

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)”¹ 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.² 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 Côte d’Ivoire has been selected for an ICPE since its country programme will end in 2020. The ICPE will be conducted in 2019 to feed into the development of the new country programme. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration with the Government of Côte d’Ivoire, UNDP Côte d’Ivoire country office, and UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA).

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

Côte d’Ivoire, with a population of 22.61 million,³ is a lower-middle-income country. The country has gone through a long socio-political crisis (1999-2011) that has shaken the social fabric and undermined the country’s development gains. Following the 2011 post-election events, the new government implemented the 2012-2015 National Development Plan (NDP), focused on restoring the rule of law, promoting good governance and rehabilitating social and economic infrastructure. Since 2012, Côte d’Ivoire has experienced remarkable economic success, illustrated by rapid growth in GDP, driven by public and private investment, raw material exports and the service sector, thanks to an improved business environment. In December 2015, the government adopted its second NDP 2016-2020, which aims to

¹ The Assessment of Development Results “ADR” is now replaced by the Independent Country Program Evaluations “ICPE.”

² 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).

³ General Census of Population and Housing (RGPH 2014)

transform Côte d'Ivoire into a pre-emerging economy by 2020 and further reduce social inequalities. The economic outlook remains good, and the GDP growth rate is expected to be 7% in 2018 and 2019.⁴

Despite this progress, poverty in the country remains high, with a rate of 46.3% in 2015 as compared to 48.9% in 2008.⁵ This poverty is more pronounced in rural areas than in urban areas. In rural areas, the incidence of poverty is 56.8% compared with 35.9% in urban areas. However, while poverty is declining significantly in rural areas (from 62.5% in 2008 to 56.8% in 2015), it continues to increase in urban areas: 24.5% in 2002, 29.5% in 2008 and 35.9% in 2015.⁶ At the regional level, poverty is higher in the border regions from the northwest to the northeast and lower in the border regions from east to southwest. Interior (non-frontier) regions have an intermediate level of poverty between these two extremes.⁷ Poverty affects both women (47.4% of them are poor) and men (45.5% of men are poor) even if the latter contribute slightly more to this poverty (50.6% of the poor are men).⁸ As for literacy rates, the gaps between men and women are even greater: 53.3% of men are literate as compared to 36.3% of women.⁹ Poverty particularly affects young people: 51.4% of youth under 25 are poor.¹⁰ In terms of human development, Côte d'Ivoire is classified as a country with a low level of human development, with an estimated 2018 index of 0.492 in 2018. Disaggregated by sex, the index is 0.446 for women compared to 0.531 for men.¹¹

In terms of governance, security has improved, and the country has established a peaceful climate. Significant progress has been made in consolidating the rule of law. The country saw an improvement of 12.7 points on the Mo Ibrahim index between 2008 and 2017, and the country was ranked 22nd out of 54 African states in 2017 (it was 34th in 2014).¹² In addition, institutional capacity for governance, in particular the Parliament and the High Authority for Good Governance, as well as civil society organizations, remains insufficient to enable these entities to fully exercise their monitoring function.

The decentralization process remains incomplete. Public administration has greatly suffered greatly from years of crisis, and there are administrative capacity shortcomings in terms of skills, mastery of systems, procedures and methods, but also adequate equipment.¹³ Despite progress in the Transparency International Index (from 27 in 2013 to 36 in 2017, ranked 103 out of 180 in 2017),¹⁴ the country still faces the challenge of fighting corruption in order to effectively manage its resources and improve social justice. In addition, the limited capacity of national structures which lead the transitional justice process, the insufficiency of permanent frameworks of exchange and consultation for rapprochement between communities, along with the persistence of ethno-community tensions and conflicts in certain regions, weigh on the dynamics of social cohesion and national reconciliation.¹⁵

⁴ World Bank, <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/cotedivoire/overview>, accessed October 25, 2018.

⁵ World Bank, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.NAHC?locations=CI>, accessed 25 October 2018.

⁶ Household Living Standards Survey 2015, p. 21

⁷ Household Living Standards Survey 2015, p. 24

⁸ Household Living Standards Survey 2015, p. 31

⁹ Household Living Standards Survey 2015, p. 33

¹⁰ Household Living Standards Survey 2015, p. 32

¹¹ UNDP, <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/CI>, accessed October 25, 2018.

¹² Mo Ibrahim Foundation, IIAG 2018 scores, rankings and trends– Côte d'Ivoire, <http://mo.ibrahim.foundation/iiag/downloads/>, accessed 29 October 2018.

¹³ CPD 2016-2020, p. 108.

¹⁴ https://www.transparency.org/news/feature/corruption_perceptions_index_2017#table, accessed October 29, 2018.

¹⁵ Survey report on the perception of the population on national, international and transitional justice,

With regard to sustainable development and resilience, climate change is a major concern for Côte d'Ivoire. Efforts must be made in energy, forestry and agriculture to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, safeguard the environment and preserve the balance of biodiversity. These sectors occupy an important place in industrialization, the economic transformation of the country and the fight against poverty. Forests in Côte d'Ivoire are degrading at a rate of about 200,000 hectares (ha) per year; the area of dense forest, which was 12 million ha in 1960, was estimated in 2014 at less than two million ha. Forest degradation is a threat to biodiversity. In addition, in general, high population and uncontrolled urbanization lead to increased conflicts in the use of natural resources.¹⁶ In response to these challenges, Côte d'Ivoire is engaged in the international process to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD +), has set up a National Program Climate Change as well as a platform for risk management and natural disasters and adopted a sustainable development orientation law.

With regard to the United Nations in Côte d'Ivoire, the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI) was deployed in April 2004, when the country was split in two, with North and South separated by a “zone of confidence” but in a political stalemate. The disputed 2010 presidential election resulted in a crisis in which approximately 3,000 people were killed and 600,000 were displaced, and the mandate of UNOCI was extended. Five years later, in April 2016, the Security Council commended Côte d'Ivoire's remarkable progress towards lasting peace, stability, economic prosperity and the successful October 2015 presidential election, and decided to extend the mandate of UNOCI for a final period ending on June 30, 2017.¹⁷ It is expected that the UN Country Team will continue to support Cote d'Ivoire to sustain its progress in peace and stability. In preparation for the closure of UNOCI, in 2017, a Peacebuilding Support Program (PACoP) was developed to address the remaining challenges of the transition – security, protection of human rights, and social cohesion, among others.

3. UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN CÔTE D'IVOIRE

The IEO conducted an Assessment of Development Results (ADR) in 2013, covering the 2003-2007, 2007-2008 and 2009-2013 programming cycles. UNDP then implemented a new country programme, initially planned for the 2013-2015 period and extended until 2016.

UNDP's strategy in Côte d'Ivoire for the period 2017-2020 is set within the Unique Programmatic Framework (CPU) of the United Nations System for Development Assistance, which is aligned with the priorities identified by the Government in its NDP 2016-2020. The CPU focused on three priorities: strengthening governance and social cohesion; development of human capital; and sustainable development. Through these three axes, the CPU aims to contribute to the reduction of inequalities making Côte d'Ivoire's process of emergence more inclusive and sustainable. The CPU also anticipates the departure of UNOCI, with uptake by the UN Country Team of residual matters (security sector reform, reintegration of ex-combatants, social cohesion and national reconciliation as well as remaining humanitarian needs)

Ivorian Coalition for the International Criminal Court, cited in the Cote d'Ivoire Country Programme Document 2017-2020.

¹⁶ Country programme document 2017-2020, p. 82.

¹⁷ United Nations Security Council, S/RES/2284 (2016).

UNDP puts human development and the reduction of inequalities at the center of its country programme for 2017-2020, which is structured around two pillars:

1. Governance, rule of law and social cohesion, built around two sub-components:
 - a. Democratic governance, with target support to the Government, Parliament, anti-corruption bodies, the Independent Electoral Commission and local authorities; and
 - b. Peace consolidation, access to justice and national reconciliation
2. Inclusive growth and sustainable development, with a focus on initiatives seeking to promote access to renewable energy; improve sustainable production capacities and forest protection; and create jobs and income generating opportunities benefitting the poor, especially women, youth and vulnerable populations.

Country Programme		Budget (US\$ million)	
Outcomes	Outputs	Planned budget	Expenditure to date
Outcome 1 State and non-state institutions implement public policies and inclusive and sustainable strategies that strengthen governance and social cohesion and reduce inequality.	Output 1.1. The follow-up of the implementation of the national development plan is operationalized and takes into account the sustainable development goals (SDGs), specifically the gender dimension. Output 1.2. Republican institutions, especially Government, High Authority for Good Governance, and Independent Electoral Commission, ensure the checks and balances of public action and citizen participation Output 1.3. Local institutions have reinforced capacities for national reconciliation and the prevention and peaceful management of conflicts. Output 1.4. Vulnerable populations, especially women and youth, have better access to justice services and have increased trust in security services at the community level	2017-2020: 13.2	2018 : 6.645 2017 : 10.965
Outcome 2: Public authorities implement policies that ensure sustainable production and consumption methods, income generation, and resilience to climate change for vulnerable populations	Output 2.1. Village communities not connected to the electrical network and actors of private sector have improved access to a renewable source of energy Output 2.2. Actors in the agricultural and forestry sectors adopt sustainable production and management practices Output 2.3. Populations most disadvantaged, in particular youth and women, have technical capacities and better access to financing, and undertake revenue-generating activities and/or jobs	2017-2020: 38.3	2018 : 0.539 2017 : 1.477

Source: UNDP Côte d'Ivoire Country Programme Document 2017-2020. UNDP Corporate Planning System – Programme Profile Côte d'Ivoire.

The country programme also aligns with UNDP's Strategic Plan and Gender Strategy¹⁸ and is expected to contribute to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 1, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, 16 and 15. 17. The goal is to improve policy coordination, implementation capacity and accountability to strengthen inclusion, resilience and sustainability.

¹⁸ The country programme document, prepared in 2016, makes reference to the UNDP 2014-2017 Gender Strategy, In 2018, UNDP adopted a new gender strategy (DP/2018/21).

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The ICPE is carried out during the penultimate year of the ongoing UNDP country programme to contribute to the process of developing the new country programme. Thus, the evaluation will cover the current program (2017-2020), covering the period of 2017-early 2019. Since the evaluation will cover a relatively short period, it will also examine, as appropriate, the results of key interventions during the previous programme. It will also examine the degree of adoption and follow-up of the recommendations of the last evaluation conducted by the IEO in 2013.

The evaluation will evaluate UNDP's contribution in the country, as defined by the outcome results in the country programme document, approved by UNDP's Executive Board. It will aim to draw lessons from current and, where appropriate, previous programme implementation in order to assess UNDP performance, and to make forward-looking recommendations that will contribute to the formulation of the next country programme. The ICPE will extend to all UNDP interventions and activities implemented by the Country Office, including interventions funded by regular UNDP resources, donors, and by the Government during the period covered by evaluation. It is important to note that a UNDP country office may also 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, and will be taken into account by the ICPE.

Special efforts will be made to capture the role and contribution of the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) and UNCDF programme through their collaboration and joint work with UNDP. This information will be used in the synthesis framework to provide evaluative evidence at the organizational level regarding the performance of programs and associated funds.

5. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards.¹⁹ The ICPE will address the following three key evaluation questions.²⁰ 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?

In addition, as gender equality is central to UNDP's support to countries to implement and achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals, the evaluation will also analyze the extent to which UNDP (country) support was designed to and did contribute to gender equality.

The ICPE is conducted at the outcome level. To address question 1, 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

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

²⁰ The ICPEs have adopted a streamlined methodology, which differs from the previous ADRs that were structured according to the four standard OECD DAC criteria.

the intervention(s) and the intended country programme outcomes. As part of this analysis, the CPD's progression 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.

The effectiveness of UNDP's country programme will be analyzed under evaluation question 2. This will include an assessment of the achieved outputs and the extent to which these outputs have contributed to the intended CPD outcomes. In this process, both positive and negative, direct and indirect unintended outcomes will also be identified.

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

6. DATA COLLECTION

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. A preliminary assessment was carried for each outcome to ascertain the available information, identify data constraints, to determine the data collection needs and methods. The assessment outlined the level of evaluable data that is available. The UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (CRE) reports that 8 evaluations were planned as part of the country programme. As of February 2019, only one project evaluation had been completed. Two final outcome evaluations of the previous country programme were conducted in 2016. The UNDP Audit and Investigation Office conducted an audit in 2014.

In terms of indicators, the country programme framework document lists 7 CPD outcome indicators, and 36 indicators associated with the 7 specific UNDP program outputs. The indicators include reference data and targets, as well as their source of verification. To the extent possible, the ICPE will use these indicators and data to interpret the UNDP programme goals and to measure or assess progress toward the intended outcomes. The evaluation team will do a further assessment of existing data and possible constraints during the preparatory and desk analysis phases.

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 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, 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 Côte d’Ivoire programmes and operations. Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes.

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 Côte d’Ivoire country office, the Regional Bureau for Africa and the Government of Côte d’Ivoire. 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 Côte d’Ivoire: 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, country office 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 Africa: The UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa 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:** Two external consultants (preferably national but international will also be considered, as appropriate) specialized in peacebuilding and recovery and in local inclusive sustainable development will be recruited to carry out data collection and support evaluation of the program, or specific effects of the program. Under the supervision of the Lead Evaluator, the consultants will conduct preliminary research and data collection activities, prepare an effects analysis, and contribute to the drafting of the final report of the EIPP.
- **Research Assistant (RA):** A research assistant based in the IEO will support the background research.

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The ICPE will be conducted according to the approved IEO process²¹. 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 March 2019. During this phase, the evaluation team undertakes an in-country mission to engage in data collection activities. The estimated duration of the mission is up to 2-3 calendar weeks, with planned dates of 18 March – 2 April. Data will be collected according to the approach outlined in Section 6. 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 with the country office.

²¹ The evaluation will be conducted according to the [ICPE Process Manual](#) and the [ICPE Methodology Manual](#)

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 Africa for factual corrections. The second draft, which takes into account any factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for further comments. Any necessary additional corrections will be made and the UNDP Côte d’Ivoire 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 will be written in English. A French version will be produced if necessary. 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 Côte d’Ivoire country office and the Government of Côte d’Ivoire will disseminate the report to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website²² 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.²³

9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are proposed as follows in Table 3:²⁴

Table 3: Timeframe for the ICPE process going to the Board in 2020		
Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
Phase 1: Preparatory work		
TOR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office	LE	November 2018
Selection of other evaluation team members	LE	December 2018 – January 2019
Phase 2: Desk analysis		
Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis	Evaluation team	January – mid-March 2019
Phase 3: Data Collection		
Data collection and preliminary findings	Evaluation team	18 March – 2 April 2019
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief		
Analysis and Synthesis	Evaluation team	April-May 2019
Zero draft ICPE for clearance by IEO and EAP	LE	June 2019

²² web.undp.org/evaluation

²³ erc.undp.org

²⁴ The timeframe, indicative of process and deadlines, does not imply full-time engagement of evaluation team during the period.

First draft ICPE for CO/RB review	CO/RB	July 2019
Second draft ICPE shared with government	CO/Government	August 2019
Draft management response	CO	September 2019
Final debriefing with national stakeholders (video conference)	CO/LE	September 2019
Phase 5: Production and Follow-up		
Editing and formatting	IEO	October-November 2019
Final report and Evaluation Brief	IEO	December 2019
Dissemination of the final report	IEO/CO	January 2020