

United Republic of Tanzania

Independent Country Programme Review (ICPR)

Terms of Reference (31 January 2020)



1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Program (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.¹ UNDP Tanzania has been selected for an ICPR since its country programme will end in 2021. The ICPR will be conducted in 2020 to feed into the development of the new country programme. It has been selected for an ICPR as an [Assessment of Development Results](#) was recently conducted by the IEO in 2015, which encompassed two programme cycles: 2007-2010/2011 and 2011–2015/2016. Part of the ICPR methodology will be adapted to reflect on the progress of the conclusions and recommendations made in the 2015 report.

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

The United Republic of Tanzania has one of the fastest growing economies in Africa, sustaining growth of 6-7% over the last decade.² Tanzania has been positioning itself to become a middle-income country by 2025. In 2019, Tanzania reported that it is on track to achieve four of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by target year 2030, and is doing reasonably well in addressing eight other

¹ See UNDP Evaluation Policy: www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf.

² <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/tanzania/overview>

goals (as of 2019). Achievements have been made with a sustained real GDP growth of 7% and an average labour force participation rate of 83%.³ The country's progress in human development is

noted in its increase in Human Development Index (HDI) from 0.373 in 1990 to 0.528 in 2018, an increase of 41.8%. This HDI positions Tanzania at 159 out of 189 countries, placing it in the low human development category. Over the same time period, Tanzania has made strides in increasing its life expectancy at birth (by 14.8 years) and its mean years of schooling by 2.4 years. Tanzania's GNI per capita also increased by approximately 88.2 percent during the same 18-year period, from 1.490 in 1990 and 2.805 in 2018.⁴

Mainland Tanzania has seen its poverty levels decrease from 34.4% in 2007 to 26.4% in 2018. Extreme poverty on the mainland has also declined from 11.7% to 8% over the same time period. Despite this improvement, much of the population of mainland Tanzania is vulnerable to poverty with nearly half the population living below the international poverty line (\$1.90 per person per day, 2011 purchasing power parity). Poverty remains highest in the lake zone districts of the mainland that also face climate-change related natural disasters.⁵

Geographic inequalities in terms of wealth and poverty exist across Tanzania, driven in part and worsened by climate change and natural disasters. The population growth of Tanzania has exacerbated land and forest degradation, biodiversity loss and the unsustainable use of natural resources. Illegal poaching of wildlife, overfishing and livestock overstocking have also impacted Tanzania's environment and poverty.⁶ Drought is among the most common natural disasters in Tanzania. Frequent droughts coupled with declining rainfall worsen food security and negatively affect livelihoods in agriculture, particularly for women who are dependent on climate-sensitive sectors and have restricted access to paid employment. Tanzania has made progress in addressing gender equality under the Millennium Development Goals, but challenges remain in terms of women's lack of access to employment, health services, education and decision-making processes.⁷ Tanzania's Gender

³ Voluntary National Review 2019, Empowering People and Ensuring Inclusiveness and Equality

https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/23429VNR_Report_Tanzania_2019_FINAL.pdf

⁴ http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/TZA.pdf

⁵ <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/tanzania/publication/tanzanias-path-to-poverty-reduction-and-pro-poor-growth>

⁶ UNDP Country Programme Document 2016-2021, URT

⁷ <https://www.tz.undp.org/content/tanzania/en/home/ourwork/genderequality/overview.html>

Inequality Index (2018) rating in 2018 was 0.539, ranking the country 129 out of 188 countries.⁸ Structural power imbalances remain between women and men as well as gender stereotypes.

3. UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN TANZANIA

UNDP's country programme document for Tanzania identified three programme priorities for the period under review (2016-2021):

- Inclusive economic growth and poverty reduction
- Environment sustainability, climate change and resilience
- Inclusive democratic governance

The CPD identified an indicative budget of \$120.9 million. As of January 2020 the programme delivered 81% of that projected figure.

⁸ <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/TZA>

Table 1: Country Programme outcomes and indicative resources (2016-2021)

Country Programme Outcome		Indicative resources (US\$ million)	Expenditures to date (US\$ million)
42. The economy is increasingly transformed for greater pro-poor inclusiveness, competitiveness and increased opportunities for decent and productive employment	<p>Output 1: Select ministries and districts have enhanced capacities to develop, implement and monitor gender-responsive, environmentally sustainable and inclusive growth policies/plans.</p> <p>Output 2: Options enabled and facilitated for inclusive and sustainable social protection.</p> <p>Output 3: Capacities of women's and youth enterprises in the 28 districts enhanced to grow and add value to their products for increased income.</p> <p>Output 4: Relevant policies and programmes in growth sectors reviewed and operationalized on the basis of evidence/data.</p> <p>Output 5: Solutions developed at national and subnational levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.</p>	<p>Regular: \$20.1</p> <p>Other: \$22.9</p> <p>Total: \$43</p>	\$26,249,138
43. Improved environment, natural resources, climate change governance, energy access and disaster risk management	<p>Output 1: Relevant ministries and districts are able to formulate, implement and enforce environmental and natural resources management policies, strategies and regulations.</p> <p>Output 2: Select districts and communities have their capacities strengthened in climate change governance and sustainable energy access.</p> <p>Output 3: Preparedness systems in place to effectively address the consequences of and response to natural hazards.</p>	<p>Regular: \$8.9</p> <p>Other: \$23</p> <p>Total: \$31.9</p>	\$39,808,214

44. National governance is more effective, transparent, accountable and inclusive	<p>Output 1: Parliaments and electoral bodies are enabled to perform core functions for improved transparency, accountability and citizen participation.</p> <p>Output 2: Citizens have improved access to and are better served by the justice system and human rights reporting.</p> <p>Output 3: Key public institutions are enabled to address corruption and implement their procurement needs in a transparent manner.</p> <p>Output 4: Government has effective mechanisms in place to monitor and report on use of ODA and other sources of global development financing.</p> <p>Output 5: Women have enhanced capacities to participate in electoral and decision-making processes at all levels.</p>	<p>Regular: \$15</p> <p>Other: \$31</p> <p>Total: \$46</p>	\$31,720,933
Total		\$120,903,000	\$97,778,285

Source: UNDP United Republic of Tanzania Country Programme Document, 2016-2021

4. SCOPE & OBJECTIVES

ICPRs are conducted in the penultimate year of UNDP country programmes in order to feed into the process of developing the new country programme. The ICPR will cover work undertaken in the current programme cycle, and focus on capturing the country office's contribution to UNSCDF 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/UNSDCF 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.⁹ The ICPR evaluation questions, data sources and approaches for analysis are elaborated in a design matrix (see Annex 3).

The ICPR is an *independent validation of the UNDP country office's self-assessment* which will be completed in the standard ICPR questionnaire in Annex 1. National Consultant TORs

Evaluation Support Officer – Inclusive growth (National)

Location:	Home-based with travel around Tanzania
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Post Level:	National Consultant
Languages Required:	English, Swahili
Starting Date: (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)	February 2020
Duration of Initial Contract:	30 days between February 2020 and July 2020

1. Background

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts independent country programme reviews (ICPRs) to support the development of Country Programme Documents and strengthen the accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders and the Executive Board.

⁹ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

IEO will conduct an ICPR of the UNDP Tanzania programme, commencing in the beginning of 2020, to feed into the preparation of UNDP's new programme starting from 2021. The ICPR will be conducted in close collaboration with the Tanzania Government, UNDP's country offices, and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa.

The IEO is recruiting one consultant that can contribute substantively to the evaluation, under the guidance and supervision of the IEO's Lead Evaluator (LE). This ToR covers the services expected from the specialist recruited to cover the inclusive growth-related components of the Tanzania country programme.

2. Consultant's responsibilities:

Under the supervision and guidance of the LE, the consultant will contribute to the analysis of the country programme by providing technical expertise and knowledge in the assigned area(s). The work can be expected to include:

- Prior to the mission, conduct preliminary research, compile documentation, and complete analysis in areas to be covered by the report;
- Plan, support and participate fully in the data collection mission in the country, including by taking a lead role in interviews in assigned areas of responsibility;
- With the support of the associate lead evaluator, ensure appropriate documentation of interviews undertaken in areas of assigned responsibility;
- Deliver high quality analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programmes in assigned areas, under broad overall direction from the LE;
- Participation in the evaluation team's meetings and analysis of key findings, conclusions and recommendations leading to the preparation of the final report.

3. Expected outputs and indicative timeframe:

The consultant, working under the leadership of the LE, will contribute to ensuring the overall quality of the evaluation report. No payment will be processed until the deliverables have been approved by the IEO. The deliverables include:

- Summary of the desk review: a summary of the context and other evaluative evidence, evaluation questions and data gaps. Contribute to design of mission schedule, including compilation of the list of stakeholders to consult and any additional protocol questions, tools

and instruments necessary for data collection specific to each outcome in each thematic area. Due prior to data collection mission.

- Short summary of mission findings: For presentation at a debriefing session with the country office, preparation of summary of preliminary findings, conclusions and areas for recommendations;
- Outcome Analysis paper of up to 15 pages covering assigned thematic area, as an input to the evaluation report.
- Final Outcome Analysis paper: Comprehensive review and necessary adjustments to the outcome analysis papers and drafts of the ICPR report, addressing feedback from stakeholders.

The timeframe and milestones for the consultants' contributions are as follows.

Activity	Date	Estimated working days
Preparation for mission, including compilation and analysis of documents	February, March	5
Participation in the data collection mission	30 March – 10 April	8
Draft written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	April – May	10
Final written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	June	7
Total estimated number of working days		30

4. Remuneration and duration of contract

Total inputs required amount to up to thirty (30) days between contract signature and July 2020, with the bulk of the work taking place from February to April 2020. Payments will be based on UNDP acceptance of the delivery of outputs, as follows:

Upon completion of the data collection mission and UNDP IEO acceptance of report covering full proceedings of the evaluation mission, including detailed meeting notes	60%
--	-----

UNDP IEO acceptance of final written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	40%
---	-----

The standard for air travel authorized by UNDP for individual consultants is economy class; should the consultant choose to arrange travel by her/himself, s/he will receive the travel entitlement at full fare economy class from UNDP for each mission. Actual settlement of travel cost will be based on invoice of ticket purchased and paid up to the entitlement amount. Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) will be paid per nights spent outside consultant's home town; at the place the mission takes place following UNDP DSA standard rates. Travel costs will be settled separately from the consultant fees.

5. Competencies

Functional competencies

- Strong oral and written communication skills in English; fluent in Swahili
- Strong analytical skills, including ability to quickly assess a diverse range of information with a discerning sense for quality of data; and
- Good mastery of information technology required for organized presentation of information.

Development and Operational Effectiveness

- Adhere to the principle of confidentiality and ethical code of conducts during the evaluation;
- Ability to work under pressure, multi-tasking skills;
- Available to travel and conduct required analysis within the agreed timelines; and

Corporate Competencies

- Ability to work in multicultural and multidisciplinary teams, acting with professionalism, diplomacy, tact and courtesy.

6. Required Skills and Experience

Applicants will be expected to have a advanced degree or equivalent in a field relevant to the scope of the assignment, such as Evaluation, Economics, Social Sciences, Public Policy.

Applicants will be expected to demonstrate good understanding of the development and institutional context of Tanzania, in addition to one, or a combination of, expertise in three different areas:

- Evaluation skills and experience;
- Experience supporting and/or contributing to evaluation missions of international organizations
- Expertise in one of the following key focus areas of the Tanzania programme is advantageous: economic policy focused on pro-poor growth and poverty reduction; energy and extractives policy; legal sector reform and access to justice.

The following experience is not required but would be an advantage:

- Familiarity with UNDP or UN operations in Tanzania.

Applicants will be expected to demonstrate a track record of high quality academic or applied research in areas relevant to the evaluation.

Note: Interested applicants should mention in their cover letter the area(s) of thematic expertise they have.

Annex 22 and will adopt 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, the IEO provides an independent judgement on: whether there is sufficient evidence to support the COs 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 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, and reporting.

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 UNSCDF 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, CPR), evaluation reports, other documentary evidence; and ii.) interviews with UNDP (primarily CO) staff and selected key stakeholders 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:

- **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.

- **High level of influence:** There is a clean line of contribution from UNDP to changes in the UNSDCF 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 UNSDCF 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 COs 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 UNSCDF 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, shown in Annex 1. National Consultant TORs

Evaluation Support Officer – Inclusive growth (National)

Location:	Home-based with travel around Tanzania
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Post Level:	National Consultant
Languages Required:	English, Swahili
Starting Date: (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)	February 2020
Duration of Initial Contract:	30 days between February 2020 and July 2020

7. Background

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts independent country programme reviews (ICPRs) to support the development of Country Programme Documents and strengthen the accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders and the Executive Board.

IEO will conduct an ICPR of the UNDP Tanzania programme, commencing in the beginning of 2020, to feed into the preparation of UNDP's new programme starting from 2021. The ICPR will be

conducted in close collaboration with the Tanzania Government, UNDP's country offices, and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa.

The IEO is recruiting one consultant that can contribute substantively to the evaluation, under the guidance and supervision of the IEO's Lead Evaluator (LE). This ToR covers the services expected from the specialist recruited to cover the inclusive growth-related components of the Tanzania country programme.

8. Consultant's responsibilities:

Under the supervision and guidance of the LE, the consultant will contribute to the analysis of the country programme by providing technical expertise and knowledge in the assigned area(s). The work can be expected to include:

- Prior to the mission, conduct preliminary research, compile documentation, and complete analysis in areas to be covered by the report;
- Plan, support and participate fully in the data collection mission in the country, including by taking a lead role in interviews in assigned areas of responsibility;
- With the support of the associate lead evaluator, ensure appropriate documentation of interviews undertaken in areas of assigned responsibility;
- Deliver high quality analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programmes in assigned areas, under broad overall direction from the LE;
- Participation in the evaluation team's meetings and analysis of key findings, conclusions and recommendations leading to the preparation of the final report.

9. Expected outputs and indicative timeframe:

The consultant, working under the leadership of the LE, will contribute to ensuring the overall quality of the evaluation report. No payment will be processed until the deliverables have been approved by the IEO. The deliverables include:

- Summary of the desk review: a summary of the context and other evaluative evidence, evaluation questions and data gaps. Contribute to design of mission schedule, including compilation of the list of stakeholders to consult and any additional protocol questions, tools and instruments necessary for data collection specific to each outcome in each thematic area. Due prior to data collection mission.

- Short summary of mission findings: For presentation at a debriefing session with the country office, preparation of summary of preliminary findings, conclusions and areas for recommendations;
- Outcome Analysis paper of up to 15 pages covering assigned thematic area, as an input to the evaluation report.
- Final Outcome Analysis paper: Comprehensive review and necessary adjustments to the outcome analysis papers and drafts of the ICPR report, addressing feedback from stakeholders.

The timeframe and milestones for the consultants' contributions are as follows.

Activity	Date	Estimated working days
Preparation for mission, including compilation and analysis of documents	February, March	5
Participation in the data collection mission	30 March – 10 April	8
Draft written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	April – May	10
Final written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	June	7
Total estimated number of working days		30

10. Remuneration and duration of contract

Total inputs required amount to up to thirty (30) days between contract signature and July 2020, with the bulk of the work taking place from February to April 2020. Payments will be based on UNDP acceptance of the delivery of outputs, as follows:

Upon completion of the data collection mission and UNDP IEO acceptance of report covering full proceedings of the evaluation mission, including detailed meeting notes	60%
UNDP IEO acceptance of final written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	40%

The standard for air travel authorized by UNDP for individual consultants is economy class; should the consultant choose to arrange travel by her/himself, s/he will receive the travel entitlement at full fare economy class from UNDP for each mission. Actual settlement of travel cost will be based on invoice of ticket purchased and paid up to the entitlement amount. Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) will be paid per nights spent outside consultant's home town; at the place the mission takes place following UNDP DSA standard rates. Travel costs will be settled separately from the consultant fees.

11. Competencies

Functional competencies

- Strong oral and written communication skills in English; fluent in Swahili
- Strong analytical skills, including ability to quickly assess a diverse range of information with a discerning sense for quality of data; and
- Good mastery of information technology required for organized presentation of information.

Development and Operational Effectiveness

- Adhere to the principle of confidentiality and ethical code of conducts during the evaluation;
- Ability to work under pressure, multi-tasking skills;
- Available to travel and conduct required analysis within the agreed timelines; and

Corporate Competencies

- Ability to work in multicultural and multidisciplinary teams, acting with professionalism, diplomacy, tact and courtesy.

12. Required Skills and Experience

Applicants will be expected to have a advanced degree or equivalent in a field relevant to the scope of the assignment, such as Evaluation, Economics, Social Sciences, Public Policy.

Applicants will be expected to demonstrate good understanding of the development and institutional context of Tanzania, in addition to one, or a combination of, expertise in three different areas:

- Evaluation skills and experience;

- Experience supporting and/or contributing to evaluation missions of international organizations
- Expertise in one of the following key focus areas of the Tanzania programme is advantageous: economic policy focused on pro-poor growth and poverty reduction; energy and extractives policy; legal sector reform and access to justice.

The following experience is not required but would be an advantage:

- Familiarity with UNDP or UN operations in Tanzania.

Applicants will be expected to demonstrate a track record of high quality academic or applied research in areas relevant to the evaluation.

Note: Interested applicants should mention in their cover letter the area(s) of thematic expertise they have.

Annex 22.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP: The UNDP IEO will conduct the ICPR in consultation with the UNDP Tanzania country office and the Regional Bureau for Africa 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 EAP members to comment on the ICPR and ratings given.

The IEO Lead Evaluator (LE) is responsible for:

- Completing, or overseeing analysis of evidence provided
- Consulting with 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 (composed of senior IEO staff and EAP members)
- 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 Tanzania: The country office will complete the standardised ICPR questionnaire including self-assessment and make available to the 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). 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 will include the following members:

- 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.

- Associate Lead Evaluator (ALE): IEO staff member with the general responsibility to support the LE, including in the preparation of terms of reference, data collection and analysis, and the final report.
- Research Associate (RA): Under the guidance of LE, IEO research associate will compile necessary information required for the ICPR, prepare analysis and suggest ratings for assigned outcomes and outputs, and contribute to the preparation of the final ICPR report as required.
- Consultants: One national consultant will be recruited to collect data and help assess the programme and/or specific outcome areas: economic policy focused on pro-poor growth and poverty reduction; energy and extractives policy; legal sector reform and access to justice. (see ToR at Annex 1).

Specific roles and responsibilities are identified

Annex 3. ICPR Design Matrix

Review Questions	Sub-questions	Data/Info to be collected	Data collection methods and tools (e.g.)
RQ 1. What progress has UNDP made towards planned CPD outputs, and how is this contributing to UNSCDF outcomes in the current programming period?	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"> • UNSDCF & CPD • Indicative Country Office Results and Resources Framework (from CPD) • Current Country Office Results and resources framework (if different from the one included in the CPD) • 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. • Data to validate CO explanation of changes in context since CPD approval (if any significant changes have occurred). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison of estimated resource estimates in UNSDCF/CPD in light to delivery over CPD • Analysis of justification for and implications of any changes (if any) country office results and resources framework since approval of the CPD.
	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"> • Evidence in ICPR questionnaire detailing CO self-assessment of performance and evidence identified. • Project documents, annual workplans, annual progress reports, audits and evaluations covering the agreed ICPR project list. • Monitoring data, including performance against outcome and output indicators, and associated baselines and targets, and evidence of attribution of related changes to UNDP interventions. • Attribution of expenditure by gender marker • ROAR covering CPD period to date. • Programme level audits, if available. • Interviews with country office staff and/or key stakeholders. • Other, as required. 	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"> • 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; • linkages between UNDP specific interventions and indicators established to monitor progress towards intended outputs, and attribution of change in those indicators to UNDP support;
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.)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reported contributions towards gender equality.
RQ2. How has UNDP performed in planning, implementation, reporting and evaluation of development results?	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"> • UNSDCF & CPD • Indicative Country Office Results and Resources Framework (from CPD) • Current Country Office Results and resources framework (if different from the one included in the CPD) • 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. • Data to validate CO explanation of changes in context since CPD approval (if any significant changes have occurred). 	<p>In light of assessment of achievement or contribution, assess and summarise evidence about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • realism of the CPD • adaptation to changes in context • quality of existing results frameworks in light of UNDP programming standards.
	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"> • ICPR questionnaire • Staff and stakeholder interviews • Staff and partnership survey data • Human resource data • Programme and project documentation and audit reports (as above) 	Consideration of evidence collected about internal factors that have constrained achievement of expected results and the strength of those factors.
	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"> • CO evaluation plan and updates to it. • Evidence identified above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In light of assessment of achievement or contribution, assess and summarise evidence collected to account for the work undertaken and results achieved? • Assess progress in implementing evaluation plan, and consistency of approach to evaluations with expectations set

Review Questions	Sub-questions	Data/info to be collected	Data collection methods and tools (e.g.)
			out in UNDP's evaluation policy and guidelines.

Annex 4.

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, ask for feedback: 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.

The IEO Lead Evaluator will subsequently issue the CO a pre-mission questionnaire (see Annex 1. National Consultant TORs

Evaluation Support Officer – Inclusive growth (National)

Location:	Home-based with travel around Tanzania
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Post Level:	National Consultant
Languages Required:	English, Swahili
Starting Date: (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)	February 2020
Duration of Initial Contract:	30 days between February 2020 and July 2020

13. Background

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts independent country programme reviews (ICPRs) to support the development of Country Programme Documents and strengthen the accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders and the Executive Board.

IEO will conduct an ICPR of the UNDP Tanzania programme, commencing in the beginning of 2020, to feed into the preparation of UNDP's new programme starting from 2021. The ICPR will be conducted in close collaboration with the Tanzania Government, UNDP's country offices, and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa.

The IEO is recruiting one consultant that can contribute substantively to the evaluation, under the guidance and supervision of the IEO's Lead Evaluator (LE). This ToR covers the services expected from the specialist recruited to cover the inclusive growth-related components of the Tanzania country programme.

14. Consultant's responsibilities:

Under the supervision and guidance of the LE, the consultant will contribute to the analysis of the country programme by providing technical expertise and knowledge in the assigned area(s). The work can be expected to include:

- Prior to the mission, conduct preliminary research, compile documentation, and complete analysis in areas to be covered by the report;
- Plan, support and participate fully in the data collection mission in the country, including by taking a lead role in interviews in assigned areas of responsibility;
- With the support of the associate lead evaluator, ensure appropriate documentation of interviews undertaken in areas of assigned responsibility;
- Deliver high quality analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programmes in assigned areas, under broad overall direction from the LE;
- Participation in the evaluation team’s meetings and analysis of key findings, conclusions and recommendations leading to the preparation of the final report.

15. Expected outputs and indicative timeframe:

The consultant, working under the leadership of the LE, will contribute to ensuring the overall quality of the evaluation report. No payment will be processed until the deliverables have been approved by the IEO. The deliverables include:

- Summary of the desk review: a summary of the context and other evaluative evidence, evaluation questions and data gaps. Contribute to design of mission schedule, including compilation of the list of stakeholders to consult and any additional protocol questions, tools and instruments necessary for data collection specific to each outcome in each thematic area. Due prior to data collection mission.
- Short summary of mission findings: For presentation at a debriefing session with the country office, preparation of summary of preliminary findings, conclusions and areas for recommendations;
- Outcome Analysis paper of up to 15 pages covering assigned thematic area, as an input to the evaluation report.
- Final Outcome Analysis paper: Comprehensive review and necessary adjustments to the outcome analysis papers and drafts of the ICPR report, addressing feedback from stakeholders.

The timeframe and milestones for the consultants’ contributions are as follows.

Activity	Date	Estimated working days
Preparation for mission, including compilation and analysis of documents	February, March	5
Participation in the data collection mission	30 March – 10 April	8
Draft written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	April – May	10
Final written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	June	7
Total estimated number of working days		30

16. Remuneration and duration of contract

Total inputs required amount to up to thirty (30) days between contract signature and July 2020, with the bulk of the work taking place from February to April 2020. Payments will be based on UNDP acceptance of the delivery of outputs, as follows:

Upon completion of the data collection mission and UNDP IEO acceptance of report covering full proceedings of the evaluation mission, including detailed meeting notes	60%
UNDP IEO acceptance of final written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	40%

The standard for air travel authorized by UNDP for individual consultants is economy class; should the consultant choose to arrange travel by her/himself, s/he will receive the travel entitlement at full fare economy class from UNDP for each mission. Actual settlement of travel cost will be based on invoice of ticket purchased and paid up to the entitlement amount. Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) will be paid per nights spent outside consultant's home town; at the place the mission takes place following UNDP DSA standard rates. Travel costs will be settled separately from the consultant fees.

17. Competencies

Functional competencies

- Strong oral and written communication skills in English; fluent in Swahili
- Strong analytical skills, including ability to quickly assess a diverse range of information with a discerning sense for quality of data; and
- Good mastery of information technology required for organized presentation of information.

Development and Operational Effectiveness

- Adhere to the principle of confidentiality and ethical code of conducts during the evaluation;
- Ability to work under pressure, multi-tasking skills;
- Available to travel and conduct required analysis within the agreed timelines; and

Corporate Competencies

- Ability to work in multicultural and multidisciplinary teams, acting with professionalism, diplomacy, tact and courtesy.

18. Required Skills and Experience

Applicants will be expected to have a advanced degree or equivalent in a field relevant to the scope of the assignment, such as Evaluation, Economics, Social Sciences, Public Policy.

Applicants will be expected to demonstrate good understanding of the development and institutional context of Tanzania, in addition to one, or a combination of, expertise in three different areas:

- Evaluation skills and experience;
- Experience supporting and/or contributing to evaluation missions of international organizations
- Expertise in one of the following key focus areas of the Tanzania programme is advantageous: economic policy focused on pro-poor growth and poverty reduction; energy and extractives policy; legal sector reform and access to justice.

The following experience is not required but would be an advantage:

- Familiarity with UNDP or UN operations in Tanzania.

Applicants will be expected to demonstrate a track record of high quality academic or applied research in areas relevant to the evaluation.

Note: Interested applicants should mention in their cover letter the area(s) of thematic expertise they have.

Annex 22) 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
- 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 evaluation team’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. In addition to the desk analysis, the evaluation team will complete a two-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. 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 the relevant UNDP Regional Bureau 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 it 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.¹⁰ The ICPR will be provided to the Executive Board at the same session the CPD is presented for approval.

9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPR PROCESS

The proposed timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are¹¹ as follows:

Table 3: Timeframe for the ICPR process going to the Board in [TBC]		
Activity	Responsible party	Indicative timeframe
Phase 1: Preparation		

¹⁰ <https://erc.undp.org/>

¹¹ The timeframe, indicative of process and deadlines, does not imply full-time engagement of evaluation team during the period.

ToR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office	LE	Feb 2020
Completion and dissemination of pre-mission questionnaire	LE + RA	Feb 2020
Completion of pre-mission questionnaire	CO	Feb 2020
Identification and provision of documents required to support self-assessment	CO	Jan – Feb 2020
Phase 2: Desk analysis data collection, and drafting:		
Desk analysis of available data and assessment of validity of CO self-assessment	Evaluation team	March 2020
Completion of field mission	LE + ALE	March 30 – 10 April 2020
Zero draft ICPR for clearance by IEO	LE + ALE	April 2020
First draft ICPR for CO/RB review	CO/RB	April 2020
Phase 3: Consideration of feedback and completion of final ICPR:		
Provision of feedback on draft report	CO/RB	May 2020
Videoconference with country office staff to discuss and clarify written feedback	Evaluation Team/CO/RB	May 2020
Complete final report addressing feedback from CO and disseminate for management response	LE	May 2020
Phase 4: Production and Follow-up		
Draft management response	CO/RB	June 2020
Editing and formatting	LE + ALE	June 2020
Dissemination of the final report	IEO/CO	June 2020

Evaluation Support Officer – Inclusive growth (National)

Location:	Home-based with travel around Tanzania
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Post Level:	National Consultant
Languages Required:	English, Swahili
Starting Date: (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)	February 2020
Duration of Initial Contract:	30 days between February 2020 and July 2020

19. Background

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts independent country programme reviews (ICPRs) to support the development of Country Programme Documents and strengthen the accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders and the Executive Board.

IEO will conduct an ICPR of the UNDP Tanzania programme, commencing in the beginning of 2020, to feed into the preparation of UNDP's new programme starting from 2021. The ICPR will be conducted in close collaboration with the Tanzania Government, UNDP's country offices, and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa.

The IEO is recruiting one consultant that can contribute substantively to the evaluation, under the guidance and supervision of the IEO's Lead Evaluator (LE). This ToR covers the services expected from the specialist recruited to cover the inclusive growth-related components of the Tanzania country programme.

20. Consultant's responsibilities:

Under the supervision and guidance of the LE, the consultant will contribute to the analysis of the country programme by providing technical expertise and knowledge in the assigned area(s). The work can be expected to include:

- Prior to the mission, conduct preliminary research, compile documentation, and complete analysis in areas to be covered by the report;
- Plan, support and participate fully in the data collection mission in the country, including by taking a lead role in interviews in assigned areas of responsibility;
- With the support of the associate lead evaluator, ensure appropriate documentation of interviews undertaken in areas of assigned responsibility;
- Deliver high quality analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programmes in assigned areas, under broad overall direction from the LE;
- Participation in the evaluation team's meetings and analysis of key findings, conclusions and recommendations leading to the preparation of the final report.

21. Expected outputs and indicative timeframe:

The consultant, working under the leadership of the LE, will contribute to ensuring the overall quality of the evaluation report. No payment will be processed until the deliverables have been approved by the IEO. The deliverables include:

- Summary of the desk review: a summary of the context and other evaluative evidence, evaluation questions and data gaps. Contribute to design of mission schedule, including compilation of the list of stakeholders to consult and any additional protocol questions, tools and instruments necessary for data collection specific to each outcome in each thematic area. Due prior to data collection mission.
- Short summary of mission findings: For presentation at a debriefing session with the country office, preparation of summary of preliminary findings, conclusions and areas for recommendations;
- Outcome Analysis paper of up to 15 pages covering assigned thematic area, as an input to the evaluation report.
- Final Outcome Analysis paper: Comprehensive review and necessary adjustments to the outcome analysis papers and drafts of the ICPR report, addressing feedback from stakeholders.

The timeframe and milestones for the consultants' contributions are as follows.

Activity	Date	Estimated working days
Preparation for mission, including compilation and analysis of documents	February, March	5
Participation in the data collection mission	30 March – 10 April	8
Draft written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	April – May	10
Final written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	June	7
Total estimated number of working days		30

22. Remuneration and duration of contract

Total inputs required amount to up to thirty (30) days between contract signature and July 2020, with the bulk of the work taking place from February to April 2020. Payments will be based on UNDP acceptance of the delivery of outputs, as follows:

Upon completion of the data collection mission and UNDP IEO acceptance of report covering full proceedings of the evaluation mission, including detailed meeting notes	60%
UNDP IEO acceptance of final written analysis of the effectiveness of UNDP programs in assigned areas	40%

The standard for air travel authorized by UNDP for individual consultants is economy class; should the consultant choose to arrange travel by her/himself, s/he will receive the travel entitlement at full fare economy class from UNDP for each mission. Actual settlement of travel cost will be based on invoice of ticket purchased and paid up to the entitlement amount. Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) will be paid per nights spent outside consultant's home town; at the place the mission takes place following UNDP DSA standard rates. Travel costs will be settled separately from the consultant fees.

23. Competencies

Functional competencies

- Strong oral and written communication skills in English; fluent in Swahili
- Strong analytical skills, including ability to quickly assess a diverse range of information with a discerning sense for quality of data; and
- Good mastery of information technology required for organized presentation of information.

Development and Operational Effectiveness

- Adhere to the principle of confidentiality and ethical code of conducts during the evaluation;
- Ability to work under pressure, multi-tasking skills;
- Available to travel and conduct required analysis within the agreed timelines; and

Corporate Competencies

- Ability to work in multicultural and multidisciplinary teams, acting with professionalism, diplomacy, tact and courtesy.

24. Required Skills and Experience

Applicants will be expected to have a advanced degree or equivalent in a field relevant to the scope of the assignment, such as Evaluation, Economics, Social Sciences, Public Policy.

Applicants will be expected to demonstrate good understanding of the development and institutional context of Tanzania, in addition to one, or a combination of, expertise in three different areas:

- Evaluation skills and experience;
- Experience supporting and/or contributing to evaluation missions of international organizations
- Expertise in one of the following key focus areas of the Tanzania programme is advantageous: economic policy focused on pro-poor growth and poverty reduction; energy and extractives policy; legal sector reform and access to justice.

The following experience is not required but would be an advantage:

- Familiarity with UNDP or UN operations in Tanzania.

Applicants will be expected to demonstrate a track record of high quality academic or applied research in areas relevant to the evaluation.

Note: Interested applicants should mention in their cover letter the area(s) of thematic expertise they have.

Annex 2. ICPR standard questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to:

- i) Capture the country office's assessment of:
 - a. the progress has UNDP made towards agreed outputs in the country programme's results framework
 - b. UNDP's contribution to intended UNSDCF/CPD outcome(s), and capacity to influence change against agreed outcomes and associated indicators and results has UNDP achieved in promoting gender equality
 - c. Significant changes in the country context since the approval of the CPD, that 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 28/02/2020.**

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.

Table 1. Tanzania progress towards outcomes and outputs in results and resources framework

OUTCOME 1.	CPD Outcome 1: The economy is increasingly transformed for greater pro-poor inclusiveness, competitiveness and increased opportunities for decent and productive employment.			
Outcome indicators Please confirm the indicators that are being used to assess UNDP's contribution to the agreed outcome:	Indicator 1.1 % of national budget allocated to address poverty, environment and gender	Outcome resources (\$m) Please include figures for: UNDAF/UNSDCF Estimated Resource requirements: \$130.5 [\$51.5 (funded), \$79 (Un-funded)] CPD Estimate: \$43 [\$20.1 (regular), \$22.9 (other)] Expenditure to date: \$26.3 [\$9.5 (regular), \$16.8 (other)]		
	Indicator 1.2 Number of poor and vulnerable households benefitting from social assistance			
	Indicator 1.3 Number of United Nations-supported business start-ups or enterprises enabled to expand under UNDAP II that are still operating 24 months later			
	Indicator 1.4 Number of individuals who report an increase in their income levels as a result of UN-supported initiatives during UNDAP II			
	Indicator 1.5 Public social protection expenditure as % of GDP			
Outcome assessment	Please provide a rating of the country programme's contribution to UNDAP outcomes, based on the level of influence UNDP has on associated outcome indicators. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High level of influence: There is a clean line of contribution from UNDP to changes in the UNSDCF 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 UNSDCF 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. Please explain the basis for this rating, referencing the key sources of evidence, including elsewhere in this questionnaire.			
CPD Output	CPD Output Indicators	UNDP progress and contribution	Key interventions	Expenditure 2016–19 (\$m)
Output 1.1: Select ministries and districts have enhanced capacities to develop implement and monitor	Indicator 1.1.1 Number of policies/plans that integrate and allocate resources for implementation of poverty, environment and gender	In this section, you will provide an assessment of the progress made against the CP output over the cycle and indicate its contribution to the associated outcome.	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:

<p>gender-responsive environmentally sustainable and inclusive growth policies/plans</p> <p>Please provide an update to the output description, if any is required in accordance with UNDP's Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures policy (B5 Manage Change).</p>	<p>Please confirm the indicators used by the CO to track progress towards agreed outputs:</p>	<p>Please select from the below to provide a rating of the country programme's progress towards the stated output, as follows:</p> <p>On track: Progress is as expected at this stage of implementation and it is likely that the output will be achieved. Standard program management practices are sufficient.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please ensure the key 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>00061911-Pro-Poor Economic Growth & environmentally sustainable development (2011-2019) \$13m [\$2.5m (regular), \$10.5m (other)]</p> <p>00068928-Rapid Response Implementation Support (2012-2021) \$3.2m [\$0m (regular), \$3.2m (other)]</p> <p>00061947-Capacity Development for Results Management (2011-2019) \$3m [\$2.7m (regular), \$0.3m (other)]</p> <p>00092476-Mainstreaming Poverty-Environment-Gender-Climate Change (2018-2022) \$1.4m [\$0.8m (regular), \$0.6m (other)]</p> <p>00061942-Capacity Development for Mainstreaming Trade (2011-2019) \$0.7m [\$0.6m (regular), \$0m (other)]</p> <p>00068926-Southern Agricultural Corridor Support Project (2012-2018) \$0.2m [\$0.2m (regular), \$0m (other)]</p> <p>00119623-Accelerator Lab-Tanzania (2019-2021) \$0.1m [\$0.1m (regular), \$0m (other)]</p>	<p>\$21.6 m [\$6.9m (Regular), \$14.7 m (Other)]</p> <p>Please confirm gender marker attribution for expenditure under this output:</p> <p>GEN0: 0%</p> <p>GEN1: 19%</p> <p>GEN2: 78%</p> <p>GEN3: 3%</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>			

IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
Output 1.2: Options enabled and facilitated for inclusive and sustainable social protection	Indicator 1.2.1 Number of households in target districts benefiting from social protection initiatives Indicator 1.2.2 Number of women with increased entrepreneurship and livelihood skills in targeted 28 districts		00085002-Joint Programme to support Productive Social Safety Nets (2014-2019) \$0.8m [\$0.5m (regular), \$0.3m (other)]	\$0.8 m [\$0.5m (Regular), \$0.3 m (Other)] GEN0: 0% GEN1: 0% GEN2: 0% GEN3: 100%
Supporting evidence	-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.			
IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
Output 1.3: Capacities of women's and youth enterprises in the 28 districts enhanced to grow and add value to their products for increased income	Indicator 1.3.1 Number of youth and women's enterprises benefiting from increased income and market access Indicator 1.3.2 Number of male and female youth in job-creation schemes under the auspices of the National Service Department who have secured employment annually		00103503-UN Joint Programme for Kigoma (2017-2021) \$0.9m [\$0.1m (regular), \$0.8m (other)] 00112905-Youths Economic Empowerment; through Connecting Dots VC Ecos (2018-2019) \$0.7m [\$0.2m (regular), \$0.5m (other)] 00117721-Connecting youth and women with sustainable agriculture through off-grid integrated farming hub in 6 districts of Tanzania (2019-2020) \$0.7m [\$0.7m (regular), \$0m (other)]	\$2.2 m [\$0.9m (Regular), \$1.3m (Other)] GEN0: 0% GEN1: 44% GEN2: 30% GEN3: 26%
Supporting evidence	-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.			

IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
Output 1.4: Relevant policies and programmes in growth sectors reviewed and operationalized on the basis of evidence/data	<p>Indicator 1.4.1 Number of growth sector policies and programmes that utilize indicators and data disaggregated by sex and groups for inclusiveness</p> <p>Indicator 1.4.2 Extent to which national data collection, measurement and analytical systems have the technical and institutional capacities to monitor progress on the post - 2015 agenda and Sustainable Development Goals.</p>		<p>00086982-Strengthening African Engagement in Global Development (2015-2019) \$0.6m [\$0.6m (regular), \$0m (other)]</p> <p>00110575-Implementation of SDGs (2018-2021) \$0.4m [\$0.4m (regular), \$0m (other)]</p>	<p>\$1.1m [\$1.1m (Regular), \$0.0 m (Other)]</p> <p>GEN0: 0%</p> <p>GEN1: 59%</p> <p>GEN2: 41%</p> <p>GEN3: 0%</p>
Supporting evidence	-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.			
IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
Output 1.5: Solutions developed at national and subnational levels for sustainable management of natural resources ecosystem services chemicals and waste	<p>Indicator 1.5.1 Number of households in the 28 targeted districts which experience an increase in their incomes</p> <p>Indicator 1.5.2 Number of new jobs/livelihoods created through management of natural resources in the 28 targeted districts, disaggregated by sex</p> <p>Indicator 1.5.3 % of hectares of land improved through soil/water conservation methods in supported districts</p> <p>Indicator 1.5.4 Number of women in selected districts participating in decision-making processes on use of national resources</p>		<p>00061990-Mainstreaming Environment & Climate Change in Development plans (2011-2019) \$0.6m [\$0.1m (regular), \$0.5m (other)]</p> <p>00106358-The Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN) Phase II (2019-2021) \$0m [\$0m (regular), \$0m (other)]</p>	<p>\$0.6 m [\$0.1m (Regular), \$0.5m (Other)]</p> <p>GEN0: 0%</p> <p>GEN1: 99%</p> <p>GEN2: 1%</p> <p>GEN3: 0%</p>
Supporting evidence	-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.			

IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
OUTCOME 2.	CPD Outcome 2: Improved environment, natural resources, climate change governance, energy access and disaster risk management.			
Outcome indicators Please confirm the indicators that are being used to assess UNDP's contribution to the agreed outcome:	Indicator 2.1 Level of capacity of ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) and LGAs with improved capacities in environmental and natural resources management, climate change governance, energy access and disaster risk management in the mainland and Zanzibar	Outcome resources (\$m) Please include figures for: UNDAF/UNSDCF Estimated Resource requirements: \$86.2 [\$57.5 (funded), \$28.7 (Un-funded)] CPD Estimate: \$31.9 [\$8.9 (regular), \$23 (other)] Expenditure to date: \$39.8 [\$7.3 (regular), \$32.5 (other)]		
Outcome assessment	<p>Please provide a rating of the country programme's contribution to UNDAP outcomes, based on the level of influence UNDP has on associated outcome indicators:</p> <p>Please provide a rating of the country programme's contribution to UNDAP outcomes, based on the level of influence UNDP has on associated outcome indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High level of influence: There is a clean line of contribution from UNDP to changes in the UNSDCF 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 UNSDCF 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. <p>Please explain the basis for this rating, referencing the key sources of evidence, including elsewhere in this questionnaire. Please explain the basis for this rating, referencing the key sources of evidence, including elsewhere in this questionnaire.</p>			
CPD Output	CPD Output Indicators	UNDP progress and contribution	Key interventions	Expenditure 2016–19 (\$m)
Output 2.1: Relevant ministries and districts are able to formulate implement and enforce environmental and natural	Indicator 2.1.1 Number of ministries with functioning sustainable environmental and natural resources plans and strategies	In this section, you will 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 below to provide a rating of the country programme's progress towards the stated output, as follows:	00083123-Enhancing the Forest Nature Reserves Network (2014-2020) \$4.8m [\$0.9m (regular), \$3.9m (other)] 00086631-Securing Watershed services - Ruvu & Zigi catchments (2015-	Please confirm CPD expenditure to date that is attributable to this output: \$14 m [\$4.2m (Regular), \$9.8 m (Other)]

resources management policies strategies and regulations	Indicator 2.1.2 Number of districts with financial and sustainable environmental / natural resources plans and strategies	On track: Progress is as expected at this stage of implementation and it is likely that the output will be achieved. Standard program management practices are sufficient.	2020) \$4.5m [\$1.2m (regular), \$3.3m (other)]	Please confirm gender marker attribution for expenditure under this output: GEN0: 0% GEN1: 22% GEN2: 78% GEN3: 0%
	Indicator 2.1.3 Extent to which national monitoring system, surveys and census are in place to monitor progress on poaching reduction and wildlife crime	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.	00060996-Strengthening protected areas in southern Tanzania (2011-2018) \$1.9m [\$0.8m (regular), \$1.1m (other)]	
	Indicator 2.1.4 % of land covered by forests in 28 targeted districts	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.	00061743-Mainstream Sustainable Forest Management in the Miombo (2011-2019) \$1.5m [\$0.8m (regular), \$0.7m (other)]	
	Please confirm the indicators used by the CO to track progress towards agreed outputs	Please ensure the key 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.	00087082-Reducing UPOPs and Mercury Releases from Health Sector (2015-2020) \$0.6m [\$ \$0m (regular), \$0.6m (other)]	
		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.	00081390-Support to combating wildlife crime and advancing conservation (2014-2017) \$0.4m [\$0.4m (regular), \$ \$0m (other)]	
			00089902-Combating Poaching and illegal wildlife trade (2015-2017) \$0.1m [\$0m (regular), \$0.1m (other)]	
			00092475-Safeguarding Zanzibar's Forest and Coastal Habitats (2018-2019) \$0.1m [\$0m (regular), \$0.1m (other)]	

Supporting evidence	-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.			
IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
Output 2.2: Select districts and communities have their capacities strengthened in climate change governance and sustainable energy access	Indicator 2.2.1 Number of districts with plans and strategies for enhanced resilience to climate change impacts Indicator 2.2.2 Number of women in the targeted districts benefiting from climate change initiatives Indicator 2.2.3 Number of new development partnerships with funding for improved energy efficiency and/or sustainable energy solutions targeting underserved communities/groups and women Indicator 2.2.4 Number of people covered by modern energy in targeted 28 districts		00061988-Capacity for energy sector & extractives (2011-2019) \$17.4m [\$0.7m (Regular), \$16.7m (other)] 00094384-Sustainable Energy for All (2017-2021) \$4.9m [\$0.4m (regular), \$4.4m (other)] 00112252-Bringing Clean Energy and Water to Off-grid Tanzania (2018-2020) \$0.8m [\$0.3m (regular), \$0.5m (other)] 00068935-Climate Change Adaptation support through SGP (2012-2018) \$0.7m [\$0.7m (regular), \$0m (other)] 00064765-Strengthening Environment & Climate Change - Zanzibar (2012-2018) \$0.2m [\$0.1m (regular), \$0.1m (other)] 00094386-Zanzibar Climate Change Program (2018-2021) \$0.1m [\$0.1m (regular), \$m (other)]	\$24.1m [\$2.4m (Regular), \$21.7 m (Other)] GEN0: 0% GEN1: 1% GEN2: 99% GEN3: 0%
Supporting evidence	-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.			

IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
Output 2.3: Preparedness systems in place to effectively address the consequences of and response to natural hazards	Indicator 2.3.1 Number of districts with early warning systems for man-made and natural hazards Indicator 2.3.2 Number of women prepared to minimize consequences of disaster (2 disaster risk reduction pilot initiatives)		00074211-Climate Information & Early Warning Systems in Tanzania (2014-2019) \$1.5m [\$0.7m (regular), \$0.9m (other)] 00102185-Support to Early Recovery after Kagera earthquake (2017-2019) \$0.2m [\$0m (regular), \$0.1m (other)]	\$1.7 m [\$0.7m (Regular), \$1 m (Other)] GEN0: 0% GEN1: 0% GEN2: 100% GEN3: 0%
Supporting evidence	-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.			
IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
OUTCOME 3.	CPD Outcome 3: National governance is more effective, transparent, accountable and inclusive.			
Outcome indicators Please confirm the indicators that are being used to assess UNDP's contribution to the agreed outcome:	Indicator 3.1 % of bills presented before Parliament for which field hearings are conducted Indicator 3.2 Voter turnout at national election: Indicator 3.3 % of population in selected districts who express confidence in the ability of the police and judiciary to deal effectively with cases of violence against women and children Indicator 3.4 % of Open Government Partnership commitments completed and information accessed Indicator 3.5 Existence and implementation of anti-corruption action plans/strategies: Indicator 3.6 Existence of a national system for data collection, measurement and analysis to monitor progress towards SDGs and Development Cooperation Framework (DCF)	Outcome resources (\$m) Please include figures for: UNDAF/UNSDCF Estimated Resource requirements: \$82.3 [\$44.3 (funded), \$38 (Un-funded)] CPD Estimate: \$46 [\$15 (regular), \$31 (other)] Expenditure to date: \$31.7 [\$5.5 (regular), \$26.2 (other)]		

	Indicator 3.7 Number of women who stand for election to Parliament and local-level councils (mainland and Zanzibar):			
Outcome assessment	<p>Please provide a rating of the country programme's contribution to UNDAP outcomes, based on the level of influence UNDP has on associated outcome indicators:</p> <p>Please provide a rating of the country programme's contribution to UNDAP outcomes, based on the level of influence UNDP has on associated outcome indicators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High level of influence: There is a clean line of contribution from UNDP to changes in the UNSDCF 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 UNSDCF 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. <p>Please explain the basis for this rating, referencing the key sources of evidence, including elsewhere in this questionnaire. Please explain the basis for this rating, referencing the key sources of evidence, including elsewhere in this questionnaire.</p>			
CPD Output	CPD Output Indicators	UNDP progress and contribution	Key interventions	Expenditure 2016–19 (\$m)
Output 3.1: Parliaments and electoral bodies are enabled to perform core functions for improved transparency accountability and citizen participation Please provide an update to the output description, if any is required in accordance with UNDP's Programme and Operations Policies and	Indicator 3.1.1 Number of CSOs and research institutions consulted by National Assembly and Zanzibar House of Representatives Indicator 3.1.2 percentage of women of voting age who are registered to vote	<p>In this section, you will provide an assessment of the progress made against the CP output over the cycle and indicate its contribution to the associated outcome.</p> <p>Please select from the below to provide a rating of the country programme's progress towards the stated output, as follows:</p> <p>On track: Progress is as expected at this stage of implementation and it is likely that the output will be achieved. Standard program management practices are sufficient.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	00095419-Legislative Support Project II (2017-2021) \$4.9m [\$0.6m (regular), \$4.4m (other)] 00068932-Democratic Empowerment Project (2012-2018) \$3.2m [\$0.1m (regular), \$3.3m (other)] 00060696-Legislature Support Project (2011-2017) \$1.4m [\$0m (regular), \$1.4m (other)]	Please confirm CPD expenditure to date that is attributable to this output: \$X9.6 m [\$0.5m (Regular), \$9.1 m (Other)] Please confirm gender marker attribution for expenditure under this output: GEN0: 0% GEN1: 8%

Procedures policy (B5 Manage Change).	Please confirm the indicators used by the CO to track progress towards agreed outputs:	Please ensure the key 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. 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.		GEN2: 88% GEN3: 5%
Supporting evidence	- 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.			
IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
Output 3.2: Citizens have improved access to and are better served by the justice system and human rights reporting	Indicator 3.2.1 Number of women in 28 targeted districts bringing their cases to the formal justice system. Indicator 3.2.2 Number of unresolved cases in lower courts Indicator 3.2.3 % of reports submitted on time to UPR, treaty bodies and special procedures.		00102787-Preventing Violent Extremism in Tanzania (2017-2020) \$3m [\$0.7m (regular), \$2.3m (other)] 00061944-Legal Sector Reform Zanzibar (2011-2018) \$1m [\$0.1m (regular), \$0.9m (other)] 00112226-Promoting Legal Empowerment and Access to Justice (2018-2021) \$0.6m [\$0.4m (regular), \$0.1m (other)] 00061957-Institutional support-National Human Rights Action Plan (2011-2019) \$0.1m [\$0.1m (regular), \$0.1m (other)] 00092477-Cross-border conflict prevention (2018-2019) \$0.1m [\$0m (regular), \$0.1m (other)]	\$8.2 m [\$3m (Regular), \$5.2 m (Other)] GEN0: 0% GEN1: 4% GEN2: 78% GEN3: 100%

Supporting evidence	-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.			
IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
Output 3.3: Key public institutions are enabled to address corruption and implement their procurement needs in a transparent manner	Indicator 3.3.1 Number of institutions implementing strategies and action plans to end corruption.		00092478-Consolidation of a UN Global Compact Local Network (2017-2020) \$0.4m [\$0.3m (regular), \$0.2m (other)] 00062051-Support Anti-corruption initiatives in Tanzania (2011-2017) \$0m [\$0m (regular), \$0m (other)]	\$0.4 m [\$0.3m (Regular), \$0.1m (Other)] GEN0: 0% GEN1: 0% GEN2: 100% GEN3: 0%
Supporting evidence	-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.			
IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
Output 3.4: Government has effective mechanisms in place to monitor and report on use of ODA and other sources of global development financing	Indicator 3.4.1 % of MDAs able to use Aid Management Platform to manage ODA Indicator 3.4.2 Existence of a national system to monitor the Sustainable Development Goals		00095415-Enhancing capacity for dvp results and effectiveness (2017-2021) \$11.6m [\$0.7m (regular), \$10.9m (other)] 00061971-Development Partners Group Secretariat (2011-2018) \$0.6m [\$0.1m (regular), \$0.5m (other)] 00062050-Capacity for Reform Management - Zanzibar (2012-2017) \$0.5m [\$0.5m (regular), \$0m (other)] 00102469-Capacity building for SDG Coordination Z/bar (2018-	\$13.5 m [\$1.7m (Regular), \$11.8 m (Other)] GEN0: 0% GEN1: 8% GEN2: 92% GEN3: 0%

			2021) \$0.4m [\$0.4m (gular), \$0m (other)] 00061905-Capacity Building for Natl HIV Response (2011-2019) \$0.3m [\$0.1m (regular), \$0.3m (other)] 00083963-Tanzania One UN Center (2015-2019) \$0m [\$0m (regular), \$0m (other)] 00061972-Aid Effectiveness and Aid Management (2011-2017) \$0m [\$0m (regular), \$0m (other)].	
Supporting evidence	- 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.			
IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
Output 3.5: Women have enhanced capacities to participate in electoral and decision-making processes at all levels.	Indicator 3.5.1 ratio of women to men participating as candidates in general elections. Indicator 3.5.2 ratio of women to men in decision-making at all levels		Please identify the key projects that have contributed to this output in the current CPD cycle.	\$0 m [\$0m (Regular), \$0 m (Other)] GEN0: %0 GEN1: %0 GEN2: %0 GEN3: %0
Supporting evidence	- 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.			
IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			
Output 3.6:	Indicator 3.6.1 Percentage of national and sub-national governmental personnel participating in UNDP PVE capacity		Please identify the key projects that have	\$0 m [\$0m (Regular), \$0 m (Other)]

National capacities strengthened to reduce the likelihood of conflicts including those arising from violent extremism.	development who demonstrate improved understanding of PVE approaches. Indicator 3.6.2 Number of mechanisms enabled for consensus-building around contested priorities, and to address specific tensions, through inclusive and peaceful processes		contributed to this output in the current CPD cycle.	GEN0: %0 GEN1: %0 GEN2: %0 GEN3: %0
Supporting evidence	-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.			
IEO assessment of adequacy of supporting evidence	-			

Annex 3. ICPR Design Matrix

Review Questions	Sub-questions	Data/info to be collected	Data collection methods and tools (e.g.)
RQ 1. What progress has UNDP made towards planned CPD outputs, and how is this contributing to UNSCDF outcomes in the current programming period?	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"> • UNSDCF & CPD • Indicative Country Office Results and Resources Framework (from CPD) • Current Country Office Results and resources framework (if different from the one included in the CPD) • 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. • Data to validate CO explanation of changes in context since CPD approval (if any significant changes have occurred). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison of estimated resource estimates in UNSCDF/CPD in light to delivery over CPD • Analysis of justification for and implications of any changes (if any) country office results and resources framework since approval of the CPD.
	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"> • Evidence in ICPR questionnaire detailing CO self-assessment of performance and evidence identified. • Project documents, annual workplans, annual progress reports, audits and evaluations covering the agreed ICPR project list. • Monitoring data, including performance against outcome and output indicators, and associated baselines and targets, and evidence of attribution of related changes to UNDP interventions. • Attribution of expenditure by gender marker • ROAR covering CPD period to date. • Programme level audits, if available. • Interviews with country office staff and/or key stakeholders. • Other, as required. 	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"> • 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; • linkages between UNDP specific interventions and indicators established to monitor progress towards intended outputs, and attribution of change in those indicators to UNDP support; • reported contributions towards gender equality.
	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.)
RQ2. How has UNDP performed in planning, implementation, reporting and evaluation of development results?	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"> • UNSDCF & CPD • Indicative Country Office Results and Resources Framework (from CPD) • Current Country Office Results and resources framework (if different from the one included in the CPD) • 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. • Data to validate CO explanation of changes in context since CPD approval (if any significant changes have occurred). 	<p>In light of assessment of achievement or contribution, assess and summarise evidence about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • realism of the CPD • adaptation to changes in context • quality of existing results frameworks in light of UNDP programming standards.¹²
	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"> • ICPR questionnaire • Staff and stakeholder interviews • Staff and partnership survey data • Human resource data • Programme and project documentation and audit reports (as above) 	<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"> • CO evaluation plan and updates to it. • Evidence identified above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? • Assess progress in implementing evaluation plan, and consistency of approach to evaluations with expectations set out in UNDP's evaluation policy and guidelines.

¹² 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.

Annex 4. ICPR Roles and Responsibilities

ICPR Phase	Task ID	Tasks	Approx RA/ALE Input Days	Approx LE input days	Other IEO input	Key milestones	Resp. Entity	Resp. Individual	Comment
Phase 1. ICPR Preparation	Task 1.1.	Establish contact with CO, identify focal point and draft ICPR ToR		1			IEO	LE	
	Task 1.2.	<p>Compile key CO strategic documents: CPD, UNDAF, Past ADRs and ICPEs, ROARs and CO level audit report, resource mobilisation and gender strategy</p> <p>Compile list of projects active in current CPD period with total budget and expenditure.</p> <p>Map projects to country programme results framework (outcomes and outputs) and identify significant interventions by outputs</p> <p>Estimate planned outcome resources and actual budget and expenditure by CP outcome and output, disaggregated by source of funding (regular and other).</p> <p>Estimate share of total output expenditure by gender marker.</p> <p>Fill in financial data into the ICPR annex table covering status of country programme progress towards outcomes and outputs in results and resources.</p> <p>Draft indicator matrix including outcome and output description and indicators, corporately</p>	4 RA 1 ALE				IEO	RA/ALE	LE should validate the mapping when reviewing the ICPR questionnaire

ICPR Phase	Task ID	Tasks	Approx RA/ALE Input Days	Approx LE input days	Other IEO input	Key milestones	Resp. Entity	Resp. Individual	Comment
		available monitoring data including baselines and actual performance against outcome and output indicators and available references on the source of this data.							
	Task 1.3.	Compilation of available project documents, annual progress reports, and any available evaluations and audit report of significant interventions. Generate a dashboard of available documentation.	4 RA			Dashboard of available project document	IEO	RA	
	Task 1.4.	Develop and issue standard ICPR questionnaire requesting the country office to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report any significant changes in context from that described in the CPD, that have affected its achievement of results. - Confirm accuracy of IEO project mapping and list of significant projects. - Report any significant projects not included in the draft mapping, including new projects. - Identify UNDP focal point(s) for all identified projects. - Provide any necessary update to the country office results framework, including indicators, monitoring data, evidence of attribution of related changes to UNDP interventions, and references of this data; 		1			IEO	LE	

ICPR Phase	Task ID	Tasks	Approx RA/ALE Input Days	Approx LE input days	Other IEO input	Key milestones	Resp. Entity	Resp. Individual	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explain revisions (if any) to country office results and resources framework, and provide evidence of approval of these changes. - Provide a succinct evidence based explanation of the country office's assessment of its contribution to CPD outcomes and achievement of established outputs over the CPD period to date. - Compile missing documentation identified by IEO and identify and evaluations not yet finalized. - UNDP's focal point and contact details Fill in other part of the ICPR questionnaire (as required)							
	Task 1.5	Complete ICPR Questionnaire					CO	CO focal point	
Phase 2. Desk analysis, Field mission data collection, and drafting	Task 2.1.	Desk review of evidence of achievement and validity of country office self-assessment. Finalize table assessing and rating progress towards agreed outputs in country programme results framework and UNDP's contribution to CPD outcome, and capacity to influence change against established outcome indicators	5 RA 5 ALE	5			IEO	LE/RA/ALE	Scope for RA to complete a component of the assessment , but this should be limited to a specific

ICPR Phase	Task ID	Tasks	Approx RA/ALE Input Days	Approx LE input days	Other IEO input	Key milestones	Resp. Entity	Resp. Individual	Comment
									outcome and/or cover up to a maximum of 10 interventions.
	Task 2.2.	Field mission	10 ALE/10 RA	10			IEO/CO	LE/ALE/Local consultant/CO focal point	
	Task 2.3.	Generate standard statistical annex showing key areas of focus, spending trends, partners, and selected country level statistics.	2 RA				IEO	RA	
	Task 2.4.	Draft short analytical report including IEO assessment of country programme contributions to intended outcomes and outputs and contribution to gender equality and the empowerment of women	4 ALE 1 RA	5			IEO	LE/ALE/RA	Scope for RA to complete a component of this work, depending on nature of contribution to desk

ICPR Phase	Task ID	Tasks	Approx RA/ALE Input Days	Approx LE input days	Other IEO input	Key milestones	Resp. Entity	Resp. Individual	Comment
									assessment
	Task 2.5.	Chief of Section convene panel to review and clear Zero Draft			3	Zero draft submitted to CO and RB	IEO	Chief of Section	
Phase 3: Consideration of feedback and completion of final ICPR	Task 3.1	Compilation of feedback from country office on Zero Draft report					CO	CO focal point	
	Task 3.2.	Meeting to discuss and clarify country office feedback, identifying any significant factual errors or omissions, and any additional supporting evidence not considered in the initial assessment.	1 ALE 1 RA	1			IEO	LE, RA, ALE, CO focal point and RB focal point	
	Task 3.3.	Draft final ICPR report, incorporating any necessary revisions in response to feedback.	1 ALE 1 RA	1		Final draft ICPR submitted for publication	IEO	LE	
	Task 3.4.	Chief of Section review and clearance of final ICPR			1			Section Chief	
Phase 4: Publication	Task 4.1	Professional edit of report					IEO	LE and Commun	

ICPR Phase	Task ID	Tasks	Approx RA/ALE Input Days	Approx LE input days	Other IEO input	Key milestones	Resp. Entity	Resp. Individual	Comment
and dissemination								ication officer	
	Task 4.2	Online publication of report	1 ALE			ICPR published	IEO	Communication officer and IT	
Total			51	24	4				