

Annex 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE



Madagascar

Independent Country Programme Evaluation (ICPE)

I. Introduction

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts independent country programme evaluations (ICPEs), previously called “Assessment 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 efforts 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 IEO is two-fold: (i) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (ii) 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. Based on the principle of national ownership, IEO seeks to conduct ICPEs in collaboration with the national authorities where the country programme is implemented.

This is the first ICPE for Madagascar, and will be conducted in 2018 towards the end of the current UNDP programme cycle of 2015-2019, with a view to contributing to the preparation of UNDP’s new programme starting from 2020. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration with the Government of Madagascar, UNDP Madagascar country office, and UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa.

II. National context

Madagascar is a large island nation located in the Indian Ocean, off the coast of east Africa. It is the world’s fourth largest island, and has an estimated population of 24.89 million.² Despite having many natural assets and economic potential, the country has experienced a series of crises, the latest and longest of which was from 2009 to 2013, which has negatively affected its economic growth. In 2012, only 30% of Malagasy lived above the national poverty line and only 10% above the international poverty line.³ The return to constitutional order following successful presidential and legislative elections in 2013 has put the country back on a positive development path. However, weak governance at all level remains a

¹ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/evaluation-policy.pdf>.

² United Nations Population Division. World Population Prospects (2016)

³ World Bank, Country Partnership Framework for the Republic of Madagascar for the period FY17-FY21, data drawn from the ENSOMD 2012 survey.

challenge, with corruption being a serious impediment to development and only 58% of the population enjoying access to justice.⁴ With a score of 26/100 on the Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index in 2016, Madagascar ranks 145th out of 176 countries.⁵ Decentralization efforts have also not yielded the expected results due to the lack of an agreed national vision and adequate implementation capacities.⁶

Since 2014, the country has slowly been recovering from the economic crisis and political instability. GDP growth was 4.2% in 2016, up from -4.0% in 2009 and 2.3% in 2013. Madagascar's Human Development Index value for 2015 was 0.512, putting the country in the low human development category, positioning it at 158 out of 188 countries and territories.⁷ Key challenges which the country faces include, among others, high poverty, high hunger (33% of the population lived below the minimum level of dietary energy consumption in 2015), low coverage of drinking water and sanitation (only 51.5% and 12% of population had access to improved drinking water sources and sanitation facility respectively in 2015), and high maternal mortality ratio.⁸ Despite generally low unemployment rates (1.3% of the labour force), under-employment is a serious problem affecting 80% of the population.⁹

Madagascar is a disaster-prone country, and extreme weather events have affected the well-being of the population, particularly the poorest. Common natural disasters, to which the country is increasingly vulnerable due to climate change, include cyclones, locust infestation, flooding and droughts. Madagascar's abundant natural resources have suffered from the rapid growth of a trafficking economy around precious woods, gold and stones, cattle, and its rich biodiversity, leading to increasing tensions around the capture of natural resources rents.¹⁰

The Government of Madagascar demonstrated its commitment to address its development challenges through the National Development Plan 2015-2019, which includes 5 strategic areas: (i) governance, rule of law, security, decentralization, democracy and national solidarity; (ii) preserving macroeconomic stability and supporting development; (iii) inclusive growth and local roots of development; (iv) adequate human capital for the development process; and (v) valorisation of natural capital and strengthening resilience to natural disasters.

III. UNDP Programme in Madagascar

The UNDP country programme in Madagascar for the period 2015-2019 focuses on two outcomes, in the areas of governance and sustainable development, with resilience running through both. The country programme is expected to contribute to the attainment of the first two outcomes of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), which have a significant governance dimension.

The governance component is built around two pillars: (i) local governance, peace building and national reconciliation; and (ii) rule of law and access to justice with a focus on the penal system and political governance, which includes support to key institutions such as the parliament, the electoral administration and the anticorruption bodies.

⁴ CPD 2015-2019, page 2, 3.

⁵ <https://www.transparency.org/country/MDG#>

⁶ CPD 2015-2019, page 3.

⁷ http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/MDG.pdf

⁸ <http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Resources/Static/Products/Progress2015/Snapshots/MDG.pdf>

⁹ CPD 2015-2019, page 2.

¹⁰ World Bank, Country Partnership Framework for the Republic of Madagascar for the period FY17-FY21, page 3.

In the sustainable development component, UNDP planned to support initiatives aimed at creating employment and income-generating activities benefiting women, youth and vulnerable populations. UNDP also planned to support initiatives aimed at reducing and recovering from the impact of natural disasters through national and local institutional capacity building, analysis and incorporation of risk-reduction measures and post-disaster recovery initiatives in national and local development plans. UNDP also intended to emphasize improving environmental governance and reconciling natural resource management with development challenges at the regional and community levels.

UNDAF outcomes, UNDP programme outputs and indicative resources are summarized in the following table:

Table 1: UNDAF outcomes, UNDP programme outputs and indicative resources (2015-2019)			
UNDAF outcomes and UNDP country programme outputs		Indicative resources (US\$ millions)	
		Regular resources	Other resources
Outcome 1 Public institutions, civil society and media, at central and decentralized level, carry out their roles and are accountable contributing to peaceful governance that protects human rights	Output 1: Decentralized entities, civil society and grassroots communities in targeted areas are structured and equipped to foster social cohesion, peace, security, effective recovery, resist external shocks and boost local development, responding to the needs expressed by the population.	11.5	2
	Output 2: Democratic institutions and stakeholders responsible for accountability and the rule of law have clear mandate, appropriate resources and the capacity to carry out their functions in an efficient and transparent manner enabling them to facilitate access to justice, the fight against corruption, and citizen participation	8.537	8
Total Outcome 1		20.037	10
Outcome 2 - Vulnerable population groups in targeted areas access income and employment opportunities, thus enhancing resilience and contributing to inclusive and equitable growth which in turn fosters sustainable development	Output 3: Institutions and stakeholders at national and local level use tools and mechanisms that facilitate the achievement of the MDGs/SDGs and more effective use of development aid	7	0
	Output 4: Structural transformation, building sustainable production capacity and good environmental governance are effective and foster the creation of employment and livelihood protection for vulnerable groups, women and young people	19.2	17
Total Outcome 2		26.2	17

Grand total	73.237
--------------------	---------------

Source: UNDP Madagascar Country Programme Document 2015-2019

IV. 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 present programme cycle (2015-2019) while taking into account interventions which may have started in the previous programme cycle (2008-2011/2014) but continued for a few more years into the current programme cycle.

As a country-level evaluation of UNDP, the ICPE will focus on the formal UNDP country programme approved by the Executive Board, but will also consider any changes from the initial CPD during the period under review. The ICPE covers interventions funded by all sources of finance, core UNDP resources, donor funds, government funds, etc. 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 advancing the political and social agenda of a country.

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.

V. Methodology

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards.¹¹ The ICPE will address the following three evaluation questions.¹² These questions will also guide the presentation of the evaluation findings in the report.

1. What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?
2. To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?
3. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP’s performance and eventually, to the sustainability of results?

To address question 1, a Theory of Change (ToC) approach will be used in consultation with stakeholders, as appropriate, to better understand how and under what conditions UNDP’s interventions are expected to lead to good governance and sustainable development in the country. Discussions of the ToC will focus on mapping the assumptions behind the programme’s desired change(s) and the causal linkages between the intervention(s) and the intended country programme outcomes.

As part of this analysis, the progression of the programme over the review period will also be examined. In assessing the CPD’s progression, UNDP’s capacity to adapt to the changing context in Madagascar and respond to national development needs and priorities will also be looked at.

The effectiveness of UNDP’s country programme will be analyzed in response to evaluation question 2. This will include an assessment of the achieved results and the extent to which these results have

¹¹ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

¹² The ICPEs have adopted a streamlined methodology, which differs from the previous ADRs that were structured according to the four standard OECD DAC criteria.

contributed to the intended CPD objectives. In this process, both positive and negative, direct and indirect as well as unintended results will be identified.

To better understand UNDP's performance, the specific factors that influenced - positively or negatively - UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results in the country will be examined in response to evaluation question 3. In addition to country-specific factors that may explain UNDP's performance, the utilization of resources to deliver results (including managerial practices), the extent to which the CO fostered partnerships and synergies with other actors (including through south-south and triangular cooperation), and the integration of gender equality and women's empowerment in design and implementation of the CPD are some of the aspects that will be assessed under this question.

VI. Data collection

Assessment of existing data and data collection constraints. An assessment was carried out for each outcome area to ascertain the available information, identify data constraints, to determine the data collection needs and methods. The assessment outlined the level of evaluable data that is available. The assessment indicated that there were 6 decentralized evaluations undertaken during the period from 2015 to present, out of which one was the UNDAF mid-term review, one was the CPD mid-term review and the 4 others were project evaluations. All these evaluations will serve as important inputs into the ICPE.

With respect to indicators, the CPD and CPAP list 8 indicators for the 2 outcome results, and 10 indicators to measure the 4 outputs, with baseline and targets. To the extent possible, the ICPE will seek to use these indicators to better understand the intention of the UNDP programme and to measure or assess progress towards the outcomes. Several indicators for CPD results did not include sources of data, while others indicated national statistics and/or project annual reports as data sources. The evaluation's ability to measure progress against these indicators will therefore depend in part on the country office's monitoring and national statistical capacities. The National Development Plan for 2015-2019 includes measures for monitoring and evaluation of national development indicators, which may constitute inputs for the ICPE. The General Housing and Population Census (RGPH 3) was planned to take place during 2017, and could also provide further data for the evaluation.

It is also important to note that UNDP projects that contributed to different outcomes are at different stages of implementation, and therefore it may not always be possible to determine the projects' contribution to results. In cases where the projects/initiatives are still in their initial stages, the evaluation will document observable progress and seek to ascertain the possibility of achieving the outcome given the programme design and measures already put in place.

Initial discussions with the country office revealed no limitations to the evaluation team's ability to travel to project sites located in different parts of the country.

Data collection methods: The evaluation will use data from primary and secondary sources, including desk review of documentation and information and interviews with key informants, including beneficiaries, partners and managers. An advance questionnaire will be administered to the country office before the data collection mission in the country. 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 group discussions will be used to consult some groups of beneficiaries as appropriate.

The evaluation team will also undertake field visits to selected project sites to observe the projects first-hand. It is expected that regions where UNDP has a concentration of field projects (in more than one outcome area), as well as those where critical projects are being implemented will be considered. There should be a coverage of both outcome areas. The coverage should include a sample, as relevant, of both successful projects and projects reporting difficulties where lessons can be learned, both larger and smaller pilot projects, as well as both completed and active projects.

The IEO and the country office have identified an initial list of background and programme-related documents which is posted on an ICPE SharePoint website. The following secondary data will be reviewed, among others: 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; and evaluations conducted by the country office and partners.

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

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: A participatory and transparent process will be followed to engage with multiple stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. During the initial phase a stakeholder analysis will be conducted to identify all relevant UNDP partners, including those that may have not worked with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. This stakeholder analysis will serve to identify key informants for interviews during the main data collection phase of the evaluation, and to examine any potential partnerships that could further improve UNDP's contribution to the country.

VII. Management arrangements

Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP: The UNDP IEO will conduct the ICPE in consultation with the UNDP Madagascar Country Office, the Regional Bureau for Africa and the Government of Madagascar. The IEO Lead Evaluator will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

UNDP Country Office in Madagascar: The country office will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders and ensure that all necessary information regarding UNDP's programmes, projects and activities in the country is available to the team, and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The country office will provide the evaluation team in-kind organizational support (e.g. arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries; assistance for 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. The country office will jointly organize the final stakeholder meeting, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, through a video-conference with the IEO, where findings and results of the evaluation will

be presented. Additionally, the country office will support the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ICPE process.

UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA): RBA 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. The IEO will ensure gender balance in the team which will include the following members:

- **Lead Evaluator (LE):** IEO staff member with overall responsibility for managing the ICPE, including preparing for and designing the evaluation (i.e. the present ToR) as well as selecting the evaluation team and providing methodological guidance. The LE will be responsible for the synthesis process and the preparation of the draft and final evaluation reports. The LE will be backstopped by a senior evaluator also from the IEO.
- **Associate Evaluator (AE):** The AE will support the LE in the preparation and design of the evaluation, including background research and documentation, the selection of the evaluation team, and the synthesis process. The AE will review the draft report and support the LE in other aspects of the ICPE process as may be required.
- **Consultants:** 2 consultants will be recruited and will be responsible for the outcome areas. Under the guidance of LE, they will conduct preliminary research and data collection activities, prepare outcome analysis, and contribute to the preparation of the final ICPE report.

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

Table 2: Data collection responsibilities by outcome areas		
Outcome	Report	Data collection
Governance	Consultant	Consultant
Sustainable development	Consultant	Consultant
General strategic and management issues	LE	LE/AE/consultant

VIII. Evaluation Process

The evaluation will be conducted according to the approved IEO process. The following represents a summary of the five key phases of the process, which constitute the framework for conducting the evaluation.

Phase 1: Preparatory work. The IEO prepares the ToR and the evaluation design, including an overall evaluation matrix. Once the TOR is approved, additional evaluation team members, comprising international and/or national development professionals will be recruited. The IEO starts collecting data and documentation internally first and then filling data gaps with help from the UNDP country office.

Additional evaluation team members, comprising development professionals, will be recruited once the ToR is complete.

Phase 2: Desk analysis. Evaluation team members will conduct desk review of reference material, and identify specific evaluation questions, and issues. Further in-depth data collection will be conducted, by administering an advance questionnaire and interviews (via phone, Skype, etc.) with key stakeholders,

including country office staff. Based on this, detailed evaluation questions, gaps and issues that require validation during the field-based phase of the data collection will be identified.

Phase 3: Field-based data collection. During this phase, the evaluation team undertakes a mission to the country to engage in data collection activities. The estimated duration of the mission is around 3 weeks. The evaluation team will liaise with CO staff and management, key government stakeholders and other partners and beneficiaries. At the end of the mission, the evaluation team will hold a debrief presentation of the key preliminary findings at the country office. Efforts will be made to coordinate the timing of the evaluation mission with the audit mission by the Office of Audit and Investigation, planned to take place in the period 12-23 March 2018. Overlapping the evaluation and audit missions to have some joint meetings in the country will facilitate sharing of information, minimizing any duplication in data collection efforts between IEO and OAI, thus enhancing the efficiency of both exercises.

Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief. Based on the analysis of data collected and triangulated, the LE will undertake a synthesis process to write the ICPE report. The draft will first be subject to peer review by IEO and its International Evaluation Advisory Panel. Once the draft is quality cleared, it will be circulated to the country office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa for factual corrections. The second draft, which takes into account any factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for further comments. Any necessary additional corrections will be made and the UNDP Madagascar country office will prepare the management response to the ICPE, under the overall oversight of the regional bureau.

The report will then be shared at a final debriefing where the results of the evaluation are presented to key national stakeholders. The way forward will be discussed with a view to creating greater ownership by national stakeholders with respect to the recommendations as well as to strengthening accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders. Taking into account the discussion at the stakeholder event, the evaluation report will be finalized and published.

Phase 5: Publication and dissemination. The ICPE report will be written in English. It will follow the standard IEO publication guidelines. A French version of the report will be produced, as needed and requested by the CO. The ICPE report 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 widely 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 Madagascar country office and the Government of Madagascar will disseminate to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website¹³ as well as in the Evaluation Resource Centre. The Regional Bureau for Africa will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.¹⁴

IX. Timeframe for the ICPE Process

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively¹⁵ as follows in Table 3:

¹³ web.undp.org/evaluation

¹⁴ erc.undp.org

¹⁵ The timeframe, indicative of process and deadlines, does not imply full-time engagement of evaluation team during the period.

Table 3: Tentative timeframe for the ICPE process going to the Board in June 2019		
Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
Phase 1: Preparatory work		
TOR completed and approved by IEO Director	LE	January 2018
Selection of consultant team members	LE	January – early February 2018
Phase 2: Desk analysis		
Preliminary desk review of reference material	Evaluation team	February 2018
Advance questionnaires to the CO	LE/AE/CO	February 2018
Phase 3: Field-based data collection		
Mission to Madagascar	LE/AE/Consultants	12-30 March 2018
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief		
Analysis of data and submission of background papers	Consultants	April 2018
Synthesis and report writing	LE/AE	May-June 2018
Zero draft for internal IOE clearance/IEAP comments	LE	July 2018
First draft to CO/RBA for comments	LE/CO/RBA	August 2018
Second draft shared with the government and national stakeholders	LE/CO/GOV	September 2018
Draft management response	CO	September 2018
Stakeholder workshop via video-conference	IEO/CO/RBA	October 2018
Phase 5: Publication and dissemination		
Editing and formatting	IEO	October 2018
Final report and evaluation brief	IEO	October 2018
Dissemination of the final report	IEO	October 2018