



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

ANNEXES – BHUTAN

United Nations Development Programme
Independent Evaluation Office

Independent Country Programme Evaluation

Contents

Annex 1. EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE	2
Annex 2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	12
Annex 3. PERSONS CONSULTED	15
Annex 4. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	21
Annex 5. STATUS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME ACTION PLAN (CPAP) OUTCOME INDICATORS.....	24

Annex 1. EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts “Independent Country Programme Evaluations (ICPEs)”, previously called “Assessments of Development Results (ADRs),” to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level, as well as the effectiveness of UNDP’s strategy in facilitating and leveraging national effort for achieving development results. The purpose of an ICPE is to:

- Support the development of the next UNDP Country Programme Document
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board

ICPEs are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.¹ The IEO is independent of UNDP management and is headed by a Director who reports to the UNDP Executive Board. The responsibility of the IEO is two-fold: (a) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision making and improvement; and (b) enhance the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function, and its coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations reform and national ownership.

Following the first country programme evaluation conducted in 2007, this is the second country-level evaluation conducted by the IEO in Bhutan. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration with the Government of Bhutan, UNDP Bhutan country office, and UNDP Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific. Results of the ICPE are expected to feed into the development of the new country programme 2019-2023.

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

The Kingdom of Bhutan is a small, landlocked country in the eastern Himalayas, bordered by China in the north and India in the south. With a total area of 38,394 km²,² it is the smallest state located entirely within the Himalaya mountain range, with a population of 789,207 (2017).³

As one of the youngest democracies in the world, the government became Democratic Constitutional Monarchy⁴ in 2008, where His Majesty the King is the Head of State. Since then Bhutan successfully conducted two elections and formed a democratic government. The Prime Minister is the Head of Government. The current Prime Minister is Mr. Tshering Tobgay, leader of the People’s Democratic Party, one of the major political parties in Bhutan, who took office in 2013.

The concept of ‘Gross National Happiness’ in Bhutan promotes a balanced approach to development that encompasses good governance, environmental conservation, cultural preservation and community vitality,

¹ See UNDP Evaluation Policy: www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf. The ICPE will also be conducted in adherence to the Norms and the Standards and the ethical Code of Conduct established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (www.uneval.org).

² National Statistics Bureau, Royal Government of Bhutan, ‘Bhutan at a glance 2016’: <http://www.nsb.gov.bt/publication/files/pub3kg7317hg.pdf>

³ National Statistics Bureau, Royal Government of Bhutan: <http://www.nsb.gov.bt/main/main.php#&slider1=4>

⁴ The Constitution of the Kingdom of Bhutan.

in addition to traditional socioeconomic indicators. Building on the United Nations General Assembly resolution 65/309 on happiness, Bhutan has contributed to the global dialogue on holistic and sustainable development, including the United Nations post-2015 development agenda.

After an economic slowdown in 2013, Bhutan's GDP rebounded to a growth rate of 6.49 percent in 2015—0.75 percentage points higher than the 2014 growth rate.⁵ This economic growth is projected to continue, reaching 8.2 percent in 2017, and 9.9 percent in 2018.⁶ The economy of Bhutan is largely dependent on the sustainability of its natural resources, with hydropower, tourism, agriculture and forestry as the main sources of revenue. In 2015, agriculture and forestry share 16.7 percent of the country's GDP; however, it employed 59 percent of the country's working population,⁷ and remains the primary source of livelihood for the majority of the population. Construction accounts for 15.6 percent of the country's GDP (2015), whereas it only employs 1.8 percent of the working population,⁸ due to the fact that many construction projects rely on Indian migrant workers, a practice that is slowly changing. The economy of Bhutan ties closely to India through monetary and trade linkages.

The GINI coefficient of Bhutan in 2013 was 0.381,⁹ indicating that the country has a low level of inequality. Nevertheless, with a per capita GDP of US\$2719.11 (2015),¹⁰ Bhutan is classified as one of the world's least developed countries. In 2015, Bhutan's Human Development Index was 0.607, ranking it 132 out of 159 countries in the 2015 index.¹¹ Bhutan's HDI is below the average of 0.631 for countries in the medium human development group and below the average of 0.621 for countries in South Asia. In Bhutan, 12 percent of the population lives below the national poverty line.¹² In addition, the proportion of employed population below \$1.90 Purchasing Power Parity a day is 4.5 percent.¹³ In urban areas, 77.9 percent of the population has access to improved sanitation facilities, whereas this rate is as low as 33.1 percent in rural areas, and 70 percent of the population lives in these rural areas.¹⁴ Many young mothers and children under five are affected by chronic malnutrition; roughly one-third of children under the age of five suffer from some form of stunting.¹⁵

Bhutan has shown progress on social indicators especially in health and education, but rapid changes in society have increased the vulnerability of some population groups, and the country is also vulnerable to natural disasters, climate change and urbanization that further challenge social outcomes. There are still significant gender challenges in Bhutan, with efforts underway to address legal and policy framework obstacles and/or gaps in promoting gender equality and women's empowerment. Domestic violence is an issue and women and girls lag behind in literacy rates as well as participation in politics and in the labour forces.

⁵ National Statistics Bureau, Royal Government of Bhutan, 'National Accounts Statistics 2016,' September 2016: <http://www.nsb.gov.bt/publication/files/pub1rt4291ni.pdf>.

⁶ Asian Development Bank, 'Bhutan: Economy': <https://www.adb.org/countries/bhutan/economy>.

⁷ National Statistics Bureau, Royal Government of Bhutan, 'Statistical Year Book of Bhutan 2016,' September 2016. http://www.nsb.gov.bt/publication/files/SYB_2016.pdf

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ World Bank, "World Development Indicators 2013." Washington, D.C.: World Bank. Data retrieved by UNDP Human Development Report Office in October 2013: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/income-gini-coefficient>

¹⁰ National Statistics Bureau, Royal Government of Bhutan, 'National Accounts Statistics 2016,' September 2016: <http://www.nsb.gov.bt/publication/files/pub1rt4291ni.pdf>.

¹¹ UNDP, 'Human Development Report: Briefing note for countries on the 2016 Human Development Report – Bhutan.'

¹² National Statistics Bureau of Royal Government of Bhutan and UNDP, 'Bhutan Poverty Assessment 2014': <http://www.nsb.gov.bt/publication/files/pub2yu10210bx.pdf>

¹³ Asian Development Bank, 'Poverty in Bhutan,' <https://www.adb.org/countries/bhutan/poverty>

¹⁴ Source: UN data: <http://data.un.org/CountryProfile.aspx?crname=Bhutan>

¹⁵ UNDP, CCPD 2014-2018.

Since the transition to a parliamentary democracy in 2008, the Government has sought to strengthen democratic governance and decentralization to improve effective service delivery and resilience to natural hazards and economic shocks.

3. UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN BHUTAN

Bhutan was admitted as a member of the United Nations on 21st September 1971. UNDP has been supporting the Royal Government of Bhutan (RGoB) and the Bhutanese people since 1973, although a local presence was only officially established only in 1979.¹⁶

Bhutan became one of the pilot countries for the UN “Delivering as One (DaO)” in 2008. The current common country programme of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF covers 2014-2018, with a focus on (1) sustainable development, (2) essential social service, (3) gender equality, and (4) democratic governance and participation. The common country programme reflects the strategic priorities and approach of a ‘Delivering as One’ Programme to: (a) highlight cross-cutting issues; (b) strengthen synergies; (c) reinforce complementarities; and (d) remove duplication, in order to enhance efficiency and effectiveness in achieving focused results. The One programme also aims to reduce the review burden for the Government and expects participating organizations to harmonize their efforts and articulate areas of cooperation.

The UNDP programme contributes to all outcomes, but focuses on the outcomes 1 and 4, in a very cross-outcome, integrated and multidimensional approach; therefore, this will also be the focus of the ICPE. Outcome 1 covers sustainable development, but includes aspects of the relationship between poverty and environment, and how climate and disaster resilience affects poverty and employment opportunity, as well as green equitable, inclusive economic growth particularly for vulnerable groups, with special attention to gender equality and women’s empowerment. It also includes UNDP’s Global Environment Facility’s Small Grants Programme in Bhutan. Outcome 4 covers democratic governance, including components of development planning, mainstreaming of Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals, justice, inclusiveness, transparency, as well as gender equality and women’s empowerment.

Table 1: Country Programme outcomes and indicative resources (2014-2018)

Country Programme Outcome		Indicative resources (US\$)
CCPD Outcome 1 UNDP Outcome 28	Sustainable and green economic growth that is equitable, inclusive, climate and disaster resilient and promotes poverty reduction, and employment opportunities particularly for vulnerable groups enhanced.	21,261,000
CCPD Outcome 4 UNDP Outcome 29/30	Governance institutions and communities exercise the principles of democratic governance at the national and local levels with a focus on inclusiveness, transparency, accountability and evidence-based decision making.	4,939,000
Total		26,200,000

Source: UNDP Bhutan Common Country Programme Document 2014-2018

¹⁶ UNDP in Bhutan: http://www.undp.org/content/bhutan/en/home/operations/about_undp/

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

ICPEs are conducted in the penultimate year of the ongoing UNDP country programme in order to feed into the process of developing the new country programme. The ICPE will focus on the current programme cycle, i.e., 2014-2018, but given the first Bhutan country programme evaluation was conducted in 2007 (ADR), the evaluation will also follow up on the ADR recommendations, considering the cumulative results also of the previous programme cycle 2010-2014. Particular attention will be paid to projects running from the past programme cycles to assess the degrees of programme achievement.

As the country-level evaluation of UNDP, ICPEs will focus on the latest formal UNDP country programmes approved by the Executive Board. The country programmes are defined – depending on the programme cycle and the country – in the Common Country Programme Document (CPD) and the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP). However, the scope of the ICPE includes the entirety of UNDP’s activities in the country and therefore covers interventions funded by all sources of finance, core UNDP resources, donor funds, government funds, etc.

Under the Delivering as One framework, UNDP Bhutan’s programmes are primarily delivered in participation of other UN agencies (e.g., joint programmes). The ICPE will focus on UNDP’s unique contributions as defined at the outcome level. However, it will also draw and, where feasible, harmonize its process (particularly stakeholder discussions and outreach with Government and other counterparts) with the UNDAF Evaluation taking place in the same timeframe. This will both maximize understanding of UNDP’s contribution to Delivering as One in Bhutan, and minimize impact on UNDP’s partners in Bhutan.

Initiatives from the regional and global programmes will be included in the scope of the ICPE. It is important to note that a UNDP country office may be involved in a number of activities that may not be included in a specific project. Some of these ‘non-project’ activities may be crucial for the political and social agenda of a country.

In line with UNDP’s gender mainstreaming strategy the ICPE will examine the level of gender mainstreaming across all programmes and operations. Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes.

The Evaluation will consider the relationship between UNDP’s environment, disaster, and climate interventions and people’s resilience. It will consider UNDP’s role in contributing to a stronger enabling environment that supports Bhutan’s vision of Gross National Happiness, including its approach to conservation and to the deepening of democracy. Based on an assessment of what has worked and what has not in terms of targeting benefits to vulnerable groups, its results will inform future targeting efforts by UNDP to help the Royal Government ensure no one is left behind as its development progresses.

Special efforts will be made to capture the role and contribution of UNV and UNCDF through undertaking joint work with UNDP. This information will be used for synthesis in order to provide corporate level evaluative evidence of performance of the associated fund and programme.

5. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology comprises two components: (i) assessment of UNDP's contribution by thematic/programme area, and (ii) assessment of the quality of this contribution. The ICPE will present its findings and assessment according to the set criteria provided below,¹⁷ based on an analysis by CCPD outcome area, in order to generate findings, broad conclusions and recommendations for future action.

- **UNDP's contribution by programme areas.** The ICPE will assess the effectiveness of UNDP in contributing to development results of Bhutan through its programme activities. Specific attention will be paid to assess the contribution related to UNDP's overall vision of helping countries achieve poverty eradication, reducing inequalities, vulnerabilities and exclusion, and its contribution to furthering gender equality and women's empowerment.¹⁸
- **The quality of UNDP's contribution.** The ICPE will also assess the quality of UNDP's contribution based on the following criteria:
 - Relevance of UNDP's projects and outcomes to the country's needs and national priorities;
 - Efficiency of UNDP's interventions in terms of use of human and financial resources; and
 - Sustainability of the results to which UNDP contributed.

UNDP's strategic positioning will be analysed from the perspective of the organization's mandate and the agreed upon and emergent development needs and priorities in the country. This will entail analysis of UNDP's position within the national development and policy space, as well as strategies used by UNDP to maximize its contribution and keep. The issues covered in the assessment will include, e.g., UNDP's response to emerging issues and how UNDP has accompanied the pace of changes in the same way that Bhutan has; whether the nature of support has changed with development needs and what needs to further change; its comparative strengths and use of partnerships (vis-à-vis other UN agencies especially within the DaO framework, donors, and national partners) in moving important national development discussions forward; UN-level coordination, also drawing on the UNDAF Evaluation; and prioritization of programme focus areas. In addition, the ICPE will examine how managerial practices impacted achievement of programmatic goals.¹⁹

The ICPE will examine how specific factors explain UNDP's performance, namely the engagement principles and alignment parameters of the 2014-2017 UNDP Strategic Plan.²⁰ For example, in addition to assessing UNDP's contribution to gender equality and women's empowerment, the evaluation will assess gender mainstreaming as a factor of UNDP's performance for each country programme outcome.²¹

In assessing the above, the evaluation will take into account country-specific factors that may have impacted and contributed to UNDP's performance, including:

- UN DaO framework;
- Landlocked LDC in the process of moving towards graduation;

¹⁷ Further elaboration of the criteria can be found in ICPE Manual 2011.

¹⁸ Using the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN SWAP) to improve gender equality and the empowerment of women across the UN system.

www.unwomen.org/~media/Headquarters/Attachments/Sections/How%20We%20Work/UNSystemCoordination/UN-SWAP-Framework-Dec-2012.pdf

¹⁹ This information is extracted from analysis of the goals inputted in the Enhanced RBM platform, the financial results in the Executive Snapshot, the results in the Global Staff Survey, and interviews at the management/operations in the country office.

²⁰ The Strategic Plan 2014-2017 engagement principles include: national ownership and capacity; human rights-based approach; sustainable human development; gender equality and women's empowerment; voice and participation; South-South and triangular cooperation; active role as global citizens; and universality.

²¹ Using inter alia the Gender Marker data and the Gender Seal parameters based on UNDP.

- Multidimensional cross outcomes approach with focus on relationships between poverty, environment, planning, governance, gender equality and women's empowerment;
- The Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)/Agenda 2030, closely related to the four pillars of the Gross National Happiness index (economic self-reliance, environmental conservation, cultural preservation and promotion, and good governance);
- Natural occurrences such as monsoons, and disasters, such as flooding and earthquakes, affecting investments in place;
- Declining, limited core resources (both at UNDP and UN One Fund) at the same time as an increase in non-core financing, reflecting a shift in both the nature of financing and the core to non-core ratio of UNDP Bhutan's programme delivery.

The ICPE is conducted at the outcome level. A Theory of Change (ToC)²² approach will be applied in consultation with the stakeholders, where appropriate. Discussions of the ToC will focus on mapping the assumptions made about a programme's desired change and causal linkages expected and these will form a basis for the data collection approach that will verify the theories behind the changes found. Where data gaps are apparent, a qualitative approach will be taken to fill those gaps to aid in the evaluation process. Early feedback will be provided to feed into the UNDAF Evaluation timeline. An outcome analysis paper will be developed for each of the two programme areas, using a standard IEO template, with also a final cross-cutting gender analysis in the final report. Inputs from all outcome analysis papers are synthesized prior to the formulation of conclusions and recommendations.

6. DATA COLLECTION

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. An evaluability assessment was carried out in order to understand potential data collection constraints and opportunities. The assessment outlined the level of evaluable data that is available. The Evaluation Resource Center information indicates that 16 decentralized evaluations were carried out for the 2010-2014 cycle and for the 2015-2018 cycle to date 3 evaluations were completed. With respect to indicators, the CCPD, UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) and the corporate planning system associated with it also provide baselines, indicators, targets, as well as annual data on the status of the indicators. There is good availability of UNDP project documents, monitoring reports and good historical record of the staff of the Office. In summary, based on documentary research, discussions with the CO and RBAP and given the existence of at least 19 evaluations, in addition to the program-level baseline represented by the ADR from 2007, the systematization and availability of documentation, evaluability is generally good.

Data collection methods. The evaluation will use data from primary and secondary sources, including desk review of documentation and interviews with key stakeholders, including beneficiaries, partners and managers. Specific evaluation questions for each criteria and the data collection method will be further detailed and outlined in the outcome analysis papers. Special attention will be given to integrate a gender

²² Theory of Change is an outcome-based approach which applies critical thinking to the design, implementation and evaluation of initiatives and programmes intended to support change in their contexts. At a critical minimum, theory of change is considered to encompass discussion of the following elements: (1) context for the initiative, including social, political and environmental conditions; long-term change that the initiative seeks to support and for whose ultimate benefit; process/sequence of change anticipated to lead to the desired long-term outcome; and (2) assumptions about how these changes might happen, as a check on whether the activities and outputs are appropriate for influencing change in the desired direction in this context; diagram and narrative summary that captures the outcome of the discussion. Source: Vogel, Isabel, "Review of the use of 'Theory of Change' in International Development" (April 2012), DFID.

equality responsive approach to the evaluation methods and reporting. A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed and interviews will include government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries of the programme. Focus groups will be used to consult some groups of beneficiaries as appropriate.

A list of projects for in-depth reviews will be developed based on a purposive sampling. The criteria for selection include programme coverage (a balanced selection of key focus areas/issues under each outcome), maturity, budgetary and geographical considerations, and the gender marker.²³ Attention will be paid to include both flagship projects of significant significance, outreach, and visibility, as well as those that experienced challenges.

The IEO and the country office will identify an initial list of background and programme-related documents which will be posted on an ICPE SharePoint website. The following secondary data will be reviewed: background documents on the national context, documents prepared by international partners during the period under review and documents prepared by UN system agencies; programme plans and frameworks; progress reports; monitoring self-assessments such as the yearly UNDP Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs); and evaluations conducted by the country office and partners. The ICPE will also support, where possible and appropriate, the ongoing data collection endeavours being undertaken by UNDP projects for outcome monitoring.

Validation. The evaluation will use triangulation of information collected from different sources and/or by different methods to ensure that the data is valid.

Stakeholder involvement. At the start of the evaluation, a stakeholder analysis conducted to identify all relevant UNDP partners, as well as those who may not work with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. Each outcome analysis paper will also develop a stakeholder analysis within the scope of the outcome.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP: The IEO will conduct the ICPE in consultation with the UNDP Bhutan country office, the Regional Bureau for Asia and Pacific and the Government of Bhutan. The IEO lead evaluator will manage the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

Government of Bhutan: Key government counterparts of UNDP in Bhutan will facilitate the conduct of ICPE by: providing necessary access to information sources within the government; safeguarding the independence of the evaluation; and jointly organizing the final stakeholder meeting with the IEO when it is time to present findings and results of the evaluation. Additionally, the counterparts will be responsible within Government for the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ICPE process.

UNDP Country Office in Bhutan: The country office will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders, make available to the team all necessary information regarding UNDP's

²³ The gender marker, a corporate tool at UNDP, is assigned for all projects, using scores from 3 to 0. A score of 3 means the project has gender equality as the main objective ; a 2 indicates that the intended outputs that have gender equality as a significant objective. A 1 signifies outputs that will contribute in some way to gender equality, but not significantly, and a 0 refers to outputs that are not expected to contribute noticeably to gender equality.

programmes, projects and activities in the country, and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The country office will provide the evaluation team support in kind (e.g., arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries; and assistance for the project site visits). To ensure the independence of the views expressed, country office staff will not participate in interviews and meetings with stakeholders held for data collection purposes.

UNDP Regional Bureau for Asia and Pacific: The UNDP Regional Bureau for Asia and Pacific will support the evaluation through information sharing and will also participate in discussions on emerging conclusions and recommendations.

Evaluation Team: The IEO will constitute an evaluation team to undertake the ICPE with expertise in integrating a gender and human rights based approach to evaluations. The IEO will ensure a gender balanced team which will include the following members:

- **Lead Evaluator (LE):** IEO staff member with overall responsibility for developing the evaluation design and terms of reference; managing the conduct of the ICPE, preparing/finalizing the final report; and organizing the stakeholder workshop, as appropriate, with the country office.
- **Associate Lead Evaluator (ALE):** IEO staff member with the general responsibility to support the LE, including in the preparation of terms of reference and the final report. Together with the LE, the ALE will help backstop the work of other team members
- **Consultants:** Two External, independent consultants (preferably national, but regional/international will be considered, as needed) will be recruited to assess the two broad outcome areas. They will also cover cross-cutting areas, such as rights and capacity building with particular attention on gender equality and women's empowerment. Under the guidance of LE/ALE, they will conduct preliminary research, plan data collection activities, prepare outcome analysis papers, and contribute to the preparation of the final ICPE report.
- **Research Assistant:** A research assistant based in the IEO will provide background research and documentation.

The roles of the different members of the evaluation team can be summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Data collection and reporting responsibilities	
Outcome	Responsible
Outcome (1) 28	Sustainable Development Specialist (backstopped by ALE)
Outcome (4) 29 and 30	Democratic Governance/Gender Specialist (backstopped by LE)
Strategic positioning	LE (Inputs from Specialists)
Operations and management issues	ALE (Inputs from LE)

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation will be conducted according to the approved IEO process as outlined in the *ICPE Methodology Manual*. The following represents a summary of key elements of the process. Four major phases provide a framework conducting the evaluation.

Phase 1: Preparation. The IEO prepares the TOR and the evaluation design and additional evaluation team members, comprising international and/or national development professionals, will be recruited once the TOR is complete.

Phase 2: Data collection and analysis. The phase will commence in June. An evaluation matrix with detailed questions and means of data collection and verification will be developed to guide data collection. The following process will be undertaken:

- Pre-mission activities: Evaluation team members conduct desk reviews of reference material, and prepare a summary of the context and other evaluative evidence, and identify the outcome theory of change, outcome-specific evaluation questions, gaps and issues that will require validation during the field-based phase of data collection
- Data collection mission: The evaluation team will undertake a mission to the country to engage in data collection activities. The estimated duration of the mission is a total of 2-3 calendar weeks. Data will be collected according to the approach outlined in Section 6 with responsibilities outlined in Section 7.

Phase 3: Synthesis, report writing and review. Based on the outcome analysis papers, the LE will undertake a synthesis process. The first draft of the ICPE report will be prepared and subjected to the quality control process of the IEO. Once cleared by the IEO, the first draft will be further circulated with the country office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Asia and Pacific for factual corrections. The second draft, which takes into account factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for review.

The draft report will then be shared at stakeholder workshop where the results of the evaluation will be presented to key national stakeholders. Moreover, the ways forward will be discussed with a view to creating greater ownership by national stakeholders in taking forward the recommendations from the report, and to strengthening accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders. Taking into account the discussion at the stakeholder workshops, the final evaluation report will be prepared. The UNDP Bhutan country office will prepare the management response to the ICPE, under the oversight of the regional bureau.

Phase 4: Production, dissemination and follow-up. The ICPE report and brief will be widely distributed in both hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board by the time of approving a new Country Programme Document. It will be distributed by the IEO within UNDP as well as to the evaluation units of other international organisations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The Bhutan country office and the Government of Bhutan will disseminate the report to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website²⁴ as well as in the Evaluation Resource Centre. The regional bureau will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.²⁵

²⁴ web.undp.org/evaluation

²⁵ erc.undp.org

9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively²⁶ as follows:

Table 3: Timeframe for the ICPE process		
Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
Phase 1: Preparation		
TOR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office	LE	May
Selection of other evaluation team members	LE	May
Phase 2: Data collection and analysis		
Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis	Evaluation team	June
Data collection and preliminary findings	Evaluation team	Mid-July
Analysis and finalization of outcome analysis papers	Evaluation team	Late July
Phase 3: Synthesis and report writing		
Synthesis	LE	August
Zero draft ICPE for clearance by IEO	LE	Early September
First draft ICPE for CO/RB review	CO/RBAP	Mid-September
Second draft shared with GOV	CO/GOV	Late September
Draft management response	CO/RBAP	Late September
Stakeholder workshop	CO/LE	October
Phase 4: Production and Follow-up		
Editing and formatting	IEO	October
Final report and Evaluation Brief	IEO	November
Dissemination of the final report	IEO/CO	November

²⁶ The timeframe is indicative of the process and deadlines, and does not imply full-time engagement of the evaluation team during the period.

Annex 2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Key questions	Sub-questions
EFFECTIVENESS	
1. To what extent did the project achieve its stated objectives?	1a. Results achieved/changes, if any brought about by the project at policy, institutional, individual and community levels as applicable?
	1b. Major factors contributing to the achievement of results?
	1c. Key results not achieved?
	1d. Major factors impeding the achievement of results?
	1e. Any positive or negative unintended results?
2. To what extent did the project reach vulnerable and excluded groups?	2a. Mechanisms/criteria applied by the project to reach the vulnerable (poor, minorities, disabled, youth, HIV/AIDS)?
3. To what extent did the project mainstream gender issues?	3a. Extent to which women benefitted from the project?
RELEVANCE	
4. How well aligned is the project/programme with national priorities as well as with the needs of the community?	4a. National plan/policy/strategic framework the project objectives fall under, if any at all?
	4b. How needs of the community and beneficiaries were assessed (e.g. needs assessment, consultations, etc.)?
	4c. Participants in planning and design of the project?
5. To what extent is/was the project aligned with UNDP's agenda in addressing inequality and exclusion and gender equality and women's empowerment?	5a. Criteria used in identifying project locations and beneficiaries?
	5b. Did such criteria identify excluded and worse-off groups in villages (poor, minorities, disabled, people living with HIV/AIDS)?
	If so, are they covered in the project?

Key questions	Sub-questions
	5c. Integration of gender issues in project design?
	5d. Were baselines established for agreed indicators on reduction of inequalities? Extent to which these were monitored and reported on?
6. To what extent were the approaches taken by UNDP appropriate in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project design (including leveraging of synergies between projects) - Implementation approach (including DIM/NIM) - Balance between upstream and downstream, including in financial allocation 	
EFFICIENCY	
7. How efficiently has UNDP used the available resources to deliver high-quality outputs in a timely manner, and to achieve the targeted objectives?	7a. Extent required support (technical, financial, supplies, etc.) for producing results provided by UNDP?
	7b. If so, adequacy and timeliness of support?
8. To what extent did UNDP address implementation issues faced by the project?	8a. Implementation challenges faced by the project, if any? Extent to which UNDP took prompt action to solve these?
9. How is the <i>current</i> project management structure including reporting structure, oversight responsibility set up?	9a. M&E activities of the project and how frequently are they conducted? How are the results from M&E reported to UNDP, donors and other partners? What worked, what did not work and why?
10. To what extent did UNDP initiate efforts to ensure synergies among various UNDP projects and with those of other partners?	10a. Extent to which UNDP ensured synergies among various interventions? What were the results of this? What were the contributing/hindering factors?
11. To what extent UNDP establish partnerships or coordination mechanisms with other key actors? (CSOs, private sector, UN agencies, donors, academia/research institutions)	11a. Frequency of coordination and progress review meetings with relevant stakeholders? Were these recorded? Any mechanism to follow up on action points?
SUSTAINABILITY	
12. To what extent did the project address sustainability concerns in its designs?	12a. Plans to ensure continuity of the efforts in terms of funding, technical capacity, if any?
	12b. Exit strategy that describes these plans?

Key questions	Sub-questions
13. To what extent will project results be sustainable?	13a. Key enabling/constraining factors (e.g. political, economic / financial, technical, and environmental factors)?
	13b. How well UNDP identified and addressed such factors?

Annex 3. PERSONS CONSULTED

Government of Bhutan

Lekzang Dorji, Director, Department of Macro Economic Affairs

Kunzang Lhamu, Executive Director, National Commission for Women and Children

Tsheltrim Zangpo, Plant Protection Officer, National Plant Protection Centre

Kiran Subedi, Deputy Chief Agriculture Officer, Department of Agriculture

Ugyen Bidha, Senior Livestock Officer, Food, Bhutan Agri. Food Regulatory Authority

Chencho Dorji, Biodiversity Officer, NBC, Ministry of Agriculture and Forest

Kelzang Tenzin, Executive Engineer, Agri. Extension Div. Ministry of Agriculture and Forest

Kencho Thinley, Chief, Policy and Planning Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests

Sangay Chopel, Planning Officer, Policy and Planning Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Forest

Rinchen Wangdi, Director, Gross National Happiness Commission

Pema Tenzin, UNDP Focal Person, Gross National Happiness Commission

Sonam Tashi, Acting Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General

Namgay Dorji, Senior Attorney, Office of the Attorney General

Chencho Norbu, Secretary, National Environment Commission

Nim Dorji, Secretary, Ministry of Finance

Dasho Lam Dorji, Former Secretary, Ministry of Finance

Aum Kinley Yangzom, Chairperson, Anti-Corruption Commission

Karma Damcho Nidup, Commissioner, Anti-Corruption Commission

Rinchen Namgay, Programme Officer, Policy & Planning Services, Anti-Corruption Commission

Ugyen Chewang, Election Commissioner, Election Commission of Bhutan

Daw Tenzin, Secretary, Election Commission of Bhutan

Mani Kumar Ghallay, Head, Policy and Planning Division, Election Commission of Bhutan

Sangay Duba, Secretary General, National Assembly of Bhutan

Dasho Kinley Dorji, Former Secretary, Ministry of Information and Communication

Kesang D. Wangmo, Woman Representative, Parliament

Dasho Karma Tshiteem, Chairperson, Royal Civil Service Commission

Local Governments, beneficiaries and local community groups

Jai Ram Ramesh, Hydrology Section, GLOF Early Warning Center, Wangdue Phodrang

Sonam Tashi, Flood Warning Section, GLOF Early Warning Center, Wangdue Phodrang

Purna Kumar Paudyal, Flood Warning Section, GLOF Early Warning Center, Wangdue Phodrang

Sangay Tshering, Hydrology Section, GLOF Early Warning Center, Wangdue Phodrang

Tshering Choden, Flood Warning Section, GLOF Early Warning Center, Wangdue Phodrang

Chimi Dem, Hydrology Division, GLOF Early Warning Center, Wangdue Phodrang

Tshering Kezang, Field In-charge, Yebesa Automated Water Level Monitoring Station, Mochhu, Punakha, GLOF Early Warning Center, Wangdue Phodrang

Sangay Dorji, Vice Principal, Technical Training Institute, Chumey, Bumthang

Ugyen Kesang, Head, Department of Carpentry, Technical Training Institute, Chumey, Bumthang

Leki Dorji, Masonry Instructor, Technical Training Institute, Chumey, Bumthang

Ugyen Lhamo, Chair, Weavers' Group, Dorjibi Weaving Center, Bumthang

Tshomo, Member, Weavers' Group, Dorjibi Weaving Center, Bumthang

Phubamo, Member, Weavers' Group, Dorjibi Weaving Center, Bumthang

Yeshey Lhamo, Member, Weavers' Group, Dorjibi Weaving Center, Bumthang

Wangmo, Member, Weavers' Group, Dorjibi Weaving Center, Bumthang

Tshering, Member, Weavers' Group, Dorjibi Weaving Center, Bumthang

Gaki, Member, Weavers' Group, Dorjibi Weaving Center, Bumthang

Gortang, Member, Weavers' Group, Dorjibi Weaving Center, Bumthang

Jamyang Choden, Secretary, Weavers' Group, Dorjibi Weaving Center, Bumthang

Sonam Tobgay, Chair, Sanam Chigthen Raanzhin Tshogpa, Chamkhar, Bumthang

Aum Phurba, Secretary, Sanam Chigthen Raanzhin Tshogpa, Chamkhar, Bumthang

Kunzang Dechen, Accountant, Sanam Chigthen Raanzhin Tshogpa, Chamkhar, Bumthang

Kesang Dema, Member, Sanam Chigthen Raanzhin Tshogpa, Chamkhar, Bumthang

Aum Zam, Member, Sanam Chigthen Raanzhin Tshogpa, Chamkhar, Bumthang

Aum Nazom, Member, Sanam Chigthen Raanzhin Tshogpa, Chamkhar, Bumthang

Jigme Choden, Member, Sanam Chigthen Raanzhin Tshogpa, Chamkhar, Bumthang

Geylong, Dzongkhag Agriculture Officer, Bumthang

Pema Chhoki, Member, Bumthang Women's Tailoring Cooperative and RENEW core volunteer member

Phurpa, Business community representative and RENEW core volunteer member

Karma Chhoden, Administrative Officer, Bumthang Hospital and RENEW core volunteer member

Kumbu Dema, Internal Auditor and RENEW Coordinator

Yeshey Nidup Operator & Technician, Sengor Community-based Micro Hydel

Thinlay, Dzongkhag Senior Planning Officer, Mongar Dzongkhag Mainstreaming Reference Group

Tshering Denkar, Dzongkhag Environment Officer, Mongar Dzongkhag Mainstreaming Reference Group

Khampa, Dzongkhag Agriculture Officer, Mongar Dzongkhag Mainstreaming Reference Group

Chimi Dem, Dzongkhag Procurement Officer, Mongar Dzongkhag Mainstreaming Reference Group and Gender Focal Person for the National Commission for Women and Children

Pema Chhoedrup, Gup, Community-based Water Harvesting Sub-component Kengkhar gewog, Mongar

Penjor, Mangmi, Community-based Water Harvesting Sub-component Kengkhar gewog, Mongar

Sangay Dorji, Gewog Administrative Officer, Community-based Water Harvesting Sub-component Kengkhar gewog, Mongar

Choni Dorji, Tshogpa, Yudaring chiwog, Community-based Water Harvesting Sub-component Kengkhar gewog, Mongar

RinchenTshogpa, Nannari chiwog, Community-based Water Harvesting Sub-component Kengkhar gewog, Mongar

Tashi Wangchuk, Local small business owner, Community-based Water Harvesting Sub-component Kengkhar gewog, Mongar

Kinzang Dorji, In-charge, Youth Group

Karma Melam, Machine operator, Egg Tray Manufacturing Plant

Karma Tsering, Director, National Centre for Hydrology & Meteorology

Karma Dupchu, Chief, HWRSD, National Centre for Hydrology & Meteorology

Dema Yangzom, Project Manager, National Centre for Hydrology & Meteorology

Pema Sylton, Engineer, National Centre for Hydrology & Meteorology

Jangchup Choephel Dorji, Engineer, National Centre for Hydrology & Meteorology

Tshewang Rigzin, Engineer, National Centre for Hydrology & Meteorology

Pema Wangyel, Engineer, National Centre for Hydrology & Meteorology
Sonam Rabteb, Deputy Project Manager, National Centre for Hydrology & Meteorology
Tashi Yangzom Dorji, Programme Director, National Biodiversity Center, Serbithang
Mani Prasad Nirula, National Biodiversity Center, Serbithang
Rinchen Dorji, National Biodiversity Center, Serbithang
Jigme Dorji, National Biodiversity Center, Serbithang
Asta M. Tamang, National Biodiversity Center, Serbithang
Chencho Dorji, National Biodiversity Center, Serbithang

Civil Society Organizations

Aum Rinchen Wangmo, Program Manager, Royal Society for Protection of Nature
Phurpa Dorji, Sr. Programme Officer, Royal Society for Protection of Nature
Aum Chime P. Wangdi, Secretary General, Tarayana Foundation
Passang Tshering, Executive Director, Bhutan Toilet Organization
Tandin Wangmo, Executive Director, RENEW
Nedup Tshering, Executive Director, Clean Bhutan
Aum Pema Lhamo, Executive Director, Bhutan Transparency Initiative
Namgay Dorji, Senior Coordinator, Ability Bhutan Society
Aum Damchae Dem, Chief Executive Officer, Bhutan Association of Women Entrepreneurs
Deki Zam, Executive Director, Draktsho Vocational Training Center for Special Children and Youth
Sonam Gyamtsho, Executive Director, Disabled Persons Association of Bhutan

Private Sector

Karma Yonten, Founder, Greener Way
Ritesh Gurung, Green Road
Ugyen, General Manager, Bio Bhutan
Nobin Gurung, Accountant & Administrator, Bio Bhutan
Namgay Dophu, Purchasing Head, Bio Bhutan
Sherab Tenzin, Head, Menjong Sorig Pharmaceuticals

Ugyen Phuntsho, Finished Goods store in-charge, Menjong Sorig Pharmaceuticals
Samten, Research & Dev. In-charge, Menjong Sorig Pharmaceuticals

International Organizations, Donors and Partners

Tenzin Lhaden, Economist, World Bank
Ramesh Chhetri, Programme Manager, Austrian Development Agency
Jamba Tobden, Project Manager, Institute for GNH Studies (IGNHaS)

UNDP Bhutan

Chimi Rinzin, Portfolio Manager, Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Risk
Nawaraj Chhetri, Portfolio Manager, Climate Change Mitigation & Energy
Sonam Rabgye, Program Analyst, UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative
Ugyen Dorji, Climate Change Policy Specialist
Namgay Wangchuk, Portfolio Manager, Inclusive Governance
Jigme Dorji, Portfolio Manager, Economic Integration and Innovation
Niam Collier-Smith, Deputy Resident Representative
Phurpa Tshering, Operations Manager
Gerald Daly, Resident Representative
Choney Wangchuk, Human Resources Associate
Rinzin, Finance Associate
Tshering L. Yangki, Programme Associate, Inclusive Governance & Climate Change Adaptation
Wangchen Norbu, Programme Associate, Economic Integration and Innovation
Tshering Penjor, Project Officer, Climate Change Mitigation & Energy
Sonam Y. Rabgye, Programme Analyst, Economic Integration and Innovation
Tshering Palden, Programme Associate, Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Management
Tshering Phuntsho, National Co-ordinator, Small Grants Programme
Ngawang Gyeltshen, Programme Co-ordinator, Economic Integration and Innovation

UNCT Bhutan

Kesang Choden Phuntsho, Coordination Officer and Head of the RCO

Hiroshi Kuwata, Special Assistant to the Resident Coordinator

Chadho Tenzin, Assistant Representative, FAO

Rudolf Schwenk, Representative, UNICEF

Suraj Pradhan, Operations Manager, UNICEF

Aniruddha Kulkarni, Child Protection Specialist, UNICEF

Yeshey Dorji, Assistant Resident Representative, UNFPA

Rinzi Pem, National Coordinator, UN WOMEN

Dechen Dorji, Country Representative, WWF

Udaya Sharma, Programme Associate, WFP

Chado Tenzin, Officer in Charge, WFP

Dungkhar Dukpa, Programme Officer, WFP

Dr. Suraj Man Shrestha, Medical Officer, WHO

Annex 4. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

In addition to the documents named below, the evaluation team reviewed project documents, annual project reports, midterm review reports, final evaluation reports and other project documents. The websites of many related organizations were also searched, including those of UN organizations, Bhutan governmental departments, project management offices and others.

Asian Development Bank (2013). *Civil Society Briefs - Bhutan*

Asian Development Bank (2014). *Bhutan Gender Equality Diagnostic of Selected Sectors*, A study conducted in partnership with UN Bhutan.

Asian Development Bank (2017). *Bhutan: Economy, in Asian Development outlook 2017*.

Gross National Happiness Commission (2008). *Tenth Five-Year Plan (2008-2013), Volume I: Main Document*, Royal Government of Bhutan.

Gross National Happiness Commission (2013). *Eleventh Five-Year Plan, Volume I: Main Document 2013-2018*, Royal Government of Bhutan.

Gross National Happiness Commission (2017). *Guidelines for Preparation of the Twelfth Five-Year Plan*, Royal Government of Bhutan

Institute for GNH Studies (2014). *Improving Women's Participation in Local Governance: An Explorative Study of Women's Leadership Journeys in Eight Districts of Bhutan*.

Ministry of Agriculture and Forests (2011). *Bhutan Land Cover Assessment 2010: Technical Report*, National Soil Services Center and Policy and Planning Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests, Royal Government of Bhutan.

Ministry of Finance (2014). *Public Environmental Expenditure Review of the Royal Government of Bhutan for the Years 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13*.

Ministry of Labor and Human Resources (2015). *National Labor Force Survey Report 2015*, Royal Government of Bhutan.

Ministry of Works and Human Settlement and the World Bank (2008). *Bhutan National Urbanization Strategy* by Cities Alliance for the Ministry of Works and Human Settlement, Royal Government of Bhutan.

National Biodiversity Center (2014). *National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan 2014*, National Biodiversity Center, Ministry of Agriculture and Forests, Royal Government of Bhutan.

National Environment Commission (2006). *Bhutan National Adaptation Program of Action*, National Environment Commission, Royal Government of Bhutan.

National Environment Commission (2012). *Bhutan National Adaptation Program of Action (updated)*, National Environment Commission, Royal Government of Bhutan.

National Environment Commission (2015). *Intended Nationally Determined Contribution*, communicated to UN Climate Change Secretariat by the Vice-Chair of NEC as part of the process of the UN Climate Change Conference at Paris, December 2015.

National Statistics Bureau (various dates). *Bhutan National Accounts, 2012 to 2016*

Royal Government of Bhutan (1999). *Bhutan 2020: A Vision for Peace, Prosperity and Happiness*.

Royal Government of Bhutan (2006). *Population and Housing Census of Bhutan 2005*, Office of the Census

Royal Government of Bhutan (2012). *Bhutan: In Pursuit of Sustainable Development*, National Report for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development 2012.

Royal Government of Bhutan (2016). *2016 Annual Report*. Royal Civil Service Commission.

Royal Government of Bhutan and UN (2017). *Gross National Happiness for the Global Goals: Technical Background Paper for the 13th Round Table Meeting between Bhutan and Its Development Partners*.

UN (2012). UNCT Gender Task Force. *UN Bhutan Gender Audit Report*.

UNDP (no date) *Bhutan Gender Mainstreaming Strategy 2013-2018*

UNDP (2013). *Graduation from the Group of Least Developed Countries: prospects and challenges for Bhutan. 12th Round Table Meeting, Thimphu, Bhutan*.

UNDP (2016). *Voices of Impact: Speaking for the Global Common*.

UNDP (2016). *Human Development Report - Briefing note for countries on the 2016 Human Development Report - Bhutan*

World Bank (2014). *World Development Indicators 2013*, Washington D.C.

World Bank (2016) *Bhutan Economic Update*, Washington D.C.

Planning Documents

UN (2007). *United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Kingdom of Bhutan 2008-2012*.

UN (2014). *Common Country Program Document for Bhutan and UNDP Results and Resources Framework 2014-2018*.

UN (2014). *United Nations Development Assistance Framework: Bhutan One Program 2014-2018*.

UNDP (2008). *Common Country Program Document for Bhutan 2008-2012*.

Evaluations

UN (2016). *Mid-term Review of Bhutan One Program 2014-2018*.

Bhutan Center for Media and Democracy, United Nations Democracy Fund, and UNDP (2013). *Strengthening Media and Civic Education to Enhance Democracy in Bhutan: Final External Project Evaluation*

Gunawardena C (2012). *UNDAF Outcome 5 Final Evaluation Report*, Megaskills Research, United Kingdom.

UNDP and Royal Government of Bhutan (2013). *Terminal Evaluation Report: Integrated Livestock and Crop Conservation Project*, UNDP/GEF Project.

UNDP and Royal Government of Bhutan (2016). *Terminal Evaluation Report: Bhutan Sustainable Rural Biomass Energy Project*, UNDP/GEF Project.

Evaluation Report of G2C Project: Enhancing Government to Citizen Service Delivery Initiative; Connecting the Remote Areas of Bhutan through E-Governance Project. No date.

Evaluation Report: Local Governance Support Program (LGSP) in Bhutan.

Annex 5. STATUS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME ACTION PLAN (CPAP)

OUTCOME INDICATORS

Indicator	Baseline and source	Target	Status/Progress			Comment
			2014	2015	2016	
Outcome 1 – Sustainable Development - Sustainable and green economic growth that is equitable, inclusive, climate and disaster resilient and promotes poverty reduction, and employment opportunities particularly for vulnerable groups enhanced						
Total greenhouse gas emissions	2,085.84 Gg <i>National Greenhouse Gas Inventory (2012)</i>	Carbon Neutral	Some progress	Some progress	No Change	There is no update on the GHG inventory as of now. The data will be updated through the Third National Communication by 2017/2018.
			1,559.56 (2011)	1,559.56 (2011)	1,559.56 (2011)	
Poverty rate	Multi-dimensional poverty index: 25.8% Poverty rate: 15% Gini coefficient: 0.35 <i>Bhutan Living Standards Survey (2012)</i>	MPI: <15% Poverty rate: <10% Gini coeff: 0.3		Significant progress	No Change	Indicators remain the same. New poverty assessment is not yet conducted by the government.
			--	MPI: 12.7% Poverty rate: 12% Gini coeff: 0.35 (2014)	MPI: 12.7% Poverty rate: 12% Gini coeff: 0.35 (2014)	
Youth unemployment				Regression	Significant progress	

Indicator	Baseline and source	Target	Status/Progress			Comment
			2014	2015	2016	
and underemployment (sex disaggregated)	Youth unemployment: 7.3% (female: 7.2%) Underemployment: 17.2% (monthly earning below Nu. 1,000) <i>Labour Force Survey (2012)</i>	Youth unemployment: 5% (men and women) Underemployment: to be set	--	9.4% (2014)	2.5% (2016)	Overall unemployment fell from 2.6% to 2.5% from 2015 to 2016. Youth unemployment increased from 9.4% to 10.7% (female 12.7% in 2016).
Percentage of government expenditure for environment and disaster risk reduction	Public environment expenditure for 10th FYP: 6.63% (2008-2013) Disaster: 0.02% of total 10th FYP budget <i>Public Environmental Expenditure Review conducted by the Ministry of Finance (2014)</i>	PEE: 7.0% Disaster: 0.03%	--	Some Progress 6.63%	No Change 6.63%	PPE for the 9 th FYP was 7.57% (2009) and for the 10 th FYP was 6.63% (2014) The data for expenditure on DRR is not available for now.
Outcome 3 – Gender. Communities and institutions strengthened at all levels to achieve enhanced gender equality, empowerment and protection of women and children						
Number of gender responsive laws	0	3 (one legislation; two policies)	Some progress	Significant progress	Significant progress	

Indicator	Baseline and source	Target	Status/Progress			Comment
			2014	2015	2016	
and policies in place	<i>National Commission for Women and Children (2012)</i>		1	3	8	
Percentage of women accepting domestic violence	68 <i>National Commission for Women and Children & RENEW (2012)</i>	55	No change	No change	Regression	<p>2016: According to CEDAW report (CEDAW/C/BTN/CO/8-9) of 18 November 2016, about 74 per cent of women believe that domestic violence is justified notwithstanding awareness programmes and activities undertaken by the State party;</p> <p>To validate the percentage, Nationwide study on violence against women led by National Commission for Women and Children will be commissioned in 2017.</p>
			68	68	74	
	0	80%	No change	Some progress	No change	

Indicator	Baseline and source	Target	Status/Progress			Comment
			2014	2015	2016	
Number of observations from the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women incorporated into policies and programmes	National Commission for Women and Children (2014)		0	32	0	<p><u>2015</u>: Of 42 total observations of the concluding Comments of the 7th CEDAW Periodic Report, 15 have been fully implemented, 17 partially implemented and 10 not implemented as of 2015. The observations which are not implemented are those observations related to amendment of definition of discrimination under the Constitution and the issues related to Nepalese refugee. Further, the observation related to ratification of other international treaties and conventions also falls under the non-implemented. The 8th and 9th CEDAW Periodic Report has been submitted in March 2015 by Bhutan.</p> <p><u>2016</u>: CEDAW 8 and 9 report submitted in November 2016. NCWC yet to conduct an assessment on the implementation status of CEDAW observations as of now.</p>
	Bill with the National Council	--		Target reached	Significant progress	

Indicator	Baseline and source	Target	Status/Progress			Comment
			2014	2015	2016	
Enactment of domestic violence bill	National Commission for Women and Children (2012)		--	Bhutan adopted Domestic Violence Prevention Act in 2013	Domestic Violence Prevention Rules and Regulation, 2015 adopted.	
Outcome 4 – Governance. Governance institutions and communities exercise the principles of democratic governance at the national and local levels with a focus on inclusiveness, transparency, accountability and evidence based decision-making.						
National Integrity Assessment Index	7.44 Anti-Corruption Commission (2009)	10	Some progress		No change	<u>2014</u> : The next NIA is planned for 2016/2017. The increase in the score is not, however, directly comparable as different methodologies were used in 2012 and 2009. <u>2016</u> : ACC has initiated the assessment. Results expected in May 2017.
Percentage of youth and women	None	Youth: 20%	No Change		Significant Progress	<u>2016</u> : data for Local Governance Election

Indicator	Baseline and source	Target	Status/Progress			Comment
			2014	2015	2016	
(disaggregated) reporting participation in local and national decision-making	<i>Department of Local governance, Ministry of Home and Cultural Affairs (2012)</i>	Women: to be set	No data available to record progress		48.96% female voter turnout. 11.39% of female out of 1423 candidates (compared to 5.1% in 2011)	
Number of local governments implementing performance based budgeting	4 <i>Department of Local governance, Ministry of Home and Cultural Affairs (2012)</i>		Significant progress	Some progress	No change	<p><u>2015</u>: The work on Performance-based climate change adaptation grant is continuing in 8 LGs in 2015.</p> <p><u>2016</u>: The target for this indicator is 105 geogs by 2020. Until 2015, 6 geogs and 2 Dzongkhags was supported through LGSDP, UNDCF. The remaining 97 geogs will be supported directly through LGSDP, EU fund. UNDP is not directly engaged in management of the EU component.</p>
			8	8	8	

Source: UNDP Corporate Planning System