Work plan for the Impact Assessment (IA) of UNCDF

Final

UNIVERSALIA

October 2003

Acronyms

CCF	Country Cooperation Framework
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
Eco	Eco-development (instrument or project)
ES	Executive Secretary
HQ	Headquarters
IA	Impact Assessment
Inf/RD	UNCDF Infrastructure and/or Rural Development Project Type
IRD	Integrated Rural Development
ITAD	Information, Training and Agricultural Development
LDC	Less Developed Country
LDF	Local Development Fund
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MF	Micro-Finance
MFI	Micro-Finance Institutions
MGDF	Management Development and Governance Division
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PD	Participatory Development
PM	UNCDF Programme Manager
PO	UNCDF Programme Officer (country office staff)
POU	Programme Operations Unit (UNCDF HQ Unit)
PSU	Programme Support Unit (UNCDF HQ Unit)
RR	UNDP Resident Representative
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
SUM	Special Unit for Micro-Finance (UNDP and UNCDF)
TA	Technical Assistance
TAU	Technical Advisory Unit (UNCDF HQ Unit)
Team	The IA Evaluation Team
ToRS	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

UNIVERSALIA

Contents

Exhibits

1. Introduction

Universalia is pleased to submit to the Evaluation Unit (EU) of the United Nation Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) a final work plan for the Impact Assessment (IA) of UNCDF. The final work plan reflects the summary of discussions held and suggestions made by UNCDF staff and stakeholders during the inception mission (October 7-9, 2003) at UNCDF HQ.

The document is organized as follows:

- Section 2 describes the Universalia's Evaluation Team's reaffirmation of the mandate

- Section 3 presents the framework for carrying out the IA

- Section 4 proposes a detailed methodology

2. Reaffirmation of the Assessment Mandate

2.1 Objectives and Scope of the IA

As stated in the Terms of Reference (ToRs) (paragraph 9), the overall objectives of the IA are to assess whether UNCDF is performing as an effective, efficient, and sustainable organization that has remained relevant in carrying out it given mandate to reduce poverty in the LDCs and has responded appropriately to implement the 1995 policy shift and subsequent recommendations of the independent external evaluation of UNCDF in 1999.

The Impact Assessment will be informed by the two distinct processes: the Organisational Performance Assessment (OPA), led by Universalia and the Programme Impact Assessment (PIA) in Microfinance and in local governance led by two separate teams of experts.

Universalia's role will be to integrate the data collected from the OPA and the PIA in order to formulate the IA.

3. Assessment Framework

Universalia understands organizational performance as the interplay of four elements – effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability. For the purposes of the assessment of UNCDF, these areas will be explored through lines of inquiry in 3 primary Assessment Domains. In addition, special attention will be paid to Lessons Learned, Best Practices, and Future Directions. The Assessment Framework is provided in Exhibit 3.1.

Exhibit 3.1   Evaluation Matrix

DOMAIN	ISSUE	QUESTION	SUB-QUESTION	EXAMPLES OF KEY VARIABLES & INDICATORS	EXAMPLES OF DATA SOURCES
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency	**a. Mission articulation and Orientation**	To what extent do UNCDF stakeholders understand, support, and pursue strategies to achieve organizational goals?	Is there understanding and buy-in to UNCDF's mission at the corporate, unit, country and project levels? To what extent do corporate policies help articulate the mission? Is there clarity among staff on who UNCDF's clients are?	Articulation of mission in corporate policies Stakeholder perceptions Evidence of client orientation Follow-up to Recommendation 1 of the 1999 external evaluation	Corporate Policy Papers External stakeholders Internal stakeholders at different levels
	b. Organization Structure	Does UNCDF's current structure (organization of staff and management and the chain of authority) support organizational performance?	To what extent is it configured to effectively and efficiently to: • enable the achievement of organizational goals? • respond to client needs? • maintain innovative and pilot nature of field operations?	Stakeholder perceptions on UNCDF ability to respond to client needs Stakeholder perceptions on ability to innovate and pilot in the field Follow-up to Recommendations 4 and 6 from the 1999 external evaluation Efficiency of decision-making Devolution of responsibility to the country level	Corporate and unit level functional analyses Stakeholders at different levels

UNIVERSALIA

Domain	Issue	Question	Sub-Question	Examples of Key Variables & Indicators	Examples of Data Sources
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency	**C. Management & Operations**				
	c.i. Corporate Management and Oversight	Does the UNCDF management provide effective leadership and maintain effective and efficient management and oversight of global operations?	To what extent does corporate and unit management provide leadership in: • Strategic planning • Results-based management • Accountability for resource use • Policy development and compliance	Stakeholder perceptions Efficiency of management processes	Internal stakeholders at different levels
		Is the Executive Board effective and efficient in its role?	To what extent is there a clear understanding of the role and mandate of the Executive Board? To what extent does it provide the support and supervision envisioned? To what extent does it ensure UNCDF responsiveness to Programme countries?	Executive Board perceptions UNCDF management perceptions Other stakeholders' perceptions	Stakeholders at different levels Executive Board decisions and other documents
		How is UNCDF managing its relations with the Executive Board, donors, and partners in the UN system?	To what extent is the UNCDF responsive to the Executive Board's decisions and to its donors? How has UNCDF responded to the Recommendations of the 1999 external evaluation? To what extent is the UNCDF integrated within the structure of the UN system and supportive of it especially of the UNDP group?	Stakeholder perceptions on relationship management No. & scope of formal agreements Response to harmonization & other relevant mandates	Stakeholders (UNCDF, donors) partners in UN system) MOUs Executive Board decisions and other documents
		To what extent are partnerships at HQ level supporting organizational performance?	What is the relevance and strengths or weaknesses of current partnerships established between UNCDF and UNDP, multilateral and bilateral donors, research and academic institutions, as well as other UN agencies and the UN system as a whole?	Stakeholder perceptions Follow-up to Recommendation 5 Evidence of stronger relationship with UNDP	Stakeholders (UNCDF, donors, partners) MOU Stakeholders

UNIVERSALIA

DOMAIN	ISSUE	QUESTION	SUB-QUESTION	EXAMPLES OF KEY VARIABLES & INDICATORS	EXAMPLES OF DATA SOURCES
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency	c.ii. Project cycle management	To what extent are units effective and efficient in their management and implementation of UNCDF projects?	How has the UNCDF improved its project management cycle since the 1999 external evaluation? Are the procedures, processes and tools used in the different stages of the project cycle in line with best practices internationally? Are corporate policies (gender, pro-poor participation, etc.) being applied?	Improvements in project cycle management Factors limiting/contributing to effective & efficient project cycle management Follow-up to recommendation 2 in the external evaluation Evidence of gender analysis	Stakeholders UNCDF Guidelines Project documents
			Are the project identification, formulation and approval processes effective and efficient? Are approved projects relevant and well designed?	Follow-up to recommendation 9 in the external evaluation Fixed & variable costs Quality of tools and processes Cost-effectiveness of processes Participation of stakeholders Stakeholder perceptions	Cost analysis (fixed and variable) Project documents Stakeholders Project evaluations
			Is project planning and implementation done in an effective and efficient manner?	Participation of stakeholders Cost-effectiveness of processes	Cost analysis; project expenditure analysis Stakeholders Project documents
			Do the monitoring and reporting systems in place support effective and efficient results-based management?	Adequacy, quality, timeliness of monitoring & reporting systems Use of monitoring & reporting system for decision making Quality and use of performance indicators Follow-up to Recommendations 7 and 8 of the external evaluation	ROARs and other reports Strategic Results Framework Unit Management Plans Results Competencies Assessment Stakeholders

Domain	Issue	Question	Sub-Question	Examples of Key Variables & Indicators	Examples of Data Sources
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency			Are evaluations of UNCDF programmes and projects carried out in an effective and efficient manner to support accountability and learning? To what extent is the corporate evaluation policy relevant and effective in achieving objectives of the evaluation function?	Compliance with corporate evaluation policy Quality of evaluations Use of evaluation findings to improve projects, programmes, policy Follow-up on Recommendation 10 of the 1999 external evaluation	Corporate evaluation policy Select project evaluations Stakeholders
	c.iii. Partnerships at Country level	To what extent has UNCDF engaged in effective partnerships at the country level?	What is the relevance and strengths or weaknesses of current partnerships with governments (central & local), private sector, NGOs, civil society, etc? To what extent have partnerships with other UN Agencies and donors (through joint programmes, cost-sharing, etc.) contributed to: • replication of its programme, • increased resources, • and greater attention given to local governance and microfinance?	Replication of UNCDF programmes Sustainability of UNCDF programmes National ownership Cost-sharing arrangements Leveraging of additional funds from other donors	Internal Stakeholders External Stakeholders, including: Central government Local government Private sector Civil society Other UN agencies Donors
	c.iv. Technical Advisory Services (TAS)	To what extent do TAS contribute to the advancement of UNCDF's mission?	What is the coverage and quality of services provided? What has been the influence of TAS on UNCDF programmes and the programmes of partners? To what extent is it a cost-effective service? To what extent does UNCDF have a comparative advantage for provision of TAS in local governance and micro-finance?	Cost recovery Staff capacity to deliver TAS Staff incentive framework Relevance of UNCDF TAS to market needs	External stakeholders: Internal stakeholders

UNIVERSALIA

Domain	Issue	Question	Sub-Question	Examples of Key Variables & Indicators	Examples of Data Sources
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency	c.v. Innovation	How does UNCDF pursue new opportunities, resources and innovations to achieve its mission?	To what extent is there a corporate strategy for developing, assessing, and testing new programmes, products, and services? To what extent is learning and innovation driven by demands from programme countries, field staff or HQ?	Resource allocation to new programme development Stakeholder perceptions	Internal stakeholders Budget and financial statements
	c.vi. Communications	To what extent do the internal and external communications systems support the organization's mission?	How effective is UNCDF in communicating & advocating its mission, approaches, and results among external audiences for the purpose of promoting its best practices and lessons learned, supporting replication, and mobilizing resources?	Stakeholder perceptions Utility & function of intranet, external web site Utility and quality of UNCDF publications and public relations materials	Stakeholders UNCDF publications UNCDF external web site and intranet
	c.vii. Resource Management	Do the financial planning, budgeting, monitoring and reporting systems support effective corporate and programme management decision-making?	Are the financial planning, budgeting, monitoring and reporting practices and tools in line with best practices? Are practices and tools providing the necessary information in a timely way?	Timeliness, accuracy, and utility of financial reporting Stakeholder perceptions	Budget Financial statements and reports Stakeholders
		To what extent are the quality and capacity of current human resources able to support management, operational and administrative, as well as TAS needs?	Is the human resource planning and management system effective and efficient in ensuring the organization is staffed with appropriate, qualified staff? Do incentive and accountability mechanisms for staff reinforce and encourage effective and efficient behaviors in support of organizational goals? What limitations exist and how have these been addressed?	Current and future staffing capacity Assessment of progress made on efforts to "retool" the organization Alignment with corporate policy on gender	1996 Capacity Assessment Corporate and unit level functional analyses Corporate policy on gender

UNIVERSALIA

Domain	Issue	Question	Sub-Question	Examples of Key Variables & Indicators	Examples of Data Sources
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency		To what extent is UNCDF a learning organization?	How does UNCDF learn lessons from its experience and ensure that these lessons are internalized, made operational and, where relevant, shared with the greater development community? What knowledge management mechanisms are in place to ensure that knowledge acquired by individual staff members is retained by the organization?	Stakeholder perceptions	Stakeholders
	c. viii. Results achievement	To what extent are UNCDF programmes and projects achieving results as framed under the Strategic Results Framework?	To what extent have outputs been achieved by LDP and MFI?	Planned vs. Completed Outputs Factors that affect the completion of outputs	Strategic Results Framework Project Annual Work plan Reports Project Annual Progress Reports Results-Oriented Annual Reports
			To what extent have outcomes been achieved by LDP and MFI ?	Outcomes for LDP and MFI in Strategic Results Framework Factors that affect the achievement of Outcomes	Project Annual Work plan Reports Project Annual Progress Reports Strategic Results Framework Results-Oriented Annual Reports PIA findings Evaluations & technical review reports Stakeholders

UNIVERSALIA

DOMAIN	ISSUE	QUESTION	SUB-QUESTION	EXAMPLES OF KEY VARIABLES & INDICATORS	EXAMPLES OF DATA SOURCES
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency			To what extent has the local governance programme made progress towards planned impacts in: • Poverty reduction, • Policy impact and Replication, • Sustainability of results?	Poverty reduction: Changes in Peoople's lives due to: • Increased access to relevant & good quality basic social infrastructure & public services • Services provided through more effective, pro-poor, participatory & accountable planning & delivery mechanisms • Improved natural resource management Policy impact & replication: • Innovations piloted by LDB successfully tested • Results produced by pilot interventions have exerted wider influence as per Policy Impact and Replication Strategy paper Sustainability Changes in systems, institutional & capacity development; actual infrastructure and services provided, and policy influence & replication are sustainable	PIA findings Evaluation and technical review reports Stakeholders

UNIVERSALIA

DOMAIN	ISSUE	QUESTION	SUB-QUESTION	EXAMPLES OF KEY VARIABLES & INDICATORS	EXAMPLES OF DATA SOURCES
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency			To what extent has the microfinance programme made progress towards its planned impacts in: • Poverty reduction, • Policy impact and Replication, • Sustainability of results?	Poverty reduction: Changes in people's lives due to: • Increased access of the poor, especially women, to financial services Policy & replication: • Impact of UNCDF interventions as per Policy Impact & Replication strategy Sustainability: • MFIs providing services to poor clients on sustainable basis • Evidence of how UNCDF support has made MFIs stronger & sustainable	PIA findings Evaluation and technical review reports Stakeholders
			To what extent have there been unplanned results from the LDP or MFI programmes, either positive or negative?	Positive & negative unplanned results	PIA findings Project Annual Progress Reports Evaluation and technical review reports Stakeholders
			Are results achieved (output, outcome, and impact) aligned with established corporate policies?	Alignment with policies on gender, pro-poor participation, partnership, ownership, sustainability, etc.	PIA findings Evaluation & technical review reports

Domain	Issue	Question	Sub-Question	Examples of Key Variables & Indicators	Examples of Data Sources
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency		Is the UNCDF project portfolio in line with organizational goals, mandate, demand, capacity, resources and results-orientation?	What is the composition and distribution of the UNCDF portfolio? Does the portfolio reflect current UNCDF policy, including,1995 policy shift and other corporate policies for micro-finance and local governance? Do UNCDF projects generally achieve their expected results?	Characteristics of Portfolio: size, composition, distribution (thematic and geographic) Quality of portfolio: project design, implementation, and results achievement Proportion of "good performers" versus "poor performers"	Portfolio Data Bases Evaluations & technical review reports ROAR
			How were changes in the portfolio managed, either the phasing out or redesign of "legacy" projects?	Stakeholder perceptions	Stakeholders
			What are trends in new project formulation and their potential implications for the UNCDF portfolio in medium term?	No. of new project formulation over time	Portfolio Data Bases
Relevance	**a. Context**	Are the existing mandate and results produced by UNCDF pertinent given the context?	What are trends, changes, opportunities, and threats in the international development arena? What are trends, changes, opportunities, and threats in the programme areas in which UNCDF operates? How does UNCDF fit within the international development financing architecture?	UNCDF as actor in international development financing architecture UNCDF in the Microfinance and Local Governance programming areas	Stakeholders Documents on MF and Local Governance
	b. Stakeholder needs and priorities	Are the mandate, niche areas, and results produced by UNCDF relevant to its clients and donors?	Do current geographic and thematic foci remain relevant? What is UNCDF's value added and comparative advantage? Are programme interventions in LDP and MF relevant, significant and in line with the country's strategic priorities, national needs, the MDGs, the Brussels Programme of Action for the LDCs and stated Programme goals?	UNCDF vis-à-vis the demands of stakeholders (especially Programme countries and Donors)	Stakeholders

Domain	Issue	Question	Sub-Question	Examples of Key Variables & Indicators	Examples of Data Sources
Relevance	**c. Strategic Positioning**	To what extent is UNCDF strategically positioned?	To what extent do UNCDF interventions/investments strategically position the organization?	<u>Local governance</u> Choice & focus of interventions: • Aligns with 1995 policy shift • Maximizes potential to contribute to decentralization and improved local governance in programme countries • Responds to organization's comparative advantage • Is complementary to the interventions of other players <u>Microfinance</u> Choice of investments and TA to Micro Start: • Positions UNCDF in accordance with its comparative advantage vis-à - vis other players	Stakeholders PIA findings
Sustainability	**a. Financial viability**	To what extent does UNCDF have a sound and sustainable support structure?	How are UNCDF activities towards its mission being sustained?	Mobilization of core resources, non-core resources, cost-recovery	Budget Financial statements Stakeholders
			What are the sources of funding?	Follow up to Recommendation 11 from the 1999 external evaluation	Stakeholders
			Is it strategically positioned to make the best of these?	Current donor and potential donor perceptions	Stakeholders
Lessons learned and best practices	**a. Developmental lessons**	What are the key developmental or Programme-related lessons?	What has been learned from results achieved in the Local Governance and MicroFinance Programmes?	Programme theory	Stakeholders PIA findings Evaluation synthesis reports/Analytical reviews

UNIVERSALIA

Domain	Issue	Question	Sub-Question	Examples of Key Variables & Indicators	Examples of Data Sources
	b. Operational lessons	What are the key operational lessons?	What has been learned about implementing policy change? What has been learned about implementing results-based management systems? What has been learned about managing a pilot approach?	Change management processes Implementation processes M&E and reporting systems Partnership management Technical assistance delivery	Stakeholders
	c. Best Practices	What practices have proven successful? Why do they work?	How have policies been translated into operations? Given diversity of contexts, what has worked ? Why?	Participation and ownership Capacity building Implementation processes M&E and reporting systems Partnership management Technical assistance delivery	Stakeholders Project documents Evaluations
Future directions	**a. Recommendations**	What areas of improvement (if any) should be considered to enhance the overall performance of UNCDF? How should possible recommendations be addressed by the key UNCDF stakeholders?	What changes should be considered (if any) to improve performance? How should changes be administered and implemented? What are the implications for UNCDF management, staff, Executive Board, clients, donors, partners, and others?	Changes that could: -Facilitate Sr. Management and Executive Board decision making on future for UNCDF -Inform upcoming Strategy and Business Planning Cycle	Multiple stakeholder and document sources

UNIVERSALIA

4. Detailed Methodology

4.1 Phase 1: Desk Review; Portfolio Analysis; HQ interviews

4.1.1 Inception Mission- Desk Review

The inception mission took place from October 7th-9th in New York. Two members of the team visited the UNCDF HQ and:

- Validated the draft work plan with the Evaluation Unit

- Meet with the Evaluation Unit and clarified roles and responsibilities, coordination mechanisms, key milestones

- Collected relevant documents for the Organizational IA evaluation

- Collected/Reviewed information on the content and format of the databases to be analyzed

- Identified with the EU the stakeholders to be consulted both at HQ and in the field

- Reviewed and obtained feedback on the Draft Research methodology Guide

- Made a presentation on the IA to UNCDF staff

- Held a small group discussion with a selected group of members of the Executive Board (Denmark; France; The Netherlands; Belgium; Luxembourg)

- Discussed Budget implications and other issues related to the assignment

Exhibit 4.1 presents the preliminary list of documents to be reviewed. Additional documents related to each of the Programmes were collected and will be reviewed. Project-specific documents will be collected as required for the Portfolio analysis and field missions.

Exhibit 4.1 Preliminary List of Documents and Databases to Be Reviewed

LIST OF DOCUMENTS
Corporate Management Plan
Units Management Plans
Individual Results Competencies Assessment
Programme-Level M&E system
Programme –Level MIS system
Information regarding % of program resources allocated to new programme vs. ongoing programs
Project Level- Annual Reports (2000-2003)
Samples of Progress Annual reports (Prior to the institutionalization of AWP)
PIA Findings
1999 external evaluation report
Human resources policy Manual
Individual Performance appraisal System (if it exists)
Staff profile: How many at HQ, in CO, international and local
Selected Project Financial reports

UNIVERSALIA

LIST OF DOCUMENTS
Executive Board Decisions (1995-2003)
1995 Capacity Risks Assessment
Taking Risks
Selected Mid-term and final evaluation reports
Action Plan 2000
Results-Oriented Annual Reports for 2000, 2001, 2002
Corporate Guidelines for project formulation, gender mainstreaming, evaluation
Policy Impact and Replication Guideline
Business Plan 2001-2003
Unit Management Plan
Independent Project Evaluation Reports and Synthesis Reports
Programme Operations Manual
SRF-ROAR-AWP-MIS Guidelines
Corporate and Unit Functional analyses conducted in 2001-3002
Donor Peer Review of SUM
Article: Local Governance and Poverty: The UNCDF approach (2002) by Angelo Bonfiglioli
Local Development Fund: Promoting decentralized, participatory planning and financing) December 1996, by Leonardo Romeo
Decentralized Development Planning: Issues and Early Lessons from UNCDF, by Leonardo Romeo
Local Governance Approach to Social Reintegration and Economic Recovery in Post-Conflict Countries: Towards a Definition and Rationale, 2002, by Leonardo Romeo
Empowering the Poor: *Local Governance for Poverty Reduction*
Policy and Institutional Analysis and Programming Strategies: Working paper, by Roger Shotton, 1997
Minutes or Documents related to the Review of Social Funds and Decentralization, 1999 done with the World Bank
Minutes or documents on the International Workshop on Decentralization, Local Governance and Rural Development in Asia –Bangkok 1999
Minutes or Documents on the Symposium on Local Governance & Decentralization in Africa – Capetown 2001
Minutes or Documents on the Africa Governance Forum V on Local Governance and Poverty Reduction – Maputo 2002
Capacity Assessment of UNCDF, Report prepared at the request of UNCDF and financed by the Governments of France, and Denmark –July 1996
Independent Review of UNCDF of the UNCDF Local Development Fund, Dr. Judith Geist & Dr. Njuguna Ng'Ethe, UNCDF November 1997
Mandate and Legislative frameworks of UNCDF: Link to UNDO Executive Board Decision
UNCDF Mission, Charter, List of Board of Directors,
UNCDF Organigram

UNIVERSALIA

Exhibit 4.2   Databases to Be Reviewed

DATABASES TO BE REVIEWED
FIM
Programme-specific MIS
EU project database
ROAR database
Corporate MIS
UNCDF Intranet
UNCDF Internet site

4.1.2 Finalizing the Research Methodology Guide

Universalia will produce a final Research Methodology Guide that will provide the general tools and guides for collecting data at each stage. This Guide will remain a work in progress as the tools are fine-tuned for use with different stakeholder groups.

4.1.3 Interviews at HQ

The organizational IA will focus on the performance of UNCDF in being an effective, efficient, relevant and financially viable organization. The data collection for this component of the review will take place primarily at HQ, will include a visit in Washington and a questionnaire will be sent to UNCDF staff at HQ and in the field.

Through two missions at HQ, the team will to gather information and perspectives on UNCDF performance from a broad array of stakeholders in New York. The lists of the people to be interviewed by each team member during their respective visits are noted in Exhibits 4.3 to 4.5. In the event that the UNCDF staff person will not be there at the time of the visits of the team members, alternative arrangements can be made to hold the interview over the phone.

Exhibit 4.3   Interviews for the visit of Marie-Hélène Adrien (Organizational performance)

RESPONDENTS		
Ambassador of Benin	Normand Lauzon	Henriette Keijzers
UNDP (To be determined)	Leoncie Bucyana	Adam Rogers
Yee Woo Guo and Rebecca Dahele	Debjani Bagchi, Enterprising Solutions (PIA team, MicroFinance)	G-7 Countries that are currently not strong donors to UNCDF (U.S., UK, Canada)
Other Ambassadors (to be determined with UNCDF)	Leonardo Romeo Kadmiel Wekwete Cyril Guillot	Representatives of the Board members other than those met during the inception visit(some of these meetings may by phone if the Board members are not available)
Mr. Abdhullai Janneh	UN Secretariat representatives (specifically individuals who could discuss the role and the specificity of UNCDF withing the UN family)	Robertson Work

The proposed timing for the first visit is Monday -Friday November 3-7, 2003. The timing for the second visit will be determined at a later stage.

Exhibit 4.4   Interviews for the visit of Daniel Malenfant (Local Governance)

RESPONDENTS		
Kadmiel Wekwete[1]	Cyril Guillot[2]	Leonardo Romeo
Angelo Bonfiglioli[3]	Ron McGill	Roger Shotton
Hishomi Komatsu	Bettina Furhmann	Kristin Wambold-Liebling
Florence Navarro	Stephan Rummel-Shapiro	UNDP (To be determined)
Kirsten Kennedy, PIA team in Joburg	Philippe Zysset	

The proposed timing for this visit at HQ is November 19-21,2003 on the way to the field. In order to maximize the time at headquarters, group interviews may be held with the Programme Managers on the one hand and Technical Advisors on the other.

Exhibit 4.5   Interviews for the visit of Suzanne Kirouac (Microfinance)

RESPONDENTS		
Peter Kooi	Jo Woodfin	UNDP (To be determined)
John Tucker	Marc Jacquand	Leoncie Bucyana
Annette Kraus	Deena Burjorjee	Debjani Bagchi, Enterprising Solutions (PIA team, MicroFinance)

The proposed timing for the visit at HQ is November 12-13.

---

[1] Phone interview either Friday November 7th or Monday November 10th

[2] Phone interview with Daniel Malenfant)to be determined)

[3] Phone interview with Daniel Malenfant (to be determined)

After concluding the Headquarters Interviews, the Team will submit a Summary of Key Findings to the Evaluation Unit.

During the trip to Washington, the team will also aim to speak in person with representatives of CGAP, other key actors in the World Bank Group, and Mr. Stephen Silcox, LDP PIA lead consultant for Cambodia. The visit to Washington is planned for the second week of December. The airline costs to Washington will be absorbed within the existing budget.

4.1.4 Additional data collection with Field staff

Universalia proposes to attend the meeting in The Hague (January 2004) and to conduct a series of Focus groups with field staff on the management of the programme. This is a tentative proposal that will depend on the response rate of the questionnaire sent to field staff (and to HQ). If the mission occurs, the days and airfare of Dr. Adrien will be absorbed within the existing budget.

4.1.5 Project Portfolio Analysis

In order to support the IA, the team will conduct a portfolio analysis. The analysis will require two types of information – information on the general characteristics of the portfolio (what is its size, composition, distribution, etc.) and information on the quality of projects in the portfolio. The Portfolio review will consist of the following main activities:

- Analyzing Portfolio data base information

- Reviewing documents, particularly evaluations and technical review reports in order to assess projects using a set of quality criteria that relate to project design, results achieved, reach, relevance, and alignment with corporate policies and priorities

- Writing a Portfolio Summary that provides aggregate key facts and figures on the project portfolio to be included in the final report.

Overall characteristics of Portfolio

First, the IA team will use Data Base information to describe the 2003 portfolio and compare (whenever equivalent data is available) the characteristics of the overall portfolio at three points in time: December 1995, December 2000, October 2003.[4]

These "snapshots" will provide information on the following aspects of the portfolio:

- No. of ongoing projects on the books

- No. Of ongoing projects by country (LDC status) and region

- Stage of maturity of projects (using Start and End dates, when available, and/or ROAR classification)

- No. of projects:

    - by type (LDF/LDP, MF, OTHER)[5];

    - by size of Total Budget;

---

[4] The three points in time have been selected to reflect timing of significant policy shifts and availability of data.

[5] Within the "OTHER" category, ECO and INFR will be identified, whenever possible.

- approved annually by type (taking the year specified in the Project Code to be the year approved);

- reformulated/redesigned into "new policy" projects after 1995 <u>by type</u>[6]<u>;</u>

- that have been closed.

Quality of the Portfolio

It is anticipated that approximately 20 projects in the UNCDF portfolio will be analyzed in greater depth to assess quality issues, representing approximately 20% of ongoing projects on the books as of October 2003. The sample will be selected using the following criteria:

- drawing from three bands of projects that can be classified as "good" performers, "average" performers; and "poor" performance based on average scores for output achievement, as self-reported in 2002 ROAR;

- drawing from the projects that are listed in EU data base, indicating availability of evaluation reports;

- checking regional distribution of the sample;

- checking distribution of LDP and MF projects;

Projects will be rated on a set of qualitative criteria that integrates variables used in recent Analytical Reviews of UNCDF Evaluations. The general criteria are presented in Exhibit 4.4 . These criteria will be defined in a subsequent guide for conducting the qualitative review. The criteria may be adapted to reflect differences in the two UNCDF Programmes and ensure that the quality aspects are adequately captured for both MF and LDP projects.

Exhibit 4.6   General criteria for assessing portfolio quality

PRELIMINARY IDENTIFICATION OF GENERAL CRITERIA TO ASSESS QUALITY
• Quality of project design (rationale, project logic, etc.)
• Attainment of results
• Relevance of results to the context
• Effectiveness of technical assistance and capacity building
• Community participation
• Alignment of objectives, implementation, and results to 1995 and 1999 policies/guidelines
• No. Direct project beneficiaries
• Appropriateness of M&E system

4.2   Phase 2: Field Visits

4.2.1 Field Verification of Portfolio Analysis

The purpose of the Field review is to verify results of the portfolio review and deepen the understanding of UNCDF Programme (Local Governance and Microfinance) and organizational

---

[6] This will require input from Programme Managers to identify those projects that have been reformulated/redesigned.

performance issues raised during the Headquarters review. In addition, information and opinions shared at the Country level may add new issues or dimensions that had not emerged in the work at Headquarters. Universalia proposes to conduct visits in two countries (instead of three) for each programme. This will allow having a more balance level of efforts for the filed and the HQ data collection.

The team is proposing four countries to be visited, two for local governance projects and two for microfinance projects. The main criteria for selecting the countries were:

- Countries different from those where the PIAs are taking place;

- Projects that are "good", "average" and "poor" performers in terms of achieving results

- Geographical distribution that reflects overall portfolio (especially in Africa and Asia) yet clustering, to the extent possible, of countries for efficiency purposes.

- Countries for which project information (evaluations) exist

- Projects in the country that start-up after 1995[7]

- Programme managers' analysis

- Timing and other issues in the country context (crisis situations, security issues, etc.)

- Ability of the Team member to collect data in the local language

- Having a balance between French and English countries

Based on the review of documents, the above-mentioned criteria, and discussions with UNCDF programme staff, the countries that will be visited are:

Local governance[8]: [9], Niger and Nepal

Microfinance: Egypt, Benin

4.2.2   Collecting Data from People in the Field

Data will be collected primarily through interviews, Focus group where relevant, and through observation. Exhibit 4.5 present a preliminary list of categories of people to be interviewed:

Exhibit 4.7   Collecting Data from People in the Field

CATEGORY	METHODOLOGY
Local Governance and Microfinance client group	Focus Group or interviews
National Government Officials	Interviews
UNCDF Donors with a country presence	Focus Group or individual interviews
Major NGOs	Interviews
Local Government officials	Interviews

---

[7] If before 1995, a second phase of the project has started after 1995.

[8] Tanzania and Bangladesh no longer appears on the list further to discussions with UNCDF Programme managers.

[9] We would prefer to keep Madagascar as one of the countries where results have been limited.

CATEGORY	METHODOLOGY
Other actors in LD or MF programming	Interviews
Partners in the UNDP Group	Focus group
Project beneficiaries	Focus groups

4.2.3 Synthesis of Findings and Debrief with Country and HQ Teams

At the end of the field visit, the Universalia expert will hold a debriefing session with the country office and project teams in which preliminary findings can be discussed and any remaining concerns about the OPA can be addressed.   The results of this discussion will be incorporated into an *Aide Mémoire* on the results of the field visits to be shared with stakeholders in the country and at Headquarters

The IA experts will also attempt to schedule a stop in New York on their way back to Montreal in order to hold a face-to-face debrief with the Evaluation Unit, as appropriate. If it is not possible to do it in person, the debrief will be conducted via conference call.

4.3 Synthesis and Report

4.3.1 Draft and Final Report

During the final phase of the IA, the team will analyze the findings from the PIAs and draft a Synthesis of these to be incorporated into the draft IIA report. The final report will cover both the results on overall organizational performance and the programme-specific results from the PIAs. A draft report will be available by February 8 and a final report on March 12, 2004, as per the dates stipulated in the contract with UNCDF.

The draft report will be submitted to the Evaluation Unit for distribution and discussion with all relevant stakeholders, including an informal presentation to members of the Executive Board. The Unit will consolidate the comments from key stakeholders to be noted and incorporated into the final report to be submitted to the Evaluation Unit, for subsequent submission to the Executive Board in March 2004.

4.3.2 Presentation to the Executive Board

The IA Team will present the report to the Executive Board at its June 2004 session in Geneva.

5 .   R e v i s e d   S c h e d u l e   o f   A c t i v i t i e s

Activities	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June
Phase 1 - Planning									
1.1 Inception Meeting in New York	■								
1.2 Assessment Work Plan	■								
1.3 Research Methodology Guides	■								
1.4 Liaison with client	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Phase 2 - Data Collection and Analysis									
Phase 2.1 - Headquarters Review									
2.1.1 Desk review	■								
2.1.2 Portfolio review	■	■							
2.1.3 HQ interviews		■	■						
2.1.4 Data analysis			■						
2.1.5 Written summary of key findings			■						
2.1.6 Mission in The Hague					■				
2.1.7 Liaison with client	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Phase 2.2 - Field Review									
2.2.1 Travel to countries		■							
2.2.2 Data collection in-country		■	■						
2.2.3 Data analysis			■						
2.2.4 Aide memoire/ Summary of Key findings			■						
2.2.5 Debrief with country and HQ			■						
2.2.6 Liaison with client	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Phase 3 - Synthesis report									
3.1 Draft IIA report					■				
3.2 Final draft IIA report						■			
3.3 Presentation to Executive Board									■
3.4 Liaison with client	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■

UNIVERSALIA

6. Outline of Report

Exhibit 6.1 presents the outline of the report.

Exhibit 6.1   Report Outline

SECTION	CONTENT
I	Table of Content Executive Summary (French and English) List of acronyms
1.0	Introduction
2.0	Methodology
3.0	Context of UNCDF and description of its portfolio
5.0	Organizational Performance: Key Findings Effectiveness of UNCDF and Efficiency of UNCDF Relevance of UNCDF Financial viability
7.0	Conclusions Lessons Learned at the organizational level
8.o	Recommendations

The following components will be presented in a separate document:

- Terms of Reference

- Evaluation Matrix

- Questionnaire results

- Summary of actions on the implementation of the recommendations of UNCDF's 1999 evaluation

- People Interviewed

- Documents reviewed

- Complete Project Portfolio review

UNIVERSALIA

7. Revised Level of Effort and Budget

7.1 Revised LOE and Budget

The following Tables present the level of effort and financial budget for conducting the portfolio analysis.

Exhibit 7.1   Level of Effort

TASK	TEAM MEMBER LEVEL OF EFFORT			
	MHA	**DM**	**SK**	**KR**
Data gathering, entry, and analysis (Overall Portfolio)	1			14
Qualitative review and rating of the Sample of Projects	1	8	3	
Writing the Review and Summary	-	4-	2	-
Total days	3	8	7	15
Days already allocated	3	2	2	-
Days to be funded through Addendum/Additional Budget	--	6	5	15

Exhibit 7.2   Additional Budget [10]

TEAM MEMBER	LOE	RATE IN US$	TOTAL US$
SK	5	650	4,800
DM	6	800	3,250
KR	15	450	6,750
Total			US$ 14,800

7.2 Additional Team Member for HQ Visits

Universalia proposes to include a two-day visit at HQ by Dr. Charles Lusthaus. Dr. Lusthaus is an expert in Organizational assessment. He has conducted the UNHCR review, has worked extensively with Unicef, GEF, UNDP and Unesco and will add to the team some specific expertise in understanding the relationship between UNCDF and other UN agencies. The fees for Mr. Lusthaus's time and travel will be absorbed within the existing budget.

---

[10] Given the feedback received from UNCDF we will allocate more days for Mr. Daniel Malenfant (8) and less for Suzanne Kirouac (3) . However, Universalia will not modify the rates so as to remain within the 15,000 additional envelope provided by UNCDF. We will absorb the difference withing the overall budget of the project.