

Annex 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Introduction

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts “Independent Country Programme Evaluations (ICPEs)”, previously known as “Assessments of Development Results (ADRs),” to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level, as well as the effectiveness of UNDP’s strategy in facilitating and leveraging national effort for achieving development results. The purpose of an ICPE is to:

- Support the development of the next UNDP Country Programme Document
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board

ICPEs are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.¹ The IEO is independent of UNDP management and is headed by a Director who reports to the UNDP Executive Board. The responsibility of the IEO is two-fold: (a) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (b) enhance the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function, and its coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations reform and national ownership.

Based on the principle of national ownership, IEO seeks to conduct ICPEs in collaboration with the national authorities where the country programme is implemented.

UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina has been selected for an ICPE. Its country programme was due for renewal in 2019, now extended until 2020. The ICPE will be conducted during the last quarter of 2018 to feed into the establishment of a new country programme, and UN Development Assistance Framework. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration with the UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina country office, and UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States.

2. National context

Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) is a country in the Western Balkans bordered by Croatia to the north, west and south, Serbia to the east and Montenegro to the south. BiH has a total area of 51,200 km² and is landlocked except for its 12.2 km² of Adriatic Sea coastline.³ The population of BiH is 3.5 million people (2017).⁴

BiH has a complex constitutional structure and political system resulting from the Dayton Peace Agreement, which ended the 1992-1995 war in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁵ The country is divided into two

¹ See UNDP Evaluation Policy: www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf. The ICPE will also be conducted in adherence to the Norms and the Standards and the ethical Code of Conduct established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (www.uneval.org).

² <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/AG.LND.TOTL.K2>

³ Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BHAS) http://www.bhas.ba/?option=com_content&view=article&id=52&itemid=80&lang=en

⁴ <http://data.un.org/en/iso/ba.html>

⁵ <http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/news/briefing/2004/9/414ffeb44/returns-bosnia-herzegovina-reach-1-million.html>

entities, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republika Srpska, in addition to the Brčko District, a separate administrative unit. The country's complicated political system includes 13 constitutions, 10 cantons each with their own government, 14 legal systems and 141 ministries,⁶ making for exceedingly complicated legislative processes and slow progress on reforms, particularly those required for European Union accession. Bosnia and Herzegovina is an EU potential candidate country that applied for EU membership in February 2016. The country's constitution remains in breach of the European Convention on Human Rights, and Bosnia will need to amend its electoral framework in order to satisfy the political criteria for EU accession.⁷

Since the end of the war, Bosnia and Herzegovina has experienced steady economic growth. An upper middle-income country, BiH had a GDP per capita of \$12,875 in 2017 (purchasing power parity), with a GDP growth rate of 3.1% in 2016 and 3% in 2017⁸. The country has modernized its labour legislation and addressed weaknesses in its financial sector. Unemployment remains high at 20.5% (2017), and youth unemployment even higher at 54.3% (2016).⁹ Poverty is strongly associated with high unemployment, and in 2015, 16.9% of the population lived below the national poverty line.¹⁰ Bosnia and Herzegovina does not have a national development strategy, although there are sectoral strategies at the national level and most recently a country-wide Strategic Plan of Rural Development was developed, to support and improve management and regulation in agriculture and rural development sectors.¹¹

The GINI coefficient of Bosnia and Herzegovina was .338 in 2015,¹² indicating a relatively low level of inequality. Its HDI value for 2015 was 0.750, placing it in the high human development category, ranking 81 out of 188 countries. Its HDI value is above the average for countries in the high human development group, 0.746, and below the average of 0.756 for countries in Europe and Central Asia. However, when accounting for inequality the HDI drops to 0.650.¹³ Certain communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, such as the Roma community, internally displaced persons and the long-term unemployed, experience significant difficulties in accessing education, housing, healthcare and employment. The challenges for the Roma population to gain access to employment, housing and health care services has received attention through a recent government strategy (2017-2020). In terms of gender equality, there are legal provisions in place promoting equality between men and women in BiH, however the implementation of these provisions is uneven. Legislation to prevent and protect victims of gender-based violence, particularly domestic violence, is not implemented effectively and women continue to be underrepresented in the political arena and public life.¹⁴

Bosnia and Herzegovina is susceptible to natural disasters and environmental shocks. In 2014, the country experienced devastating floods with a total economic impact of 2.04 billion Euros, or 15% of its GDP for 2013. The floods have been calculated as a set-back of five years in terms of overall development¹⁵. Since

⁶ Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BHAS)

http://www.bhas.ba/?option=com_content&view=article&id=52&itemid=80&lang=en

⁷ <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/20180417-bosnia-and-herzegovina-report.pdf>

⁸ <http://povertydata.worldbank.org/poverty/country/BIH>

⁹ http://www.bhas.ba/?option=com_publicacija&id=1&lang=en

¹⁰ <https://data.worldbank.org/country/bosnia-and-herzegovina>

¹¹ <http://europa.ba/?p=54408>

¹² <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/BIH#>

¹³ <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/BIH#>

¹⁴ <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/20180417-bosnia-and-herzegovina-report.pdf>

¹⁵ http://www.ba.undp.org/content/bosnia_and_herzegovina/en/home/library/nhdr/human-development-report--2016--risk-proofing-the-western-balkan.html

the floods, emphasis has been placed on climate-resilient development and climate risk management to be integrated into flood risk management policies and strategies.

3. UNDP programme strategy in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Bosnia and Herzegovina was admitted into the United Nations in 1992. UNDP has been supporting the country since 1996.

The current UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for BiH covers the period 2015-2019 (extended until 2020), and recognizes the overarching national priority of becoming a member of the European Union. The Framework supports four strategic areas of assistance: (1) the rule of law and human security, (2) sustainable and equitable development and employment, (3) social inclusion, and (4) women’s empowerment. Through the UNDAF, the UN country team aims to support BiH authorities and civil society in addressing poverty, discrimination, inequity and exclusion and to deal effectively with the country’s past related to the war.¹⁶

Within the UNDAF, UNDP leads in the delivery of the first two focus areas and contributes to the third and fourth through individual and joint programmes. UNDP has aligned its 2015-2019 country programme with the UNDAF by focusing on four strategic areas: (1) access to justice and increased human security, (2) reduction of regional, economic and social disparities, (3) sustainable management of environmental and energy resources, and green jobs creation, and (4) access to services and employment opportunities for the most vulnerable. Across these four areas, there is a stated emphasis on conflict-sensitive and integrated approaches that can compliment the country’s priorities. The UNDP country programme has been designed to align with regional strategies for the European Union and the Regional Cooperation Council and to take into account country strategies of the other UN agencies as well as bilateral donors to Bosnia and Herzegovina. Cooperation between UNDP and the European Union has been of particular importance, especially in response to the 2014 flood.

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

Country Programme Outcome		Indicative resources (US\$)	Expenditures to date (US\$ million)
UNDAF Outcome 3	Effective management of war remnants and strengthened prevention and responsiveness for man-made and natural disasters	\$29,200,000	\$66,212,069
UNDAF Outcome 4	Economic, social and territorial disparities are decreased through coordinated approach by national and subnational actors	\$56,250,000	\$37,213,815
UNDAF Outcome 5	Legal and strategic frameworks are enhanced and operationalized to ensure sustainable management of natural, cultural and energy resources	\$20,400,000	\$18,306,700

¹⁶ One United Nations Programme and Common Budgetary Framework Bosnia and Herzegovina 2015-2019: United Nations Development Assistance Framework

UNDAF Outcome 9	Targeted legislation, policies, budget allocations and inclusive social protection systems are strengthened to proactively protect the vulnerable	\$19,350,000	\$14,083,673
Total		\$125,200,000	\$138,816,257

Source: UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina Country Programme Document 2015-2019

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 new country programmes. The last country programme evaluation for Bosnia and Herzegovina was conducted in 2009 (ADR). This ICPE will focus on the current programme cycle, i.e. 2015-2019, taking into account also the cumulative results of the previous programme cycle 2010-2014 and its contributions to the outcomes of the current cycle.

ICPEs focus on UNDP country programmes approved by the Executive Board, as defined in the Country Programme Document (CPD). The scope of this ICPE for Bosnia and Herzegovina includes the entirety of UNDP's activities in the country, covering interventions funded by all sources, including core UNDP resources, donor funds, government funds, etc. Regional and global programme initiatives that include activities within the country are also included in the scope of this ICPE. The ICPE will consider UNDP's unique contributions as defined at the outcome level. It will also draw on pertinent information from other recent and concurrent UN evaluations, in particular the most recent UNDAF Evaluation.

In line with UNDP's gender mainstreaming strategy the ICPE will examine the level of gender mainstreaming across all programmes and operations. Gender disaggregated data will be collected, where available, and assessed against its programme outcomes.

It is important to note that in addition to specific programmes and projects, there are typically 'non-project' activities that UNDP offices carry out, and which may be crucial for the political and social agenda of a country. To the extent that there are such 'non-project' activities of significance for UNDP in Bosnia and Herzegovina, these too will be assessed.

5. Methodology

The evaluation methodology will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards.¹⁷ The ICPE will address the following three key evaluation questions.¹⁸ 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?

To address question 1, a Theory of Change (ToC) approach will be used in consultation with stakeholders, as appropriate, to better understand how and under what conditions UNDP's interventions are expected to lead to i) inclusive and sustainable growth and development, ii) improved democratic governance, and iii) reduced risks to climate change and natural disasters). Discussions on the ToC will focus on mapping

¹⁷ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

¹⁸ 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 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 evolution 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. This will be done through a desk review of relevant national documents (i.e. development plans, policies and strategies), UNDP's CPD and supporting documents, UNDP's strategic plan and corporate strategies, an analysis of UNDP's portfolio and its evolution based on changes at the national level, and through interviews with key national stakeholders.

The effectiveness of UNDP's country programme will be analyzed under evaluation question 2. This will include an assessment of the achieved outcomes and the extent to which these outcomes have contributed to the intended CPD objectives. In this process, both positive and negative, direct and indirect unintended outcomes will also be identified. Data for this specific question will be collected through a desk review of CPD related documents (i.e. UNDP evaluations and its quality assurance, project documents, M&E documents), focus group discussions with country staff, and interviews with government and other national stakeholders partners both in Sarajevo and in the project sites, donors and beneficiaries.

To better understand UNDP's performance, the specific factors that have influenced - both positively or negatively - UNDP's performance and eventually, the sustainability of results in the country will be examined (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 cooperation), and the integration of gender equality and women's empowerment in the 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 equality approach to data collection methods. To assess gender across the portfolio, the evaluation will use the gender marker¹⁹ and the gender results effectiveness scale (GRES). The GRES, developed as part of the corporate evaluation on UNDP's contribution to gender equality and women's empowerment, classifies gender results into five categories: gender negative, gender blind, gender targeted, gender responsive, gender transformative.

A five-point scale matrix, with four criteria, will be used to examine the (potential) sustainability of the identified achieved results, if any. The criteria include: ownership by beneficiaries, sufficient capacities, availability of resources and enabling institutional and social environment (see appendix 1).

6. Data collection

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. An assessment was carried out to identify available evaluable data as well as potential data collection constraints and opportunities. The Evaluation Resource Centre information indicates that 29 evaluations were carried out since 2010 on UNDP programming in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 9 being for the 2015-2019 cycle. With respect to indicators, the CPD, UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) and the associated corporate planning system also provide baselines, indicators, targets, as well as annual data on the status of the indicators. There is good availability of UNDP project documents and monitoring reports. Based on documentary research, discussions with the CO and RBEC and given the existence of at least 29 evaluations, the systematization and availability of documentation, there is sufficient evaluable data to conduct the evaluation.

¹⁹ A corporate tool to sensitize programme managers in advancing GEWE through assigning ratings to projects during project design to signify the level of expected contribution to GEWE. It can also be used to track planned programme expenditures on GEWE (not actual expenditures).

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 project managers. A pre-mission questionnaire with key questions has been administered to the CO to validate corporately available self-reported data. (e.g. ROARs, Project QA). 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, as well as projects reporting difficulties where lessons can be learned).

The IEO and the country office have identified an initial list of background and programme-related documents which have been made available to the IEO. The desk review includes: 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. An evaluation matrix will be developed and used to guide how each evaluation question will be addressed.

Stakeholder engagement: A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed to engage with stakeholders at all stages of the evaluation process. During the inception phase, a stakeholder analysis will be carried out to identify the most 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: i) identify key informants for interviews during the main data collection phase of the evaluation, ii) assess UNDP’s position vis-à-vis other actors, and iii) identify 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 Bosnia and Herzegovina country office, and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (RBEC). The UNDP IEO will seek out opportunities to discuss UNDP performance with key officials in the government of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the government of the Republika Srpska, and Brčko District; and UNDP will share the results of the evaluation with these governments. The IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

UNDP Country Office in Bosnia and Herzegovina: The country office is expected to support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders, make available to the team all necessary information regarding UNDP’s programmes, projects and activities in the country, and provide factual

verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The CO should provide in-kind support (e.g. arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries; assistance for field site visits). To ensure independence of the views expressed, country office staff will not participate in stakeholder interviews. At the report writing and debriefing phase, the CO will provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The CO and IEO will jointly organize a final stakeholder meeting, via videoconference, with participation of key government counterparts, where findings and results of the evaluation will be presented. Additionally, the CO will be responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the Management Response to the evaluation, in consultation with the Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (RBEC).

UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States: RBEC is expected to support the evaluation through information sharing and participation in discussions on emerging conclusions and recommendations. Moreover, it will support the preparation of the management response by the CO. The evaluation manager intends to visit the UNDP Regional Hub in Istanbul to gather information for this evaluation.

Evaluation Team: The IEO will carry out this evaluation using its own staff.

- **Lead Evaluator (LE):** Alan Fox, Chief, Corporate Section for the Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP will conduct the evaluation. He has overall responsibility for developing the evaluation design and terms of reference; managing the conduct of the ICPE, writing the report; and organizing the stakeholder workshop, as appropriate, with the country office.
- **Consultants:** The Lead Evaluator, Mr. Fox, may decide to recruit one or more external consultants (national/regional or then international) to help assess specific programme areas. Consultants will conduct preliminary research and data collection, and prepare outcome analyses, under the guidance of the Lead Evaluator.
- **Research Assistant (RA):** Nicki Mokhtari, a research assistant based in the IEO at UNDP HQ, is assisting the Lead Evaluator, including carrying out background research and documentation preparation.

8. Evaluation process

The ICPE will be conducted according to the approved IEO process.²⁰ The following represents a summary of the five key phases of the process, which constitute framework for conducting the evaluation.

Phase 1: Preparatory work. This TOR has been prepared by Mr. Fox, the Lead Evaluator, and Ms. Mokhtari, the Research Assistant. During the preparatory phase, initial data collection is ongoing, with background documentation provided by the Country Office, through the appointed task manager at the CO, (Marina Dimova, UNDP Governance Chief Technical Specialist). Evaluation questions are being finalized in an evaluation matrix containing detailed questions and means of data collection and verification to guide data collection based on an overall evaluation matrix for the ICPE.

Phase 2: Desk analysis. Data collection will be conducted through interviews (via phone, Skype etc.) with key stakeholders, including country office staff, coupled with desk reviews of reference material. The IEO may elect to administer a “survey” to gather additional information on specific issues – and with particular stakeholders. The effort includes summarizing context and other evaluative evidence, and identifying an outcome theory of change, specific evaluation questions, gaps and issues requiring validation during the field-based phase of data collection.

²⁰ The evaluation will be conducted according to the [ICPE Process Manual](#) and the [ICPE Methodology Manual](#)

Phase 3: Field data collection. During this phase, there will be a mission to the country to engage in data collection activities. The duration of field data collection will be 10 days, commencing 18 September 2018. Data will be collected according to the approach outlined in Section 6. The evaluation manager, Mr. Fox, will hold interviews and project site visits during this period, during which time he will liaise with CO staff and management, key government stakeholders, other partners and beneficiaries.

Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief. Mr. Fox will remain in Bosnia and Herzegovina for an additional week to draft the evaluation report. Before returning to UNDP HQ, Mr. Fox will hold a debrief presentation of the key preliminary findings for country office management. Upon his return to UNDP HQ, Mr. Fox will finalise the ICPE, building from the data collected and triangulated. The first draft of the ICPE report will be subject to internal IEO peer review and critiqued by a member of the IEO International Evaluation Advisory Panel. Once quality cleared, the draft will be circulated to the country office and the Regional Bureau for review. The second draft, taking into account any factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for further comment. An “audit trail” will be prepared to document and respond to comments received from the CO, Regional Bureau, and national stakeholders in preparation for finalising the evaluation report. Following completion of the evaluation, the UNDP country office for Bosnia and Herzegovina is required to prepare a management response, in consultation with the Regional Bureau. The report and CO management response will be presented at a final stakeholder meeting, via videoconference, with participation of key government counterparts. Taking into account the discussion at the stakeholder event, the final evaluation report and management response will then be published.

Phase 5: Publication and dissemination. The ICPE report and a brief summary will be available in hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to the UNDP Executive Board at the time of its approval of 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 Bosnia and Herzegovina country office and the authorities in the country will be asked to disseminate the report to national stakeholders. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website²¹ as well as in the Evaluation Resource Centre. The Regional Bureau will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.²²

9. Timeframe for the ICPE process

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively²³ as follows:

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

²¹ web.undp.org/evaluation

²² erc.undp.org

²³ The timeframe, indicative of process and deadlines, does not imply full-time engagement of evaluation team during the period.

Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis	Evaluation team	June – August 2018
Phase 3: Data Collection		
Data collection and preliminary findings	Evaluation team	September 2018
Phase 4: Analysis, report writing, quality review and debrief		
Analysis and Synthesis	LE	September 2018
1st draft ICPE for clearance by IEO and EAP	LE	October 2018
First draft ICPE for CO/RB review	CO/RB	October 2018
Second draft ICPE shared with GOV	CO/GOV	November 2018
Draft management response	CO/RB	November 2018
Final debriefing with national stakeholders	CO/LE	November, 2018
Phase 5: Production and Follow-up		
Editing and formatting	IEO	December, 2018
Final report and Evaluation Brief	IEO	January, 2019
Dissemination of the final report	IEO/CO	January, 2019