications?

The limited information on projects’ details made available to the evaluation team – due to constraints mentioned under 3.2 - does not allow for a comprehensive analysis of this aspect. Interviews held by the evaluation team have evidenced some positive outcomes that are mainly linked to the capacity of UNDP to act as a catalyst for resources mobilisation.

* Exposure of project partners to UNDP funding modalities and requirements – be they financial or substantive reporting – has built capacities of recipient institutions and has promoted a learning process, thus enabling stakeholders to further work with other development partners.
* In some cases the support provided by UNDP to institutions has acted as an ‘endorsement’ of those institutions, thus activating other donors which resumed – or initiated – financing of the organisations. The team observed such dynamics at least in two cases, SADA and the peace project, where the UNDP support to the NPC has determined the involvement of USAID and DANIDA.

How effective have been practices and tools used in the programme? (support to local initiatives, best practices, institutional strengthening)

Results obviously vary, depending upon thematic areas, nature of interventions, choice of partners, and degree of policy support; the team will present some cases where practices and tools have been particularly successful.

In the sustainable development cluster, UNDP’s focus on institutional capacity strengthening for effective brokering, negotiations, dialogues and engagements, problem identification and decision making led to significant progress. In the governance thematic area, besides successful records at upstream level such as the drafting and approval of strategies and laws, much has been done at the grassroots level through involving local actors in the discourse around good governance themes, including transparency and accountability, and peace. The inclusion of traditional leaders in awareness and training activities has proven to be critical to an adequate communication and has favoured the absorption of the concepts among communities. Also, platforms for accountability established in over 80 districts through governance assessment and regular interface meetings between duty bearers and right holders led to improvements in service delivery and in the citizens’ capacity to monitor the performance of the public sector. Partnership, capacity building, and institutional strengthening approaches adopted were also significant in the achievement of results; for example, the relationship between UNDP and its partners was strengthened through regular group and one-on-one meeting and on-spot visits.

In the inclusive growth thematic area, the introduction of innovative technologies has greatly expanded the potential of country’s institutions to monitor and lead economic transformation in target areas. A platform to enhance development effectiveness in the hitherto marginalized and poor Northern Savannah Economic Zone, through a ‘one-stop shop’ and related mechanisms to increase impact and policy coherence, was facilitated through support to the SADA, which has been enabled to accelerate inclusive growth and transformation through strategic planning, resource mobilization for private sector, social and infrastructure investments, as well as through development coordination.

What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede UNDP performance in this area?

This section reviews the drivers (favourable factors) and spoilers (unfavourable factors) that have supported or hindered the achievement of the outcomes and overall objective of the CPD based on the research and analysis conducted.

* + 1. Contributing factors

Apart from factors mentioned under paragraph 7.2.1 which deals with the added value of UNDP, the following is worthwhile noting:

***Alignment with country priorities.*** The UNDP knowledge of Ghana’s economic and social reality, and the close and continuous dialogue with the country’s main actors and stakeholders have greatly favoured the alignment of interventions with country priorities. This has produced the most effective results when actions have supported concrete needs: development of policies, strategies; drafting of legislation and bylaws; support to management mechanisms of target institutions (strategic plans, action plans, and codes of conduct). Examples of that are the UNDP’s technical and financial support was central to the development of the National Climate Change Policy Strategies, which set a solid foundation for effective implementation of the National Climate Change Policy throughout sectors, regions, and districts; the support provided to the development of the Gender Ministry Strategic Plan, launched in December 2016. In some cases, UNDP leads working groups on state policies, as in the case of the green economy policy advisory support based on the increasing demand of the Government.

***Policy support***. Findings from the desk review, corroborated by interviews and further document analysis during the field phase of the evaluation, pointed out that effectiveness during project implementation is strongly influenced by the policy support provided by the beneficiary institutions and related government authorities. For example, effectiveness of UNDP’s intervention in the area of sustainable development was enhanced by the strong government commitment and the stringent need to devise and implement a set of adequate policies.

***Flexibility.*** Despite cumbersome procedures which were almost unanimously noted by interviewees, UNDP has been able to maintain a good degree of flexibility and has favoured adjustments in budget or activities when this was deemed necessary by partners. This has undoubtedly contributed to the effectiveness of projects through increased adherence to changing needs.

***Knowledge of the ground.*** As already mentioned under 7.2.1, UNDP’s deep knowledge of the country’s economic, social and institutional dynamics is one of the key success factors of its programming choices. One of the major achievements is linked to the UNDP decision to re-start support to SADA shortly after its massive restructuring, following allegations of financial misappropriation. At that time SADA was practically isolated and cut off from access to international development partners, and UNDP was the first organisation to show trust and confidence in the expressed commitment of SADA to transparency and quality of its future working practices and to help it develop the systems, capacities and tools to deliver on its mandate. This choice was deliberate: *UNDP had to work with these agencies to develop systems that would enable them work better and not to abandon them in times of difficulty[[18]](#footnote-19)*.

It is worthwhile noting, on the other side, that the capacity and subsequent decision of dealing with institutions that have been affected by negative public perception can bring about the risk of being confused with clientele-prone attitudes, thus hindering UNDP’s credibility among development partners. Such risk was highlighted in the 2012 ROAR: *more programmatic investments are often also dictated by political considerations in the sense that refusing certain demands from government can be harmful to UNDP's programme overall in the long run. In other terms programmatic investments are the reflection at a certain point in time of the balance between political consideration, implementation capacity of a partner and development results driven criteria.* Such risks can only be mitigated by constant and resilient focus on objectively identified country’s priorities (based on national development plans, policies, strategies) and on continuous attention to tangible and measurable results.

* + 1. Challenges

***Management***. The management (supervision, activity coordination, reporting etc.) of CPD projects is mainly left to IPs. The issue of capacities at that level has been reported by UNDP CO programming units several times, as for example in the 2012 ROAR, stating that a significant factor is *the capacity of an implementing partner and its track record in implementing UNDP funded projects. The lack of implementation capacities, in particular with regard to quality assurance of and reporting on project activities is a constraint for UNDP.* Such concerns have been expressed in further reports, and little changes have been recorded in the CPD implementation period. A suggestion might be to put in place adequate measures aiming at creating a system of conditionality, where payments are made on the basis of evidence (timely and regular financial and substantive reporting), as in use among other development partners (the EU, as an example).

***Programmes and projects structure.***  It is worthwhile examining the way interventions are articulated under different clusters. The inclusive growth area has only one project, with one IP and a large number of partner organisations. The same can be said for the governance area, where at least two projects (Transparency and Accountability, and Representation and Participation) include from six to sixteen project partners. This solution offers some advantages, such as simplified administration; but on the other hand it poses a heavy burden to the IPs in terms of coordination, management and monitoring of actions implemented. Combined to the existing challenges in IPs’ capacities, detailed in the above paragraph, risks of imbalances and inability to manage and control the projects’ implementation are high. It also brings about a risk of excessive fragmentation of activities, some of which may not be totally relevant for the achievement of objectives, with consequent dispersion. It might be suggested to opt for a simpler project structure, with fewer partners and activities, all of which should be part of a logical and strategically formulated sequencing. If this solution would not please all stakeholders – or would imply a bigger number of projects under a single cluster -, it would avoid the risk of scattering and it would contribute to a stronger design, where objectives are clearly formulated and activities are and well structured. The reduction of the number of stakeholders per project would also allow for a stronger prioritisation of areas and results; and would simplify the project management process, at least from an IP’s perspective.

***Non homogeneous management of clusters***. As noticed in the above paragraphs, each thematic area presents different management modalities and practices. This might be due to the different history of each cluster: inclusive growth area was one of the first areas of intervention, whereas sustainable development has been introduced in recent years. Such differentiation is to be noted in the general programme structuring, in the use of diverse tools to measure impact of projects, in the selection of stakeholders, in reporting practices.

 (This makes it rather difficult to measure the results of the whole programming exercise in an objective way. The introduction of more uniform methods would allow for more objective monitoring of the whole process, and would help the whole programming cycle to better identify gaps and formulate priorities.

***Resource constraints***. The peculiar funding process of the UNDP (see Efficiency) does not allow for a proper planning process which would imply certainty of funds, from which a logical sequencing of allocation of funds to various projects and activities should derive. Many projects have been subject to disruption of funds, with heavy impact on the project structure and the consequent need – often quite stringent – to prioritize and shrink activities. It has been reported, for example, that the Transparency and Accountability project has suffered for a reduction of financial resources amounting at more than 80% of the estimate. This problem seems to largely depend on structural issues affecting the whole UN system. In any case UNDP is well aware of the issue, which is duly signalled in the 2015 UN Retreat report, listing – among lessons learnt in the previous year - the need for early planning, realistic budgeting and projections.

It is to be noted, however, that disruption of funds occurs only with internally (core) funded projects, whereas with non-core funded projects it is possible to have multi-year work plans with certainty of resources throughout the project period. This is a key factor ensuring quality and effectiveness of actions. It is therefore strongly encouraged to take more active measures in the mobilisation of external resources.

Is UNDP well suited and well perceived to support Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development initiatives in Ghana?

In general terms the UNDP experience, knowledge and expertise in such areas are extremely relevant and are universally perceived as undisputable success factors.

In the governance cluster, the establishment of networks and the joint engagement of the different stakeholders operating in the country on different areas addressed in the projects are proving to be highly needed, and are providing value contributions to the development of consensus-based approaches which were largely missing among the actors.

It is also contributing to create and spread out the concept of the importance of dialogue among stakeholders, and of the added value of interventions devised and developed together, towards a new awareness about the pro-active roles each institution can play if effectively coordinated. This is evident, as an example, in the UNDP contributions to the establishment of a peace architecture in the country.

In the sustainable development thematic area, UNDP is greatly contributing to formulate and support sound state policies, and its role is adequately recognised by relevant actors in the fields of climate change, disaster reduction and green economy. At downstream level, notable results have been achieved through UNDP interventions at community level - for example in the projects on Environmental Sustainability and Policy for Cocoa Production – and through initiatives addressed at improving energy efficiency.

In the area of inclusive growth, UNDP is one of the historical partners of the government in the development of policies and strategies aimed at enhancing the economic development of Ghana with a focus on vulnerable areas and on poverty reduction goals.

Has UNDP utilized innovative techniques and best practices in its programming in these areas?

The introduction of innovative practices is more apparent in sectors such as sustainable development, which for its nature is aimed at seeking advanced approaches. As an example, the AAP Ghana project realized a number of innovative measures on its leadership objectives, including a Mentoring and Coaching Initiative which led to the improvement of knowledge and skills such as facilitation on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction for thirty two mentors and mentees in the country. Other interesting tools used in the project were a leadership for results programme which saw the creation of two committees and a volunteer Group to oversee water management along Osubin River at Begoro in the Eastern Region. In general, all interventions aimed at empowering local communities are to be seen as

## Efficiency

This section will analyse the measurement of outputs in relation to inputs, assessing in particular the resources made available to the CPD and their conversion into results.



Figure : Project/Program Actual Expenditure versus Budgeted Amount (USD) over the CPD period (2012-2017)

Was management of resources adequate to the planning and execution requirements?

Over the CPD period UNDP obtained external resources from other development partners (multilaterals, bilaterals, embassies and the private sector) to support development programs/projects. These external resources were adequately managed in the planning and execution requirements of specific interventions. Indeed UNDP has been commended by some of these development partners i.e. (DANIDA, Japan, etc.) who have funded projects supported by UNDP. UNDP’s grant management role has been commended for its efficiency in terms of due diligence and its accountability systems.

Unlike the management of externally funded or cost-shared projects using non-TRAC resources, UNDP’s management of interventions relying solely on TRAC resources was not adequate to the planning and execution requirements. This could however be due to asynchronous planning at UNHQ and UNCT. The result of which is that when planning is done at the country level with partners the full envelop of resources to the country office is not known. This has resulted in TRAC funded projects on a regular basis having to cut down on their activities and or cut budgets. This lessens the quality and or impact of activities and is also a source of concern for the IP/RPs where they believe once the AWP is signed the figures are cast in stone.

The following table assesses the CPD efficiency in its different aspects.

Table : CDP efficiency Assessment in its Different Aspects

| CRITERIA | ASSESSMENT |
| --- | --- |
| PLANNING | *Management Arrangements* | =Management arrangements of projects and programs are for the most part sufficient at the Implementing/responsible partner level. However due to the high number of projects/interventions being undertaken simultaneously by the UNDP Clusters, the program officers are understaffed[[19]](#footnote-20) to manage and monitor projects/programs efficiently. e.g. In the inclusive Growth Cluster there are only 2-3 personnel with the technical capacity to engage technically and competently with stakeholder regarding analytical work and knowledge products, limiting the capacity to undertake analytical work. This is also reflected in the inability to consecutively prepare HDR*.* Program managers are mostly focussed on project administration and project management work Due to the large number of projects in their portfolio. |
| *Finance and co-finance* | Consistently UNDP has not been able to mobilise resources to fund the non-trac part of its AWPs and in some cases even those that are funded by trac resources. This has created difficulties with implementing partners and also lessen in some cases quality and or impact of intervention. There is also the need to synchronise activity timeline with the money allocation timeline. Co-financing from government is for the most part in-kind and not in-in cash. This has, at times been a source of difficulty when government need to make cash payments to ensuring the implementation of activities. |
| *Work Planning* | Feedback from partners in the public sector and civil society sector commend UNDP for not only funding the AWPs but also playing a major role in the coordination, supervision and planning of the intervention. However in the implementation of AWPs, especially with government partners who form the majority of UNDP partners, it is observed that frequently when AWP activities are due for implementation focal points or key people in the sector are on other institutional business and can’t devote time to AWP activities. It would be helpful that prior to AWPs being signed off, the activities are integrated into the IP/RP’ institutional work plan.  |
| EXECUTION | *stakeholder Engagement* | All IPs credit UNDP with regular meetings during execution of AWPs and a high level of awareness as to the status of projects implementation (or lack thereof) at any given time.However there is an inordinate amount of bureaucracy which stifles work flow. |
| *Value for Money (VfM)* | Value for Money (VfM) is about maximizing the impact of every money spent to improve people’s lives. UNDP VfM principles consist of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. In regards to effectiveness and efficiency they have been addressed in the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria.On the economy of interventions, UNDP adheres to value for money principles in its procurement of services and products to support interventions. The development of appropriate ToRs and use of competitive tendering processes infers that inputs are being bought of appropriate quality and price. However it is observed and deduced from discussions with program officers and RP/IP focal points that no conscious effort is done on cost effectiveness of activities to answer how much impact, progress, or stability does an intervention achieve relative to the inputs that are invested in it? Does the cost justify the results? Though there are tools such as the social return on investment (SROI) quantification of results e.g. “peace, stability, co-operation et” is not an exact science.  |
| *Timing and delays,* | Whilst UNDP receives commendation for efficient planning it has drawbacks due to poor synchronisation when it comes to timing of implementation activities and timing of disbursement. However this is mostly with project partners who have not undergone micro-assessment.This is exemplified by support to CHRAJ under the Transparency and Accountability project which encountered delays in the release of funds.  |
| *monitoring* | The three UNDP clusters as a whole do well with regards to monitoring, the SDC has additionally invested time and resources in improving the way it conducts M&E. It has developed an M&E System for the cluster, made of different components. One of them is a report/result card that we update on an annual basis. For some time, we also had a cluster-level M&E officer to help.One weakness that is often reported in project evaluations is that, at the project development stage, the project M&E frameworks are weak, and makes it difficult to conduct effective monitoring during implementation.  |
| *evaluation systems* | To date only five (5) evaluations[[20]](#footnote-21) have been undertaken all from the Sustainable development cluster. Over the CPD project 25 projects/programs have been undertaken In TRAC funded UNDP AWPs it is rare to see mid-term and terminal evaluation embedded into the projects/ programs. |
| *Reporting* | From feedback received in the UNCO and the volume of reports received by CO, reporting from government and civil society stakeholders has witnessed marked improvement especially in terms of the consistency, this is to a large extent due to UNDPs training and the quarterly meetings on AWP progress.The issue of concern is the quality of the reporting which mainly deal with activity level issues and not at results level.With regards to external reporting by UNDP to its partners, concerns have been expressed (DANIDA and Embassy of Japan) of encountering difficulties in the retrieval of archival data from UNDP of past projects they collaborated on. Though this cannot be said to be systemic, it exposes a challenge in the lack of a well-structured internal UNDP country office database. |
| *Communications* | Donor Partners also were of the view that UNDP should be more proactive in engaging them on possible collaborations. This would be welcomed. The evaluation occurring at the time of the upcoming elections therefore it was not surprising that all donors visited made particular mention of UNDPs creditable communication on the 2016 elections process where UNDP was the focal point. Feedback received confirmed that UNDP provided timely, useful information on a regular basis. This said however the general feedback was that this level of UNDP visibility and consistency in communication is generally lacking over the period of the CPD as well as in other sectors (anti-corruption, climate change, environment, etc.) and therefore appear to be event specific.Internally, feedback from members of PMUs showed a need for clear communication especially on their status and reporting lines. The view was shared that UNDP staff treated the PMU as if they were government staff and Government staff treat them as if they were UNDP staff.  |

## Sustainability

This aspect by definition addresses the continuity of benefits created and changes achieved after the completion of the intervention.

The issue of sustainability is multidimensional, since it is related to:

* Sectorial aspects: related to the perspective that thematic areas addressed within the CPD will be further identified as priorities by the Government;
* Institutional aspects: related to the internal capacities of institutions to absorb UNDP support under the CPD; to their ability to provide adequate leadership and actively taking responsibility and ownership for achievement of results and objectives; to their future commitment to the continuation of the results/benefits;
* Policy aspects: related to the country’s national strategies and policies in place; to the evidence of changes in legislation, budgetary policies and allocation, supporting the sustainability of the project’s results and benefits; finally, to the possibility of future shift/changes in policy directions;
* Knowledge related issues: how the large knowledge resources, tools, research developed in the implementation of the projects under CPD are being utilised in the recipients of the intervention after the completion of the projects;
* Project-level concerns: linked to the stakeholders’ level of ownership, commitment to embed projects’ outputs and results in their working practices; to the presence of exit strategies in project documents and evidence of sustainability measures introduced in the projects.

**General remarks**

Sustainability issues need to be more appropriately addressed in the CPD programming process. Emphasis must be on making mandatory sound practical exit strategies and or sustainability plans prior to AWP sign-off. The issue of sustainability is an increasing concern in the international donor community that is facing a global reduction of funds allocated to development. Therefore it should be one of the main *foci* of Ghana’s aid policies, considering the country’s transition to LMIC status, with the consequences this will imply.

There is little mention of sustainability strategies in the clusters’ concept notes, theories of changes and other background programming documents; and there is little attention to ensuring that actions implemented under the programme achieve durable results. It seems that sometimes the concept of sustainability as one of the tools in programming is not fully understood in its potential and implications. It is yet to be understood whether this challenge is due to the way programmes are designed and implemented, or the lack of stakeholder commitment to ensure sustainability.

The governance concept note of 2012 states that *national ownership and participation is central to the lasting success of peace and governance programmes….Going forward, the peace and governance programme will continue clustering partners logically, using thematic areas as an organizing tool, and promoting ever greater levels of national ownership*. This is clearly not sufficient to ensure sustainability, which should be realised through a differentiated set of measures.

Similarly, the programmatic documents for the inclusive growth cluster – although mention is made of opportunities to *enhance the sustainability of Ghana’s development, opportunities to address economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainability and resilience* - do not provide for a detailed articulation of the needed measures to achieve this objective. The objective of enhancing capacities of MDAs for data management and analytical work to inform policy and planning aimed at promoting inclusive socio-economic growth stated in the ToC of the cluster has been pursued through support to NDPC and GSS. It is not clear, however, whether efforts have led to durable results. It seems that many activities have been focused on provision of training and support to staff; there is little evidence of their focus on long-lasting achievements and on consolidation of knowledge. In the case of GSS, training on data collection and analysis has been conducted across the entire duration of the CPD; there are doubts that such activities have produced a real impact in terms of corporate capacities, considering that the institution is regularly requesting the same type of support. The same can be observed at the NDPC. None of the two institutions seems to refer to training centres, where the material produced under CPD can be further utilised.

The cluster has been perhaps more successful in its support to the production of knowledge resources, such as the Ghana Living Standard Survey 6; the analytical papers on Non- Monetary Poverty and the MDGs; the paper “Achieving the MDGs with Equity in Ghana: Unmasking the Issues behind the Averages”; the Annual Progress Report (APR), the monitoring instrument of Ghana’s Medium-Term Development Framework; the National Medium-Term Development Policy Framework (Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (GSGDA II, 2014-2017), developed by the NDPC; and the National Human Development Reports, which represents a flagship for UNDP and is widely used as an important source of information by development economists, development partners and probably country’s MDAs.

Finally, the programmatic documents on sustainable development do not indicate any specific measures or strategies for the enhancement of sustainability across the initiatives foreseen in the 2012-2017 programming cycle. However, the document is a well-reasoned basis for the identification of areas of intervention, and contains sufficient elements for ensuring durable results, such as the scaling up of support for integrating adaptation and mitigation strategies and practices into development policies, plans and programmes; the extension of UNDP support to policy development, coordination, and support to international negotiations; the engagement of the public and private sectors towards strengthening their capacity to mobilize and absorb international climate finance; the support to government’s effort to fulfil its international commitments.

Institutional sustainability

The previous sections have evidenced the persistence of gaps in the organisational and management capacities of MDAs. Further work is required in these areas. It is hoped that new boost will be given by the new Government; on the other side, efforts might be put at the design stage to ensure that all initiatives are aimed at building durable results. This might be done, for example, through devising strategized approaches to interventions, starting from needs assessment to identification of gaps (including analysis of other donors’ support), followed by specific support to sector strategies and policies, and finally ad hoc training on a limited number of areas which should result in tangible improvement of organisational capacities of target institutions.

An issue which affects all thematic areas is the high turnover of public sector staff, which has been indicated in several interviews held by the evaluation team. Remedial actions on this regard are the focus on institutional, rather than individual, capacity building. This is in general hindered by the fact that the Government has weak capacities in institutionalization of knowledge, repositories and systems; this makes it hard for persons within government and outside to find information. Further, all partners struggle with the fact that there are no functional cadres – where for example if someone was trained on an issue in one geographical area and then transferred to another, the training would not in fact go to waste.

Appropriate attention should be put in ensuring that knowledge developed under projects’ implementation is duly utilised and embedded into daily practices among project partners, through its insertion into institution-, sector- and/or community –level training or knowledge centres. The initiative for such inclusion is most likely left to IPs and RPs, but UNDP programme staff should adequately contribute.

Financial sustainability

The transition of Ghana to LMIC might be one of the challenges which the UNDP and the country will face in the following years.

 It is a matter of fact that many development partners engaged with UNDP in CPD related projects are withdrawing from Ghana given that it was classified as an LMIC in 2010[[21]](#footnote-22), and this will surely have an impact on the continuity required in many of the projects. An example is provided by the precious DANIDA contribution to the Consolidating Peace project. Further efforts will be required to UNDP for mobilizing new resources, possibly expanding to actors which have not been explored much in the past, such as the private sector.

POLICY SUSTAINABILITY

This paragraph will analyse the extent to which national policies are conducive to further consolidation of results achieved in the implementation of the CPD.

Ghana enjoys a favourable track record on good governance, rule of law and respect for human rights. Since the return to constitutional rule in 1993, under the 1992 Constitution, Ghana has made considerable progress in establishing democratic governance. The results of the last elections, held in December 2016, have confirmed that Ghana is *a beacon of democracy in a region that has seen a series of civil wars and coups with a record of peaceful elections in which power has alternated between two main parties*.[[22]](#footnote-23) The commitment of the country in conflict prevention and peaceful democratic processes, such as elections, is to be praised and it is likely to continue in the following years.

Nevertheless, there is strong recognition by the Government and development partners that some governance challenges need to be addressed in Ghana in the immediate future: improving service delivery to citizens, expanding public and private participation in governance, further strengthening rule of law and access to justice though more effective, responsive and transparent justice sector, accountability in managing Ghana's natural resources.

 Overall, reforms shall include strengthening of different government institutions including Parliament, justice sector institutions and non-government institutions to draft laws and perform control and oversight responsibilities.

One of the key issues in this regard is implementation. UNDP has supported the development of a number of policies, but are they actually being implemented? Do they receive the necessary funding? An assessment of results is perhaps needed, in order to identify gaps and devise possible solutions.

Knowledge sharing

It is surely noteworthy spending a few words on the utilisation of knowledge material produced and disseminated during the CPD implementation. In the evaluators’ opinion, all initiatives should contain provisions aimed at ensuring that tools, materials and knowledge elaborated during projects are not dispersed. This is becoming of increasing importance in ensuring durability of outputs developed under aid interventions. Development partners are highly interested in creating knowledge sharing practices in targeted organizations, and new methods are being developed to build the enabling environment and develop the skills needed to capture and share knowledge gained from operational experiences, to improve performance and scale-up successes.

There is little evidence that appropriate attention is put on the consolidation and expanded utilisation of knowledge developed under UNDP activities. The use of such knowledge is mainly left to the initiative of beneficiaries or implementing partners, with little oversight. Yet, many studies or other outputs are of high quality and should be adequately utilised; this is the case of the Conflict Mapping, or studies produced under the Inclusive growth cluster.

Other activities are composed of conferences and events, which are by definition not transferable into institutions’ practices and had different purposes, such as awareness on peace and conflict prevention, or contributions to the discourse on transparency and accountability.

Training activities have been numerous throughout the CPD implementation. It seems that in the majority of cases training material was not embedded in beneficiary or training institutions. In general, according to interviews held with UNDP partners, there is very little evidence that the material produced in the training sessions is still being used; this is partly due to high staff turnover, bust mostly to the fact that IAs and beneficiaries have limited care of outputs and do not receive instructions on how to make use of them in their work, or there is no consolidated interest in this theme at institutional level.

As a conclusion, not much attention has been paid to ascertain that the knowledge produced and provided under training is being kept ‘alive’ and used. The responsibility is shared between the project executors and the beneficiaries, the former for not having provided clear indications about the use of the knowledge resources, the latter for not perceiving the value of what they received. The role of UNDP staff might be strengthened at this stage.

Knowledge resources are a very precious value. They imply a lot of work, passion, high level expertise and efforts. It is the evaluators’ opinion that they should be treated with care and respect by all stakeholders: by UNDP, which might insert some conditions in its projects for further use of them; and by partners, who should maximize their use by including them into their training, research and working practices.

It is strongly recommended that the UNDP and the UN system strengthen these aspects when projecting and implementing actions; this would also reinforce the credibility of the organisation among development partners, thus increasing funding opportunities.

Sustainability at project level

Table : Sustainability plans / assessment of sustainability achieved after the life of the project.

|  |
| --- |
| Cluster 1- Governance  |
| # | **Project** | **Sustainability plan/ exit strategy** | **Sustainability after the end of the project** |
| 65055 | Consolidating Peace In Ghana | AWPs mention the need to develop appropriate exit strategies inCollaboration with national partners to ensure the sustainability of programmes. Not addressed.  | Not much reflection on how to ensure durability. However, the project has attracted funds from DPs.it is hoped that this area will be further supported by UNDP but more efforts should be put in the elaboration of strategies for continuation of activities (institutional strengthening etc.) |
| 65118 | Consolidating Representation & Participation In Ghana | No mention in the ProDoc. AWPs mention the need to develop appropriate exit strategies inCollaboration with national partners to ensure the sustainability of programmes. Not addressed | Not much effort has been put on ensuring durability of results obtained. Exit strategies are seemingly not in place. |
| 65356 | Consolidating Transparency & Accountability | AWPs mention the need to develop appropriate exit strategies inCollaboration with national partners to ensure the sustainability of programmes. Not addressed | Not clear how sustainability has been ensured.  |
| 64338 | Regional Small Arms And Light Weapons Project | No docs (women and security?) If women and security (Kofi Annan) no mention of sustainability | Under question |
| 87510 | Joint Party Support And Strengthening Project (J-Pass) | Vaguely mentioned in the ProDoc through inviting the EC to nominate a senior representative to the Project Board | Under question |
| Cluster 2 – Inclusive Growth |
| # | **Project** | **Sustainability plan/ exit strategy** | **Sustainability after the end of the project** |
| 65229 | Promoting Inclusive Growth And Development | No mention of sustainability in the Concept Note nor in AWPs. The CN mentions the need for identifying opportunities to enhance the sustainability of Ghana’s development: opportunities to address economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainability and resilience  | GSS: no evidence that sustainability is addressed in the UNDP interventions. The National Statistic Strategy has been supported by the World Bank. Data analysis and capacity building activities are not tailored to ensure durability of results.NDPC: SADA: UNDP support in difficult times has enlarged the opportunities for further funding by DPs.Other? |
| Cluster 3: Sustainable DevelopmentProject documents under this cluster are not available. The team reconstructed the degree of sustainability based on the list of projects and comments provided by the cluster. |
| # | **Project** | **Sustainability plan/ exit strategy** | **Sustainability after the end of the project** |
| 65880 | Preparation Of Ghana's Low Emission Capacity Building Project | The project will focus on strengthening Ghana’s capacity to align its economic development to a low carbon path | The following activities are specifically aimed at ensuring durability: (i) develop up to 2 financeable energy-related NAMAs and the associated MRV plans; (ii) finalize and promote the Ghana NAMAs Investor Guide among the business community. |
| 72067 | Community Resilience Through Early Warning (Crew) | The project design leads to tangible results in both the national and community levels through the implementation of hazard mapping, early warning, and vulnerability assessment  | Sustainability measures are not identifiable. |
| 72342 | Environmental Sustainability And Policy For Cocoa | The ProDoc mentions several actions aimed at improving durability: address policy, strengthening of relevant institutions to support environment best practices, and development of M&E tools; scaling up of tree certification programme; develop the institutional system; etc. |  Sustainability measures not identifiable. |
| 60740 | Hydro chlorofluorocarbon Phase-Out Management Plan For GH | Focus on providing training and certification of refrigeration Technicians in Greater Accra (120 persons) Ashanti region (100 persons), and 60 persons each for the rest of the 8 regions of Ghana in good servicing practices | Although certification is partly ensuring durability of results, no other sustainability or replicability measures are in place. |
| 88002 | Green Climate Fund Readiness Programme In Ghana | The goal of the UNEP-UNDP-WRI joint GCF readiness programme is to support the Government of Ghana in strengthening their national capacities to effectively and efficiently plan for, access, manage, deploy and monitor climate financing. | The Green Climate Fund (GCF) is expected to become the main global fund for financing climate change mitigation and adaptation measures in developing countries in the coming years. As such, it will channel significant amounts of funding required to support developing countries to adapt to the impacts of climate change and to limit or reduce their greenhouse gas emissions.  |
| 88628 | Advocacy & Cap Building On DRR | This project is aimed at supporting Ghana’s efforts to implement the Ghana Plan of Action on DRR | In pipeline? |
| 89037 | Increased Resilience To Climate Change In Northern Ghana |  | Not clear whether sustainability measures are or will be put in place |
| 89426 | Reducing Unintended Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPS) | The project takes place in 4 countries including Ghana and is related to POPs which are covered by the Stockholm Convention.  | The project aims at reducing Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants (UPOPs) and mercury releases from the health sector in Africa. It also aims at reducing mercury usage in the medical sector. Most likely results will be sustainable |
| 95425 | Environmentally Sustainable Production Practices In Coco | The project supports innovative environmental approaches by building institutional knowledge and incentivizing farmers to adopt sustainable environmentally friendly production practices throughout cocoa growing communities | Sustainability is contained in the nature of the project. There is room for replicability of community models developed under the action. |
| 70731 | GHA/SEV/72/INS/38 - Renewal Of Inst. Strength (Phase 11) | The project seeks to provide institutional strengthening support to the National Ozone Office established in 1991. | It is to be asked since how many years UNDP and DPs are supporting the NOO, and which results are being achieved. |
| 75195 | Se4all Action Plan Implementation Supported | One of the activities is support exit strategies of the GEF/UNDP Refrigerator Energy Efficiency Project, in particular monitoring and enforcement of regulations, and promotion of the refrigerator rebate and turn-in scheme. | Some sustainability seems in place |
| 82764 | China-Ghana SSC Project On Rett | The focus is on the institutional framework and capacity required to make the local absorption of renewable energy technologies effective. | Sustainability might be ensured by the nature of activities envisaged, but specific measures are not clearly evidenced. |

Doubts about the extent to which sustainability is addressed in UNDP’s programmes in Ghana were already expressed in a 2011 evaluation[[23]](#footnote-24), where it was stated *that sustainability is a challenge across UNDP Ghana’s programme portfolio, though it plays itself out slightly differently in the various thematic areas and across different types of projects. Although all AWPs contain details of threats to sustainability, the risk-mitigation strategies are seldom in place or followed consistently. Explicit exit strategies are the exception rather than the rule*. Also, sustainability is not part of the reporting format.

Apart from devising appropriate exit strategies, sustainability approaches can include adoption of progressive laws and regulations, stronger partnerships with government institutions, elaboration of long-term strategies where steps towards institution strengthening are clearly formulated, institutionalization of new methodologies or practices acquired in the project implementation. Continuous dialogue needs to be maintained with Government counterparts and all partners in order to ensure that outputs continue to be utilised and knowledge resources developed under the programme are embedded, or at least further utilised, in the beneficiary institutions.

 It would be advisable to introduce a sustainability section in programmatic documents, where reflections are made and specific solutions are proposed on how to tangibly improve durability of results achieved through the projects. This would considerably improve the credibility of UNDP among development partners, who are increasingly concerned about the

The hardest task to plan for sustainability is for activities where proper financial support is requested for enabling the durability of results. One of the challenges is the high staff turnover in the great majority of institutions; for this reason, all projects should focus on institutional sustainability measures, that means, for example, ensuring that the knowledge resources produced under the action will continue to be utilised, in the institutions’ training or research centres or at decision making level.

Role and responsibilities of UNDP in ensuring sustainability should be strengthened. A sustainability section should be always included in the project design, and discussion over project sustainability strategy must be part of the required format for project documentation and reporting.

## Partnership and Coordination

Ghana is a NEX (National Execution Country so UNDP project implementation is wont to leverage on existing national institutions in order to ,Strengthen and develop national capacities , Foster better collaboration, ownership and sustainability and Avoid duplication etc. However a snapshot of UNDP partners who collaborate on projects/programs over the CPD period shows a glaring disparity in the nature of its intervention partners. It can be observed that, apart from rare exceptions, UNDP has only been using government institutions as implementing partners. Civil society groups are consulted as stakeholders throughout implementation of projects, but rarely are they the key focal points or implementing partners. Also partnership with local and international private sector is insignificant. With the exception of MTN and Mondelez over the five(5) year period of the CPD, UNDP could have perhaps have made a bigger effort to involve more directly civil society as implementation partners and also foster relationships with the private sector

* + 1. Resource mobilisation

 In some cases, potential partners receive information from the UNDP regional office or headquarters about existing or future regional/global programmes; they ask if Ghana is interested in taking part in the programme and stakeholders check that with Government. In other cases, potential partners are approached by Government with a concept that it is subsequently translated into a full project proposal, presented to donors. Finally, in other cases it is the donor that asks UNDP to implement a project for them. There is no single pattern: every project has its own history in terms of resource mobilization.

UNDP has demonstrated proactivity in doing match-making, i.e. where UNDP links two parties in development and then plays a project administrative role in superintending the development project/program. This was reflected in the Increased Resilience to Climate Change in Northern Ghana project, where when UNDP identified a partner willing to fund and matched with New Energy a CSO with a specialisation in renewable energy.

With regard to multilateral organisations (EU, AfDB, NDF), who formerly used to channel intervention funds through UNDP, are now in-country and implementing, thus closing the space for use of UNDP as a facilitator of funds or a vehicle for development intervention implementation.

Partners have been able to leverage on UNDP interventions for additional resource mobilization. This is exemplified by the UNDP support to UCC to develop a Conflict mediation program. As a result of the sponsoring of one of the outputs “Doing Mediation-A guide for Practitioners” USAID agreed to fund the printing and dissemination of the manual.

It should be noted that, apart from rare exceptions, UNDP has only been using government institutions as implementing partners. Civil society are consulted as stakeholders throughout implementation of projects, but perhaps UNDP should put bigger effort to involve civil society more directly in implementation.

The following Graph recapitulates the UNDP partnership with different actors under the CPD.



Figure : UNDP Project Partnerships

* + 1. Coordination

UNDP is an active participant in the sector working groups; it is currently the Development Partners Lead for the Environment and Natural Resources (ENR) Sector Working Group. These avenues allow for UNDP to strengthen relationships with other development partners and improve coordination.

Internally, though there are joint activities – e.g. on resilient cities; information sharing on areas of common focus or holding AWP meetings back to back (2015 for IGC and SDC); coordination of clusters appears weak. Not enough information-sharing forums are conducted. Clusters largely work in silos, and are not actively involved in activities of other clusters. Though opportunities exist for sharing of inputs, this is not institutionalised and is few and far between. However, feedback shows an awareness and commitment for more integration and coordination in the new programme cycle.

Interagency coordination, is led by the RCs office. The effectiveness of DaO is a work in progress and leaves much more room for improvement in: working together more closely in joint programming, delivering together, harmonizing processes, and joint resource mobilization.

.

* + 1. Partnership with Development Partners

The key observations collected by the evaluation team from interviews held with DPs[[24]](#footnote-25) highlight the following:

Limited role of UNDP in programme implementation: it is perceived that UNDP role in the implementation of programme activities is not very active and is essentially limited to logistical and administrative coordination with little inputs to substance and to effective management of resources. This perception might considerably influence the credibility of UNDP and its access to external resources. It seems that UNDP is not aware of such image gaps; UNDP needs to better market its role and added value among the international donors’ community, especially in times of downsizing of external aid in Ghana.

Easy management of funds: an important comparative advantage of UNDP from a donor’s perspective is represented by the fact that direct funding to UNDP projects is considered more efficient and effective than other funding modalities, which require far more efforts and resources in terms of projecting (identification of actions, selection of stakeholders…), as well as technical and financial management. More should be done to enhance communication and marketing of the benefits of working with UNDP among development partners.

## Horizontal Issues

Human Rights

Rights - based approaches in development (RBA) call for existing resources to be shared more equally and for assisting the marginalised people to assert their rights to those resources. Such approach has been pursued by the United Nations since several decades and has been made explicit in the *UN Statement of Common Understanding on Human Rights-Based Approaches to Development Cooperation and Programming* (the Common Understanding), adopted by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) in 2003.According to the statement, all programmes of development co-operation, policies and technical assistance should further the realisation of human rights as laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments. Standards and principles contained in the Declaration should guide all development cooperation and programming in all sectors and in all phases of the programming process. Development cooperation contributes to the development of the capacities of ‘duty-bearers’ to meet their obligations and/or of ‘rights-holders’ to claim their rights.

UNDP has positioned since the early introduction of RBA at the forefront of its implementation[[25]](#footnote-26) and is actively pursuing such approaches in programming. UNDP concern for the needs and rights of vulnerable groups and disadvantaged communities is generally considered one of the positive peculiarities of the organisation by both development partners and country stakeholders.

On the other side, RBA is not part of the ROAR, at least for Ghana. The CPD broadly captures human rights aspects by providing general indications; each cluster is then supposed to encapsulate human rights aspects in their projects. Results are more evident under the governance cluster; for example, activities aimed at strengthening the voice of marginalised group, youth, elderly and people with disabilities. Under the Consolidation of Peace project, modules have been prepared on mediation capacities and have involved traditional and religious leaders.

A challenge is represented by the fact that RBA is generally welcome and recommended, but is not compulsory. To address this shortcoming, specific training is reportedly foreseen in 2017 for UNDP staff to mainstream human rights. It is considered that RBA approaches should be dealt with more attention in the future UNDP programming.

Gender Equality

Gender equality issues are at the core of the UN programming system. UNDP is optimally placed to ensure that gender equality and the empowerment of women are integrated into every aspect of its work to support countries to eradicate poverty and reduce inequalities and exclusion, as affirmed in the Gender Equality Strategy 2014-2017. Moreover, gender equality as well as women’s and girls’ empowerment constitutes Goal 5 of SDG.

The strategy provides detailed guidance for UNDP business units on how to mainstream gender perspectives as they operationalize all aspects of UNDP’s Strategic Plan 2014-2017. This includes identifying strategic entry points for advancing gender equality and women’s empowerment in all outcomes of the strategic plan.

The annual ROAR exercise includes a gender component, which requires that approaches to gender equality and women’s empowerment be clearly articulated and integrated into programmes, projects, and monitoring, with sex disaggregated indicators, baselines and targets.

The UNDP Ghana CO pays due attention to this issue, both internally and at programming level.

Internally, this is done through regular monitoring and reporting on gender ratio in recruitment; in 2015, a gender ratio of 43% was reached, which compared favourably to the corporate ratio of 45%.

A conscious effort has been made in all programs to bring to the fore the gender mainstreaming perspective this is exemplified by in J-PASS program in which when an opportunity arose to increase nominees/participants from political parties it was strictly made that there representation should be gender balanced. This provided an opportunity to make one of the outputs of the program a gender strategy for the parties in their manifestoes.

Adequate measures are in place to take into due consideration gender aspects in programming. In the inclusive growth cluster, this aspect regards for instance promotion of and support to the generation of relevant, reliable statistics, which include data sets on vulnerable groups and gender disaggregated data. As an example, in 2016 some efforts have been made at the GSS to ensure that gender disaggregated data are provided at national and local level, and specific training was provided. In the work on MDGs, process of reporting on the implementation of the goals included gender related issues (such as women’s participation in political parties). With regard to the sustainable development thematic area, the support to NADMO, the DRR and clean energy projects are targeting women, who are the main stakeholders of the initiatives on refrigerators and cook stoves.

The AWP process foresees a peer review system which includes recommendations on strengthening the gender dimension of programmatic actions. As an example, in the case of the cook stove initiative, attention was given to the fact that most women using those appliances are from rural areas and do not speak English. The Ministry of health is also committed to mainstream gender in MTDP (???) malaria and in developing specific manuals.

Apart from these achievements, much is reportedly still to be done. UNDP does not implement project directly and the commitment of IPs in gender mainstreaming issues is still not at optimal levels. Some Government units have dedicated programmes because of their specific mandates, for example on disabilities and marginalised groups; this is more noticeable under the governance cluster which encompasses projects such as the Representation and Participation initiative, foreseeing actions directly aimed at empowering women (such as the development and enforcement of the Affirmative Action bill). Finally, more efforts might perhaps be put in the involvement of interest groups at the field level, to ensure adherence to the needs of communities in terms of gender equality and human rights.

Overall assessment

The table below provides a concise recapitulation of the answers to evaluation questions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **PERFORMANCE RATING** |
| **CRITERIA** | **POOR** | **LOW** | **AVERAGE** | **GOOD** | **HIGH** |
| **Relevance** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Efficiency** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partnership & Coordination** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Human Rights** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Gender Equality** |  |  |  |  |  |

# Lessons Learnt

1. The CPD has effectively stimulated and improved policy and strategy streamlining in the various sectors supported by the interventions in terms of institutional strengthening and contribution to policies and strategies, as expected in the programme’s objectives.
2. Although the intervention presents a wide range of themes, issues and activities, these have been well aligned with country’s priorities and coherently responded to needs.
3. UNDP is well positioned to effectively respond to the country’s needs, and is positively perceived among partners as an institution able to translate those needs into tangible support.
4. The UNDP rich potential and comparative advantages is not fully unfolded and not sufficiently marketed among development partners. On the other side, more efforts should be put to better articulate and structure the programme, especially in terms of design and sustainability.
5. Projects have been more successful where they were carried out in synchrony with sector reforms and legislative developments.
6. The programme suffered by uneven management and coordination, thus hampering a proper and objective assessment of benefits and gaps. Also, reporting format is not uniform across the clusters, and reports are not regular.
7. In some projects the combination of weak capacities of IPs and heavy structuring of the action, both in terms of quantity of activities and number of stakeholders involved in the implementation, has impacted on results and has diminished positive effects.
8. Unexpected disruption of funds affecting some projects – particularly in the governance cluster – has hindered the effectiveness of actions.
9. More attention should be paid on M&E and sustainability issues, which are not adequately addressed at design and monitoring level.

# Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions and recommendations are provided for each of the evaluation criteria utilised in this exercise.

Table : Conclusions and Recommendations on Evaluated Criteria

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | Conclusions | Recommendations | To whom?  |
| Relevance | By the nature of developing projects/program UNDP Ghana interventions are highly relevant. Though Relevant they appear to be too many piecemeal projects/programs | UNDP should have a smaller number of projects/programs with a narrower more focused can make more impact.  |  EMT and Cluster Managers |
| Effectiveness | The achievement of results seems uneven across thematic areas. It depends upon project structure, number and typology of actions, nature of the IP, institutional context | Re-think the structure of projectsReduce number of activities per projectsReduce number of stakeholders per project | Cluster and CPD management |
| Efficiency | Overall management is hindered by the high differentiation of management tools and features across the three clusters | The CO should implement the PPM reforms across board  | CPD managementUNDP SMTCluster heads |
| Sustainability  | The use of knowledge resources developed within the programme is not obvious | More attention is required by IPs and RPs to make further use of the knowledge resources  | UNDP staff, IPs, RPs |
| The CPD and the project documents do not have sustainability sections; reports do not analyse sustainability | Insert a sustainability(exit strategy) section in all projects’ templates – including reporting - and in the CPD | UNDP programming units |
| The issue of staff turnover is not sufficiently addressed in projects | Focus on institutional sustainability, ensuring as much as possible that training material and knowledge resources are duly embedded in the beneficiary institutions | UNDP programming units, IPs, RPs |
| Partnership and Coordination | UNDP is not fully capitalising on its full potential with regards to building partnerships.There is a receptive donor environment for collaboration with UNDP. | Conscious outreach to bilateral and embassies for collaborations. Institutionalise regular programme meetings that cut across clusters. | SMT |
| Human Rights | RBA is not always used as a necessary element of programming and implementation | More efforts are needed to ensure that RBA is practiced and implemented across actions | UNDP programming units, IPs, RPs |
| Gender Equality | Although this issue is satisfactorily dealt with in the CPD, IPs should play a more active role in its monitoring and implementation | Further sensitize IPs and RPs on gender equality needs and concerns | UNDP programming units |

**Analysis of UNDAF and CPD Observations, findings, conclusions and recommendations**

The present evaluation has been conducted shortly after the UNDAF evaluation; the shared aim of the two exercises was *generate lessons aimed at informing the design of UNDP’s continued support to Ghana as a middle income country[[26]](#footnote-27)*. In terms of general finding there were areas of strong convergence between the findings of the UNDAF evaluation and that of the CPD. This portents to systemic issues that need to discussed beyond the agency level. Below are some points of convergence,

Overall, the UNDAF evaluation found that the UN performance and delivery of UNDAF results was not adequately reflected in its reporting. This was due mainly to the weakness of its design, particularly the fact that it had too many outcomes.

Almost similarly the CPD shares the point that UNDP’s performance on its programs/projects lacks in performance in the areas of technical assistance and knowledge products sharing, due in large part to the large number of projects being managed by Program officers. The issue of external reporting also was observed in the where development partners who collaborate were of the view that reporting could be better.

In addition, the UNDAF evaluation observed a weak M&E framework in the design of the UNDAF this posed a big challenge; more so with technical gaps of CTO and M&E Specialists within the RCO

Similarly the CPD observed weak M&E structure at the country office and an emphasis on monitoring activities.The conduct of evaluations were not systemic in project/program design and the feedback loop for the integration of lessons learnt was also not institutionalised.There is no personnel tasked specifically with the responsibility of the M&E function/oversight with program officers conferred this responsiibility.The skill sets in M&E is disparate and therefore coherence in project/program M&E is erraatic downstrem at the cluster/project level and weak upstream at the country office level.

The above shortcoming are reflected in the recommendations of both the UNDAF and CPD evaluation. More specifically, in terms of the OECD/DAC criteria, the findings of this evaluation share with the UNDAF evaluation a number of points, as detailed in the table below.

Table :

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | UNDAF findings | CPD findings |
| Relevance | It was observed that the UNDAF document for the period was relevant to the Ghanaian context and takes into consideration country systems and policies. | Also observed in the CPD was the high relevance of the interventions to the country’s needs and priorities and that it fully reflected Ghana development priorities.  |
| Effectiveness | The effectiveness of the UNDAF document is average in light to the fact that it achieved about 60% of its results however the effectiveness of DaO leaves much more room for improvement in working together more closely in joint programming, delivering together, harmonizing processes, better coordination and joint resource mobilization. | CPD effectiveness is mixed. It seems higher in the SDC cluster, where the adoption of management tools has allowed for enhanced planning and monitoring. Programming, planning and management processes were observed to be very different across clusters. In some projects, the excessive number of stakeholders and activities hindered the impact and effectiveness of planned actions.  |
| Efficiency | The full measure of efficiency gains still leaves much more room for UN agencies to work more closely to increase efficiency gains. | The CPD noted some improvements but concluded that much needs to be done to improve resource planning, programme management, reporting (timing and format). Project resources seem correctly and reasonably allocated. |
| Sustainability | Sustainability of results is complex and the readiness of country systems to sustain gains of the UN is an area of further study. However, the support of the UN in policy development, research and capacity building will endure. | Sustainability is still an issue and s not adequately supported by management mechanisms and tools. Sustainability elements should be inserted in the CPD, in project documents and in reporting arrangements. However, the support of UNDP to Ghana’s policies through capacity building and other actions will surely continue. |
| The table below shows the main recommendations provided in the two evaluations. Major points of agreement are to be found under the efficiency and sustainability criteria. |
| Criteria | **UNDAF recommendations** | **CPD recommendations** |
| Effectiveness | Continuous capacity building of national institutions Exploring strategic innovative partnerships and enhancing South to South Cooperation | Re-think the structure of projectsReduce number of activities per projectsReduce number of stakeholders per project |
| Efficiency | Strengthening and enhancing M&E with IT systems Resource Mobilization strategy | Standardise management tools across clustersIntroduce a proper knowledge management system  |
| Sustainability | Sustainability planning. A clearly defined sustainability path should be developed and used in the implementation of the UNDAF. | More attention is required by IPs and RPs to make further use of the knowledge resources Insert a sustainability (exit strategy) section in all projects’ templates – including reporting - and in the CPDFocus on institutional sustainability, ensuring as much as possible that training material and knowledge resources are duly embedded in the beneficiary institutions. |
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## Annex 1. ToRs

**TERMS OF REFERENCE TO CONDUCT FINAL COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATION OF UNDP SUPPORTED PROGRAMME 2012-2017**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title | UNDP CPD-2012-2017 Evaluation  |
| Purpose  | This terms of reference is designed to guide the evaluation of the 2012-2017 Country Programme Document (CPD) of UNDP Ghana. |
| Location |  Accra – Ghana  |
| Application categories  | 1. An individual **international consultant** (Team leader) to undertake the evaluation of the CPD.
2. An individual **national consultant** (Team member) to partner with the international consultant to undertake the CDP evaluation.
 |
| Start date | September 2016 |
| Duration  | 36 Working Days Not later than November 17* 10 days for desk review and submission of draft inception report prior to arrival in Ghana
* 25 days in-country work including travel to other regions and locations outside Accra as may be required
 |

1. **INTRODUCTION**

UNDP’s corporate policy is to evaluate its development cooperation with the host government on a regular basis in order to assess whether and how UNDP-funded interventions contribute to the achievement of agreed outcomes, i.e. changes in the development situation and ultimately in people’s lives. Evaluating country programming therefore involves ascertaining whether and how UNDP has assisted in improving human development conditions, including for individuals, institutions and systems. Evaluation also helps to clarify underlying factors affecting development, to identify unintended consequences (positive and negative), to generate lessons learned and to recommend actions to improve performance in future programming.

2016 is the penultimate year of UNDAF implementation (2012-2016) and the UN System in collaboration with the Government of Ghana will be embarking on an independent evaluation of its cooperation. Under the framework of the UNDAF evaluation, it is also an opportune moment to commission an independent evaluation of the UN and UNDP’s contributions to Ghana.

From UNDP perspective, the evaluation is also very timely, as it provides an opportunity for a holistic evaluation and assessment of UNDP’s support to Ghana since the last assessment ADR was conducted in 2011 by the UNDP Evaluation office.

From the national perspective, 2016/17 are important years to steer strategic thinking around the future development priorities of the country. As Ghana adapts and adopts the SDGs, the UN system and UNDP are already contributing support to Ghana’s development of its 40-year Long Term National Development plan and the medium development frameworks ensuring the incorporation of the SDGs, the Africa Agenda 2063, the COP21 and other priorities.

The CPD evaluation, in tandem with the UNDAF evaluation and others, will generate lessons aimed at informing the design of UNDP’s continued support to Ghana as a middle income country. A particular focus will be on the extent to which the UNDP’s support addressed issues of sustainable human development, inclusive growth; democratic governance and consolidation of peace and how these can be improved. This evaluation will be conducted alongside, the overall UNDAF evaluation will present forward-looking recommendations to shape the design of the next phase of the programme.

This terms of reference is designed to guide the evaluation of the 2012-2017 Country Programme Document (CPD) of UNDP Ghana. The 2012-2017 CPD which is derived from the 2012-2017 United National Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The UNDAF 2012-2017 encapsulates the collective results the UN system in Ghana in collaboration with development partnership seek to achieve in support of the key development priorities of the Government as outlined in its medium term national development agenda (Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (GSGDA 1 and 11).

1. **BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

In 2010 Ghana moved above the World Bank threshold of Lower Middle Income (GNI per capita from $976-3,855), due in part to a GDP re-basing exercise. Additional revenues from oil that started flowing from the first major field and expected revenues from gas were anticipated to contribute to GDP growth of 15-20% in 2011 and 8% in 2012 (MoFEP, 2010). The discovery of the oil provided mixed opportunities for Ghana, it was underscored that if properly and transparently managed, this would expand opportunities for rapid growth which would lead to accelerated achievement of the MDGs. On the other side it also came with associated risks, learning from other countries with similar experiences.

The 2012-2017 CDP recognized that despite the discovery of the oil the country still faced major development challenges typical of low income economies: widespread poverty and widening inequality along with significant regional disparities and gender inequity; low educational achievement and limited health coverage; and high aid dependence and weak institutions.

In response to this the CPD (2012-2017) focused on making the most effective use of an expanded resource base to advance equitable development and consolidation of Ghana’s transformational gains. Thus, the key areas of focus are: Sustainable Human Development; Inclusive Growth; Democratic Governance and Consolidation of Peace.

**Sustainable Human Development:** the CPD outcome as captured in UNDAF states:

*“National systems and existing institutional arrangements for Climate Change mitigation and adaptation, and for disaster risk reduction, as defined in the Hyogo Framework for Action at the district, regional and national level are functional”.*

UNDP projects and programme for the period aimed at scaling-up its support for integrating adaptation and mitigation strategies and practices into development policies, plans and programmes. Interventions focused on the promotion and development of renewable energies and energy efficiency as well as on adaptation initiatives in vulnerable districts. At the institutional level, UNDP aimed to strengthen the capacity of the Climate Change Committee for policy development, participation in international negotiations and coordination of sectoral strategies on climate change. Support to the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, the private sector and key stakeholders to mobilize and access international funds on climate change were also critical components of the CPD.

**Promoting Inclusive Growth:** the CPD outcome as captured in UNDAF states:

*“Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Local Government and CSOs have effectively developed, funded, coordinated, implemented, monitored and evaluated national and sectoral policies, plans and programmes aimed at reducing poverty and inequalities and promoting inclusive social-economic growth by 2016”*

UNDP aimed to support change management processes in response to Ghana’s MIC status and the consequent capacity development (technical, institutional and enabling environment) of state institutions for development planning and management, monitoring and evaluation of programmes using reliable statistics, including gender disaggregated data. This included targeted training of key government officials, strategic institutional capacity support for key institutions such as Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, National Development and Planning Commission, Ghana Statistical Service and the Office of the President. UNDP also aimed to promote advocacy work on MDGs and emerging development agenda through production of analytical studies, MDG reports and Human Development Reports.

**Democratic Governance and Consolidation of Peace:** the CPD outcome as captured in UNDAF states:

“*Key national institutions of democracy are effective, accountable, gender responsive and promote peace, inclusive governance, human security with focus on vulnerable groups, by 2016”.*

UNDP within the period continued to build on gains made in the previous Programme with a focus on strengthening transparency and accountability systems, especially as Ghana started producing oil. Access to justice for the poor and vulnerable was aimed to expand through Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms under broad justice sector reforms. The High Level Judicial Council was aimed to be further supported to deepen collaboration among justice sector institutions in order to facilitate a holistic approach to justice delivery. UNDP also aimed to intensify support to Ghana’s decentralization and local governance towards increasing representation and participation of all stakeholders in decision-making and governance processes, especially for women and the disadvantaged.

1. **EVALUATION PURPOSE**

UNDP commissions CPD evaluations to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of its contributions to development results at the country level. This evaluation would be carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. In line with the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Ghana, the CPD evaluation is being conducted to assess the impact of UNDP’s development assistance across the major thematic and cross cutting areas of Governance, Sustainable Development and Inclusive Growth.

UNDP is commissioning this evaluation as to compliment the broader UNDAF evaluation, but with sharp focus on the 3 selected UNDAF outcomes to capture evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the current programme of UNDP, which would be used to strengthen existing programmes and to set the stage for new the preparation of new CPD. The evaluations serves an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in Ghana with an impartial assessment of the results of UNDP support.

1. **EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

This evaluation covers the period 2012-2016 of the CPD implementation. It would be conducted during the months September and October, with a view to enhancing programmes while providing strategic direction and inputs to the preparation of the next UNDP country programme and the next UNDAF, both scheduled to start in last quarter of 2016.

*Strategic Positioning, Concept and Design*

The Evaluation Team will assess the concept and design of the CPD and UNDP’s overall intervention in, including an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives.

*Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk Management*

A further focus of the evaluation will be on the extent to which adequate monitoring was undertaken throughout the period, and the extent to which evaluation systems were adequate to capture significant developments and inform responsive management. The evaluation will assess how Lessons Learned have been captured and operationalized throughout the period under investigation. It will look into how effectively the management of support to the UXO sector incorporated relevant global knowledge on good practices.

1. **EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

Specifically, the evaluation shall examine the following specific areas as catalogued in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Relevance | * Has UNDP been influential in national debates on Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development? Has it contributed to national priorities?
* To what extent are UNDP’s engagements a reflection of key strategic considerations, in the development context of Ghana in relation to its comparative advantage vis-a-vis other partners?
* To what extent has UNDP’s selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?
* To what extent have UN reforms influenced the relevance of UNDP support to the Government of Ghana as a LMIC
 |
| Effectiveness  | * What are the main contributions to development for which UNDP is recognized in the Country?
* Did UNDP programme accomplish its intended outcomes?
* What are the unexpected outcomes or consequences it yielded? What are their implications?
* Is the programme on track to achieve its results?
* To what extent has UNDP been effective in supporting local initiatives for MDG fulfilment? Considered in aggregate, are these local initiatives producing nationally significant results?
* Has UNDP been effective in advocating best practices and desired goals?
* What evidence is there that UNDP support has contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening?
* What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede UNDP performance in this area?
* Taking into account the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of the UNDP country office, is UNDP well suited to providing Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development initiatives in Ghana?
* Is UNDP perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development in Ghana?
* How effective has UNDP been in partnering with development partners, civil society and private sector in Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development?
* Has UNDP utilized innovative techniques and best practices in its programming in these areas?
 |
| Efficiency | * To what extent have the programme or projects outputs been efficient and cost effective?
* Has there been an economical use of resources? What could be done to ensure a more efficient use of resources in the country context? What are the main administrative constraints/ strengths?
* Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that UNDP has in place helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively?
* Has UNDP been efficient in building synergies and leveraging with other programmes and stakeholders in Ghana?
 |
| Sustainability | * What is the likelihood that the Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development initiatives which UNDP has supported are sustainable?
* What mechanisms have been set in place by UNDP to support the government of Ghana to sustain improvements and gains in these areas?
* How should the portfolio of activities be enhanced to support central authorities, local communities and civil society in improving service delivery over the long term?
* What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships with national institutions, CSOs, UN Agencies, private sector and other development partners in Ghana, in order to promote long term sustainability and durability of results?
 |
| Partnership and Coordination | * In the context of UNDAF delivery as one the evaluation will assess effectiveness and appropriateness of the collaborations and partnerships that were established to deliver support on the CPD and ultimately the UNDAF. This includes an assessment of the partnerships with key line ministries, as well as with international Development Partners, Non-Governmental Organizations, and local Non Profit Associations. The evaluation should draw conclusions about the extent to which the UN and UNDP were effective in coordination the support offered by all partners. It will also evaluation what risks were taken with regards to partnership management and how these were managed.
 |
| The evaluation questions should include an assessment of the extent to which the CPD design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration: Human rights * To what extent do the poor, vulnerable, indigenous and tribal peoples, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP’s work?

Gender Equality* To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring and reporting? Is gender marker data assigned to projects representative of reality (focus should be placed on gender marker 2 and 3 projects)?
* To what extent has UNDP supported Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development initiatives promoted positive changes in gender equality? Are there any unintended effects? Information collected should be checked against data from the UNDP country office’ Results-oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) during the period 2012 - 2015.

Based on the above analysis, the evaluators are expected to provide overarching conclusions on achievement of the 2012-2017 CPD, as well as identify key development priorities which shall inform the focus the CPD. The evaluation is additionally expected to offer wider lessons for UNDP support in Ghana and elsewhere. |

1. **METHODOLOGY AND APPROACHES**

An overall guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the *UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results* and the *UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*.

The evaluation will be carried out by an external team of evaluators, and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including national and local government officials, donors, civil society organizations, academics and subject experts, private sector representatives and community members.

The evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change’’ (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that UNDP has supported, and observed progress in Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development growth initiatives at national and local levels in Ghana. The evaluators will develop a logic model of how UNDP interventions in these area are expected to lead to improved national transformation.

Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, evaluations and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits.

The following steps in data collection are anticipated:

***Desk Review***

A desk review should be carried out of the key strategies and documents underpinning the work of UNDP in Ghana in support of Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development. This includes reviewing the UNDAF and pertinent country programme documents AWPS, monitoring and evaluation documents etc., to be provided by the UNDP country office.

The evaluators are expected to review pertinent strategies, national plans and reports developed by the Government of Ghana that are relevant to UNDPs support in Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development.

***Field Data Collection***

Following the desk review, the evaluators will build on the documented evidence through an agreed set of field and interview methodologies, including:

* Interviews with key partners and stakeholders
* Field visits to project sites and partner institutions
* Survey questionnaires where appropriate
* Participatory observation, focus groups, and rapid appraisal techniques

**D. DELIVERABLES**

The following reports and deliverables are required for the evaluation:

* Inception report
* Draft CDP Evaluation Report
* Presentation at the validation workshop with key stakeholders, (partners and beneficiaries)
* Final CPD Evaluation report and a separate Lesson learned report extracted from the full report.

Ten working days following the contract signing, the evaluation manager will produce an **inception report** containing the proposed theory of change for UNDPs of the CDP outcomes. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables, and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. Protocols for different stakeholders should be developed. The inception report will be discussed and agreed with the UNDP country office before the evaluators proceed with site visits. The evaluator will also propose a rating scale in order that Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability

The **draft evaluation report** will be shared with stakeholders, and presented in a validation workshop, that the UNDP country office will organise. Feedback received from these sessions should be taken into account when preparing the final report. The evaluators will produce an ‘audit trail’ indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the **final report**.

The suggested table of contents of the evaluation report is as follows:

1. Title
2. Table of Contents
3. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations
4. Executive Summary
5. Introduction
6. Description of the interventions
7. Evaluation Scope and Objectives
8. Evaluation approach and methods
9. Data Analysis
10. Findings and conclusions
11. Recommendations
12. Lessons Learned
13. Annexes
14. **EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES**

The CPD evaluation will be undertaken a team of two one international/external evaluator (Team Leader) and one national evaluator. Both international and national consultants can be considered for these positions.

Required Qualifications of the International Consultant (Team Leader)

* + Minimum Master’s degree in economics, public administration, regional development/planning or any other social sciences related to economic management and pro-poor development;
	+ Vast experience in conducting Output/outcome/impact/CPD/UNDAF evaluations.
	+ Strong working knowledge of UNDP and its mandate, the civil society and working with government authorities;
	+ Extensive knowledge of results-based management evaluation, as well as participatory M&E methodologies and approaches;
	+ Experience in applying SMART (S Specific; M Measurable; A Achievable; R Relevant; T Time-bound) indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
	+ Extensive professional experience in the area of development, including gender equality and social policies;
	+ Strong reporting and communication skills; excellent communication skills with various partners including donors;
	+ Knowledge on mainstreaming Gender and Human rights in projects and programmes; and,
	+ Evidence of similar evaluations conducted. Previous experience on UNDP output/outcome/impact/CPD/UNDAF evaluations.

The **Team Leader** will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the final evaluation report. The team leader will perform the following tasks:

* Lead and manage the evaluation mission;
* Design the detailed evaluation scope and methodology and approach;
* Ensure efficient division of tasks between the mission members;
* Conduct the CPD evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation and UNDP evaluation guidelines;
* Draft and present the Inception Report, the Draft and Final evaluation report;
* Finalize the evaluation report and submit it to UNDP

Required qualification of the Evaluator (National Consultant)

* Be a Ghanaian citizen with extensive experience working in Ghana during the last 15 years
* Minimum Master’s degree in social sciences
* Extensive experience in evaluation process and techniques
* Have strong communication skills
* Have good experience working with UN agencies will be an added advantage
* Have excellent reading and writing skills in English
* Have a strong understanding of the development context in Ghana and preferably understanding of the strategic Poverty and inclusive growth issues within the Ghanaian context.

The evaluator will, *inter alia*, perform the following tasks:

* Review documents;
* Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology;
* Conduct the evaluation in accordance with the proposed objectives and scope of the evaluation;
* Draft related parts of the evaluation report as agreed with the Evaluation Manager; and
* Assist the Team Leader in finalizing the draft and final evaluation report.
1. **Evaluation Ethics**

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’ and sign the Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations. In particular, evaluators must be free and clear of perceived conflicts of interest. To this end, interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly and substantively involved, as an employee or consultant, in the formulation of UNDP strategies and programming relating to the CPD under evaluation. The code of conduct and an agreement form to be signed by each consultant are included in Annex 1.

***Implementation Arrangements***

The UNDP Ghana country office will select the evaluation team, and will be responsible for the management of the evaluators. UNDP will designate a focal point for the evaluation and any additional staff to assist in facilitating the process (e.g., providing relevant documentation, arranging visits/interviews with key informants, etc.). The Country Office will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report. The Assistant Country Director Programme will arrange introductory meetings within UNDP and Unit Heads to establish initial contacts with government partners and project staff. The consultants will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The UNDP country office will develop a management response to the evaluation within two weeks of report finalization.

The Task Manager of the Project will convene an Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detail rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

While the Country Office will provide some logistical support during the evaluation, for instance assisting in setting interviews with senior government officials, it will be the responsibility of the evaluators to logistically and financially arrange their travel to and from relevant project sites and to arrange most interviews. Planned travels and associated costs will be included in the Inception Report, and agreed with the Country Office.

**J. DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Responsible party | Timeframe/Deadline |
| Desk review, Evaluation design and work plan (Inception report) | Evaluation team | 5 days |
| Field visits, interviews with partners, and key stakeholders | Evaluation team | 20 days |
| Drafting of the evaluation and lesson learned reports | Evaluation team | 5 days |
| Debriefing with UNDP  | Evaluation team |  1/2day |
| Debriefing with partners | Partners and the Evaluation team | 1/2day |
| Finalization of the evaluation reports (incorporating comments received on first drafts) | Evaluation team | 5 days |
| Total No. of Working Days |  | **36** |

**I. FEE**

The consultants will be recruited and paid in accordance with UN conditions and procedures. The below structure may apply

* 20% upon submission and acceptance of an inception report, indicating preparations made and how the assignment is going to be executed.
* 40% on submission and acceptance of Draft Final Report.
* 40% on submission and acceptance of Final Report.

**J. CONSULTANT SELECTION PROCESS**

The proposals will be evaluated based on the merit of the proposed approach, including the following;

* 10%. Qualification and experience
* 15%. Technical approach as illustrated in the description of the proposed methodology.
* 10%. Timeline reflecting proposed activities, which emphasis the ability to meet the proposed deadlines
* 20%. Evidence of experience of the consultant in conducting evaluations as detailed in the CV
* 15%. Reference from Past performance. To enable this reference check is carried out, applicants are required to provide a list of all related consultancies/ evaluations conducted during the past three years with associated contact details of references.
* 30% Financial

## Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevant Evaluation Criteria | Key Evaluation Questions | Sub-questions | Indicators where applicable | Sources of data | Data collection methods |
| 1.Relevance and Design | **1.1.** How relevant and appropriate has been the UNDP intervention to national policies and strategies? | **1.1.1**.To what extent were project stakeholders including beneficiaries involved in the formulation and design of the project  | Degree of engagement between UNDP and Implementation Partners/ Responsible partners in the design of the project | Grant Agreement, Appraisal Report, feedback from IPs/RPs  | Project documents review and analysis, interviews with UNDP Project Staff, face to face interviews with IP/RP focal points, face to face interviews with beneficiaries, and officials  |
| 1.1.2 To what extent has UNDP’s selected approach /method of delivery appropriate to the development context? | Responsiveness of the project to the priorities of GoG, Perceptions of project beneficiaries and stakeholders, priorities of objectives and vision | UNDP AWPs, Evaluation reports and Feedback from IPs/RPs and stakeholders | Document review, project progress reports and analysis and stakeholder interview |
| 1.1.3 To what extent have UN reforms influenced the relevance of UNDP support to the Government of Ghana as a LMIC? | Degree of relationship/attribution of UNDP reform vis a vis program interventions design. | Project documents- Appraisal, MTR, Progress reports | Documents review and face to face interview with project implementation team |
| 2. Effectiveness | **2.1** What are the main contributions to development for which UNDP is recognized in the Country? | 2.1.1 What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede UNDP performance in this area? | Actual outputs and outcomes achieved as against the expected | Project Reports, MTR report, Project completion report, UNDP PMU, MMDAs, Private Sector and, UNDP | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
| 2.1.2 Is UNDP well suited and well perceived to support Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development initiatives in Ghana? |  | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
|  | **2.2** How has the programme achieved expected outcomes? | **2.2.1** How effective have been practices and tools used in the programme? (support to local initiatives, best practices, institutional strengthening) | Changes in UNDP’s capacity to support MMDAs Changes in MMDAs skills and competencies in relation to delivery of mandate. | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
| **2.2.2** How effective has UNDP been in partnering with development partners, civil society and private sector in Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development? |  | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
| **2.3** What are the unexpected outcomes or consequences it yielded? What are their implications? | **2.3.1** What challenges were experienced and how did it affect the achievement of the desired outcomes | challenges and their effect on project outcomes | Project Reports, Aide Memoires, Project Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP PMU, MMDAs | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
| **2.3.2**. Has UNDP utilized innovative techniques and best practices in its programming in these areas? |  | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
| 3.Efficiency | **3.1. To what** extent was the management was adequate to the planning and execution requirements?  | **3.1.1** Was the management Arrangements, Work Planning appropriate? Finance and co-finance, value for money, Timing and delays, Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, Stakeholder Engagement, Reporting, Communications). | Number of activities implemented by component and cost Outputs delivered (actual against expected) Deviations or variations between planned and actual. | Project documents: appraisals, progress , Project Completion report measured against the PMF | Documents review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| **3.2** Strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the project?  |  | Pace with which work plans and budgets were approved, pace with which requests for procurements and project monies were signed off and made available to UNDP | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
| **3.3**.Critically analyse the implementation, coordination and feedback mechanisms for Integrating lessons and recommendations into the project’s decision making cycle. | **3.3.1**. what were the systems and mechanisms used for tracking performance of the project How did the project monitoring and evaluation frame work influenced co-ordination and decision making  | Effectiveness of project coordination mechanisms, degree of participation of MMDAs/stakeholders in project decision making processes, degree to which project implementation processes promoted knowledge management (amongst beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders).xx | Project beneficiaries, UNDP PMU, Project Reports, Aide Memoires, UNDP staff, Project Stakeholders | Document reviews and analysisStakeholder interviews |
|  | **3.3.2.** To what extent did the absence of a project implementation plan (Road Map) affected implementation and resource utilisation | Timeliness in activities implementation, Project's absorption rates (of project funds), consonance between Project and MMDAs work plans  | Project beneficiaries, UNDP PMU, Project Reports, Aide Memoires, UNDP staff, Project Stakeholders | Documents review and analysisStakeholder interviews |
|  | **3.3.3**. To what extent was the Project Steering Committee effective and efficient in addressing issues and challenges affecting the smooth implementation of the project? | Frequency of ISC meetings, Speed with which project work plans and budgets were approved, ISC's general performance in relation to T.O.Rs, mechanisms in place for integrating findings, recommendations and lessons learnt from project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries into the project’s decision making cycle? | Project Steering Committee members, Project Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP staff, UNDP PMU, project beneficiaries, Project reports, | Documents review and analysis Stakeholder interviews |
| **3.4.** Assess the project’s flexibility to respond to opportunities and challenges encountered during implementation | **3.4.1.** To what extent were findings and recommendations from project reports, lessons learnt and feedback from stakeholders and partners integrated into project planning and implementation | -Timeliness of reporting and robustness of feedback mechanism-Project response to delays in No Objections Clearance by UNDP | UNDP PMU, UNDP Project Staff, Project beneficiaries, Aide Memoires, MTR and Project reports | Documents review and analysisStakeholder interviews |
| 4. Sustainability | **4.1**.Assess the sustainability of the project in terms of the likelihood of continuation of the regional integration process including activities/results, outcomes/benefits after completion of UNDP funding; | **4.1.1**. Will the project benefits and results be sustained after the expiration of the grant | Degree to which project outcomes and lessons learnt have helped shape UNDP PMU's capacity to support MMDAs in delivery of mandate | UNDP PMU, UNDP Project Staff Project beneficiaries | Documents review and analysisStakeholder interviews |
| 5. Partnership and Coordination | **5.1** Aassess effectiveness and appropriateness of the collaborations and partnerships that were established to deliver support on the CPD and UNDAF.  | Partnership with Government  | Number of actionable request from government agencies | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
| Partnership with development partners | Number and progression of collaborations with other development partners  | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
| Partnership with NGOs and non-profit associations | Number and degree of engagements with NGOs | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
| 6. Human Rights | **6.1** Assessment of UNDP’s promotion of Human Rights in its program design and implementation | **6.1.1** To what extent do the poor, vulnerable, indigenous and tribal peoples, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP’s work? | Extent to which projects have a pro-poor, pro marginalised groups  | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
| 7. Gender Equality | **7.1** The extent to which UNDP has promoted positive changes in gender equality in its Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development initiatives?  | **7.1.1**To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring and reporting? Is gender marker data assigned to projects representative of reality (focus should be placed on gender marker 2 and 3 projects)?  | Number of projects with explicit gender considerations. | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
| **7.1.2** Are there any unintended effects? Information collected should be checked against data from the UNDP country office’ Results-oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) during the period 2012 - 2015. | Advantages or disadvantages outside the core project objectives | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview  |
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## Annex 5. List of persons interviewed

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Position | Institution | Contact Number | Email |
| Christine Ann Evans-Klock | UNDP Resident Representative and Resident Coordinator | UNDP | 0501413768 | christine.evans-klock@one.un.org |
| Dominic Sam | Country Director | UNDP | 0501323114 | Dominc.sam@undp.org  |
| Mulugeta Abebe | Deputy Country Director Operations | UNDP | 0501414103 | Mulugeta.abebe@undp.org |
| Louis Kuukpen | Assistant Country Director Programmes | UNDP | 0501323258 | Louis.kuukpen @undp.org  |
| Radhika Lal | Senior Economist | UNDP | +233 501323610 | Radhika.Lal@undp.org  |
| Nana Teiba Chinbuah | Head Democratic Governance Cluster | UNDP | +233 248134732 | Nana.chinbuah@undp.org  |
| Kordzo Sedegah | Head-Inclusive Growth Cluster | UNDP | +233244271847 | Kordzo.sedegah@undp.org  |
| Paolo Dalla Stella | Head-Sustainable Development Cluster  | UNDP | +233 546 260994 | paolo.d.stella@undp.org  |
| Jennifer Asuako |  | UNDP | 0209017736 | Jennifer.asuako@undp.org  |
| Godfrey Appiah-Kubi | Finance Head | UNDP | 0501323267 | godfrey.appiah-kubi@undp.org  |
| Peter Segbedzi-Pongo | ***Head of Programme Mgt Support*** | UNDP | +233 501323268 | peter.segbedzi-pongo@undp.org  |
| Chika-Charles  | Programme Specialist  | UNDP | 0501516720 | chikacharles.aniekwe@undp.org |
| Justice Agbezuge  | Peace Analyst  | UNDP | 0265060628 | justice.agbezuge@undp.org |
| Dr Edward Salifu Mahama | Director | University for Development Studies (UDS) | 0243821111/0205975918 | drsalifu@uds.edu.ghedsalifu@yahoo.co.ukkatanfe@gmail.com |
| Dr Abdulai Abubakari | Deputy Director | University for Development Studies (UDS) | 0244890768/0208318665/0268318665 | abdulai.abubakari@uds.edu.ghabkaria72@yahoo.co.uk |
| Mamudu Abunga Akudugu | Head of Consultancy Services | University for Development Studies (UDS) | 0240052058/0504395605 | makudugu@uds.edu.ghabungah@gmail.commacmoudan@yahoo.com |
| Amadu Mahama | Chairman | New Energy | 0200799601/0243229810 | mahama.amadu@gmail.com |
| Mrs. Christiana Akpilima-Atibil | Director – Research, Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation | Savannah Accelerated Development Authority (SADA) | 0506153950 | cakpilima-atibil@sadagh.org |
| Danse Sam | Director – Corporate Affairs & Relationship Coordination | Savannah Accelerated Development Authority (SADA) | 0501329532 | ssdanse@sadagh.org |
| Robert Nana Mensah | Assistant Commissioner – Communication & Public Affairs SPR-IPR Ghana | Ghana Revenue Authority (GRA) | 0244363269/0233363269 | ronamen@gmail.com |
| Michael Ayesu | Director- External Resource Mobilisation Multilateral Division | Ministry of Finance | 0302663304 | MAyesu@mofep.gov.gh |
| Prof. Stephen Bugu Kendie | Full Professor/Provost- College of Humanities and Legal Studies | University of Cape Coast (UCC) | 0208123677/0244802516 | skendie@ucc.edu.ghstephenkendie@gmail.com |
| Dr. Simon Mariwah | Head, Department of Geography and Regional Planning | University of Cape Coast (UCC) | 0243257101 | smariwah@ucc.edu.gh |
| Dr. Patrick Osei-Kufuor | Research Fellow, Institute for Development Studies (IDS) | University of Cape Coast (UCC) | 0243418374 | posei-kufuor@ucc.edu.gh |
| Prof. S.B. Kendie | Head, Institute for Development Studies (IDS) | University of Cape Coast (UCC) | 0208123677 | skendie@ucc.edu.gh |
| Yaw Kwakye | Head, Climate Change Unit | Forestry Commission (FC) | 0244769874 | ykwakye.hq@fcghana.orgbeemayaw@gmail.com |
| Yoshihiko Higuchi | First Secretary | Embassy of Japan in Ghana | 0244326463 (Ghana)+231 (0)888517510/+231 (0)770517510 (Liberia) | yoshihiko.higuchi@mofa.go.jp |
| Lasse Moller | Counsellor (Development) | Embassy of Denmark | 0244311273/0302208730 | lassmo@um.dk |
| Eugene Yirbuor | Tamale Sub-Office Coordinator | USAID Ghana | 0244329953 | eyirbuor@usaid.gov |
|  | Representative  | Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) Ghana Office | 0244330212/0302760781 | Kakehashi.Taro@jica.go.jp |
| Sylvester Bagulo Bayowo | Programmes Officer- Governance and Decentralization Education and Gender | Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) Ghana Office | 0243578745/0553121472 | BayowoSylvesterb.GN@jica.go.jpsylvesterb@yahoo.com |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Institution  | Contact  | Attention  | Email  | Contact number  |
| GOVERNANCE |
| CHRAJ | Whittal Joseph, Deputy Commissioner, Accra |   | josephwhittal@ymail.com | 0245990644 |
|   | Ms. Gloria Gyedu | ggyedu@yahoo.com; |   |
| Legal Aid Scheme | Director of Legal Aid,Opposite DOVVSU HQ, Accra | Mr. Yahaya Alhassan Seini | 'eswaia@hotmail.com' | 0244224498 |
| Ghana Anti-Corruption Coalition | Linda Ofori Kwafo, Executive Secretary - GACC P. O. Box GP 17921, Accra-Ghana |   | lokwafo@gaccgh.org/ lynkwaf@yahoo.com;  |   |
|   | Ms. Sandra Arthur | sarthur@gaccgh.org | 0244636330 |
| Ministry of Justice and Attorney General’s Department | The Chief Director, MoJAGD, Accra | Ms. Sandra Thompson | ewuramasthompson@gmail.com | 0208169767 |
| Customs Division of GRA | The Commissioner, HQ Accra | Mr. Robert Mensah | ronamen@gmail.com | 0244363269 |
| Inter-Ministerial Coordinating Committee on Decentralization | Mr. Callistus Mahama The Executive Secretary IMCC, East Legon, Accra | Mr. Gameli Hoedoafia | ghoedoafia@imccod.gov.gh | 0200131455 |
| Youth Bridge Foundation | The Director | Mr. Seth Oteng | otengseth@yahoo.com | 0243229505 |
| Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection | Director, Department of Gender, near Accra City Campus, Accra | Mrs. Catherine Bobmilliar | bobmilliarcathy@yahoo.com | 0208236475 |
| CDD, Ghana | Head of Research and Programs/Deputy Director |  Franklin Oduro  | f.oduro@cddgh.org | 0244350266 |
| National Peace Council | Executive Secretary |   | georgeamoh@ymail.com |   |
|   | Francis Azuimah | francis.awenlateyazuimah@yahoo.com | 0205896978 |
| Ghana Aids Commission (GAC) | Dr. Angela El-Adas. Director General |   |   |   |
|   | Kwaku Osei | kosei@ghanaids.gov.gh | 0244247277 |
| Electoral Commission (EC) | Mrs. Charlotte Osei | Yvonne Kemevor | fisakodie@yahoo.ca | 0504523232 |
| EC Chairperson  | 0303968750 |
| Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping and Training Centre (KAIPTC) | Air Vice Marshall Griffiths Santrofi Evans. The Commandant |   |   |   |
|   | Dr. Kwesi Aning | Kwesi.aning@kaiptc | 0244693782 |
| National Commission on Small Arms (NACSA) | Jones Applerh. The Executive Secretary |   |   |   |
|   | Johnson Asante-Twum | jatbarima@yahoo.co.uk | 0244722087 |
| Peoples’ National Convention (PNC) | The General Secretary | Mr. Emmanuel Wilson | emmawilson.jr@gmail.com | 0244044045 |
|   | Hajia Hajara M. Ali | hajmusali@gmail.com | 0244807617 |
| Progressive Peoples’ Party (PPP) | The National Secretary |   |   |   |
|   | Mr. William Dowokpor | billdowokpor@gmail.com | 0243588422 |
| Convention Peoples’ Party (CPP) | The General Secretary | Mr. Kadri Abdul Rauf | kadri.rauf@gmail.com | 0273464465 |
|   | Haruna Hamdatu Ibrahim | harunahamdatu@yahoo.com | 0200000938 |
| New Patriotic Party | The General Secretary  | Mr. Peter Mack Manu | pmacmanu@hotmail.com | 0244313631 |
| National Democratic Congress | The General Secretary | Mr. Ahmed M. Gedel | ahmedgedel@yahoo.com | 0277781540 |
|   | Dr. Catherine |   | 0249631055 |
| Institute for Democratic Governance (IDEG) | Executive Director | Emmanuel O. Akwetey | eakwetey@ideg.org | 0302-543320 / 543295 |
|   |   | drakwetey@yahoo.com | 0244 325157 |
| SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CLUSTER |
| Energy Commission | The Executive Secretary | Kwabena Otu-Danquah | otu-danquahk@energycom.gov.gh | 0277850756 |
|   | Paula Edze | pedze@energycom.gov.gh | 0265676250 |
|   | Kofi Agyarko | kofiagyarko@gmail.com | 0277705242 |
| Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation | The Chief Director | Fredua Agyeman | fredua\_agyeman@hotmail.com | 0242184162 |
|   | Peter Dery | peterjdery@yahoo.com | 0243646749 |
| Environmental Protection Agency | The Executive Director | Daniel Tutu Benefoh | dbenefor2000@yahoo.com | 0246114652 |
|   | Emmanuel Quansah | eosaequansah@yahoo.com | 0244633992 |
| Emmanuel Tachie Obeng | etachieobeng@gmail.com | 0240973625 |
| Christine Asare | christina.asare@yahoo.com | 0244612911 |
| Lambert Faabeluon | lfaabeluon@gmail.com |   |
| Ministry of Health | The Chief Director | Mr. Isaac Adams | isaac.adams@moh-ghana.org |   |
| Ghana Health Service | The Director General | Dr. Edith Clarke | edith.clarke@ghsmail.org |   |
| National Disaster Management Organization | The National Coordinator | Dr. Kingsford Asamoah | kingasam@gmail.com | 0547776056 |
|   | Koranteng Abrokwa | kofikabrokwah@yahoo.com |   |
| Ghana Cocoa Board | Chief Executive Officer | Tei Quartey | teiquartey@gmail.com | 0244619102 |
|   | Eric Bani | ekokabama@gmail.com | 0243212214 |
| MINISTRY OF FINANCE |
| Ministry of Finance | The Chief Director | Mrs. Gladys Ghartey | GGhartey@mofep.gov.gh | 0202030296 |
|   | Robert Mensah | ROMensah@mofep.gov.gh | 0573341533 |
|   | Ebenezer Nortey | enortey@mofep.gov.gh | 0208439187 |
| INCLUSIVE GROWTH CLUSTER |
| Ghana Statistical Service | Dr. Philomena Nyarko Government Statistician |   |   |   |
|   | Sylvester Gyamfi | Sgyamfi1958@yahoo.com | 024388 8570 |
| National Development Planning Commission |  |  Stephen Ampem-Darko |  tsikngh@yahoo.co.uk |  0206497100 |
|   | Kweku Adjei-Fosu | kwakujnr@yahoo.co.uk | 024482 4402 |
| Savannah Accelerated Development Authority  | Charles Abugre Chief Executive Officer |   | cabugre@sadagh.org | 0501334144 |
|   | Salifu-Samson Danse | ssdanse@sadagh.org | 0501329532 |

Partnership with Government

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Government | Private Sector |
| Governance | Peace  | NPC, GNACSA, NMC, |  |
| J-PASS | EC |  |
| T &A | CHRAJ, LAS, Customs, MOJAG |  |
| R &P | IMCC, EC, MoGCSP, CRIC, GAC, NCCE |  |
| Inclusive Growth |  | NDPC,GSS, MoF, SADA, MOTI, OoP | MTN |
| Sustainable Development |  | MESTI, EPA, MOH, GHS, NADMO, Energy Commission, COCOBOD, PEF, GSA, Forestry Commission | Mondelez |
|  |  |  |  |

Partnership with development partners

**Partnerships with Embassies, Multilaterals and Bilateral**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Embassies/High Commissions | Bilateral | Multilaterals |
| Governance | Peace  | Japan, Canada, Norway | USAID, EU | UN Women |
| J-PASS |  |  |  |
| T &A |  |  |  |
| R &P | Canada | DANIDA |  |
| Inclusive Growth |  |  |  | Worldbank |
| Sustainable Development |  |  | Denmark, Norway, Japan, Italy, Germany, EU, Australia | GEF, Adaptation Fund, World Bank, Montreal Protocol |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Partnership with NGOs and non-profit associations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Civil Society and academia | Private Sector |
| Governance | Peace  | KAIPTC, UCC, IDEG |  |
| J-PASS | NDC, NPP, PNC, CPP, PPP |  |
| T &A | GACC, GenCed |  |
| R &P | GACC, YBF, DoG, CDD, GenCED YES, IMCC, LogNET, APRM, ILGS, YBF,CRIC, |  |
| Inclusive Growth |  | UDS, Housing the Masses,  | MTN |
| Sustainable Development |  | New Energy, Energy Foundation, KNUST, UCC, KASA | Mondelez |

1. Figures for 2012. Source [Revised 2015 Annual Gross Domestic Product](http://www.statsghana.gov.gh/docfiles/GDP/GDP2016/Revised_Annual_2015_GDP_September%202016%20Edition.pdf) (Sept 2016) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. More, 2010 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. See <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/DT.ODA.ODAT.GN.ZS?locations=GH> and <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/DT.ODA.ODAT.XP.ZS?locations=GH> for figures [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. On 3 April 2015, Ghana signed onto a 3-year Extended Credit Facility (ECF) arrangement with the IMF with a view to stabilizing the economy. See IMF [Ghana: Third Review under the ECF Arrangement](http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/longres.aspx?sk=44320.0) (October 03, 2016); the prevailing difficult economic conditions also impacted the fiscal situation. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Page 3 Terminal evaluation: Promoting Appliance Energy Efficiency and Transformation of the Refrigeration Appliances Market in Ghana by Klinckenberg Consultants-Netherlands Feb 2016 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Assessment of Development Results: Ghana, UNDP, 2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. e.g. faciliating 2 national consultations in the lead up to the SDGs (2013, 2014), collaborative ctivities with the UNDP's centre of UNDP Global Centre for Public Service Excellence at Singapore and with UNDESA to introduce foresight and modelling tools for sustainable development to better implement an integrated sustainable development agenda [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Source: ROAR 205. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. See http://www.ndpc.gov.gh/search\_detail/publications/1433/ [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Source: ROAR 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. See here for brief of objectives and activities. <http://moti.gov.gh/document/1445342845/the-ghana-commodity-exchange-and-warehouse-receipt-system-project>. The post UNDP phase 2 was launched by the [President on 23 June 2015](http://www.ghana.gov.gh/index.php/media-center/news/1522-ghana-launches-gcx-to-boost-agriculture) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Within the 2015 national housing policy there is recognition of the high cost of building materials, and SADA has also been exploring the use of different technologies to reduce the cost of housing in the NSEZ. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. See <http://maps.sadagh.org/> the portal is being revamped and re-organized [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. M&E is an issues across many agencies and entities and is a subject which requires a broader discussion, outside the scope of this evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. UNDP staff comments that some activities do in fact need to be repeated and that the question *is to improve collaboration modalities to find ways to help partners innovate, make available information in more useful and integrated ways*. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. The ROAR, among others, makes a positive reference to the cluster’s M&E tool: *This can be largely attributed to the improved work planning, monitoring and reporting process, made possible by the development of the Sustainable Development Cluster monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system in 2014.* [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. CO UN Retreat, 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. See full UNDP Country Office staff list as on Dec 2016 in Annex 5 [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. 1. Terminal Evaluation-African Adaptation Program Hhana March 2013

2.Mid-term Evaluation-Promotion of appliance of Energy Efficiency and Transformation of the Refrigeration Appliance Market in Ghana-June 2013

3. End-of project Evaluation-Institutional Support to integrate Climate Change and Disaster Risk into national Development march 2015

4.Terminal Evaluation- Promotion of appliance of Energy Efficiency and Transformation of the Refrigeration Appliance Market in Ghana Feb 2016

5.Terminal Evaluation Integrating Climate Change into the Management of Priority Health Risks in Ghana March 2016 [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. At the macro level, UNDP supported Ghana towards a sustainable transition to LMIC in 2010 through: the *Moving Towards MIC Status: Potential Implications for Development Assistance and Achievement of MDGs* in Ghana UNDP-IEA 2011; transitional aid effectiveness and partnership strategies (The *Ghana Aid Policy and Strategy: 2011-2015* (revised 2014-17) ; and leveraging *Partnership for Shared Growth and Development: Government of Ghana – Development Partners*

-

Support for the development of a transitional aid effectiveness and partnership strategies (The Ghana Aid Policy and Strategy: 2011-2015 (revised 2014-17) ; and leveraging Partnership for Shared Growth and Development: Government of Ghana – Development Partners *Compact* (2012 – 2022)) and more recently support for developing a (currently draft) development cooperation (as opposed to aid) policy, in line with the SDG era; and more varied opportunities to engage on non-official development cooperation. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-ghana-election-idUSKBN13Y0HA> - Reuters, 9th December 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Assessment of development results – Evaluation of UNDP contribution, Ghana, 2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. The team that the following observations derive from interviews with a few DPs,(DANIDA,JICA,USAID and Japanese Embassy) [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. See Putting the ‘rights-based approach’ to development into perspective, ANDREA CORNWALL & CELESTINE NYAMU-MUSEMBI, 2004 where it is stated that *although on the whole it seems that most UN agencies are still trying to figure out what a rights approach as such means, and what programming around it would entail, some UN agencies such as UNICEF and UNDP are ahead of the rest.* [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. ToRs. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)