

Annex 1. Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts country evaluations called “Independent Country Programme Evaluations (ICPEs)” 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.

Based on the principle of national ownership, IEO seeks to conduct ICPEs in collaboration with the national authorities where the country programme is implemented.

Following the first country programme evaluation conducted in 2013, this is the second country-level evaluation conducted by the IEO in Angola. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration with the Government of Angola, UNDP Angola country office, and UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa region. Results of the ICPE are expected to feed into the development of the new country programme 2020-2024.

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

Angola is a Southern African nation on the south-western coast of the continent, bordered by Democratic Republic of the Congo, Republic of the Congo, Zambia and Namibia. Angola has a long Atlantic coastline and varied terrain of river systems and Sub-Saharan desert within a 1,246,700 km² surface area.² There are 18 provinces in Angola and its population is 28.3 million (2017).³

Since the end of the 27 year long civil war in April 2002, Angola has maintained political stability and experienced rapid economic growth that has outpaced its human development. This economic growth has enabled Angola to pass the threshold from a Least Developed Country to middle-income nation, although human development in Angola is still low and wealth distribution disparities exist. Angola’s economy is heavily reliant on oil, which represents approximately one-third of Angola’s GDP and over 95% of its exports. The country’s gross national income per capita has been steadily increasing throughout the 21st century and is above the middle-income country threshold at \$6,220 (2016), yet Angola’s Human Development Index value was 0.533 in 2016, ranking 150 out of 188 countries. When adjusted for inequality, Angola’s HDI loses 37% and is brought down to 0.336,

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 Source: UN data: <http://data.un.org/CountryProfile.aspx?crName=angola>

³ National Statistical Institute of Angola: <http://www.ine.gov.ao/xportal/xmain?xpid=ine&xpgid=login>

reflecting the conditions of least developed countries. The extractive sector employs less than 1% of Angola's labour force,⁴ despite its dominance of the country's economy and official unemployment in Angola is 20.2% (2015).⁵ Since the global decline in oil price mid-2014, Angola's GDP growth has decelerated significantly from an annual average of 10.3% from the years 2004 to 2014, to 1.5% in 2015.⁶ Angola's government has responded by reducing government spending and prioritizing economic diversification in order to rely less on oil and increase agricultural development, industry, tourism and fisheries.⁷

Poverty in Angola reflects the disparities in wealth distribution from the country's economic growth. Angola's national poverty rate is 36.6%, 58.3 % in rural areas and 18.7% in urban areas (2008). The Gini coefficient was 0.427 in 2013,⁸ indicating that inequality remains a challenge for the country. Angola also ranks 175th out of 190 countries in the World Bank's 2017 'doing business' index.⁹ Angola has a young median age of 16 years old¹⁰ which, when coupled with relatively high unemployment and economic disparity, could lead to social tensions and challenges in furthering development gains.

Angola has shown progress on social indicators related to education, HIV/AIDs and gender. Angola has one of the lowest rates of HIV/AIDs in the Southern African Development Community, with a prevalence of 1.9%,¹¹ down from 2.4 in 2013. Angola has also been addressing gender equality with a new gender policy and law on domestic violence. A positive change has been seen in the increase of women represented in Parliament, from 16% in 2000 to 36.8% in 2015. Challenges still remain however, in terms of low access to HIV/AIDs treatment and prevention services for the most vulnerable members of society, and women's access to education, the formal economy and the political arena.¹²

Angola has also made progress in increasing democratic governance, including strengthening governance structures namely at the municipal level, and democratic institutions and practices. In 2010, a presidential parliamentary system was established and presidential limits of two five-year terms were put into place.¹³ Three legislative elections have been held in Angola since the end of the civil war, with the most recent election in August 2017 resulting in the first Presidential change in 38 years. Angola has also experienced increased engagement by civil society groups and the creation of human rights institutions. The country has also made governance reforms to the justice and legal sector resulting in more courts and updated civil codes. Challenges remain still for citizens to enjoy these basic rights and benefit from the governance reforms, particularly in terms of access to justice systems and greater citizen engagement, particularly at the local level.

Angola is vulnerable to natural disasters and climate change, particularly floods and droughts that threaten vital ecosystems and biological resources. The recent 2015-2016 drought, which followed four previous years of consecutive droughts in Southern Angola, resulted in total damages of USD 297.2 million and total losses of USD 452.4 million in three affected provinces.¹⁴ The economic and social impact of persistent floods and droughts is compounded by the government's weak disaster preparedness and response. The consequences of these droughts are significant for the local populations that lost their livelihoods and compounds their constraints to access food and public services. Although the government has policies and strategies in place to address environmental sustainability and climate change, action has been impeded by low institutional capacity and

⁴ UNDP CPD Angola, 2015-2019

⁵ National Statistical Institute of Angola, Angola em Numeros, October 2015

⁶ The World Bank, Angola Overview: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/angola/overview>

⁷ UNDP CPD Angola, 2015-2019

⁸ The World Bank, World Development Indicators database

⁹ The World Bank, Doing Business rankings, June 2017

¹⁰ <http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/worldageing19502050/pdf/034angol.pdf>

¹¹ The World Bank, World Development Indicators database

¹² UNDP CPD Angola, 2015-2019

¹³ The World Bank, Angola Overview: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/angola/overview>

¹⁴ UNDP, Droughts in Angola: Post Disaster Needs Assessment 2012-2016

insufficient capabilities. Challenges still remain to coordinate and manage landmine removal, which impedes agricultural development and contributes to the countries high dependence on food imports. Angola’s disaster risk management and response, particularly in the context of the latest drought, is further challenged by high inflation rates and reduced government spending resulting from the recent economic slowdown.

3. UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN ANGOLA

Relations between the Government of Angola and the United Nations system were formalized on 1 December 1976. Article 12 of the constitution of Angola establishes the principles upon which the country bases its foreign policy. UNDP executes its activities through the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBBA) with the United National Organization and its specialised agencies, which was approved by the Government of Angola and UNDP in February 1977.

Testing its conceptual theory of change, in line with the priorities in the National Development Plan and reflected in the UN partnership Framework, UNDP intended to work at the nexus of governance, inclusive growth and resilience. Drawing on its global reach, convening power, and partnerships with the Government, UN organizations, the private sector civil society and local communities, UNDP was to provide policy, technical and implementation support to address these interrelated dimensions in a coherent and sustainable manner. UNDP support to each of these intervention areas was to represent a catalytic investment to leverage national resources for the replication from transformative outcomes.

The programme is expected to contribute to the national goal of achieving inclusive growth and sustainable development and UNDP to support the ‘graduation’ programme and the development aspirations of the Government by providing innovative policy advice, leveraging South-South and triangular cooperation approaches to investment, and opening access to regional and international markets. The programme is expected to explore and harness best practices and knowledge in social protection (Brazil), economic diversification (Madagascar, South Africa), and local governance (Mozambique). A National Human Development Report on the graduation of Angola from least developed country status to be used as a means gathering this work together, providing an advocacy tool, and building a solid conceptual and analytical foundation for progress.

UNDP committed to support, in an integrated manner, the following programme priorities: (a) policies and strategies to promote inclusive, sustainable growth, leading to ‘graduation’ from the least developed countries group; (b) participatory governance and the modernization of public institutions for effective service delivery; (c) human rights, access to justice by all citizens, and accelerated progress on women’s empowerment; and (d) environmental sustainability for disaster risk reduction and economic advancement. In all areas, an emphasis on thinking innovatively in programme design is expected to ensure complementarity with national priorities, and ensuring that lessons learned are replicable, can be scaled up, and will contribute to sustainable development results.

Country Programme Outcome		Indicative resources (US\$ million)	Expenditures to date (US\$ million)
Outcome 60	By 2019, Angola has put in place and is implementing policies and strategies to promote inclusive and sustainable growth, leading to graduation from the Least Developed (LDC) group.	32,726,000	14,564,793

Outcome 61	By 2019, all citizens actively participate in public issues, and the public institutions are modernized, delivering effective services at local levels based on good governance criteria.	5,000,000	2,795,412
Outcome 62	By 2019, national institutions are strengthened for the promotion of human rights, ensuring knowledge of and access to justice by all citizens, especially the most vulnerable.	2,666,000	1,198,782
Outcome 63	By 2019, the environmental sustainability is strengthened through the improvement of management of energy, natural resources, access to green technology, climate change strategies, conservation of biodiversity, and systems and plans to reduce disasters	32,312,000	8,909,261
Unlinked			24,249,011
Total		72,704,000	61,825,302

Source: UNDP Angola Country Programme Document 2015-2019

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. 2015-2019, but given the first Angola country programme evaluation was conducted in 2013 (ADR), the evaluation will also follow up on the ADR recommendations, considering the cumulative results also of the previous programme cycle 2009-2012 and how it contributes to the outcomes of the current cycle.

As the country-level evaluation of UNDP, ICPEs will focus on the formal UNDP country programmes approved by the Executive Board. The country programmes are defined – depending on the programme cycle and the country – in the Country Programme Document (CPD)¹⁵ 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. There will also be initiatives from the regional and global programmes that are included in the scope of the ICPE. It is important to note, however, that a UNDP county 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.

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 will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards¹⁶ and IEO’s new strategy for ICPEs. The ICPE will address the following key evaluation questions. 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, the sustainability of results?

¹⁵ This could be termed a CCF or CPO in older programmes

¹⁶ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

To address question 1, a Theory of Change (ToC)¹⁷ 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 i) inclusive and sustainable growth and development, ii) improved democratic governance, and iii) reduced risks to climate change and natural disasters). 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 CPD's evolution over the review period will also be examined. In assessing the CPD's evolution, UNDP's capacity to adapt to the changing context and respond to national development needs and priorities will also be looked at. This will be done through a desk review of relevant national documents (i.e. development plans, policies and strategies), UNDP's CPD and supporting documents, UNDP's strategic plan and corporate strategies, an analysis of UNDP's portfolio and its evolution based on changes at the national level, and through interviews with key national stakeholders.

The effectiveness of UNDP's country programme will be analyzed under evaluation question 2. This will include an assessment of the achieved outcomes and the extent to which these outcomes have contributed to the intended CPD objectives. In this process, both positive and negative, direct and indirect unintended outcomes will also be identified. Data for this specific question will be collected through a desk review of CPD related documents (i.e. UNDP evaluations and its quality assurance, project documents, M&E documents), focus group discussions with country staff, and interviews with government and other national stakeholders partners both in Asuncion and in the project sites, donors and beneficiaries.

To better understand UNDP's performance, the specific factors that have influenced - both positively or negatively - UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results in the country will be examined (evaluation question 3). 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 cooperation), and the integration of gender equality and women's empowerment in the design and implementation of the CPD are some of the aspects that will be assessed under this question.¹⁸

A five-point scale matrix, with four criteria, will be used to examine the (potential) sustainability of the identified achieved results, if any. The criteria include: ownership by beneficiaries, sufficient capacities, availability of resources and enabling institutional and social environment (see appendix 1).

6. DATA COLLECTION

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. An assessment was carried for each outcome to ascertain the available information, identify data constraints, to determine the data collection needs and method. The assessment outlined the level of evaluable data that is available. The Evaluation Resource Center information indicates that 16 evaluations were carried out since 2009 and 3 for the 2015-2019 cycle to date. With respect to indicators, the CPD, 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

¹⁷Theory 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.

¹⁸ 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.

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 RBA and given the existence of at least 16 evaluations, in addition to the program-level baseline represented by the ADR from 2013, 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, surveys and information and interviews with key stakeholders, including beneficiaries, partners and managers. Specific evaluation questions and the data collection method will be further detailed and outlined in the outcome analysis. 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.

The criteria for selecting places for field visits include:

- Programme coverage (projects covering the various components and cross-cutting areas);
- Financial expenditure (projects of all sizes, both large and smaller pilot projects);
- Geographic coverage (not only national level and urban-based ones, but also in the various regions);
- Maturity (covering both completed and active projects);
- Programme cycle (coverage of projects/activities from the past and mainly the current cycles);
- Degree of “success” (coverage of successful projects, as well as projects reporting difficulties where lessons can be learned).

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 and others will be reviewed: background documents on the national context, documents prepared by international partners and other UN agencies during the period under review; programmatic documents such as workplans 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, including the quality assurance reports.

All the information and data collected from multiple sources will be triangulated to ensure its validity. The evaluation matrix will be used to organize the available evidence by key evaluation question. This will also facilitate the analysis process, and will support the evaluation team in drawing well substantiated conclusions and recommendations.

In line with UNDP’s gender mainstreaming strategy, the ICPE will examine the level of gender mainstreaming across all of UNDP Angola’s programmes and operations. Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes. Special efforts will be made to capture the role and contribution of UNV and UNCDF through joint work with UNDP. This information will be used to provide corporate level evidence on the performance of the associated fund and programme.

Stakeholder engagement: a participatory and transparent process will be followed to engage with multiple stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. During the inception 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.

Consultations will take place with 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 with some beneficiary groups as appropriate. Special attention will be given

to integrate a gender equality approach to the evaluation data collection methods and report.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

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

Government of Angola: Key government counterparts of UNDP in Angola 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 Angola: 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 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 in interviews and meetings with stakeholders held for data collection purposes, country office staff will not participate.

UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa: The UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa 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), Ana Rosa Soares:** 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 Evaluator (AE), Mar Guinot:** IEO staff member with the general responsibility to support the LE, including in the preparation of terms of reference, data collection and analysis and the final report. Together with the LE, he/she will help backstop the work of other team members
- **Consultants:** 2 External, independent consultants (preferably national, but regional/international will be considered, as needed) will be recruited to collect data and help to assess the 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, they will conduct preliminary research and data collection activities, prepare outcome analysis, 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.

Outcome	Report	Data collection
Inclusive sustainable growth (outcome 1)	LE + Governance and sustainable growth expert	
Governance and modernization of public institutions and service delivery (Outcome 2)	LE + Governance and sustainable growth expert	

Human Rights, Justice and Women’s Empowerment (Outcome 3)	LE + Governance and sustainable growth expert
Environmental Sustainability and DRR (Outcome 4)	AE + Environment and DRR expert

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The ICPE will be conducted according to the approved IEO process. The following represents a summary of the five key phases of the process. Five major phases provide a framework for conducting the evaluation.

Phase 1: Preparatory work. The IEO prepares the TOR and the evaluation design and recruits additional evaluation team members, comprising international and/or national development professionals. They will be recruited once the TOR is approved. The IEO start collecting data and documentation internally first and then filling data gaps with help from the Country Office, and external resources through various methods.

Phase 2: Desk analysis. Further in-depth data collection is conducted, by administering an “early survey” and interviews (via phone, Skype etc.) with key stakeholders, including Country Office staff. Based on these the key evaluation questions are finalized in an evaluation matrix containing detailed questions and means of data collection and verification to guide data collection based on an overall evaluation matrix for the ICPEs. Evaluation team members conduct desk reviews of reference material, prepare a summary of context and other evaluative evidence, and identify the outcome theory of change, specific evaluation questions, gaps and issues that will require validation during the field-based phase of data collection.

Phase 3: Field data collection. The phase will commence in February. 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 a total of 2-3 calendar weeks. Data will be collected according to the approach outlined in Section 6 with responsibilities outlined in Section 8. 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 holds a formal debrief presentation of the key preliminary findings at the country office.

Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief. Based on the analysis of data collected and triangulated evidence, the LE will undertake a synthesis process to write the ICPE report. The first draft (“zero draft”) of the ICPE report will be subject to peer review by IEO and the International Evaluation Advisory Panel (IEAP). Once the first draft is quality cleared it will be circulated with the country office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa for factual corrections. The second draft, which takes into account factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for further comments as well as with the IEAP for further quality assurance review, and corrections and the UNDP Angola 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. Ways forward will be discussed with a view to creating greater ownership by national stakeholders in taking forward the recommendations and strengthening national accountability of UNDP. Taking into account the discussion at the stakeholder event, the final evaluation report will be published.

Phase 5: Publication and dissemination. The ICPE report and brief summary will be widely distributed in 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 Angola country office and the Government of Angola will disseminate the report to stakeholders

in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website^[1] 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.^[2]

9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively ¹⁹ as follows:

Table 3: Timeframe for the ICPE process going to the Board in 2019		
Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
Phase 1: Preparatory work		
TOR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office	LE	December
Selection of other evaluation team members	LE	January
Phase 2: Desk analysis		
Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis	Evaluation team	January
Phase 3: Data collection		
Data collection and preliminary findings	Evaluation team	February - March
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief		
Analysis and Synthesis	LE	April
Zero draft ICPE for clearance by IEO	LE	May
First draft ICPE for CO/RB review	CO/RB	May
Second draft shared with GOV	CO/GOV	June
Draft management response	CO/RB	June
Final debriefing with national stakeholders	CO/LE	July
Phase 5: Production and Follow-up		
Editing and formatting	IEO	July
Final report and Evaluation Brief	IEO	August
Dissemination of the final report	IEO/CO	August

[1] web.undp.org/evaluation

[2] erc.undp.org

¹⁹ The timeframe is indicative of the process and deadlines, and does not imply full-time engagement of the evaluation team during the period.