

## Belize

# Independent Country Programme Review (ICPR) Terms of Reference (6 April 2020)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts “Independent Country Programme Reviews (ICPR)” to generate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level. The purpose of an ICPR 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

ICPRs are independent exercises carried out by the IEO within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.<sup>1</sup> UNDP Belize has been selected for an ICPR, since its country programme will end in 2021. This will be the first time for IEO to conduct an independent country-level assessment in Belize. The ICPR will be carried out in 2020 to feed into the development of the new country programme.

## 2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

Belize sits on the Yucatan Peninsula in Central America, with a total surface of 22,966 sq.km<sup>2</sup>, bordered with Mexico, Guatemala and the Caribbean Sea. The country has high vulnerability to natural disasters and hazards, namely hurricanes, storms and associated flooding, wind damage, and storm surge, especially in Belize City, and is also at risk to extreme temperature events.<sup>3</sup> Despite the efforts the country has made in the sustainable management of its natural resources and the protection of the environment, Belize continues to experience increased impact of flooding, decreased forestation, the pollution of waterways and seas, the indiscriminate use of resources leading to a reduction in marine and terrestrial resources.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, the economy of Belize relies largely on its natural resources; the primary drivers - tourism, agriculture and fisheries “are intimately linked to the health of the natural resources and the environment”<sup>5</sup>.

The country has undergone significant economic transformation since the 1990s, mainly due to its growing tourism industry and the commercial discovery of oil in 2005<sup>6</sup>, albeit the petroleum industry has been on the decline since early 2010s<sup>7</sup>. Classified as a small upper-middle income country, Belize achieved modest growth (on average 2.1%) in gross domestic product (GDP) between 2009 and 2018, despite a decrease in 2016 (-0.6%). The economy is forecast to accelerate to around 2 percent annual growth between 2019 and 2022.<sup>8</sup> As a small economy with high dependence on exports and imports

---

<sup>1</sup> See UNDP Evaluation Policy: [www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf](http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Environmental Statistics for Belize 2012, Lands and Surveys Department, Ministry of Natural Resources and Agriculture, Belize

<sup>3</sup> The World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal <https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/belize>

<sup>4</sup> 2014-2024 National Environmental Development Policy, Department of the Environment, Belize

<sup>5</sup> *ibis*

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/caribbean/overview>

<sup>7</sup> Data from the Central Bank of Belize

<https://www.centralbank.org.bz/docs/default-source/4.2.4-annual-reports/cbb-annual-report-2011---6-developments-in-the-real-economy.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

<https://www.centralbank.org.bz/docs/default-source/4.2.4-annual-reports/annual-report-2018.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

<sup>8</sup> Data from the World Bank

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG?end=2018&locations=BZ&start=2009&view=chart>  
<https://data.worldbank.org/country/belize>

and exposure to natural disasters, the country is particularly vulnerable to terms-of-trade volatility and shocks.<sup>9</sup>

The population of Belize in 2019 is estimated at 408,487, out of which 50% are female. The country has a young population; approximately 56% of the population is under the age of 25. 45% of the population live in urban settings, while 55% live in rural areas.<sup>10</sup> According to the 2019 Human Development Reports, 4.3 percent of the population are multidimensionally poor while an additional 8.4 percent are classified as vulnerable to multidimensional poverty.<sup>11</sup> Belize's HDI value for 2018 is 0.720, ranking 103 out of 189 countries and territories. Between 1990 and 2018, the country has seen an increase of 17.5% in HDI value. The country's Gender Inequality Index (GII) value in 2018 (0.391) ranks 91 out of 162 countries.<sup>12</sup> The most urgent issue that requires a gendered approach is that of crime and violence.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, with a prevalence rate of 1.9<sup>14</sup>, HIV/AIDS remains a concern for the Government.

The September 2019 labour force survey showed an unemployment rate of 10.4%; unemployment rate among women (15.7%) is much higher than that among men (6.6%).<sup>15</sup> Despite a significant increase in women's participation in employment (from 53.1% in April 2019 to 58.9% in September 2019), men continue to have higher levels of participation (81.4%).<sup>16</sup>

Belize is a parliamentary democracy and constitutional monarchy, and a member country of the Commonwealth.<sup>17</sup> Belize is also a member state of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). The National Development Framework for Belize 2010-2030, or Horizon 2030, sets out the country's long-term national development policy and strategic priorities.

### 3. UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN BELIZE

UNDP's country programme document for Belize 2017-2021<sup>18</sup>, derived from the United Nations Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework (UN MSDF) in the Caribbean<sup>19</sup> for the same period, has identified three priority areas:

- A sustainable and resilient Belize
- A safe, cohesive and just Belize
- A healthy Belize
- plus*
- Gender, as a cross cutting theme

The country programme is aligned with most of the SDGs, including SDG 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15,16.

The CPD identified an indicative budget of \$16.5 million. As of end-2019, the country programme delivered 47% of that projected figure with \$7.865 million in expenditure (see Table 1).

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/caribbean/overview>

<sup>10</sup> Data from the Statistical Institute of Belize <http://sib.org.bz/statistics/population/>; 2020 Census to be conducted in May-July 2020.

<sup>11</sup> UNDP Briefing note for countries on the 2019 Human Development Report: Belize ([link](#))

<sup>12</sup> UNDP Briefing note for countries on the 2019 Human Development Report: Belize ([link](#))

<sup>13</sup> Horizon 2030: National Development Framework for Belize 2010-2030

<sup>14</sup> 2018 data, UNAIDS <https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/belize>

<sup>15</sup> Data from the Statistical Institute of Belize <http://sib.org.bz/statistics/labour-force/>

<sup>16</sup> Data from the Statistical Institute of Belize [http://sib.org.bz/wp-content/uploads/LabourForce\\_2019-09.pdf](http://sib.org.bz/wp-content/uploads/LabourForce_2019-09.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> <https://thecommonwealth.org/our-member-countries/belize/constitution-politics>

<sup>18</sup> Available on UNDP website ([link](#))

<sup>19</sup> Available on United Nations Caribbean website ([link](#))

**Table 1: Country Programme outcomes and indicative resources (2017-2021)**

Country Programme Outcomes	Country Programme Outputs	Financials (US \$million)	
		Indicative resources (2017-21)	Expenditure (2017-19)
1. Policies and programmes for climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and universal access to clean and sustainable energy in place.	Output 1.1. National and community planning and investments integrate climate-change adaptation and mitigation to provide co-benefits Output 1.2. National priority growth sectors have adopted strategies, science-based practices and innovations that promote resilience	\$5.120	\$0.705
2. Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted for the conservation, restoration and use of ecosystems and natural resources.	Output 2.1. Local livelihoods opportunities expanded through the sustainable use of common natural resources Output 2.2. Legal and institutional reforms supported within key government ministries, to operationalize Belize's sustainable development framework (Growth and Sustainable Development Policy)	\$3.575	\$1.295
3. Equitable access to justice, protection, citizen security and safety reinforced	Output 3.1. Coordinated and effective gender-sensitive mechanisms and frameworks for citizen security in place Output 3.2. Access to justice for most vulnerable strengthened Output 3.3. Youth who come in conflict with the law have access to quality, secondary and tertiary prevention programs and diversion Output 3.4. Social protection and human rights systems strengthened	\$4.255	\$1.537
4. Universal access to quality health care services and systems improved	Output 4.1. National health systems are responsive to current inequities manifested in the healthcare system Output 4.2. Ministry of Health budget targeting HIV-TB programmatic interventions for key populations correlated to need in access/coverage identified through National AIDS Spending Assessment reports Output 4.3. The use of equity criteria (through equity audits) in national development of health sector budgets and in informing health sector investments successfully piloted. Output 4.4. National HIV-AIDS/TB programmes are aligned to 90-90-90 World Health Organization targets	\$3.535	\$2.770
Other (regional and global projects, management projects)		\$0	\$1.557 <sup>20</sup>
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$16.485</b>	<b>\$7.865</b>

Source: Indicative resources are from UNDP Country Programme Document for Belize, 2017-2021; expenditure is 2017-2019 expenditure as of 8 March 2020 from the Atlas/PowerBI system; figures are rounded to the nearest \$1,000.

<sup>20</sup> Includes \$1.359 million for environment projects, \$0.180 million for the regional PREJUVE project, and \$0.018 million for management projects.

#### 4. SCOPE & OBJECTIVES

ICPRs are conducted in the penultimate year of UNDP country programmes to feed into the process of developing the new country programme. The ICPR will cover work undertaken in the current programme cycle (2017-2021) and focus on capturing the country office's contribution to UN MSDF outcomes, and progress towards agreed outputs and output indicators in the country office's results framework.

The ICPR will address the following two evaluation questions:

- What progress has UNDP made towards planned country programme outputs, and how is this contributing to UNDP/UN MSDF outcomes in the current programme period?
- How has UNDP performed in planning, implementation, reporting and evaluation of development results?

#### 5. METHODOLOGY

ICPRs will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards.<sup>21</sup> The questions addressed in an ICPR, data sources and approaches for analysis are elaborated in a design matrix (see Annex 2).

The ICPR is an *independent validation of the UNDP country office's self-assessment* which uses a standard ICPR questionnaire (template in Annex 1) and adopts a system of ratings of progress towards outputs, and contribution to outcomes identified in the country offices results and resources framework (see explanation below). The ICPR is not a comprehensive evaluation of the country programme. Based on the evidence presented by the CO in the ICPR questionnaire, available documentation and interviews, the IEO provides an independent judgement on: whether there is sufficient evidence to support the CO's self-assessment; whether CO ratings are consistent with the definitions and methods described below. A lack of evidence to justify CO ratings is an important factor in the IEO downgrading them.

The evaluation will pay particular attention to validating *evidence about the country programme's focus on promoting gender equality and key gender results*. Gender-related questions will be incorporated in the data collection methods and tools, such as the pre-mission questionnaire and interview questionnaire.

The *ICPR data sources will consist of* i) evidence provided in support of self-assessed performance against the agreed country office results framework, capturing the country office's contribution to UN MSDF outcomes, and progress towards agreed outputs and output indicators. This will be expected to include programme and project documents, programme and project planning and reporting tools (ROARs, AWP, APR), evaluation reports, other documentary evidence; ii) interviews with UNDP (primarily CO) staff and selected key stakeholders; and iii) additional IEO evidence if the evidence identified in the self-assessment and interviews is insufficient.

A standard set of contextual parameters about the country and UNDP programme (e.g. ODA trends, programme delivery rates, budget/expenditures, planned vs actual resource mobilized, etc) will be systematically collected and used in the analysis. Results will be summarized in a standardised Annex to the report.

#### 6. ICPR RATINGS SYSTEM

ICPRs will employ a rating system. The IEO will *apply a rating to the country programme's progress towards planned CPD outputs* as follows:

---

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914>

- **On track:** Progress is as expected at this stage of implementation and it is likely that the output will be achieved. Standard programme management practices are sufficient;
- **At risk:** Progress is somewhat less than expected at this stage of implementation and restorative action will be necessary if the output is to be achieved. Close performance monitoring is recommended;
- **Off track:** Progress is significantly less than expected at this stage of implementation and the output is not likely to be met given available resources and priorities. Recasting the output may be required.

To determine the appropriate rating, the IEO will examine the results chain running from supporting interventions to CPD outputs associated indicators. In addition to assessing whether targets associated with indicators have been met, the IEO will consider how well these indicators capture the significance of UNDP's contributions to the agreed output.

The IEO will *apply a rating to the country programme's assessed contribution to UN MSDF outcomes*, based on the level of influence UNDP has on associated outcome indicators, as follows:

- **High level of influence:** There is a clear line of contribution from UNDP to changes in the UN MSDF outcome and associated indicators. UNDP might not be the only contributor, but it is a major contributor.
- **Moderate level of influence:** There is a line of contribution from UNDP to changes in the UN MSDF outcome and associated indicators, but either the level of contribution is only modest, or the significance of other factors contributing to changes in the indicator are not known.
- **low level of influence:** UNDP made little or no contribution to changes in the outcome and associated indicators, or the indicators used do not adequately capture UNDP's contribution. New indicators may need to be developed that meet quality standards and support monitoring and reporting of progress.
- **Insufficient evidence:** there is insufficient evidence that UNDP contributed to changes in the outcome and associated indicators. Evidence about the attribution of changes in the outcome needs to be improved.

As per the process for assessing progress towards outputs, in determining the level of contribution, the IEO will examine the results chain running from UNDP CPD outputs and supporting interventions to agreed outcome indicators. In addition to assessing whether targets associated with indicators have been met, the IEO will consider how well these indicators capture the significance of UNDP's contributions.

Ratings will be based on the CO's approved results and resources framework. If CPD outputs and associated output indicators remain in the results framework but the country programme took no actions to help achieve them, *they will be rated as off track*, even if the lack of action was justified for reasons beyond UNDP's control. Similarly, if the country office is using outcome indicators that UNDP has had no significant influence over, or where there is insufficient evidence that UNDP contributed to changes in the indicator, the IEO will assess UNDP as having a low level of influence on the achievement of the associated UN MSDF outcome.

To understand the implementation progress of the CPD, the IEO will also *examine and assess any approved changes to planned results* in the approved CPD, and the basis for these changes.

Ratings and the basis for them will be set out in a standardised tabular format.

## 7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

**Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP:** The UNDP IEO will conduct the ICPR in consultation with the UNDP Belize country office and the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean under the

leadership of the IEO lead evaluator. The IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPR. The IEO will convene a review panel comprised of senior staff and Evaluation Advisory Panel (EAP) members to comment on the ICPR and ratings given.

The IEO Lead Evaluator (LE) is responsible for:

- Conducting or overseeing analysis of evidence provided
- Interviewing CO staff and other in-country stakeholders (as appropriate)
- Assigning ratings based on the evidence in the self-assessment and other information provided by the CO
- Revising the ICPR and ratings based on comments from the review panel
- Reviewing written comments from the CO or bureau, incorporating any new and relevant information, correcting any inaccuracies, updating ratings if warranted, and drafting an explanation of the response to feedback.

**UNDP Country Office in Belize:** The country office will complete the standardised ICPR questionnaire including self-assessment and make available to the evaluation team all necessary personnel and information regarding UNDP's programmes, projects and activities in the country. The CO will provide support in kind (e.g. arranging meetings with programme and project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries; assistance for field site visits, if planned). To ensure the anonymity of interviewees, the country office staff will not participate in the stakeholder interviews. The CO will provide factual verifications of the draft report within two weeks of receiving the draft report and will jointly organize a meeting to discuss the feedback on the draft report. Additionally, the CO will prepare a management response in consultation with RB and will support the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ICPR process.

**Evaluation Team:** The ICPR team which will include the following members (as appropriate):

- Lead Evaluator (LE): IEO staff member with overall responsibility for ICPR, including terms of reference and CO self-assessment questionnaire; managing the conduct of the ICPR, preparing/finalizing the final report and liaising with the CO on all of the above.
- Research Associate (RA): Under the guidance of LE, the IEO research associate will compile necessary information required for the ICPR, will prepare analysis and suggest ratings for assigned outcomes and outputs, and contribute to the preparation of the final ICPE report as required.
- Project Lead (PL): IEO senior evaluation specialist with oversight responsibility of the ICPR process.
- Consultant: If necessary, an external consultant may be recruited to support the team in data collection and outcome assessment, paying attention to gender equality and women's empowerment.

## 8. ICPR PROCESS

**Phase 1. ICPR Preparation:** The IEO Research Associate will compile a list of projects that have been active in the CPD period, map these projects to the COs results framework, and collate available project information downloaded from UNDP's systems, and indicator matrix. The IEO lead evaluator will develop the ICPR ToR, and when sharing it with the CO for feedback, the lead evaluator with the assistance of the RA will:

- confirm the list of projects identified and ask that any significant new initiatives not included in the data be identified, and
- ask for an up-to-date results framework including output descriptions and indicators, and outcome indicators, and discuss with the CO definitions of these indicators.

The IEO Lead Evaluator will subsequently issue the CO a pre-mission questionnaire (see template in Annex 1; country specific questionnaire will be sent by LE to CO subsequently) which will ask the CO to:

- Confirm the validity of IEO project mapping
- Report any significant changes in context from that described in the CPD, that have affected its achievement of results and explain any major changes from the indicative framework included in the CPD;
- Provide a succinct explanation of the country office’s assessment of its contribution to CPD outcomes and achievement of established outputs over the CPD period to date;
- Identify and provide access to evidence required to support the assessment, including:
  - o Project documents, annual progress reports, and any available evaluations covering the project list identified by the IEO. If evaluations are currently underway but not yet available this should be brought to the IEO’s attention.
  - o Monitoring data including baselines and actual performance against outcome and output indicators, evidence of attribution of related changes to UNDP interventions, and full references for the source of this data.

**Phase 2. Desk analysis, data collection, and drafting:** The IEO will review programme documentation and data, to enable its own independent assessment of evidence of achievement, and the validity of the country office self-assessment. The results of this review will be detailed in a short analytical report, highlighting key evidence to sustain the assessment, which will also include the IEO’s assessment of the country programmes contribution to intended outcomes and achievement of outputs. Depending on the results of the desk analysis, the IEO may conduct a one week field mission to ensure that the IEO has a thorough understanding of the country programme, the perspective of key stakeholders, and has access to the information required to validate or refute the country office’s own assessment of results reported in the pre-mission questionnaire. The IEO may hire an external consultant to support data collection and analysis in specific outcome areas if necessary. Based on the analysis of data collected and triangulated, the IEO will complete a first draft (“zero draft”) of the ICPR which will be subject to internal clearance and will then be circulated to the country office and UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean for feedback, including any factual corrections.

**Phase 3: Consideration of feedback and completion of final ICPR:** The country office and regional bureau will be provided two weeks to provide feedback on the draft report, including any significant factual errors or omissions, and any additional supporting evidence that was not considered in the initial assessment. The IEO will convene a video conference meeting with country office staff to discuss and clarify written feedback. The final report will be developed incorporating any factual corrections, or changes arising from the response to feedback from the country office.

**Phase 4: Publication and dissemination.** The country office will prepare a management response, under the oversight of the regional bureau and submit within two weeks of receipt of the final report. The report will be professionally edited and published and published on the UNDP website and in the Evaluation Resource Centre.<sup>22</sup> The ICPR will be made available to the Executive Board at the same session the CPD is presented for approval.

## 9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The proposed timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are<sup>23</sup> as follows:

Table 3: Tentative timeframe for the ICPR process going to the Board in 2021		
Activity	Responsible party	Indicative timeframe
<b>Phase 1: Preparation</b>		
TOR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office	LE	Early Apr

<sup>22</sup> <https://erc.undp.org/>

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

Share preliminary project list and indicator matrix	LE/RA	Early Apr
Validate project list and indicator matrix and provide documentation	CO/RA	Mid-Apr
Launch recruitment process of consultant	LE/IEO	Apr
Completion and dissemination of pre-mission questionnaire	LE	Apr
Completion of pre-mission questionnaire	CO	May
Identification and provision of documents required to support self-assessment	CO	May
<b>Phase 2: Desk analysis data collection, and drafting:</b>		
Desk analysis of available data and assessment of validity of CO self-assessment	Evaluation team	June/July
Completion of field mission	Evaluation team	20-24 July TBC
Zero draft ICPR for clearance by IEO	LE	Early Sept
First draft ICPR for CO/RB review	LE/CO/RB	Sept
<b>Phase 3: Consideration of feedback and completion of final ICPR:</b>		
Provision of feedback on draft report	CO/RB	Oct
Videoconference with CO staff to discuss and clarify written feedback	Evaluation Team/CO/RB	Oct
Complete final report addressing feedback from CO and disseminate for management response	LE	Mid-Nov
<b>Phase 4: Production and Follow-up</b>		
Draft management response	CO/RB	Nov
Editing and formatting	LE	Dec
Dissemination of the final report	IEO/CO	Dec

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, and thus the uncertainty with regards to travel restrictions, data and stakeholders' availability, the tentative timeframe above is subject to eventual adjustment during the ICPR implementation.



## Annex 1. ICPR standard questionnaire (template)

The purpose of this questionnaire is to:

- i) Capture the country office's assessment of:
  - a. the progress UNDP has made towards agreed outputs in the country programme's results framework
  - b. UNDP's contribution to intended UN MSDF/CPD outcome(s), and capacity to influence change against agreed outcomes and associated indicators and results UNDP has achieved in promoting gender equality
  - c. Significant changes in the country context since the approval of the CPD, which have affected achievement of results and/or prompted changes in the country office's results framework.
- ii) identify sources of evidence that will enable these assessments to be validated.

There is no word limit to the answers, use additional pages if necessary. Please send it back **by XX/XX/XXXX.**

### Questions

- 1.** Have there been any significant changes in context from that described in the CPD, that have affected achievement of results? If so, please elaborate.
- 2.** Please review Table 1 and:
  - a. Confirm the validity of IEO project mapping and provide details about any significant new initiatives not included in the data;
  - b. Identify any approved changes to the results framework including output descriptions and indicators, and outcome indicators. Explain the reasons for any major changes in the results framework from when the CPD was approved;
  - c. Provide a succinct explanation and ratings of the country office's contribution to CPD outcomes and achievement of established outputs over the CPD period to date;
  - d. Identify and provide access to all evidence required to support the assessment. This will include, but not be limited to project documents, annual progress reports, annual workplans and evaluations covering the projects identified by the IEO in the table below, or others not in the table that the CO considers should be considered by the ICPR. If evaluations are currently underway but not yet available this should be brought to the IEO's attention.

SAMPLE TEMPLATE ONLY; A SIMILAR TABLE WILL BE CONSTRUCTED FOR THE CO.

**Table 1. [Country] progress towards outcomes and outputs in results and resources framework**

<b>Outcome 1.</b>	<b>BY 2020, MORE VULNERABLE, LOW-INCOME AND FOOD-INSECURE PEOPLE HAVE AN ADEQUATE STANDARD OF LIVING AND EQUITABLE ACCESS TO DECENT WORK, SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INCOME-EARNING OPPORTUNITIES.</b>			
<b>Outcome indicators</b>	Please confirm the indicators that are being used to assess UNDP's contribution to the agreed outcome:  E.g. Percentage of population covered by social protection floors/ systems, disaggregated by sex, children, unemployed, old age, people with disabilities, pregnant women, new-borns, work injury victims, poor and vulnerable. Etc.		<b>Outcome resources (\$m)</b>  Please include figures for:  <b>UN MSDF/UN MSDF Estimated Resource requirements:</b> \$X.X [\$X.X (regular), \$X.X (other)]  <b>CPD Estimate:</b> \$X.X [\$X.X (regular), \$X.X (other)]  <b>Expenditure to date:</b> \$X.X [\$X.X (regular), \$X.X (other)]	
<b>Outcome assessment</b>	Please select from one of the following options to rate of the country programme's contribution to UN MSDF outcomes, based on the level of influence UNDP has on associated outcome indicators:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>High level of influence:</b> There is a clear line of contribution from UNDP to changes in the UN MSDF outcome and associated indicators. UNDP might not be the only contributor, but it is a major contributor.</li> <li>- <b>Moderate level of influence:</b> There is a line of contribution from UNDP to changes in the UN MSDF outcome and associated indicators, but either the level of contribution is only modest, or the significance of other factors contributing to changes in the indicator are not known.</li> <li>- <b>Low level of influence:</b> UNDP made little or no contribution to changes in the outcome and associated indicators, or the indicators used do not adequately capture UNDP's contribution. New indicators may need to be developed that meet quality standards and support monitoring and reporting of progress.</li> <li>- <b>Insufficient evidence:</b> There is insufficient evidence that UNDP contributed to changes in the outcome and associated indicators. Evidence about the attribution of changes in the outcome needs to be improved.</li> </ul> Please explain the basis for this rating, referencing the key sources of evidence, including elsewhere in this questionnaire.			
<b>CPD Output</b>	<b>CPD Output Indicators</b>	<b>UNDP progress and contribution</b>	<b>Key interventions</b>	<b>Expenditure 2016–19 (\$m)</b>
<b>Please provide an update to the output description, if any is required in accordance with UNDP's Programme and Operations Policies and</b>	Please confirm the indicators used by the CO to track progress towards agreed outputs:  E.g. # of people with improved incomes through sustainable productive activities,	In this section, you please provide an assessment of the progress made against the CP output over the cycle, and indicate its contribution to the associated outcome.  Please select from the three options below to provide a rating of the country programme's progress towards the stated output as follows:	Please identify the key projects that have contributed to this output in the current CPD cycle.	Please confirm CPD expenditure to date that is attributable to this output:  \$X.X m [\$X.Xm (Regular), \$X.X m (Other)]

<p><b>Procedures policy (B5 Manage Change).</b></p> <p><b>Output 1.1:</b> Local governments and communities have enhanced capacity to design and implement sustainable livelihood programmes.</p>	<p>disaggregated by sex and small landholders.</p> <p># local governments in targeted regions that have established local economic development agencies or programmes to foster growth, increase access to credit and support farmers/small entrepreneurs.</p>	<p><b>On track:</b> Progress is as expected at this stage of implementation and it is likely that the output will be achieved. Standard programme management practices are sufficient.</p> <p><b>At risk:</b> Progress is somewhat less than expected at this stage of implementation and restorative action will be necessary if the output is to be achieved. Close performance monitoring is recommended.</p> <p><b>Off track:</b> Progress is significantly less than expected at this stage of implementation and the output is not likely to be met given available resources and priorities. Recasting the output may be required.</p> <p>Please provide a succinct explanation of the basis for this rating, ensure the sources of evidence required to verify the accuracy of this assessment are referenced in the section below, and upload documentation to the SharePoint site established for this purpose.</p> <p>Please identify key gender equality results achieved under this output, if any. Please identify key sources of evidence that justify gender marker attribution of expenditure in the output.</p>		<p>Please confirm gender marker attribution for expenditure under this output:</p> <p>GEN0: %X</p> <p>GEN1: %X</p> <p>GEN2: %X</p> <p>GEN3: %X</p>
<p>Supporting evidence</p>	<p>- Please cite the key sources of evidence used to underpin this assessment of progress and upload to SharePoint folder established by the IEO for this purpose.</p>			
<p>IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence</p>	<p>-</p>			

## Annex 2. ICPR Design Matrix

Review Questions	Sub-questions	Data/info to be collected	Data collection methods and tools (e.g.)
<b>RQ 1. What progress has UNDP made towards planned CPD outputs, and how is this contributing to UNMSDF outcomes in the current programming period?</b>	What are the results UNDP expected to contribute towards Cooperation Framework outcomes, and the resources required from UNDP and other financing partners for achieving those results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN MSDF &amp; CPD</li> <li>• Indicative Country Office Results and Resources Framework (from CPD)</li> <li>• Current Country Office Results and resources framework (if different from the one included in the CPD)</li> <li>• Explanation for revisions (if any) to country office results and resources framework, and of approval of these changes through the monitoring and programme board or Executive Board.</li> <li>• Data to validate CO explanation of changes in context since CPD approval (if any significant changes have occurred).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparison of estimated resource estimates in UNSCDF/CPD in light to delivery over CPD</li> <li>• Analysis of justification for and implications of any changes (if any) country office results and resources framework since approval of the CPD.</li> </ul>
	If there have been any changes to the programme design and implementation from the initial CPD, what were they, and why were the changes made?		
	What is the evidence of progress towards planned country programme outputs and that results will be sustainable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in ICPR questionnaire detailing CO self-assessment of performance and evidence identified.</li> <li>• Project documents, annual workplans, annual progress reports, audits and evaluations covering the agreed ICPR project list.</li> <li>• Monitoring data, including performance against outcome and output indicators, and associated baselines and targets, and evidence of attribution of related changes to UNDP interventions.</li> <li>• Attribution of expenditure by gender marker</li> <li>• ROAR covering CPD period to date.</li> <li>• Programme level audits, if available.</li> <li>• Interviews with country office staff and/or key stakeholders.</li> <li>• Other, as required.</li> </ul>	Triangulate data collected (e.g. cross-check interview data internal and external sources) to validate or refute statement of achievement or contribution.  Assessment to consider, validity and reliability of evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• linkages between UNDP's specific interventions and indicators established to monitor contribution to UNSCDF defined outcome level changes and attribution of change in those indicators to UNDP support;</li> <li>• linkages between UNDP specific interventions and indicators established to monitor progress towards intended outputs, and attribution of change in those indicators to UNDP support;</li> <li>• reported contributions towards gender equality.</li> </ul>
	To what extent did the achieved results contribute to achievement of intended outcomes?		
What results has UNDP achieved in promoting gender equality?			

Review Questions	Sub-questions	Data/info to be collected	Data collection methods and tools (e.g.)
<b>RQ2. How has UNDP performed in planning, implementation, reporting and evaluation of development results?</b>	Was the CPD realistic about the expected size and scope of the results that could be delivered with the available resources and resource mobilization opportunities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN MSDF &amp; CPD</li> <li>• Indicative Country Office Results and Resources Framework (from CPD)</li> <li>• Current Country Office Results and resources framework (if different from the one included in the CPD)</li> <li>• Explanation for revisions (if any) to country office results and resources framework, and of approval of these changes through the monitoring and programme board or Executive Board.</li> <li>• Data to validate CO explanation of changes in context since CPD approval (if any significant changes have occurred).</li> </ul>	<p>In light of assessment of achievement or contribution, assess and summarise evidence about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• realism of the CPD</li> <li>• adaptation to changes in context</li> <li>• quality of existing results frameworks in light of UNDP programming standards.<sup>24</sup></li> </ul>
	Has UNDP actively adapted to changes in the development context since the CPD was approved to maximise the relevance and impact of its work on intended outcomes?		
	Are the programme's outcomes and outputs and associated indicators at an appropriate level and do they reflect a sound theory of change?		
	Are there any specific factors that are in the control of UNDP and have constrained achievement of expected results that need to be factored in when planning the next CPD?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICPR questionnaire</li> <li>• Staff and stakeholder interviews</li> <li>• Staff and partnership survey data</li> <li>• Human resource data</li> <li>• Programme and project documentation and audit reports (as above)</li> </ul>	<p>Consideration of evidence collected about internal factors that have constrained achievement of expected results and the strength of those factors.</p>
	Has UNDP collected sufficient evidence to account for the work undertaken and results achieved? Has the CO made good use of evaluation to promote accountability and learning?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CO evaluation plan and updates to it.</li> <li>• Evidence identified above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In light of assessment of achievement or contribution, assess and summarise evidence about the quality of evidence collected to account for the work undertaken and results achieved?</li> <li>• Assess progress in implementing evaluation plan, and consistency of approach to evaluations with expectations set out in UNDP's evaluation policy and guidelines.</li> </ul>

<sup>24</sup> Outcomes and outputs are defined at an appropriate level, are consistent with the theory of change, and have SMART, results-oriented indicators, with specified baselines and targets, and identified data sources. Gender-responsive, sex-disaggregated indicators are used when appropriate. Relevant indicators from the Strategic Plan's Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF) have been adopted in the programme or project results framework.

