

Annex 1. Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) will conduct an Independent Country Programme Evaluation (ICPE) in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in 2018/2019 as part of its annual work plan. The ICPEs, formerly known as the “Assessments of Development Results (ADRs),” are typically conducted in the penultimate year of the country programme cycle to inform the elaboration of the new country programme with evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contribution to national development priorities. The purpose of an ICPE is to:

- Support the development of the next UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD);
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders; and
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board.

ICPEs are carried out in accordance with 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. IEO’s responsibility 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.

This is IEO’s third country programme evaluation conducted for Afghanistan.² The evaluation will focus on UNDP’s work during the ongoing programme cycle 2015-2019. It is conducted in close collaboration with UNDP Afghanistan, Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific (RBAP), and the Government of Afghanistan. Results of the evaluation are expected to provide a set of forward-looking recommendations as input to the new CPD process for the next country programme.

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

Afghanistan is a land-locked, mountainous and semi-arid country, bordered by China, Iran, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. It is made up of 34 provinces (*wilayat*). Its population was 34.7 million in 2016,³ of which 73 percent reside in rural areas.⁴ About 63.7 percent of the population are under age 25.⁵ It is a multi-cultural and multi-lingual country with Pashto and Dari/Farsi as the major languages.

Protracted conflict for almost thirty-five years and continued insurgency in parts of the country have taken a serious toll on Afghanistan’s development process. The last decade was also marked by considerable international aid efforts and an international military intervention. In 2004, the first democratic elections took place, with subsequent presidential elections in 2009 and 2014. Parliamentary and district council elections are scheduled for October 2018. With the withdrawal of international troops in 2014 and the creation of the National Unity Government, Afghanistan began a transformation decade towards self-reliance, aiming to transition towards a post-crisis recovery context with more developmental initiatives.

¹ DP/2016/23, *UNDP Evaluation Policy*, 19 July 2016.

² The first two ADRs covered the programme periods 2002-2008 (UNDP, 2009) and 2009-2013 (UNDP, 2014).

³ 29.7 million as per national statistics, of which 1.5 million are nomads

⁴ World Bank data

⁵ UNFPA, <http://afghanistan.unfpa.org/en/node/15227>. According to World Bank data, 44 percent are under 14

More recently, this has been reflected on the Afghanistan National Peace and Development Framework (2017-2021) presented in October 2016 at the Brussels Conference on Afghanistan.⁶

The 2004 constitution created a centralized presidential government with a bicameral system. However, Afghanistan's institutions remain fragile and challenged by security concerns, ineffective governance, patronage-based politics, corruption, a weak justice system and political exclusion.⁷ The ongoing conflict has led to significant landmine/ERW contamination, increasing civilian casualties⁸ and to large population movements, with 1.8 million internally displaced people and 354,000 returnees,⁹ bringing mounting pressure on the overstretched public services. State building, security and development efforts are challenged by armed non-state actors who have territorial control in many parts of the country. The 2017 UNAMA strategic review noted that “Afghanistan is not in a post-conflict situation, where sufficient stability exists to focus on institution-building and development-oriented activities, but a country undergoing a conflict that shows few signs of abating.”¹⁰

Afghanistan has witnessed positive trends in life expectancy (from 55 in 2000 to 63 in 2015), primary school enrolment and infant mortality and maternal rates.¹¹ Progress has been uneven, however, and the country's Human Development Index remains one of the lowest in the world, ranking it at 169th out of 188 countries.¹² In 2014, 39 percent of Afghans lived below the national poverty line. About 33 percent are food insecure and 41 percent of Afghan children under the age of five are stunted.¹³ Participation of women in the national workforce and the parliament remains low, and they continue to suffer widespread discrimination and human rights abuses. With fertility rates at 4.8 in 2016, increasing unemployment and high rates of illiteracy, the country's economic growth could turn to be insufficient to cover the needs of the population, particularly its large ‘youth bulge.’

Afghanistan is a low-income country.¹⁴ The economy is mostly driven by foreign military and development aid and illicit agricultural production.¹⁵ Following foreign military disengagement, the economy deteriorated although the economic growth rate moderately increased during 2015-2017. The development of the agricultural sector and the extractive industries is a major challenge for the country but has potential to drive economic growth. Afghanistan's agricultural sector represented 22 percent of GDP and 62 percent of total employment in 2016. However, economic volatility is high and the World Bank's 2018 Doing Business index positioned Afghanistan at 183 out of 190 countries.

Widespread natural disasters are recurrent, particularly floods, drought, earthquakes, avalanches and landslides, and their impact can be very severe as 80 per cent of the population depends on natural

⁶ At the Berlin conference in March 2004, the Afghan Government presented a post-conflict transition plan. Renewed strategies towards self-reliance were presented in several subsequent international conferences, leading to growing pledges of military, financial and development assistance.

⁷ UNDP Conflict Development Analysis, 2013.

⁸ A total of 10,453 civilian casualties were reported in 2017, including 3,438 deaths. UNAMA, 2017 Annual Report on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict in Afghanistan, Feb 2018.

⁹ UNHCR data, 2018. http://popstats.unhcr.org/en/overview#_ga=2.115113550.899334860.1515684169-1671454803.1513002967

¹⁰ A/72/312, <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/N1723365.pdf>

¹¹ World Bank data.

¹² UNDP Human Development Report 2016. Afghanistan is in the low human development category with the HDI value for 2015 being 0.479.

¹³ WFP, <http://www1.wfp.org/countries/afghanistan>

¹⁴ World Bank, country classifications by income 2017-2018

¹⁵ UNDAF 2015-2019

resources for their livelihoods. Forest coverage has been decimated and only 12% of the land is now suitable for farming. Disputes over land are very common. Although some efforts have been made, the environment remains a neglected sector by the government.

3. UNDP PROGRAMME IN AFGHANISTAN, 2015-2019

UNDP's operation in Afghanistan began in 1966. Its programme of work for the current cycle has been defined in the Country Programme Document (CPD) for Afghanistan 2015-2019.¹⁶ The preparation of the CPD was guided by the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the same period, developed by the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in Afghanistan in coordination with the Afghan Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The UNCT comprises 28 UN agencies, of which 24 are represented in-country.¹⁷

With the 'Transformation Decade' in Afghanistan on the horizon, following presidential elections and the withdrawal of international troops in 2014, UNDP seeks during the current programme period to "achieve transformational change in an environment of great complexity and insecurity."¹⁸ In line with the Afghanistan National Development Strategy (ANDS) and the mandate of the integrated United Nations Assistance Mission to Afghanistan (UNAMA), UNDP is programmatically expected to address four UNDAF priority areas through its outputs (or areas of contribution) as shown in Table 1: i) Accountable Governance; ii) Justice and Rule of Law; iii) Equitable and Inclusive Development; and iv) Social Equity.¹⁹ Four cross-cutting guiding principles apply to all areas of the programme, i.e. i) area-based approaches for better targeting of beneficiaries; ii) scalability of results and use of multidisciplinary approaches; iii) partnership building; and iv) use of national systems and 'Serving as One.' UNDP is also expected to exercise conflict sensitivity and focus on capacity development (vis-à-vis capacity substitution) in each of the country programme outcomes during the period.

Table 1. UNDAF/UNDP Outcomes and UNDP's Areas of Specific Contribution (CPD 2015-2019)		
UNDAF/UNDP Outcomes	UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017	UNDP Outputs (Areas of Contribution)
<p>Accountable Governance (UNDAF pillar 5/ UNDP Outcome 7): Improved legitimate, transparent and inclusive governance at all levels that enables progressive realization of human rights</p> <p>Indicative resources: i) Regular \$390M</p>	<p>Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Political processes are more inclusive and representative institutions are enabled to hold government more accountable at all levels 2. Capacity of state and non-state institutions strengthened to advance peacebuilding 3. Capacities of national and local institutions strengthened through improved assessment, planning, and budgeting to respond to development priorities, especially of the most vulnerable and women.

¹⁶ DP/DCP/AFG/3, *Country Programme Document for Afghanistan, 2015-2019*, 11 July 2014, submitted to the Second Regular Session of 2014 Executive Board, 2-5 September 2014.

¹⁷ UNCT Afghanistan, *United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Afghanistan, 2015-2019*.

¹⁸ UNDP CPD 2015-2019.

¹⁹ The UNDAF has a total of five priority areas, including Basic Social Services, which has not been covered in the UNDP CPD.

<p>Justice and Rule of Law (UNDAF pillar 4/ UNDP Outcome 8): Trust in and access to fair, effective, and accountable rule of law services is increased in accordance with applicable international human rights standards and the Government's legal obligations</p> <p>Indicative resources: i) Regular \$500M for 3 years (\$1.5B) for the Law and Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan (LOTFA) payroll; and ii) Other \$350M over 5 years</p>	<p>Countries have strengthened institutions to progressively deliver universal access to basic services.</p>	<p>4. National institutions enabled for strengthened justice and police governance</p> <p>5. Capacity of justice and rule of law institutions strengthened for improved access to justice and police services delivery</p>
<p>Equitable and Inclusive Development (UNDAF pillar 1/ UNDP Outcome 9): Economic growth is accelerated to reduce vulnerabilities and poverty, strengthen the resilience of the licit economy and reduce the illicit economy in its multiple dimensions</p> <p>Indicative resources: i) Regular \$360M</p>	<p>Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded (Outcome 1); Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change.</p>	<p>6. Improved economic livelihoods, especially for vulnerable populations and women</p> <p>7. Vulnerable and marginalized populations, especially women, have increased and equitable access to natural resources and affordable energy, including through improved environmental governance</p> <p>8. Increased community resilience to climate change and disasters, thereby reducing vulnerability and sustaining economic gains</p>
<p>Social Equity (UNDAF pillar 3/ UNDP Outcome 10): Social equity of women, youth and minorities and vulnerable populations is increased through improved and consistent application by Government of principles of inclusion in implementing existing and creating new policies and legislation</p> <p>Indicative resources: i) Regular \$48M</p>	<p>Faster progress is achieved in reducing gender inequality and promoting women's empowerment.</p>	<p>9. Government enabled to implement national and international commitments impacting women</p> <p>10. Enhanced government and civil society capacity to monitor and report on national and international commitments affecting women</p> <p>11. Formal and informal systems and mechanisms operational for effective enforcement of laws and policies to eliminate gender-based discrimination and violence against women</p>

Following the formulation and launch of the UNDAF and UNDP's country programme, Afghanistan's security continued to deteriorate, further bringing political and economic instabilities. To meet the growing expectations by the Government of Afghanistan for the UN entities to 'deliver as one' at the country level, the UNCT undertook in late 2017 a comprehensive review of its work under the existing UNDAF 2015-2019.²⁰ This has led to the development of a new UN programme framework for the period

²⁰ UN Afghanistan, the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of UNDAF 2015-2019, Nov 2017. The MTR covered the work period 2016-2017.

2018-2021, “One UN for Afghanistan 2018-2021,” with six new priority areas: i) normative (e.g. human rights, policy and data); ii) education; iii) food security, nutrition, livelihoods; iv) health; v) return and reintegration; and vi) rule of law and governance.²¹

To align its programme cycle to the new Government priority, Afghanistan National Peace and Development Framework 2017-2021, as well as to the revised extended UNDAF (“One UN”) 2018-2021, UNDP Afghanistan is planning to extend its current country programme in 2019 by two years to 2021.²²

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The ICPE Afghanistan will examine UNDP’s ongoing programme, 2015-2019, as formally approved by the Executive Board. Guided by the Results and Resources Framework defined in the CPD 2015-2019, the evaluation will assess UNDP’s performance in contributing to the four programme outcomes through its specific areas of support, in the areas of:

- Accountable governance;
- Justice and rule of law;
- Equitable and inclusive development; and
- Social equity.

The scope of the evaluation, at the same time, will reflect the multiple constraints 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. For example, with a highly likely extension of the CPD by two years at the Executive Board in 2019, the evaluation is expected to take place roughly at the ‘midpoint’ of the extended country programme, i.e. 2015-2021, at the time of this writing. The UNDP country office has also gone through a significant change management process since the end of 2014, entailing changes in the office structure, staffing (e.g. a 65 percent reduction in the number of international staff between 2014 and 2015), programme portfolios (reflecting the new One UN framework that seeks a ‘clear value proposition’ from both individual UN agencies and the UNCT as a whole), and programme operations (e.g. shift from a decentralized, project-driven model with large project teams to a leaner, centralized model with tighter oversight mechanisms).²³

As with other ICPEs, the evaluation will attempt to assess the ***level of progress and achievements made thus far by UNDP against its initial programmatic objectives***. Given the significant programmatic and operational changes UNDP has undergone at the start of the current programme, however, the evaluation will place greater focus on assessing the relevance of ***UNDP’s strategies for achieving programme effectiveness during the time of transition*** both within the country office and the country. This will include identification of potential gaps, as well as implications to the rest of the programme cycle and to the next country programme cycle. Areas of particular attention in this strategic analysis will include programming strategies (including use of a theory of change for broader development goals), plans for sustainability and resilience, application of a conflict sensitivity approach, the level of gender equality and women’s empowerment integrated in programming, the role of partnerships with development partners (e.g. UN

²¹ UN Afghanistan, One UN for Afghanistan: 1 January 2018 – 31 December 2021 (15 January 2018)

²² DP/2018/22 Extensions of country programmes, 2 July 2018, expected to be submitted to the Second Regular Session of the 2018 Executive Board. The submission has now been postponed to the 2019 January Board session.

²³ UNDP Afghanistan, Country Profile: Afghanistan, updated in November 2017.

agencies, including the contribution of UNV and UNCDF; international financial institutions; and donors), and civil society engagement.

The ICPE will assess UNDP's interventions in the country that are active or completed between 2015 and 2018. The interventions under review are funded by all sources, including those from UNDP's regular resources, donors, and the Government. The efforts supported by UNDP's regional and global programmes will also be included.

5. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the norms and the standards for evaluations established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), which include ethical standards for ensuring overall credibility and responsible use of resources.²⁴

The ICPEs typically address three standard evaluation questions and methodological approaches.²⁵ The evaluation for Afghanistan will address the following two key questions, reflecting changes in the country's programme context (Section 3) and the modified scope of the evaluation. A specific design matrix will be developed to address the two questions:

1. To what extent has UNDP been able to achieve its initial and adjusted programme objectives in contribution to each outcome?
2. To what extent has UNDP's strategy for achieving programme effectiveness in the context of changing environment been applied and successful?

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. The analysis is conducted at the outcome level, but the full results are not expected at the level for Afghanistan, given the portfolio changes and the fact that the evaluation takes place at the midpoint (only a few years into) of the extended programme cycle. Thus, the focus will be on capturing the progress made thus far in the areas UNDP is expected to uniquely add values based on its comparative strengths, and identifying lessons moving forward.²⁶ 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.
- A gender analysis to assess the extent to which UNDP support was designed to and contributed to gender equality and women's empowerment by using the tools such as the Gender Marker and the Gender Results Effectiveness Scale (GRES), respectively.²⁷

²⁴ United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Norms and Standards for Evaluation, 2016 revision.

²⁵ 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?"

²⁶ This may include an analysis on the existing M&E mechanism, given limited access to project sites by UNDP staff.

²⁷ *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

- The recommendations drawn from the last country programme evaluation (ADR 2014) and the status of implementing actions under the management response.
- An extensive desk review of documents, including evaluation reports, available internally and externally to facilitate the results validation process, given the anticipated challenges in collecting primary data in the country due to insecurity, which will be complemented by any other means of data collection available (Section 6).²⁸

The second question focuses on the relevance of various strategic choices made by UNDP during the cycle through a number of reviews - including the Afghanistan Strategic Programme Review (2016) and the Alignment Mission (2015), which examined UNDP's sector-specific strategies and instruments and its organizational structure, and the mid-term review of the UNDAF (Nov 2017) and the mid-term review of the UNDP Country Programme (Dec 2017) - to strengthen its programme effectiveness. The question will examine how UNDP has exploited its added value to the programming during the transitional period. It will assess how well the programmatic and operational adjustments made through those reviews and change management processes have worked, including the extent of the expected milestones being on track, potential gaps, and implications for strategically positioning UNDP in the next programme cycle.

The evaluation will examine factors that may have influenced UNDP's performance, both positively or negatively, in alignment with the engagement principles and parameters of its Strategic Plan as well as from programme management perspectives.²⁹ This will include, among others, the degree of gender mainstreaming and civil society engagements as factors for UNDP's programme effectiveness.

The evaluation will pay attention to various country-specific issues that may have impacted the degree of UNDP's programme implementation and results, including:

- Afghanistan's unique political decision-making processes through the National Unity Government led by the President and the Chief Executive.
- Its history of high aid dependency and challenges in donor coordination.³⁰

A participatory approach will be taken to ensure that relevant stakeholders are fully informed of the evaluation process, participate in the activities as intended, and exercise the ownership of the process and the final evaluation results. Based on the stakeholder mapping (Section 6), key stakeholder groups will be identified, who may or may not work directly with UNDP.

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 Afghanistan include the following:

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).

²⁸ E.g. the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the Law and Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan Support to Payroll Management Project (LOTFA SPM project), completed and available in March 2018.

²⁹ E.g. The Strategic Plan 2014-2017 engagement 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.

³⁰ OXFAM and Swedish Committee for Afghanistan (SCA), Aid Effectiveness in Afghanistan, 15 March 2018

- **Security constrains and stakeholder availability:** Given the country's ongoing armed conflict setting, significant limitations in the evaluation team's ability to travel within the country are expected. The initial consultations with the country office and RBAP have suggested logistical challenges in conducting field-based data collection activities, including limited or no access to many of the project sites by international staff, and requiring advance preparations for internal travels (e.g. security advance clearance and military escorts). The May 2017 bombing of nearby embassies have forced many staff evacuations. The Rest and Recuperation (R&R), which allows staff to be away from the office for one week every 6 weeks, is also in effect, requiring a careful, advance planning for scheduling stakeholder interviews and meetings.
- **Availability of past evaluation reports:** The Evaluation Resource Center (ERC) information indicates that a total of 13 evaluations are available since 2015, including the CPD Midterm Evaluation, UNDAF Evaluation (Joint UNCT, 2017), Final Evaluation of LOTFA, and 11 project evaluations. The outcome evaluations are yet to be completed although those for 4 outcomes are planned for 2017-2018 according to the costed evaluation.³¹
- **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. At the preliminary phase, there is a fair amount of required project documents, strategic papers, and monitoring reports. The CPD provides a measurement framework, including indicators, baselines, and targets for the outcomes. 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 2015, 2016, and 2017, and the Corporate Planning System associated with them.
- **National statistical capacity:** Afghanistan's internal statistical capacity has made improvements in the last decade, and yet remains below the average among countries in South Asia, according to the World Bank's Statistical Capacity Indicator.³²

Data collection methods. The general data collection plan will be guided by the ToC (Section 5), as well as a stakeholder mapping to be conducted at the beginning of the evaluation.³³ A design matrix will elaborate data collection plans for each of the evaluation questions. Data and information required for the evaluation will be collected primarily through the following:

- **Desk reviews:** The evaluation team will review various reference material, including country programme and strategy documents, corporately-available results data, project documents, annual work plans, ROARs, past evaluation reports (internal and external), audit reports, UNDP/UNCT publications, government reports. Given the significance of the desk review exercise for this evaluation, the quality of each documentation will be critical for the team's ability to extract meaningful information.
- **Stakeholder interviews:** Face-to-face and/or telephone/Skype interviews will be conducted with relevant stakeholders, including government officials, national implementation partners, development partners (UN agencies, IFIs, and donors), UNDP country office and RBAP (and its Regional Hub), and beneficiary groups.³⁴ Interviews also include UNDP's relevant headquarter

³¹ UNDP Afghanistan Fully-Costed Evaluation Plan, updated 23/07/2017.

³² <http://datatopics.worldbank.org/statisticalcapacity/SCIdashboard.aspx>

³³ A mapping of stakeholder groups relevant to the ICPE. They may include key players in the national context (including those who may not have direct relationships with the UNDP programme) and the existing partners in the design and implementation of the programme areas. The exercise will identify the relationship between different stakeholders and their interests.

³⁴ Given the limited physical mobility anticipated in the country, the evaluation team's ability to reach required groups (e.g. beneficiary groups) is likely to be limited. The use of national consultants for field work (locally-based in provinces

offices (e.g. Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, and Crisis Response Unit), relevant UN departments (e.g. Department of Peacekeeping Operations), and others appropriate, including the UNAMA. Efforts will be made to collect views from a diverse range of stakeholders on UNDP's performance.

- Site visits: Visits to field project sites are expected to be minimal and will be planned, as possible, in close consultation with the country office.
- Additional data collection activities may be planned, as appropriate, including the use of an experts meeting and administration of an advance questionnaire.

A list of projects for in-depth reviews will be developed based on a purposive sampling. The criteria for selection includes programme coverage (a balanced selection of issues covered under each outcome), project maturity, budget, and geographical spreads. Attention will be paid to include both flagship projects of significant scope, outreach, and visibility, as well as those that experienced challenges.

Gender-related data will be collected by using corporately-available sources (e.g. the Gender Marker) and programme/ project-based sources (e.g. through desk reviews of documents and interviews). Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available.

Validation. Data and information collected from different sources and through various means will be triangulated before the evaluation reaches conclusions and recommendations.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP: The IEO lead evaluator leads the evaluation and coordinates the work of the evaluation team. The IEO will meet all costs related to the conduct of the ICPE.

UNDP Country office in Afghanistan: The country office supports the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and stakeholders, and provides all necessary documentation and information related to UNDP's programmes, projects and activities. It provides support in kind during the evaluation (e.g. scheduling of interviews and meetings with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries; and assistance for the project site visits). The country office reviews a draft evaluation report and provides factual verifications in a timely manner. The country office staff do not participate in the stakeholder interviews to ensure anonymity of the interviewees. Once a final draft report has been prepared, the country office prepares a management response to the evaluation recommendations, in consultation with the RBAP. The management response will be included in the final ICPE report. The country office facilitates the organization of a final stakeholder debriefing, through a videoconference, ensuring participation of national stakeholder representatives, including government officials. It facilitates the process of document reviews by national stakeholders (e.g. TOR and the draft evaluation report) and ensure the dissemination and use of the final ICPE report at the country level.

UNDP Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific: The UNDP Regional Bureau will support the evaluation through information sharing and participation in the final stakeholder debriefing. Once the evaluation has been completed, the Bureau is also responsible for monitoring the status and progress of the country office's implementation of the evaluation recommendations, as defined in its management response.

to be selected for the evaluation) will be explored.

Evaluation Team: The IEO will constitute an evaluation team to undertake the ICPE. It is expected to ensure gender balance in the team, which will comprise the following members:

- **Lead Evaluator (LE):** IEO staff member with an overall responsibility of developing the evaluation design and terms of reference; managing the conduct of the ICPE, preparing/ finalizing the final report; and organizing the stakeholder debriefing with the country office and national stakeholders.
- **Associate Lead Evaluator (ALE):** IEO staff with the general responsibility to support the LE, including in the preparation of terms of reference and evaluation design, data collection and analysis, synthesis of the team members' individual reports, and the overall implementation of the evaluation.
- **Consultants:** External consultants (national/ international team specialists) will be recruited to support data collection and analysis of programme outcomes and strategies, which include relevant cross-cutting issues (e.g. gender). Under the guidance of LE/ALE, they will conduct a preliminary desk review research, develop a data collection plan, prepare outcome analysis papers, and contribute to the preparation of final conclusions and recommendations of the report.
- **Research Assistant:** A research assistant at the IEO will provide background research and documentation support.

The role and responsibilities of the evaluation team members are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Data collection responsibilities by outcome	
Outcome	Report and Data collection
Accountable Governance (O#7), Social Equity/ Gender (O#10)	Team Specialist
Justice and Rule of Law (O#8)	Team Specialist
Equitable and Inclusive Development, Resilience, DRR (O#9)	Team Specialist
Strategic Policy Guidance and Positioning	LE + Evaluation Team

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The ICPE will be conducted according to the approved IEO process. There are five key phases to the evaluation process, as summarized below.

Phase 1: Preparatory work. Following the initial consultation with the country office and the Regional Bureau and preliminary reviews of the country programme-related documents, the IEO prepares the terms of reference (TOR), which will be shared with the country office and Regional Bureau for comments. An evaluation design matrix will be developed detailing evaluation questions, criteria and data collection and analysis strategy. The IEO will recruit required external consultants with relevant skills and expertise. The IEO, with the support of the country office, collect all relevant reference documents and material for the evaluation.

Phase 2: Desk analysis. A full desk review of reference material is conducted by all team members. To facilitate the preliminary data collection, an advance questionnaire may be administered to the stakeholders as well as an initial set of interviews with some of the stakeholder groups, including the country office/ headquarter staff (via face-to-face, telephone, or Skype). The evaluation plan in the design matrix will be adjusted, as needed, at this stage. The evaluation team members familiarize themselves with the outcome analysis framework, study (or develop unless available) a relevant theory of change for the designated outcome area(s), review self-reported outcome results on (ROAR compilation from 2015 to present), and identify any data gaps that need to be filled during the in-country data collection mission.

Phase 3: Data collection. The evaluation team travels to Afghanistan to engage in a three-week in-country data collection. The timing of the mission will be closely discussed and coordinated with the country office, considering, e.g. national events and environment (including the planned Parliamentary elections, which has been postponed from July to October 2018). The data and required information are collected in accordance with the TOR and design matrix, following the general approaches outlined in Section 6 (data collection) and Section 7 (team members' role and responsibilities). At the end of the mission, the evaluation team holds a mission debriefing session at the country office, presenting preliminary findings. By the end of the mission, additional data gaps and areas requiring further analysis should be identified for follow-ups.

Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief. Based on the analysis of data collected and triangulated, the LE undertakes a synthesis process to prepare the ICPE report. The first draft ("zero draft") is subject to peer reviews by IEO and the Evaluation Advisory Panel (EAP). It will then be circulated to the country office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific for factual corrections. The second draft, which reflects any factual corrections, is shared with national stakeholders for further comments. Any additional corrections/ revisions are made and the UNDP Afghanistan country office prepares a management response, under the oversight of the Regional Bureau. The report is then shared at a final debriefing where results of the evaluation are presented to key national stakeholders. Ways forward are discussed with a view to creating greater ownership by national stakeholders in taking forward the recommendations and strengthening national accountability of UNDP. The final evaluation is completed and published, after considering the discussions at the stakeholder event.

Phase 5: Publication and dissemination. The ICPE report and the evaluation brief are widely distributed in hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report is made available to UNDP Executive Board at the time of its approval of the new Country Programme Document. It is 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 Afghanistan country office and the Government of Afghanistan disseminate the report to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response are published on the UNDP website as well as in the Evaluation Resource Centre. The Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific is responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.

9. TIMEFRAME

The tentative timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are summarized, as follows:

Table 3: ICPE Process Timeframe		
Activity	Responsible party	Tentative timeframe
Phase 1: Preparatory work		
Initial engagement with CO and RBAP; Preliminary collection of reference material; Evaluability assessment	LE/ALE	Spring 2018
Development of TOR	LE/ALE	Sept 2018
Selection of evaluation team members	LE/ALE	Sept-Oct
Preparation of a design matrix and other instruments	LE/ALE	Sept-Oct
Phase 2: Desk analysis		
Preliminary analysis of available data, including HQ-based meetings and interviews	Evaluation Team	Nov-Dec
Phase 3: Data collection		

In-country data collection and validation (approx. 3 weeks)	Evaluation Team	Jan – Feb 2019
Follow-up activities (additional data collection)		Feb – Mar
Preparation of individual reports		Feb – Mar
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief		
Analysis and Synthesis	LE/ALE/Evaluation Team	Apr
Zero draft ICPE for clearance by IEO	LE/ALE	May
First draft ICPE for CO/RB review	CO/RB	June
Second draft shared with GOV and national stakeholders	CO/GOV	July
Draft management response	CO/RB	July
Final debriefing meeting (VCR) with national stakeholders	CO/LE/ALE	Aug
Phase 5: Production and Follow-up		
Editing and formatting	IEO	Sept
Final report and Evaluation Brief	IEO	Sept – Oct
Dissemination of the final report	IEO/CO	Oct – Nov
*Submission of the new CPD for EB approval	CO/RBAP	*Sept 2021