ETHIOPIA
Assessment Development Results (ADR)
Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts country evaluations called "Assessments of Development Results (ADRs)" to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP's contributions to development results at the country level, as well as the effectiveness of UNDP's strategy in facilitating and leveraging national effort for achieving development results. The purpose of an ADR is to:

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

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

The first ADR for Ethiopia was conducted in 2004. UNDP Ethiopia has been selected for a second ADR since its country programme will end in 2016. The ADR will be conducted in 2015 to feed into the development of the new CPD.

2. NATIONAL CONTEXT

Ethiopia is a landlocked country, the ninth largest country in Africa, with a total land area is over one million square kilometres and the third most populous with a population of 94.1 million. The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) is composed of 9 regional states representing substantial ethnic and religious diversity: more than 85 ethnic groups and most major world religions are represented, and more than 80 languages are spoken in the country. The FDRE has a bicameral parliamentary system and constitutionally independent judiciary. National parliamentary elections were held on 24 May 2015 and the results announced 22 June that the incumbent government will remain in power.

---

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

Over the past decade, Ethiopia has been one of the world's fastest growing economies, mainly due to the expansion of the services and agricultural sectors with the performance of manufacturing sector relatively modest. Economic growth has achieved positive results in reducing poverty, in both urban and rural areas. While 38.7 percent of Ethiopians lived in extreme poverty in 2004-2005, five years later this was 29.6 percent, which is a decrease of 9.1 percentage points as measured by the national poverty line. Under the Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP), the government has targeted a further reduction to 22.2 percent by 2014-2015. However, significant challenges remain, including unemployment and a limited modern industrial sector base. Inequality remains a challenge, for example, the rural poverty rate was 30.4 percent in 2011 compared to 25.7 percent in urban areas. Gender-based inequalities, especially in reproductive health and economic empowerment, are additional challenges.

Conditioned by the fact that Ethiopia is bordered by volatile and conflict-ridden countries (i.e. Sudan, Somalia, and Eritrea) in the Horn of Africa region, it has overtaken Kenya to become the largest refugee-hosting country in Africa. Furthermore, drought and famine-induced migrations are chronic problems in the country. It is estimated that more than 80 percent of the population lives in rural areas and rely heavily on rain-fed agriculture for their livelihood. Their vulnerability is frequently exacerbated by natural hazards, including drought and flooding, and as a result millions of Ethiopians often face severe food shortages. Climate change will also amplify the likelihood of heat waves and other extreme incidents that generate various risks for the country.

Ethiopia has been one of the major recipients of international aid, with a net Official Development Assistance (ODA) of US$ 3.83 billion in 2013 provided in the form of development financing, technical assistance and debt relief. Over half of the aid to Ethiopia is concentrated in the social and humanitarian sectors. Addis Ababa will also host the Third International Conference on Financing for Development in mid-July 2015.

3.   UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN ETHIOPIA

The previous country programme (2007-2011) focused on: (1) enhancing pro-poor economic growth; (2) addressing food insecurity and vulnerability to disasters; and (3) promoting good governance, with gender, capacity development and human rights as cross-cutting issues. The approach focused primarily on policy reform, strengthening institutional capacities and piloting to inform policy and to up-scale good practices. However, the list of outcomes used during this period changed over time and showed limited consistency between the CPD, Integrated Work Plans (IWP) and Results-Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs).[2]

For the current period (2012-2016)[3], the UNDAF Action Plan provides the operational framework for the country programme. UNDP will support joint programming, implement joint programmes and administer the One UN Fund.[4] In contrast to the previous period, the outcomes for the current programme (2012-2016) are consistent and framed around three strategic priorities: (1) enhanced economic growth and poverty reduction; (2) democratic governance and capacity development; and (3) development of a low-

---

[2] There is no Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for this period.

[3] The approved programme was for 2012-2015 but was extended by 6 months at the request of the Government to fully align the new UNDAF, with the national priorities expressed in the next Growth and Transformation plan and to synchronize the UNDAF with the Government fiscal year (DP/2015/13)

[4] Ethiopia voluntarily decided to pursue UN reform at the country level in the context of the Delivering as One agenda.

carbon and climate-resilient economy. Gender, knowledge management and South-South cooperation will be utilized to facilitate innovation, and scale-up good practices.

Table 1: Country Programme outcomes and indicative resources (2012-2015)[5]		
Country Programme Outcome		**Indicative resources (US$)**
Sustainable economic development		
UNDAF outcome 1	Increased use by <u>agricultural producers</u> of improved institutional services, efficient marketing system, and appropriate technology and practices for sustainable increase in agricultural production and productivity by 2015.	21,060,000
UNDAF outcome 2	By 2015, private sector-led Ethiopian <u>manufacturing and service industries</u>, especially small- and medium-scale enterprises, have sustainably improved their competitiveness and employment creation potentials.	31,340,000
Climate, risk and resilience		
UNDAF outcome 4	By 2015, national and sub national institutions and vulnerable communities have systematically reduced <u>disaster</u> risks, impacts of disasters and have improved food security.	29,100,000
UNDAF outcome 5	By 2015, the governance systems, use of technologies and practices and financing mechanisms that promote a low carbon <u>climate resilient</u> economy and society have improved at all levels.	45,400,000
Democratic governance and capacity development		
UNDAF outcome 10	By 2015, national and sub-national actors utilize improved <u>mechanisms</u> that promote inclusiveness, participation, transparency, accountability and responsiveness in national development processes;	40,766,000
UNDAF outcome 11	By 2015 <u>capacities</u> of national, local and community institutions strengthened for evidence based planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and decision making.	14,000,000
Total		181,666,000

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This ADR will focus on the ongoing programme (i.e. from 2012) while taking into account some longer terms activities that cross over into the previous programming cycle. Examples of such initiatives include:
- Support to the Ethiopia Commodity Exchange (ECX)
- Enhancing National Capacity for Agricultural Growth and Transformation
- Democratic Institutions Programme (DIP)

As the country-level evaluation of UNDP, the ADR will cover the formal UNDP country programme approved by the Executive Board funded by all sources of finance (core UNDP resources, donor funds, government funds, etc.). However, the scope of the ADR includes the entirety of UNDP's activities in the country and therefore also covers initiatives from the regional and global programmes. It is also important to note that a UNDP county office may be involved in a number of activities that may not be included in a specific project. Some of these 'non-project' activities may be crucial for the political and social agenda of a country.

---

[5] UNDP Ethiopia Country Programme Document 2012-2016 (DP/DCP/ETH/2)

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

5. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology comprises two components: (i) assessment of UNDP's contribution by thematic/programme area, and (ii) assessment of the quality of this contribution. The ADR will present its findings and assessment according to the set criteria provided below,[6] based on an analysis by CPD/CPAP outcome area, in order to generate findings, broad conclusions and recommendations for future action.

- **UNDP's contribution by programme areas.** The ADR will assess the effectiveness of UNDP in contributing to development results of Ethiopia through its programme activities. Specific attention will be paid to assess the contribution related to UNDP's overall vision of helping countries achieve poverty eradication and reduce inequalities and exclusion, and its contribution to furthering gender equality and women's empowerment.[7]

- **The quality of UNDP's contribution.** The ADR will also assess the quality of UNDP's contribution based on the following criteria:
    - Relevance of UNDP's projects and outcomes to the country's needs and national priorities;
    - Efficiency of UNDP's interventions in terms of use of human and financial resources; and
    - Sustainability of the results to which UNDP contributed.

Key explanatory factors: First, the ADR will also assess how specific factors explain UNDP's performance, namely the engagement principles and alignment parameters of the 2014-2017 UNDP Strategic Plan.[8] For example, in addition to assessing UNDP's contribution to gender equality and women's empowerment, the evaluation will assess gender mainstreaming as a factor of UNDP's performance for each country programme outcome.[9] Second, UNDP strategic positioning will be analysed from the perspective of the organisation's mandate and the agreed and emergent development needs and priorities in the country. This will entail systematic analysis of UNDP's position within the national development and policy space, as well as strategies used by UNDP to maximize its contribution. Finally, the ADR will assess how managerial practices impacted achievement of programmatic goals.[10]

In assessing the above, the evaluation will also examine a number of country-specific factors that are assumed to have had an impact on UNDP's performance, namely:
- Working in the context of strong national ownership
- Operating in a highly competitive donor context
- Capturing policy work outside formal projects

---

[6] Further elaboration of the criteria can be found in ADR Methodology Manual 2015.
[7] Using the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN SWAP) to improve gender equality and the empowerment of women across the UN system. www.unwomen.org/~/media/Headquarters/Attachments/Sections/How%20We%20Work/UNSystemCoordination/UN-SWAP-Framework-Dec-2012.pdf
[8] The Strategic Plan 2014-2017 engagement principles include: national ownership and capacity; human rights-based approach; sustainable human development; gender equality and women's empowerment; voice and participation; South-South and triangular cooperation; active role as global citizens; and universality.
[9] Using inter alia the Gender Marker data and the Gender Seal parameters based on UNDP/UNEG methods.
[10] This information is extracted from analysis of the goals inputted in the Enhanced RBM platform, the financial results in the Executive Snapshot, the results in the Global Staff Survey, and interviews at the management and operations levels in the CO.

- Ensuring delivery and management efficiency

Assessment at the outcome level: An outcome paper will be developed for each outcome noted in Table 1 above, which examines the programme's progress towards the respective outcome and UNDP's contribution to any change. A Theory of Change (ToC) approach will be used and developed by the evaluation team in consultation with UNDP and national stakeholders, where appropriate. Discussions of the ToC will focus on mapping the assumptions made about a programme's desired change and causal linkages expected and these will form a basis for the data collection approach that will verify the theories behind the changes found. The outcome papers will use the ToC approach to assess UNDP's contribution to the outcome using the evaluation criteria, and identify outcome-specific factors that have influenced this contribution. Each outcome paper will be prepared according to a standard template provided by the IEO which will facilitate synthesis and the identification of conclusions and recommendations in the ADR report for UNDP to consider together with main partners for future programming.

6. DATA COLLECTION

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. An assessment was carried for each outcome to ascertain available information, identify data constraints, and determine the data collection needs and methods. The assessment outlined the level of evaluable data that is available, indicating:
- There is adequate availability of national data: while the primary sources of data will be from the government, there is also abundant research on Ethiopia in regard to its social and economic developments from international organizations, academia, and NGOs;
- There is strong availability of UNDP country-level monitoring data based on corporate systems but the quality of project level monitoring seems to vary;
- There is good UNDP access to government partners;
- The security situation varies across the country and, while the security levels are low in most of the major cities, the risk of cross-border tensions remains; and
- There is a relatively strong national evaluation capacity considering (a) the capacity of national consultants, and (b) the fact that the planning commission plans to establish an evaluation unit.

Data collection methods. The evaluation will use data from primary and secondary sources, including desk review of documentation and information and interviews with key stakeholders, including beneficiaries, partners and managers. Specific evaluation questions for each criteria and the data collection method will be further detailed and outlined in the outcome papers. A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed and interviews will include government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors, and beneficiaries of the programme. Focus groups will be used to consult some groups of beneficiaries as appropriate.

The criteria for selecting places for field visits include:
- Programme coverage (projects covering the various components and cross-cutting areas)
- Financial expenditure (projects of all sizes, both large and smaller pilot projects)
- Geographic coverage (not only national level and urban-based ones, but also in the various regions)[11]
- Maturity (covering both completed and active projects)
- Programme cycle (coverage of projects/activities from the past and mainly the current cycles)

---

[11] Given the territorial inequalities in the country and differences between urban and rural areas, the analysis will reach out and validate the results and development inequalities at the departmental level where UNDP (and national or UN partners) operate.

- Degree of "success" (coverage of successful projects, as well as projects reporting difficulties where lessons can be learned)
- Security considerations

The IEO and the country office have identified an initial list of background and programme-related documents which is posted on an ADR SharePoint website. The following secondary data will be reviewed: background documents on the national context, documents prepared by international partners during the period under review and documents prepared by UN system agencies; programme plans and frameworks; progress reports; monitoring self-assessments such as the yearly UNDP Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs); and evaluations conducted by the country office and partners. The ADR will also support, where possible and appropriate, the ongoing data collection endeavours being undertaken by UNDP projects for outcome monitoring. Official national statistics will be used to the extent possible.

Validation. The evaluation will use triangulation of information collected from different sources and/or by different methods to ensure that the data is valid.

Stakeholder involvement: At the start of the evaluation, a stakeholder analysis was conducted to identify all relevant UNDP partners, as well as those who may not work with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes. Each outcome paper will also develop a stakeholder analysis within the scope of the outcome.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP: The UNDP IEO will conduct the ADR in consultation with the UNDP Ethiopia country office, the Regional Bureau for Africa and the Government of Ethiopia. The IEO evaluation manager will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ADR.

Government of Ethiopia: The Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MOFED) and other key government counterparts of UNDP in Ethiopia will facilitate the conduct of ADR by: providing necessary access to information sources within the government; safeguarding the independence of the evaluation; and jointly organizing the final stakeholder meeting with the IEO when it is time to present findings and results of the evaluation. Additionally, the counterparts will be responsible within MOFED for the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the ADR process.

UNDP Country Office in Ethiopia: The country office will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders, make available to the team all necessary information regarding UNDP's programmes, projects and activities in the country, and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The country office will provide the evaluation team support in kind (e.g. arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries; and assistance for the project site visits). To ensure the independence of the views expressed in interviews and meetings with stakeholders held for data collection purposes, country office staff will not participate.

UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa: The UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa will support the evaluation through information sharing and will also participate in discussions on emerging conclusions and recommendations.

Evaluation Team: The IEO will constitute an evaluation team to undertake the ADR. The IEO will ensure gender balance in the team which will include the following members:

- Evaluation Manager (EM)*:* IEO staff member with overall responsibility for managing the ADR, including to: (i) prepare and design the evaluation (i.e. this TOR); and (ii) select the evaluation team and provide methodological guidance. The EM will supervise the portion of the evaluation related to strategic positioning issues (together with Principle Consultant); UN coordination issues (together with Principle Consultant); finalizing the report after reviews; and the stakeholder workshop. The EM will travel Addis Ababa for 1-2 weeks.
- Principle Consultant (PC): The PC has the responsibility of producing the draft report based on the inputs from various other national consultants and IEO staff. In addition, he/she will be specifically responsible for: strategic positioning issues; UN coordination issues; the synthesis process; presentation to the UNDP country office as inputs into the CPD; preparation of the draft ADR report according to IEO guidelines; and participation in the stakeholder workshop.
- National consultants: Consultants each collect and analyse data for two assigned outcomes and produce two (2) outcome papers based on the standard template prepared by the IEO.
- Evaluation Analyst (EA): IEO consultant conducts data collection on particular issues (e.g. operational themes) and provides support to the three national consultants in understanding ADR approaches and methods, notably: the logic of outcome papers, issues of UN coordination, and capturing contributions from UNV, UNCDF, and the UNDP regional programme.
- Research Assistant (RA)*:* A research assistant based in the IEO will provide background research and documentation.

The data collection roles of the different members of the evaluation team can be summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Data collection responsibilities by outcome			
Outcome/Area		**Report**	**Data collection**
1	Sustainable economic development	National consultant	National consultant
2		National consultant	National consultant
4	Climate, risk and resilience	National consultant	National consultant
5		National consultant	National consultant
10	Democratic governance and capacity development	National consultant	National consultant
11		National consultant	National consultant
Gender		EM and EA	EM and EA
Strategic positioning		Principle Consultant and EM	Principle Consultant and EM
Operations/management		EM and EA	EM and EA

Although the PC is responsible for preparing the zero draft of the complete report the, Table 3 below sets out the specific responsibilities of team members in producing the different draft chapters of the report.

Table 3: Report writing responsibilities by chapter		
1	Introduction	EA based on ToR
2	National context	EM based on background paper with support of EA
3	UNDP	EA based on background paper with support of EM
4	Findings by outcome	PC with the support of the EM and EA based on outcome papers
5	Strategic Positioning[12]	PC with the support of the EM and EA
6	Cons and Recs	PC with the support of the EM and EA
Annexes		EA (all consultants to keep to format)

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation will be conducted according to the approved IEO process as outlined in the *ADR Methodology Manual*. This ADR, however, faces a number of process constraints. First, in order to be fully utilized by the CO and national partners, the evaluation team should be ready to provide feedback in mid-September at the latest. Second, the time for data collection is restricted by the elections (end-May with results announced end-June) after which time the government and stakeholders will be fully occupied and the Third International Conference Finance for Development (Mid-July). This leaves a small window for data collection (August-September) and the need for undertaking the analysis in an efficient manner.

The following represents a summary of key elements of the process with four major phases provide a framework conducting the evaluation. To address the constraints above, several adjustments have been made to the standard ADR process.

Phase 1: Preparation. The IEO prepares the TOR and the evaluation design, following a preparatory mission to UNDP Ethiopia country office by the Evaluation Manager. The preparatory mission and discussions with UNDP programme staff include the following objectives:
- Ensure that key CO staff are familiar with the objectives of the ADR and the ADR process
- Gain a much stronger understanding of the CO programme, origins, strategies, and theory of change
- Understand the intended use of evaluation
- Assess the programme evaluability prior to developing the TOR, including which intermediate or long-term outcomes in the theory of change can be measured
- Identify areas where support can be provided for ongoing data collection endeavours being undertaken by UNDP projects for outcome monitoring.

Additional evaluation team members, comprising international and/or national development professionals, will be recruited once the TOR is complete. In the meantime, IEO staff will start preparing the first three descriptive chapters of the ADR report (methodology national context and the UNDP programme). These will be shared with the CO and government for factual corrections in July to speed up the report review process.

Phase 2: Data collection and analysis. The phase will commence in August. An evaluation matrix with detailed questions and means of data collection and verification will be developed to guide data collection. The following process will be undertaken:

---

[12] This chapter can include major issues that are found to cut across the outcomes, for example management and operational issues, gender, capacity development etc.

- Pre-mission: Evaluation team members conduct desk reviews of reference material, and prepare a summary of the context and other evaluative evidence, and identify the outcome theory of change, outcome-specific evaluation questions, gaps and issues that will require validation during the field-based phase of data collection.
- Outcome Data collection: The evaluation team will undertake a mission to the country to engage in data collection activities. The estimated duration of the mission is a total of 4 weeks. Data will be collected according to the approach outlined in Section 6 with responsibilities outlined in Section 7. An IEO Evaluation Analyst will provide orientation to national data collection consultants on data collection and ensure the production of high quality and timely reports.
- Strategic data collection: The EM and PC will undertake data collection related to the strategic position of UNDP in Ethiopia including interviews with senior government officials and representatives of the international donor community.

Phase 3: Synthesis, report writing and review. In parallel with the strategic data collection and based on the outcome reports, the PC will undertake a synthesis process. Together with the EM, he/she will provide detailed feedback to the CO on completion of the synthesis. This will represent the major input into the new CPD.

The first draft of the ADR report will be prepared and subjected to the quality control process of the IEO. Once cleared by the IEO, the first draft will be further circulated with the country office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa for factual corrections. The second draft, which takes into account factual corrections, will be shared with national stakeholders for review. The EM is responsible for ensuring report quality and timeliness.

The draft report will then be shared at stakeholder workshop where the results of the evaluation will be presented to key national stakeholders. Moreover, the ways forward will be discussed with a view to creating greater ownership by national stakeholders in taking forward the lessons and recommendations from the report, and to strengthening accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders. Taking into account the discussion at the stakeholder workshops, the final evaluation report will be prepared. The UNDP Ethiopia country office will prepare the management response to the ADR, under the oversight of the Regional Bureau for Africa.

Phase 4: Production, dissemination and follow-up. The ADR report and brief will be widely distributed in both hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board by the time of approving a new CPD. It will be widely distributed by the IEO within UNDP as well as to the evaluation units of other international organisations, evaluation societies/networks and research institutions in the region. The Ethiopia country office and the Government of Ethiopia will disseminate to stakeholders in the country. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website[13] as well as in the Evaluation Resource Centre. The Regional Bureau for Africa will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.[14]

9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ADR PROCESS

---

[13] web.undp.org/evaluation
[14] erc.undp.org

The timeframe and responsibilities for the evaluation process are tentatively[15] as follows:

Table 2: Timeframe for the ADR process		
Activity	**Responsible party**	**Timeframe**
Phase 1: Preparation		
Preparatory mission	EM	March
TOR – approval by the Independent Evaluation Office	EM	June
Selection of other evaluation team members	EM	June
Phase 2: Data collection and analysis		
Preliminary analysis of available data and context analysis	RA/EA	March-July
Sharing Chapter 1-3 of ADR report with CO	EA/EM	July
In-county outcome data collection	EA/consultants	August-September
In-county strategic data collection	PC/EM/consultants	September
Phase 3: Synthesis and report writing		
Synthesis	PC/EM	September
Feedback to CO	PC/EM	September
Zero draft ADR for clearance by IEO	PC/EM	October
First draft ADR for CO/RB review (factual corrections)	PC/EM	October
Second draft for review by the Government	EM	November
Draft management response	CO/RBA	November
Stakeholder workshop	EM	December
Phase 4: Production and follow-up		
Editing and formatting	EM	January
Final report and Evaluation Brief	EM	February
Dissemination of the final report	EM	February

---

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