

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. 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 Uganda 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 Uganda, UNDP Uganda country office, and UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa.

2. National context

Development Context: Uganda is a low-income country with an estimated population of 37.7 million people in 2016/17. Over the past 30 years, Uganda has achieved high growth and poverty reduction. Uganda ranks 162nd (of 189) countries in the 2017 Human Development Index with a score of .516. The Country aims to achieve lower-middle income status by 2040, and Government strategies have accordingly shifted from a poverty reduction to an economic growth and transformation agenda.

Key development challenges continue to include the uneven distribution of development gains across social groups and regions, gender inequality in politics and the economy, governance gaps and low citizen participation, corruption, regional insecurity, degradation of natural resources, and youth unemployment.

There are significant regional and social disparities within the country which have impacted and slowed development progress in recent years. The national poverty rate was 21.4% in 2016, reaching 35.7% in the North and 32.5% in the East. An estimated 57% of Ugandans – over 23.5 million Ugandans – live in multidimensional poverty. Within the Eastern region, poverty is particularly acute in the Karamoja sub-region at 60.2%. The 2012 disarmament brought a fragile peace to the region, ending the extended conflict between the government and pastoral Karimojong groups and inter-group disputes. The arid

region faces risks of drought and famine with the impact of climate change. Uganda has made strides in its health outcomes yet there are still gaps in maternal and child health, particularly in communicable diseases and unmet need for family planning.

Uganda adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and was a pioneer in mainstreaming the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in development planning. Vision 2040 outlines Uganda's long-term development strategy, implemented through five-year development plans including the 2015/6-2019/2020 National Development Plan (NDP-II).

Political Context: Uganda is a parliamentary democracy, led by President Yoweri Museveni since 1986. He was re-elected in 2016 with 60.62% of the vote; the next elections are scheduled for 2021.

Corruption is a key concern within the country. In 2017, Transparency International ranked Uganda 151st (of 180 countries) in its Corruption Perceptions Index and the Country loses an estimated \$250-300 million dollars of public resources annually through corruption.

Instability in South Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DR Congo) has disrupted trade and resulted in an influx over one million refugees since mid-2016. Uganda hosts over 1.1 million refugees and asylum seekers and has earned international recognition for its progressive refugee policies.

Environment: Uganda remains predominantly rural and agricultural with rural Ugandans representing 75.7% of the population, with a poverty incidence of 25% compared to 9.6% for the urban population. Uganda is vulnerable to the effects of climate change including increased temperatures and drought, particularly in the arid northeast areas, disease, and other extreme weather events.

Gender: Uganda ranks 126th (out of 160 countries) on the Gender Inequality Index and 43rd (out of 149 countries) on the Global Gender Gap report. Uganda has implemented progressive gender legislation yet women still face barriers including access to credit and low rates of land ownership (27%). While narrowing, women have lower rates of educational attainment, employment, and political representation. Violence against women is prevalent: 55.5% of women ages 15-49 reported physical or sexual violence.

3. UNDP programme strategy in Uganda

The UNDP country programme is outlined in the 2016-2020 Country Programme Document (CPD), and is in alignment with the 2016-2020 UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and the Ugandan National Development Plan II (NDP-II), 2015/16 to 2019/20. The CPD has pillars covering 4 outcomes, i) inclusive governance and ii) the sustainable and inclusive economic development pillars, with gender equality and women's empowerment as a cross-cutting issue.

The **Inclusive Effective Governance portfolio** focuses developing national capacities in three key areas – corresponding to Outcomes 1, 2, and 3 in the CPD:

- **Rule of Law and Constitutional Democracy:** Focused on upstream support in justice, law and order sector institutions in order to enhance service delivery and equitable access in line with human rights standards. At lower levels, support provided increased access to legal aid and justice for poor and vulnerable groups, especially the elderly; HIV & AIDS infected and affected persons; youth; and female-headed households.

- **Institutional Effectiveness:** UNDP supports a transformative approach to address the bottlenecks that hinder institutional effectiveness, transparency and accountability in Uganda's public sector. Bottlenecks include: i) gaps in policy, legal and regulatory frameworks, and operational mechanisms to foster effectiveness in public sector management; ii) weak institutional capacities to implement policies for accountable institutional effectiveness and corruption control in an inclusive manner, and iii) weak public demand for transparency, accountability and efficacy in the management of public affairs. The programme aims to ultimately improve the overall government effectiveness, particularly in critical areas such as human capital development (including service delivery effectiveness).
- **Peace, Security and System Resilience:** UNDP supports innovative formal and informal community security and peacebuilding mechanisms to promote social cohesion. Working in partnership with other UN agencies, work focuses on cross-border peace and resilience system-building initiatives to leverage peace dividends for communities particularly those in Northern Uganda. This includes leveraging cross border initiatives such as the Intergovernmental Authority on Development's Horn of Africa initiative particularly in Karamoja. Strengthening the voice and participation of women, youth and the elderly is key in this area.

In order to advance **gender equality and the empowerment of women**, the portfolio focuses on i) promoting electoral systems that ensure equitable engagement of citizens particularly the youth, women and other vulnerable groups, ii) supporting gender champions at national and local level to advocate for reforms and accountability mechanisms that improve women's participation and leadership in conflict prevention and peace building and iii) increasing women's presence in border community policing and reporting mechanisms for cross-border crimes.

The **Sustainable, Inclusive Economic Development portfolio** – Outcome 4 – strengthens capacities for natural resources management, climate change resilience and disaster risk reduction, whilst expanding livelihoods and creating employment opportunities through empowerment of youth, women and other vulnerable members of the population. The programme is aligned to NDP II's priority of agriculture, tourism, and minerals and extractives. The programme supports government in the areas of:

- **Climate Change Response and Disaster Risk Reduction:** The programme emphasizes suppressing climate and disaster stresses on the economy by increasing capacity of selected communities to manage climate change as well as natural disasters through:
 - Integrating climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction in government policies and legal frameworks, including a gender perspective
 - Promoting policy implementation, planning, coordination, monitoring, and evaluation
 - Increasing capacities for adoption and adaptation of emerging technologies to combat climate change and disaster.
 - Empowering citizens to engage more in climate change mitigation.
- **Inclusive Green Growth:** This programme supports government efforts in natural resource management, livelihoods, and job creation through building and expanding capacities, particularly among women and youth. UNDP advocate for:
 - Improved livelihoods and expanded employment opportunities
 - Increased capacity and improved accountability for sustainable natural resources management
 - Empowered public and private sector institutions to effectively participate in East African regional peace and trade enhancement processes.

Table 1: Country Programme outcomes and indicative resources (2016-2020)

Country Programme Outcomes	Indicative resources 2016-2020 (US\$ Million)	Expenditure 2016-2018
Outcome 1: By end 2020, rule of law, separation of powers and constitutional democracy are entrenched in Uganda and all individuals are treated equally under the law and have equitable access to justice	\$8.5	\$4.3
Outcome 2: By end 2020, targeted public institutions and public -private partnerships are fully functional at all levels, inclusive, resourced, performance-oriented, innovative and evidence-seeking supported by a strategic evaluation function; and with Uganda’s citizenry enforcing a culture of mutual accountability, transparency and integrity	\$10	\$10.7
Outcome 3: By end 2020, Uganda enjoys sustainable peace and security, underpinned by resilient institutional systems that are effective and efficient in preventing and responding to natural and man-made disasters	\$15.5	\$5.9
Outcome 4: By end 2020, natural resources management and energy access are gender responsive, effective and efficient, reducing emissions, negating the impact of climate-induced disasters and environmental degradation on livelihoods and production systems, and strengthening community resilience.	\$102.7	\$19.6
Other (regional and global projects, unlinked expenses)		\$2.2
Total	\$136.7	\$42.6

Source: UNDP Uganda Country Programme Document 2016-2020 (DP/DCP/UGA/4); Atlas financial data for budget and expenditures as of 30 July 2019.

4. Scope of the evaluation

ICPEs are conducted in the penultimate year of the ongoing UNDP country programme in order to feed into the process of developing the new country programme.

As the country-level evaluation of UNDP, ICPEs will focus on the formal UNDP country programmes approved by the Executive Board. The country programmes are defined – depending on the programme cycle and the country – in the Country Programme Document (CPD) and the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP). The scope of the ICPE includes the entirety of UNDP’s activities in the country and therefore covers interventions funded by all sources, including core UNDP resources, donor funds, and government funds. There will also be initiatives from the regional and global programmes that are included in the scope of the ICPE. It is important to note, however, that a UNDP country office may be involved in a number of activities that may not be included in a specific project. Some of these ‘non-project’ activities may be crucial for the political and social agenda of a country.

Special efforts will be made to capture the role and contribution of UNV and UNCDF through undertaking joint work with UNDP. This information will be used for synthesis in order to provide corporate level evaluative evidence of performance of the associated fund and programme.

5. Methodology

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards. The ICPE will address the following three key evaluation questions. These questions will also guide the presentation of the evaluation findings in the report.

- What did the UNDP country programme intend to achieve during the period under review?
- To what extent has the programme achieved (or is likely to achieve) its intended objectives?
- What factors contributed to or hindered UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results?

The ICPE is conducted at the outcome level. To address question 1, a Theory of Change (ToC) approach will be used in consultation with stakeholders, as appropriate. Discussions of the ToC will focus on mapping the assumptions behind the programme's desired change(s) and the causal linkages between the intervention(s) and the intended country programme outcomes. 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 analysed 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.

Special attention will be given to integrate a gender-responsive evaluation approach to data collection methods. To assess gender, the evaluation will consider the gender marker in the portfolio analyses by priority outcome area and the gender results effectiveness scale (GRES) when assessing results. The GRES classifies gender results into five categories: gender negative, gender blind, gender targeted, gender responsive, gender transformative. In addition, gender-related questions will be incorporated in the data collection methods and tools, such as the pre-mission questionnaire and interview questionnaire, and reporting.

6. Data collection

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. An assessment was carried for each outcome to ascertain the available information, identify data constraints, to determine the data collection needs and method. The assessment outlined the level of evaluable data that is available. The assessment indicates that the country office has conducted 11 evaluations of a total 15 planned for the 2016-2020 programme cycle. With respect to indicators, the CPD, UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) and the corporate planning system associated with it also provide baselines, indicators, targets, as well as annual data on the status of the indicators

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 method will be further detailed and outlined in the outcome analysis. A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed and interviews will include government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries of the programme. Focus groups will be used to consult some groups of beneficiaries as appropriate.

The criteria for selecting 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 Uganda 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 Uganda country office, the Regional Bureau for Africa and the Government of Uganda. The IEO lead evaluator will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will cover all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

UNDP Country Office in Uganda: 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, the CO staff will not participate in the interviews with key stakeholders. The country office and IEO will jointly organize the final stakeholder debriefing, ensuring participation of key government counterparts, through a video-conference, where findings and results of the evaluation will be presented. Once a final draft report has been prepared, the CO will prepare a management response to the evaluation recommendations, in consultation with the Regional Bureau. It will support the use and dissemination of the final ICPE report at the country level.

UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa: The UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa will support the evaluation through information sharing and will also participate in the final stakeholder debriefing. Once the evaluation has been completed, the Bureau is also responsible of supporting the country office in the preparation of the management response, as required, and monitoring the implementation of the evaluation recommendations, in accordance with the management response.

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:

- IEO senior evaluation advisor *and* Lead evaluator (LE) 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: Up to two 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 and/or the specific outcome areas. The experts will support the evaluation across inclusive effective governance and sustainable, inclusive sustainable economic development portfolios. 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 provide background research and will support the portfolio analysis.

8. Evaluation process

The ICPE will be conducted according to the approved IEO process. The following represents a summary of the five key phases of the process, 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 May 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. 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 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 Uganda 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. Considering the discussion at the stakeholder event, the evaluation report will be finalized.

Phase 5: Publication and dissemination. The ICPE report, including the management response, 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 Uganda country office and the Government of Uganda will disseminate the report to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website 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.

9. Timeframe for the ICPE process

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

Table 3: Timeframe for the ICPE process going to the Board in 2020 (tentative)	
Activity	Proposed Timeframe
Phase 1: Preparatory work	
TOR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office	January 2019
Selection of other evaluation team members	February 2019
Phase 2: Desk analysis	
Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis	January – April 2019
Phase 3: Data Collection	
Data collection and preliminary findings	10 th June to 21 st June
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief	
Analysis and Synthesis	July/ August 2019
Zero draft ICPE for clearance by IEO and EAP	August 2019
First draft ICPE for CO/RB review	September 2019
Second draft ICPE shared with GOV	October/ November 2019
Draft management response (CO/RB)	October/ November 2019
Final debriefing with national stakeholders	December 2019
Phase 5: Production and Follow-up	
Editing and formatting	December 2019
Final report and Evaluation Brief	January 2020
Dissemination of the final report	February 2020