

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts “Independent Country Programme Evaluations (ICPEs)”, previously known as “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. Based on the principle of national ownership, IEO seeks to conduct ICPEs in collaboration with the national authorities where the country programme is implemented.

The ICPE will be conducted in collaboration with the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (Venezuela), with the UNDP Venezuela Country Office, and with the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean. The results of, and lessons learned from, the ICPE are expected to feed into the development of the new country programme.

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, is a country situated on the Northern corner of South America, with an area of 916,445 km²,² and a population of almost 32 million³, with 88 percent percent of the population living in urban areas⁴.

Following economic shocks in 1980s-1990s and related political crises, including the 1989 Caracazo riots, the 1998 elected administration adopted a new Constitution. Since then, the country has experienced changes in its development, production and wealth distribution models which led to the modification of

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 INE. Basic Results, Census 2011:

<http://www.ine.gov.ve/documentos/Demografia/CensodePoblacionyVivienda/pdf/ResultadosBasicosCenso2011.pdf>

³ World Bank data as of 31 July 2018, and Population estimated at 2018 - Base Census 2011:

http://www.ine.gov.ve/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=98&Itemid=51. According to the last National Census, the estimated population in 2011 was 28.9 million.

⁴ Population estimated at 2018 - Base Census 2011.

public institutions and policies and the nationalization of private firms.⁵ Between 1999 and 2010, fifteen electoral processes were carried out.⁶ Political divergence has increased and, in 2017, the Supreme Court dissolved the National Assembly, controlled by the opposition, and convened a National Constituent Assembly, tasked with the drafting of a new constitution.

The political crisis has been exacerbated by an economic crisis which has reversed previous social advances. Although Venezuela is rich in resources, the country has not been able to diversify its economy and is heavily dependent on imported goods, and oil - which accounts for 96 percent of exports⁷ and 45 percent of the government's revenue⁸. The decline in international oil prices since 2014 and in oil production since 2016 have significantly impacted the economic situation of the country. The economy has been in recession for over four years and the country faces important macroeconomic imbalances with an increasing hyperinflation (inflation rose to almost 24,600 percent between May 2017 and May 2018)⁹, price controls, restricted access to external financing, decreased investments, and imports' restrictions.¹⁰ Between 2016 and 2017, food imports fell by 67 percent.¹¹

Large social programmes called "social missions and grand social missions" have been created to deliver basic services and redistribute resources to the most vulnerable social groups. Social investments represented 62.5 percent of central expenses between 1999 and 2012¹² and 19 percent of GDP in 2013¹³ and gave priority to the education, social security and health sectors. The country achieved the MDG extreme poverty reduction target in 2006, moving from nearly 50 percent in 1998 to 11 percent.¹⁴ In 2015, Venezuela's Human Development Index (HDI) value was 0.767; positioning the country at 71 out of 188 countries in the high human development category¹⁵. Venezuela increased supply of drinking water to residential networks, offering access to over 90 per cent of the population.¹⁶ In 2010, the country had the fifth-highest gross enrolment rate in higher education in the world, at 85 percent, the second-highest rate in the region.¹⁷

⁵ UNDP CPD 2015-2019, p.2

⁶ <http://evaw-global-database.unwomen.org/-/media/files/un%20women/vaw/country%20report/america/venezuela%20bolivarian%20republic%20of/venezuela%20upr%20wg%20report.pdf?vs=4406>

⁷ World Bank, Venezuela Overview: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/venezuela/overview#1>

⁸ Ibid

⁹ <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-venezuela-economy/venezuela-annual-inflation-hits-24600-percent-in-may-national-assembly-idUSKBN1J71YB>. Venezuela's central bank has not published inflation data in the last years.

¹⁰

https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/20180523_acaps_thematic_report_humanitarian_crisis_in_venezuela.pdf

¹¹ <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-venezuela-politics-food/for-poor-venezuelans-a-box-of-food-may-sway-vote-for-maduro-idUSKCN1GO173>

¹² Venezuela meets the Millennium Goals, 2010. MINCI

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/MDG/english/MDG%20Country%20Reports/Venezuela/CUMPLIENDO_LAS_METAS_DEL_MILENIO_23-09-13.pdf

¹³ https://www.unicef.org/venezuela/spanish/overview_13275.html

¹⁴ Venezuela meets the Millennium Goals, 2010. MINCI

¹⁵ Human Development Report 2016, Venezuela: http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/VEN.pdf

¹⁶ <http://evaw-global-database.unwomen.org/-/media/files/un%20women/vaw/country%20report/america/venezuela%20bolivarian%20republic%20of/venezuela%20upr%20wg%20report.pdf?vs=4406>

¹⁷ <http://evaw-global-database.unwomen.org/-/media/files/un%20women/vaw/country%20report/america/venezuela%20bolivarian%20republic%20of/venezuela%20upr%20wg%20report.pdf?vs=4406>

Although the government stopped releasing most of the official data in 2014, the Encovi (Encuesta de Condiciones de Vida, or Living Conditions Survey) provides recent data on the social conditions in the country. The last survey indicates that 87 percent of Venezuelans were poor in 2017 compared to 48.4 in 2014, and 61.2 percent were living in extreme poverty in 2017 compared to 23.6 in 2014.¹⁸ Inequalities also remain high with 74.5 percent of the population in rural areas living under the poverty line compared to 34 percent in the capital. The survey reports a changing trend in 2017 when the social missions benefited 13.4 million people. Yet, this support has taken place mainly through the CLAP (Local Provision and Production Committees established in April 2016 which benefited 12.6 million Venezuelans in 2017), moving government support from social protection programmes to only food stamps programmes. Almost 90% of households surveyed in the study considered their family had insufficient income to buy food. Prevalence of malnutrition and wasting among children has been growing.¹⁹

The economic crisis has also reduced the availability and access to basic goods and services. The conditions have deteriorated with shortages of medical supplies. According to the 2018 National Hospital Survey, 53 percent of operating rooms are now reported not functional and 79 percent of hospitals reported water shortages.²⁰ The crisis has also extended to the education sector, with children missing classes, and professors and students abandoning universities.

Important gender stereotypes remain regarding the roles and responsibilities of women and men. According to the 2015 Human Development Report, Venezuela ranked 101 out of 159 countries in the Gender Inequality Index and only 17 percent of seats in parliament were held by women. There are important concerns regarding trafficking of women and girls, particularly in border areas.²¹ In terms of economic participation, only 51.4 percent of women participate in the labour force compared to 78.4 percent of men. Efforts have been achieved to improve the institutional framework with the Act on Women's Right to a Life Free from Violence and the Act on the Promotion of Breastfeeding in 2007, and the establishment of the National Commission for Gender Justice in 2011 to facilitate women's access to justice.

Amid economic instability, protests started in 2014 over high levels of criminal violence, corruption, hyperinflation, and scarcity of basic goods, with hundreds of people killed. According to OHCHR, "extensive human rights violations and abuses have been committed in the context of anti-Government protests".²² A more recent report spotlights that "civil society organizations working on human rights issues also continue to face severe legal restrictions, smear campaigns, threats and harassment, as well as accusations of terrorism, treason and other crimes".²³ Since 2017, migration to other countries has also significantly increased and over 1.6 million Venezuelans are estimated to be living abroad, compared to 700,000 in 2015.²⁴

¹⁸ <https://www.ucab.edu.ve/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/02/ENCOVI-2017-presentaci%C3%B3n-para-difundir-.pdf>

¹⁹ https://www.unicef.org/media/media_102501.html

²⁰ https://public.tableau.com/profile/julioacstrom#!/vizhome/enh_2018/Story1?publish=yes

²¹ <http://evaw-global-database.unwomen.org/->

</media/files/un%20women/vaw/country%20report/america/venezuela%20bolivarian%20republic%20of/venezuela%20cedaw%20co.pdf?vs=4355>

²² <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=22007&LangID=E>

²³ <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=23242&LangID=E>

²⁴ OIM (2018) National migration trends in South America. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. Regional Office for South America. February 2018. https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/press_release/file/plan_de_accion_regional_en_espanol.pdf

3. UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN VENEZUELA

Relations between the Government of Venezuela and the United Nations system were formalized on 1971. The work of UNDP in the country is guided by the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF, or MANUD in Spanish) for the period 2015-2019. The UNDAF was developed by the UN country team composed of 7 resident agencies, in coordination with the Minister of Popular Power for Planification.

In line with the Second Socialist Plan 2013-2019 (Plan de la Patria²⁵), the UNDAF 2015-2019 and the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017, UNDP committed in its Country Programme Document 2015 – 2019 to support, in an integrated manner, the following programme priorities: (a) inclusive sustainable development and poverty reduction; (b) environmental sustainability and disaster risk reduction; and (c) security and culture of peace.

UNDP intended to focus on capacity development and knowledge management through a multidimensional approach and the use of South-South and Triangular Cooperation.

²⁵ <https://observatorioplanificacion.cepal.org/sites/default/files/plan/files/VenezuelaPlandelaPatria20132019.pdf>

Source: UNDP Venezuela Country Programme Document 2015-2019 and UNDP data extracted from Atlas

Table 1: Country Programme outcomes and indicative resources (2015-2019)

Country Programme Outcome		Country Programme Output	Planned resources (US\$)	Indicative expenditures to date (US\$)
Outcome 39 (UNDAF pillar 1)	By 2019, the United Nations system will have contributed to the implementation of public policies geared towards poverty reduction, promotion of equality, social inclusion and sustainable development, taking into consideration the demographic dynamism of the country	1.Socio-productive and artisanal initiatives oriented to vulnerable populations in marginalized areas, supported through technical assistance 2. Improved institutional capacities for the formulation, management and monitoring of programs and plans aimed at poverty reduction with a sustainable human development approach 3.Strengthened institutional mechanisms for an efficient and sustainable management of inclusion programs for women, youth, children and adolescents	CPD: 51,450,000 Received: 59,005,347	33,798,389
Outcome 40 (UNDAF pillar 6)	By 2019, the United Nations system will have contributed to the implementation of public policies aimed at the conservation and sustainable management of natural ecosystems and efficient environmental management in urban and rural areas, integral risk reduction, efficient and diversified energy production	4.Systematized initiatives promoting the diversification of the energy matrix, the efficient use of electrical energy and the application of community co-management models 5.Strengthened institutional capacities for the production, disaggregation, analysis and integration of socioeconomic, environmental, electric power, comprehensive risk management and citizen security statistics 9. Systematized initiatives articulating the efforts for the consolidation of integral risk management	CPD: 14,350,000 Received: 22,589,347	9,269,615
Outcome 41 (UNDAF pillar 5)	By 2019, the United Nations system will have contributed to the implementation of public policies in the areas of citizen security and access to justice, ensuring the exercise of human rights and the reduction of crime	6. Strengthened capacities of local level public institutions in management, access to information and efficiency 7. Initiatives to promote access to basic services with emphasis on isolated and vulnerable populations, supported in their implementation and systematized	Not included in the CPD Received: 728,373	215,056
Outcome 42 (UNDAF pillar 5)	By 2019, the United Nations system will have contributed to the implementation of a comprehensive policy aimed at consolidating a culture of peace, focusing in solidarity	8. Strengthened the system of citizen security, disarmament, culture of peace and integral attention to victims, especially of vulnerable women	Not included in the CPD Received: 0	0

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 (2015-2019) to provide forward-looking recommendations as input to UNDP Venezuela's

formulation of its next country programme. The scope of the ICPE includes the entirety of UNDP's activities in the country, therefore covers interventions funded by all sources.

5. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards.²⁶ The ICPE will address the following key evaluation questions.²⁷ 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? To what extent has the country programme strategically adapted to the changes in the country context and needs?
3. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results?

The ICPE is conducted at the outcome level. To address question 1 and 2, a Theory of Change (ToC) approach will be used in consultation with stakeholders, as appropriate. 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. Where data gaps are apparent, a qualitative approach will be taken to fill those gaps to aid in the evaluation process. As part of this analysis, the CPD's progression over the review period will also be examined. The effectiveness of UNDP's country programme will be analysed 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 considered.

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 under evaluation question 3. In assessing the CPD's evolution, UNDP's capacity to adapt to the changing context and respond to national development needs and priorities will be looked at. The utilization of resources to deliver results (including managerial practices), the extent to which the CO fostered partnerships and synergies with other actors (i.e. through south-south or triangular cooperation), and the extent to which the key principles of UNDP's Strategic Plan²⁸ have been applied in the CPD design and implementation are some of the aspects that will be assessed under this question.²⁹

Special attention will be given to integrate a gender-responsive evaluation approach to data collection methods. To assess gender across the portfolio, the evaluation will consider the gender marker³⁰ and the

²⁶ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

²⁷ The ICPEs have adopted a streamlined methodology, which differs from the previous ADRs that were structured according to the four standard OECD DAC criteria.

²⁸ These 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.

²⁹ 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.

³⁰ A corporate tool to sensitize programme managers in advancing GEWE by assigning ratings to projects during their design phase to indicate the level of expected contribution to GEWE. It can also be used to track planned programme expenditures on GEWE (not actual expenditures).

gender results effectiveness scale (GRES). The GRES, developed by IEO, classifies gender results into five categories: gender negative, gender blind, gender targeted, gender responsive, gender transformative.

6. DATA COLLECTION

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. A preliminary assessment was carried out to identify the evaluable data available as well as potential data collection constraints and opportunities. The Evaluation Resource Center (ERC) information indicates that 6 evaluations (5 projects and 1 portfolio) were carried out for the 2009-2014 period, and 2 project evaluations for the 2015-2019 cycle to date. With respect to indicators, the CPD Outcomes, UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) and the corporate planning system associated with it do not provide adequate baselines³¹, data sources are not defined and indicators are more at the output than the outcome level. At the time of the CPD design, outcomes 41 and 42 were not included and its related indicators were only recently collected in 2017. The corporate planning system does not report on the only CPAP indicator for outcome 42 (5.2.1) and includes an additional indicator (6.1.3) for outcome 40 not considered in the CPD nor CPAP. The CPD and CPAP do not present a clear results matrix with fully aligned indicators, outputs and outcomes. In addition, the National Statistics Institute (INE) does not publish regularly official statistical data. The security level is moderate, and protests and roadblocks could constraint primary data collection.³² In response to these limitations and constraints, the evaluation will work with Theories of Change to try to estimate baselines and map assumptions against the expected and achieved results.

Data collection methods. The evaluation will use data from primary and secondary sources, including desk review of corporate and project documentation and surveys and information from interviews with key stakeholders, including government, beneficiaries, partners' staff and managers. A pre-mission questionnaire will be administered and expected to be completed at least ten days prior to the arrival of the evaluation team in Caracas for the data collection mission. Special attention will be given to integrate a gender equality responsive approach to the evaluation methods and reporting. Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes.

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. At the start of the evaluation, a stakeholder analysis will be conducted with the support of the CO to identify relevant UNDP partners to be consulted, as well as those who may not work 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.

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. Document reviews will include: 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 quality assurance reports available. All information and data collected from multiple sources will be triangulated

³¹ Some general data sources are included in the CPD.

³² UNDSS data as of 30 July 2018.

to ensure its validity. An evaluation matrix will be used to guide how each of the questions will be addressed 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.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

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

UNDP Country Office in Venezuela: The Country Office (CO) 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 CO will provide support in kind (e.g. arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries). To ensure the anonymity of interviewees, the Country Office staff will not participate in the stakeholder interviews. The CO and IEO will jointly organize the final stakeholder meeting, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, through a videoconference, where findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation will be presented. Additionally, the CO will prepare a management response in consultation with the RB and will support the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ICPE process.

UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean: The UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean 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 team 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 debrief, 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, data collection and analysis and the final report. Together with the LE, will help backstop the work of other team members.
- **Consultants:** One external evaluator will be recruited to collect data and help to assess the outcome areas, paying attention to gender equality and women’s empowerment. Under the guidance of the LE, this evaluator will conduct preliminary desk review, data collection in the field, prepare sections of the report, and contribute to preparing and reviewing the final ICPE report.
- **Research Assistant:** A research assistant based in the IEO will provide background research and will support the portfolio analysis.

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

Area	Report	Data collection
Inclusive sustainable development and poverty reduction	External evaluator + LE	
Environment	External evaluator + ALE	

Security and culture of peace	LE
Gender equality and women's empowerment	All

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The ICPE will be conducted according to the approved IEO process in the Charter of the Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP. 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 if needed. The IEO starts collecting data and documentation internally first and then filling data gaps with help from the UNDP Country Office.

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 a pre-mission questionnaire to the Country Office. Based on this, detailed questions, gaps and issues that require validation during the field-based phase of the data collection will be identified.

Phase 3: Field 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 will be 15 days, from 22 October to 3 November 2018. Data will be collected according to the approach outlined in Section 5 with responsibilities outlined in Section 7. 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 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, the LE will undertake a synthesis process to write the ICPE report. The zero draft of the report will be subject to peer review by IEO and the Evaluation Advisory Panel (EAP). It will then be circulated to the Country Office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean 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 Venezuela 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 (via videoconference) 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. Considering the discussion at the stakeholder event, the final evaluation report will be published.

Phase 5: Publication and dissemination. The ICPE report, including the management response, and summary will be widely distributed in hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board at the time of the approval of a new Country Programme Document. It will be distributed by the IEO within UNDP and to the evaluation units of other international organisations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The Venezuela Country Office will disseminate the report to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website and the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). The Regional Bureau will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the ERC.

9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively³³ 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	August
Selection of other evaluation team members	LE	September
Phase 2: Desk analysis		
Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis	Evaluation team	September-October
Phase 3: Data collection		
Data collection and preliminary findings	Evaluation team	22 Oct – 2 Nov
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief		
Analysis and Synthesis	LE	November-December
Zero draft ICPE for clearance by IEO	LE	January 2019
First draft ICPE for CO/RB review	CO/RB	February 2019
Second draft shared with the government	CO/GOV	March 2019
Draft management response	CO/RB	March 2019
Final debriefing with national stakeholders	CO/LE	April 2019
Phase 5: Production and Follow-up		
Editing and formatting	IEO	April-May 2019
Final report and Evaluation Brief	IEO	May 2019
Dissemination of the final report	IEO/CO	June 2019
Presentation to the Executive Board	IEO	September 2019

³³ The timeframe is indicative of process and deadlines, and does not imply full-time engagement of the team during the period.