

Annex 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (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.

UNDP Iraq has been selected for an ICPE in 2019 since its country programme was intended to end at the end of 2020. However, the current schedule for submission of a new Country Programme Document (CPD) to the Executive Board has been anticipated to September 2019 and the ICPE will therefore be conducted at the beginning of 2019 to feed into the development of the new country programme. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration with the Government of Iraq, the regional government in Kurdistan, UNDP Iraq country office, and UNDP Regional Bureau for Arab States (RBAS).

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

As of 2012-2013, after years of dictatorship, the impact of sanctions and three major conflicts, Iraq was achieving notable gains. An Upper Middle Income Country which had made important progress towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, Iraq was the world’s third largest oil exporter, and it had

¹ See UNDP Evaluation Policy: www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf. The ICPE is 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).

the resources to increase its oil production significantly. Economic growth rate was projected to reach 9% on average over the period 2014-2018.

Challenges remained, including a significant disparity between urban and rural areas, lack of progress on income equality, less progress than expected on gender parity, access to potable water, and environmental problems, including the risk that the Tigris and Euphrates, the two major surface water sources, may dry up by 2040. However, overall, the country had reduced extreme poverty; child malnutrition, infant and early childhood mortality had decreased significantly. Food insecurity had been reduced. Net enrolment in primary education had increased and girls' participation in school was improving. Women's participation in parliament was above the 25% constitutional quota. Malaria had been completely eliminated.²

What gains had been achieved, had been reversed by the end of 2014 as a result of a resurgence in violence and the worsening of the economic environment due to the collapse of oil prices. For example, achievements in increasing literacy and reducing gender disparities were erased.³ By mid-2015, 2.9 million people had fled their homes reaching 5.8 million at the peak of the conflict. Over 8.2 million people required immediate humanitarian support as a direct consequence of violence and conflict linked to the take-over of Iraqi territory by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and the counter-insurgency operation launched by the Government and its allied forces.

The ISIL insurgency was one of the most brutal in the world. Populations have been subjected to mass executions, systematic rape and horrendous acts of violence, including executions and torture. Children have been used as suicide bombers and human shields, sold at markets, killed by crucifixion and buried alive. Women and girls have been enslaved and subjected to grotesque sexual violence. To add to the already very serious situation, tens of thousands of refugees fled the intense fighting and destruction in Syria, seeking safety in Iraq reaching 250,000 mostly in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq.⁴

By mid-2015, the Government was forced into pre-sales of Iraqi oil reserves. The Kurdistan Government was equally hard-hit, struggling to cope with denied and delayed oil transfers. Hosting close to one million displaced persons and refugees, the Kurdistan Government was forced to cut back on public services, delay salaries and halt development and investment projects.

The humanitarian crisis in Iraq has as of end 2018 entered a new phase. Combat operations against the ISIL ended as of December 2017 and hundreds of thousands of displaced people are returning to their homes and communities. Retaken areas are being cleared of explosive hazards⁵, and rubble and major efforts are underway to restore electricity, water and sewage grids, re-establish the Government's social protection floor, jump-start local economies and open schools and health centres. Displaced camps are being consolidated and decommissioned and modalities are being put in place for ensuring that the highly

2 Iraq UNDAF 2015-2018

3 Iraq Systemic Country Diagnostic, World Bank, 2017

4 Iraq Humanitarian Response Plan, OCHA, 2015

5 albeit very high level of contamination requiring significant investment to clear

vulnerable families who are currently receiving assistance from humanitarian partners are covered under the Government's new Poverty Reduction Strategy.⁶

Damage and loss assessments conducted by the Ministry of Planning and analysed by the World Bank estimate that reconstruction will take at least 10 years and cost well over US\$88 billion. The health and education sectors have been particularly hard hit. For example, thirty-six per cent of health centres in Salah al-Din are damaged or destroyed and only half of health facilities in Ninewa are fully functional. In 2017 alone, more than 150 schools were damaged or destroyed. Agricultural production has declined 40 per cent compared to pre-conflict levels.⁷ Years of conflict and violence left chemical pollution and unexploded ordnances affecting the livelihoods and safety of many.

Economic decision-making has been dominated by short-term needs and rent-seeking. Fiscal institutions are weak and unequipped to deal with the complexities of an oil-dominated budget, which has made the Iraqi economy extremely vulnerable to a sudden decline in oil prices. State-owned enterprises (SOEs) dominate the financial and non-financial sectors and enjoy significant privileges, thus crowding out private firms and impeding factor reallocation. Yet only one quarter of all SOEs are profitable. The costs of environmental degradation, particularly the degradation of water resources, are huge, amounting to over 6 per cent of GDP in some recent years.⁸

In general, Iraq's oil wealth makes it a country of considerable international interest and importance. Its geographic and political location make it a key player in the jockeying for power in the region. Many of the Middle East's major geopolitical struggles are being played out in Iraq. Under Saddam Hussein, Iraq was part of the Sunni block of countries – alongside Turkey and Saudi Arabia – maintaining a balance with Shia Iran. Today, in January 2019 Iraq is governed by its majority Shia population, a vital shift in the region's balance of power. The role of Iran in Iraq is of consequence to Turkey, which has its own ties to the Sunni Turkmen in Northern Iraq around Mosul, and interest in the political evolution of Iraqi Kurdistan. ISIL's control over stretches of Iraqi territory and its involvement in the civil war in Syria have been a deep source of conflict and instability for Iraq, drawing in global powers and regional actors. These interests and conflicts in and around Iraq have made it difficult to achieve domestic political stability.⁹

3. UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN IRAQ

UNDP is present in Iraq since 1976, when the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement was signed. Since 2003, UNDP has operated as part of the United Nations assistance strategy coordinated by UNAMI, the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq, which was established at the request of the Government of Iraq via the 2003 Security Council Resolution (SCR) 1500.

⁶ Iraq Humanitarian Response Plan, OCHA, 2018

⁷ Iraq Humanitarian Response Plan, OCHA, 2018

⁸ Iraq Systemic Country Diagnostic, World Bank, 2017

⁹ Iraq Systemic Country Diagnostic, World Bank, 2017

The second National Development Plan (NDP) covered the period 2013-2017 and was based on the principles of diversity, decentralization, green investment, empowerment, equal opportunity and decent work. It stressed the importance of reducing the development gap between urban and rural areas, making more sustainable investments in natural resources, and exploiting the relative potential of each region and governorate. The NDP 2013-2017 was supposed to provide the guiding framework for the implementation of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in Iraq for the period 2015-2019. The UNDAF was signed in April 2014 and aimed at enhancing social cohesion, through two complementary human rights based outcomes, namely: A) Improving the performance and responsiveness of targeted national and sub-national institutions and B) Addressing acute vulnerability and participation gaps.

In parallel, the Kurdistan Government developed in 2013 a document called “Vision 2020”, which set out the following priorities; •Health and social services that meet the needs of the population • An education system and labor market opportunities that will enable the population to achieve its potential and improve its standard of living • The necessary physical infrastructure •The development of a diversified economy relying on the private sector • Effective and honest government.

However, in response to the ongoing crisis, one of the most rapidly unfolding in world history, in June 2015, a Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) had to be developed by the Iraq Humanitarian Country Team, mid-way through the annual programming cycle. The crisis had, by then, displaced 2.9 million people. The Government was faced, for the first time in decades, with a massive fiscal gap resulting from the slump in oil prices and the high costs of the ISIL counterinsurgency. Since the development of the HRP, UNDP has been coordinating the Emergency Livelihoods Cluster.

As of 2018, Iraq has been launching new planning documents which respond to the current post liberation needs for stabilisation, poverty reduction and long-term development. In January 2018, the UN system developed a two-year Recovery and Resilience Programme (RRP) to fast-track the social dimensions of reconstruction, in line with the Government’s commitment to multi-dimensional reconstruction. The table below provides a summary of current Government planning documents:

Document	Scope
National Development Plan 2018 – 2022	Launched in May 2018, the plan defines strategic development goals of Iraq in the post-ISIL phase and establishes the foundations of effective development with social responsibility
General Framework of National Plan for reconstruction of the damaged governorates by terrorism for period (2018-2027)	Reconstruction of the damaged governorates by terrorism for period (2018-2027) at a primary cost of 100 billion dollars.

¹⁰ The Kurdistan autonomous region current planning document remains the “Vision 2020” mentioned in section 2

Poverty Reduction Strategy 2018-2022	Builds on previous Poverty Reduction Strategy and takes into impacts of ISIL conflict (e.g. increase in poverty rate etc.)
Private Sector Development Strategy 2014-2030	Strategy for economic diversification, stems from the recognition that reliance on oil production is not viable nor sustainable in the long term

The UNDP CPD 2016-2020 was formally adopted in January 2016 but had been developed during 2015, before the full blown crisis triggered by the conflict with ISIL. The crisis heavily impacted on CPD implementation and led to a focus on the stabilization pillar. The CPD intended to cover three areas: public institutional reform, effective devolution of administrative and fiscal powers and stabilization (Table 2). As far as the third area is concerned, under outcome 8A, UNDP intended to support government efforts to create safe conditions for the return of internally displaced persons to newly liberated areas, in close cooperation with other UN partners. The work was meant to include rehabilitation of infrastructure to enable provision of basic services, livelihood support (including emergency livelihood support through for example cash for work, cash grants) and capacity and technical support for Governorate and local governments, support for social cohesion and reconciliation, etc.

According to the management of the Country Office, the CPD did not anticipate the scale and significance of the stabilisation work. According to the Independent Evaluation Office analysis¹¹, the total budget for outcome 8A over the period 2015-2018 is 775,401,805 USD¹², amounting to just short of 90%¹³ of the total budget over the same period (864,387,293 USD). Outcome 8A includes the work being carried out by the Funding Facility for Stabilisation (FFS), which was launched by UNDP in May 2015 at the request of the Government of Iraq and grew exponentially since 2016. The facility aims to stabilise 31 areas, across 5 Governorates liberated from ISIL control by Iraqi authorities. Its budget for 2015 was estimated in the CPD to be around 7 million USD. The contribution mobilized (signed agreements) as of 27 November 2018 is 919,198,058 USD, around four times the entire resource base of the programme, which was estimated by the CPD to be around 235 million USD.¹⁴

It is therefore widely considered that the CPD did not offer a totally suitable guiding framework for the activities managed by the CO over the period it intended to cover¹⁵. Additionally, the CPD was not aligned to the UNDAF cycle, which was, however, in itself superseded by the HRP.

¹¹ Data subject to validation with the CO

¹² Of this amount, 636,000,000 USD represent the budget for the Funding Facility for Stabilization for the period 2015-2018

¹³ It should be noted that the budgets of outcome 6A and 7A for the period 2015-2018 are 44 and 43.5 ml USD respectively, according to the initial IEO analysis. While these figures are low in percentage point, they are not negligible in absolute terms as UNDP manages several country programs which have lower budgets than of either of these two outcomes.

¹⁴ Based on the initial IEO analysis, the current total budget for the period 2016-2018 (latest available figures) amounts to approximately 798 ml USD

¹⁵ This view is not shared by all UNDP Departments concerned with the implementation of the Iraq programme.

A Management Consulting Team mission took place in April 2017 to review the programme and the structure of the Office. This review proposed the creation of a new programme structure which included four pillars: Stabilization, Economic diversification and Employment; Governance and Reconciliation Programme, Environment and Energy. A transformation plan was also developed in May 2017.

Table 2: Country Programme outcomes and indicative resources (2016-2020)			
Country Programme Outcome and Outputs		Indicative resources (2016-2020) (USD million)	Expenditure to date (2016-2018) (USD million)
Outcome 6A (SP outcome 2) ¹⁶	<p>Reformed legal and law enforcement institutions that are more transparent and accountable</p> <p>1.1.1 Technical support in place for the preparation of a detailed national security strategy implementation plan</p> <p>1.1.2 Proposals finalized on standards and mechanisms for recruitment and training of judges, prosecutors and police officers</p> <p>1.1.3 Detailed proposals developed on implementation of key aspects of the national anti-corruption strategy</p> <p>1.1.4 Legal audit of Iraqi legal framework conducted</p> <p>1.1.5 Skills developed and procedures introduced in Parliament on drafting, oversight, management and consultation</p> <p>1.1.6 Increased provision of legal services to internally displaced persons, refugees and host communities</p>	<p>Regular: \$3,456,000</p> <p>Other: \$64,375,000</p> <p>Total: \$67,831,000</p>	<p>Regular: \$635,569.62</p> <p>Other: \$20,531,765.97</p> <p>Total: \$21,167,335.59</p>
Outcome 7A (SP Outcome 3)	<p>Administrative and financial reform and devolution policies adopted and implemented at federal and governorate levels.</p> <p>2.1.1. Critical capacities developed for public financial management and development planning at governorate level</p> <p>2.1.2. Draft laws prepared on national revenue and resource sharing</p> <p>2.1.3. Performance management system for Federal Government finalized</p> <p>2.1.4. Monitoring and evaluation system for investment budget rolled out</p> <p>2.1.5. Merit-based recruitment mechanism developed for senior government officials</p>	<p>Regular: \$3,456,000</p> <p>Other: \$64,375,000</p> <p>Total: \$67,831,000</p>	<p>Regular: \$1,364,368.17</p> <p>Other: \$10,715,299.37</p> <p>Total: \$12,079,667.54</p>
Outcome 8A (SP Outcome 6)	<p>Conditions improved for the safe return of IDPs in Newly Liberated Areas</p> <p>3.1.1. Capacity of local administrations in targeted areas for planning, administrative and financial management restored</p> <p>3.1.2. Basic community infrastructure rehabilitated for water, electricity, health, education and administrative offices.</p>	<p>Regular: \$800,000</p> <p>Other: \$99,200,000</p>	<p>Regular: \$400,824.88</p> <p>Other: \$370,662,905.38</p>

¹⁶ UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017

	3.1.3. Livelihoods opportunities created 3.1.4. Local and provincial reconciliation processes established and functioning 3.1.5. Technical support provided at the governorate level in the Kurdistan region to improve crisis response 3.1.6. Improved participatory decentralized basic service delivery in Kurdistan region host communities and internally displaced persons/refugee camp ¹⁷ 3.1.7. Immediate livelihoods stabilization through emergency employment for host communities and vulnerable groups in the Kurdistan region of Iraq 3.1.8. Strengthened community solidarity through dialogue and capacity-building of local and national actors and communities in the Kurdistan region	Total: \$100,000,000	Total: \$371,063,730.26
Total		Subtotal regular: \$7,712,000 Subtotal other: \$227,950,000 Grand total: \$235,662,000	Subtotal regular: \$2,400,762.67 Subtotal other: \$401,909,970.72 Grand total: \$404,310,733.39

Source: UNDP Iraq Country Programme Document 2016-2020 (DP/DCP/IRQ/2, dated 23 Nov 2015, for the First Regular Session 2016 25-29 January 2016)

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

In principle, 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. As the CPD (see section 3) was not considered a totally suitable guiding document for the period 2016-2020, as of December 2018, the Iraq Country Office, in consultation with relevant counter-parts, decided to shorten the cycle by one year (2016-2019) and present a new programme for approval by the Executive Board at the September 2019 session. This will ensure alignment to the new UNDAF and the new Government’s planning documents.

The last Assessment of Development Results (ADR) was completed in 2015 and provided an account of UNDP contributions until January 2014. The sudden changes in the country’s political and security context significantly affected the programmes that were ongoing when the evaluation was carried out.

This ICPE is therefore being conducted in the same year of submission to the Executive Board (not one year prior, as per standard approach), it will cover the implementation period 2014-2018 and follow up only on the ADR 2015 recommendations which remained applicable.

¹⁷ This covers the assistance provided by UNDP to Syrian Refugees in Iraq, which is part of the work coordinated by UNDP within the framework of the Emergency Livelihood Cluster. This evaluation will pay particular attention to this aspect in order to provide evaluative evidence for the thematic evaluation of the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP)

The interventions under review are funded by all sources, including from UNDP's regular resources, donors, and the Government. The efforts supported by UNDP's regional and global programmes will also be included, if applicable.

The ICPE Iraq will examine UNDP's ongoing programme, 2016-2020, as formally approved by the Executive Board, in the areas defined in the Results and Resources Framework. The scope of the evaluation, at the same time, will take into account the evolution of the programme since 2014 (beginning of the crisis and end of coverage of the last ADR), the changing context UNDP has faced during its programme implementation, including the country's increasing insecurity and political and economic volatility. It will also reflect various changes taken place since the launch of the current country programme.

As with other ICPEs, the evaluation will attempt to measure the ***level of progress and achievements made thus far by UNDP against its initial programmatic objectives***. Given the programmatic and operational changes UNDP has undergone in response to the unfolding of the crisis, ***specifically in terms of adjusted scale and significance of the stabilisation work***, the evaluation will however place greater focus on assessing the relevance of ***UNDP's strategies for achieving programme effectiveness and responding to the country's needs during the crisis***. This will include identification of potential gaps in the approach adopted, as well as implications for the next country programme cycle. The evaluation will not attempt to assess the contributions made by the Funding Facility for Stabilisation that is undergoing an specific evaluation to be completed in the first quarter of 2019.

Areas of particular attention in this strategic analysis will include:

- programming strategies, including:
 - the extent to which management decisions on the prioritisation of work areas in response to the crisis led to the implementation of a coherent and coordinated programme responding to the emerging needs of the country
 - the extent to which the MCT review timely and adequately defined a new guiding framework for the effective implementation of the Programme, in line with the needs of the country and the UNDP mandate;
 - plans for sustainability and resilience and transition to a post conflict situation
- the role of partnerships, including with the Government, regional government, private sector and civil society, donors and their role in the delivery of the program
- the extent of coordination and joint delivery with other UN agencies and the UN Assistance Mission for Iraq, as well as emerging lessons on the feasibility and results of an alignment of the humanitarian and development work, in line with the "New Way of Working"¹⁸
- the extent to which gender equality and women's empowerment has been integrated in programming, and civil society engagement.

¹⁸ The "New Way of Working", OCHA, 2017 refers to the delivery of collective outcomes that reduce risk and vulnerability and serve as instalments toward the achievement of the SDGs

Special efforts will be made to capture the role and contribution of UNV 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 & Standards.¹⁹

ICPEs typically address three standard evaluation questions and methodological approaches.²⁰ The evaluation for Iraq will address the following key questions, reflecting changes in the country's programme context (Section 3). A specific design matrix will be developed to address the following questions:

1. To what extent has UNDP effectively positioned itself in a rapidly changing political, social, economic and security environment to address Iraq's critical issues through the delivery of its programme, while leveraging its own comparative advantage?
2. To what extent has UNDP been able to achieve its initial and adjusted programme objectives in contribution to each outcome?
3. What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results?

The first question will address UNDP's effectiveness in achieving its 'specific areas of contributions' (or "outputs" as defined in the CPD designed to contribute to each outcome), as well as any programme objectives adjusted over time, on a sample basis. Due to the scope and complexity of the Iraq Programme, the evaluation will focus on the areas which are most relevant to the development of the new CPD 2020 – 2024. As mentioned under section 5. Scope, the evaluation will not assess the contributions made by the FFS because: 1. An in-depth evaluation of its results is planned for 2019; 2. The FFS is scheduled to close in 2020 and it is therefore not expected to feature in the new CPD; 3. This evaluation does not have the resources to carry out a comprehensive assessment of the results achieved by the FFS.

The analysis is conducted at the outcome level and the evaluation is expected to use:

- A theory of change (ToC) to understand the underlying programme intent and logic, by outcome, including the assumptions being made for desired changes and expected causal linkages.

¹⁹ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914>

²⁰ The standard ICPE evaluation questions are: i) "What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?"; ii) "To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?"; and iii) "What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results?"

- The Gender Marker and the Gender Results Effectiveness Scale (GRES) to assess the degree of consideration made for gender equality and women’s empowerment during programming, and the results achieved, respectively.²¹
- An extensive desk review of documents, including evaluation reports, available internally and externally to facilitate the results validation process, which will be complemented by any other means of data collection available (Section 6).

As explained in Section 4 (Scope), the second question focuses on the relevance of various strategic choices made by UNDP during the cycle to strengthen its programme effectiveness and respond to the needs of the country, both at central and regional level, during the period. The question will examine how UNDP has exploited its added value and it will assess how well the programmatic and operational adjustments have worked and implications for strategically positioning UNDP in the next programme cycle.

The results of this ICPE are also intended to provide evidence for the thematic evaluation of the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP), which brings together the plans developed under the leadership of national authorities – namely, the Arab Republic of Egypt, the Republic of Iraq, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the Lebanese Republic, and the Republic of Turkey – to ensure protection, humanitarian assistance and strengthen resilience, within the framework of the Syrian crisis. The ICPE will therefore assess the extent of UNDPs support to the Syrian refugee crisis and implementation of the 3RP in Iraq.

6. DATA COLLECTION

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. An evaluability assessment was carried out to understand potential data collection constraints and opportunities. Some of the issues identified for Iraq include the following:

- **Very limited availability of evaluation evidence**²². An assessment was carried for each outcome to ascertain the available information and identify data constraints, to determine the data collection needs and method. The assessment indicates that one evaluation is being completed at the time of writing and three more are expected to be completed in Q1 and Q2 of 2019, including an evaluation of the FFS.

²¹ The Gender Marker is a corporate gender rating assigned to all UNDP projects during design phase. The rating is awarded as follows: “3” = Outputs that have gender equality as the main objective; “2” = Outputs that have gender equality as a significant objective; “1” = Outputs that will contribute in some way to gender equality, but not significantly; and “0” = Outputs that are not expected to contribute noticeably to gender equality. The Gender Marker is also used to track planned project expenditures related to gender efforts. The Gender Results Effectiveness Scale (GRES) is used to classify gender results into five groups: i) result had a negative outcome that aggravated or reinforced existing gender inequalities and norms (“gender negative”); ii) result had no attention to gender, failed to acknowledge the different needs of men, women, girls and boys, or marginalized populations (“gender blind”); iii) result focused on the number of equity (50/50) of women, men or marginalized populations that were targeted (“gender targeted”); iv) results addressed differential needs of men or women and address equitable distribution of benefits, resources, status, and rights, but did not address root causes of inequalities in their lives (“gender responsive”); and v) result contributes to changes in norms, cultural values, power structure and the roots of gender inequalities and discrimination (“gender transformative”). UNDP, IEO “ICPE How-To Note on Gender” (March 2016).

²² As highlighted by the World Bank Iraq Systemic Country Diagnostic (2017), this seems to be a trend for all the assistance provided to Iraq “Despite the volume of resources involved, the reconstruction process has not yet been comprehensively assessed so it is not clear what lessons can be learned about this assistance”.

- **Security constrains and stakeholder availability:** Although the situation in Iraq is gradually returning to normal, most project sites can only be reached in armoured vehicles and with police escorts, therefore requiring significant time and budget. The evaluation will therefore identify up to three sites relevant to the scope of the evaluation, in coordination with the Country Office.
- **Programme and project information:** With the country office's support, all available programme- and project-related documents will be collected in an internal document portal (SharePoint) prior to the evaluation. A summary of the status of progress using the outcome indicators will be prepared by using the country office's annual self-assessment of its programmes (Results-Oriented Annual Reports, or "ROARs"), which are available for 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 and the Corporate Planning System associated with them
- **National statistical capacity:** Iraq's internal statistical capacity remains below the average among countries in Middle East and North Africa, according to the World Bank's Statistical Capacity Indicator.

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. The evaluation questions mentioned above and the data collection methods 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 projects for field visits include:

- Programme coverage (projects covering the four pillars identified by the MCT review, and cross-cutting areas, projects of relevance to the development of the new CPD, projects covering the response to the Syrian Refugee crisis (see section 5 for links to 3RP thematic evaluation));
- Financial expenditure (projects of all sizes, both large and smaller pilot projects);
- Geographic coverage (specifically taking into account the geopolitical context of Iraq and the structure of UNDP);
- Maturity (covering both completed and active projects);
- Degree of "success" (coverage of successful projects, projects where lessons can be learned, etc.).

The IEO and the CO will identify an initial list of background and programme-related documents and post it 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 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 Iraq programmes and operations. Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes. This information will be used to provide corporate level evidence on the performance of the associated fund and programme.

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.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP: The UNDP IEO will conduct the ICPE in consultation with the UNDP Iraq country office, the Regional Bureau for Arab States and the Government of Iraq, as well as the Kurdistan regional government. 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 Iraq: 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 anonymity of the views expressed in interviews with stakeholders for data collection purposes, CO staff will not participate. The country office will jointly organize the final stakeholder debriefing, 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 prepare a management response in consultation with the regional bureau and will support the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ICPE process.

UNDP Regional Bureau for Arab States: The UNDP Regional Bureau for Arab States will support the evaluation through information sharing and participate in discussing 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 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.
- **Consultants:** Four external consultants (preferably national/regional but international consultants will also be considered, as needed) will be recruited to collect data and help assess the programme pillars:

stabilisation, governance and reconciliation, economic reconciliation and development, environment and energy. 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 (RA):** A research assistant based in the IEO will support the background research.

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

Table 2: Data collection responsibilities by outcome		
Outcome	Report	Data collection
Outcome 6A and 8A/ governance and reconciliation pillar	Consultant	Governance specialist
Outcome 7A/ governance and reconciliation pillar and economic diversification and employment pillar	Consultants	Governance and livelihoods specialist
Outcome 8A/ stabilisation pillar and economic diversification and employment pillar	Consultants	Stabilisations and livelihood specialist
Outcome 6A and 8A/ Environment and Energy Pillar	LE	LE
Gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment	All	All
Coordination with UN Agencies and UNAMI	LE	Stabilisation specialist
Programming strategies and partnerships	LE	LE and stabilisation specialist

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The ICPE will be conducted according to the approved IEO process²³. The following represents a summary of the five key phases of the process, which constitute framework for conducting the evaluation.

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

Phase 2: Desk analysis. Further in-depth data collection is conducted, by administering an “advance questionnaire” and interviews (via phone, Skype etc.) with key stakeholders, including country office staff. Based on these the key evaluation questions will guide the 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/March 2019. During this phase, the evaluation team undertakes an in-country mission to engage in data collection activities. The estimated

²³ The evaluation will be conducted according to the [ICPE Process Manual](#) and the [ICPE Methodology Manual](#)

duration of the mission is up to 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, 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 Evaluation Advisory Panel (EAP). Once the first draft is quality cleared, it will be circulated to the country office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Arab States 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 Iraq 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 evaluation report will be finalized.

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 Iraq country office and the Government of Iraq 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 (ERC). The regional bureau will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the ERC.²⁵

9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively²⁶ as follows in Table 3:

Table 3: Timeframe for the ICPE process going to the Board in September 2019		
Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
Phase 1: Preparatory work		
TOR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office	LE	December 2018
Selection of other evaluation team members	LE	January 2019
Phase 2: Desk analysis		

²⁴ web.undp.org/evaluation

²⁵ erc.undp.org

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

Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis	Evaluation team	February 2019
Phase 3: Data Collection		
Data collection and preliminary findings	Evaluation team	24 February -14 March 2019
Follow up activities (additional data collection)		March-April 2019
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief		
Analysis and Synthesis	LE/ Evaluation team	April 2019
Zero draft ICPE for clearance by IEO and EAP	LE	May 2019
First draft ICPE for CO/RB review	CO/RB	June 2019
Second draft ICPE shared with GOV	CO/GOV	June 2019
Draft management response	CO/RB	July 2019
Final debriefing with national stakeholders	CO/LE	August 2019
Phase 5: Production and Follow-up		
Editing and formatting	IEO	September 2019
Final report and Evaluation Brief	IEO	Sept- Oct 2019
Dissemination of the final report	IEO/CO	October 2019
Submission of the new CPD for EB Board approval ²⁷	CO/RBAS	September 2019

²⁷ Due to the compressed timeframe (see section 4), it may not be possible to have a published report prior to Board approval, in that case an online report will be provided.