

**THE 2012-2016 GAMBIA UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT
ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK**

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

**Submitted by
Dr. Annette Ittig**

8 December 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am pleased to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the many people who facilitated the research and field work in The Gambia for this final evaluation of the 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF.

I would particularly like to thank Mr. Seikou Sanyang for his availability on short notice to fill in for Prof. Yusupha Dibba, the national consultant who was originally engaged for this review, when he was unable to continue in the evaluation exercise due to unforeseen circumstances. Mr. Sanyang's support included the documentation of meetings with stakeholders (see Annex 3, below) and the production of the minutes of the 26th October stakeholder validation session (see Annex 6, below).

I am grateful to Mr. Muhamadou Lamin Jaiteh, Deputy Permanent Secretary, Office of the President and Secretary General, and to Mr. Alagie Fadera, Director, Development Planning, Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, for their availability for meetings and presentations, and for their insights into UNDAF processes, procedures and activities. I am also indebted to Ambassador Patricia Alsop, Embassy of the United States of America, and to Mr. Jossalin Amalfi, Programme Officer, European Commission, for their overviews of the local and regional development assistance contexts.

I would like to thank Ms. Ade Mamonyane Lekoetje, the UN Resident Coordinator in The Gambia, and the members of the UN Country Team and the Programme Coordination Group who shared information about programme achievements and challenges; as well as the Resident Coordinator's Office, particularly Mr. Mustapha Yarbo, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, and Mr. Thomas Njumi, Coordination Specialist, for assistance in facilitating key informant interviews and the NGO focus group discussion, and for sharing available programme documentation and other information about UNDAF structures and activities. I am pleased to acknowledge assistance from Mr. Alpha Cisse, Ms. Sally Sadie Singhateh, Mr. Francis Abanzi, Mr. Mustafa Jammeh, and Ms. Fatou Kinteh, from the Operations Management Team, the UN Communications Working Group, the Disaster Risk Mitigation Working Group, the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group and the Gender Working Group, respectively, for providing background information on the mandates and activities of these groups. The evaluation has also benefitted from information shared by Mr. Frederik Matthys, Regional Advisor Africa, UNDOCO, on the UNInfo and other on-line tools which are currently under development to streamline UNDAF-related processes.

I am as well indebted to each of the other national, NGO, private sector and Development Partners who took time to share information about their expectations of this UNDAF, their activities in support of its realization, and their recommendations for the next UNDAF cycle.

Dr. Annette Ittig
International Consultant

ACRONYMS

AGDI	African Gender Development Index
BOS	Business Operations Strategy
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
CO	Country Office
CPD	Country Programme Document
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DaO	Delivering as One
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EC	European Commission
EVD	Ebola Virus Disease
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GBoS	Gambia Bureau of Statistics
GCCI	Gambia Chamber of Commerce and Industry
GMIS	Gender Management Information System
GoTG	Government of The Gambia
HACT	Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers
HDR	Human Development Report
HIPC	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
HRG	Human Rights and Governance
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
KM	Knowledge Management
LIC	Low Income Country
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MIC	Middle Income Country
MOBSE	Ministry of Basic and Secondary Education
MoFEA	Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs
MOHSW	Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
MoYS	Ministry of Youth and Sports
NAS	National Aids Secretariat
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
NRA	Non-Resident Agency
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OHCHR	Office of the High Commission for Human Rights
OMT	Operations Management Team
OP/SG	Office of the President and Secretary General
OVP	Office of the Vice President
PAGE	Programme of Accelerated Growth and Employment
PAU	Policy Analysis Unit

PCG	Programme Coordination Group
RBM	Results-Based Management
RC	Resident Coordinator
RCO	Resident Coordinator's Office
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SRP	Strategic Response Plan
TANGO	The Association of Gambian Non-Governmental Organizations
TG	Thematic Group
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNAIDS	United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNCG	United Nations Communications Group
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDOCO	United Nations Development Operations Coordination Office
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UN-HABITAT	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
UNIC	United Nations Information Centre
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNWOMEN	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
ACRONYMS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
1.INTRODUCTION	12
1.1 The Gambia Context and National Development	12
1.2 The 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF	14
1.3 The Gambia UNDAF Final Evaluation	14
2. MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE GAMBIA UNDAF EVALUATION	17
2.1 Relevance of the UNDAF	17
2.1.1 UNDAF Design and Alignment with National Priorities	18
2.1.2 Integration of the MDGs in the UNDAF	18
2.1.3. Integration of Programming Principles in the UNDAF	18
2.2 Effectiveness of the UNDAF	19
2.2.1 Overall Assessment	19
2.2.2 Key Achievements by Outcome Area	21
2.2.3 Coordination	23
2.2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation	27
2.2.5 Partnerships	27
2.2.6 Resource Mobilization	28
2.3 Efficiency of the UNDAF	30
2.4 Sustainability	30
2.5 UN Comparative Advantage	31
2.6 DaO Coherence	32
3. BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED	32
4. CONCLUSION	33
5.RECOMMENDATIONS	34
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	37
ANNEXES	39
1 Terms of Reference	
2 Evaluation Schedule and Deliverables	
3 List of Persons Interviewed	
4 Frameworks for Questionnaires	
5 Summary Minutes of Stakeholder Validation Session, 26 October 2016	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Gambia Context and National Development Priorities. Although The Gambia aspires to achieve middle-income (MIC) status by 2020, it still faces significant development challenges due to its high debt burden, limited human capital and narrow resource and export base. Moreover, due to its reliance on tourism and its high imports of food and other commodities, The Gambia is particularly vulnerable to external shocks, including fluctuations in food prices. Furthermore, government revenues are not sufficient to provide all essential services, and the health and education sectors are supported to a large extent by Development Partner funds. Consequently, The Gambia is still classified as a “low human development” country, with a rating of only 175 out of 187 countries in the 2015 human development index¹, which is a drop from its rank as 172 in 2013.

The Gambia’s current national development priorities include investment in sustainable solutions in the areas of economic growth and employment; human capital development; social protection and infrastructure. These priorities are presented in its 2012-2015 (extended to 2016) medium term development plan, the *Programme for Accelerated Growth and Employment* (PAGE) under the following five pillars: 1. Accelerating and Sustaining Economic Growth; 2. Improving and Modernizing Infrastructure; 3. Strengthening Human Capital Stock and Enhancing Access to Social Services; 4. Improving Governance and Increasing Economic Competitiveness; and 5. Reinforcing Social Cohesion and Mainstreaming Cross-Cutting issues. Approximately 65% of the estimated \$ 943.05 million budget for PAGE I was based on the assumption of available Development Partner and private sector financing.

The United Nations System in The Gambia and the 2012-2016 UNDAF. The United Nations has had a presence in The Gambia since 1975. During the 2012-2016 UNDAF cycle, the UN System (UNS) in The Gambia current included eight resident agencies², as well as ten non-resident agencies (NRAs)³ which do not have representation in the country but are engaged there through programmes or projects with other partners.

The Government of The Gambia (GoTG) and the UNCT in The Gambia launched the 2012-2016 Gambia United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) with the aim of supporting the achievement of national development priorities as well as of the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in 2012. The 2012-2016 UNDAF is the second generation UNDAF for The Gambia, and it articulated the common strategic framework for the operational activities of the UN System in the country for that period. As of 31 October 2016, the total funding requirement for the 2012-2016 UNDAF was US \$77,249,887.00, of which US \$72,399,714.00 had been mobilized by that date.

The 2012-2016 UNDAF presents eight interrelated Thematic Outcomes through which the UN System has determined that it can respond most effectively to The Gambia’s development priorities. These are: Pro-Poor Sustainable Growth and Economic Development, Environment and DRR, Social Protection, HIV, AIDS, Health Services, Education, Governance and Human Rights, and Gender Equality and Empowerment.

The 2012-2016 UNDAF Final Evaluation. The Gambia UNDAF Final Evaluation was commissioned by the UNCT, and technical support was provided by the UN Resident Coordinator’s Office (UNRCO). The objective of this consultancy was to conduct the final evaluation of the 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF based

¹ UNDP, *Human Development Report 2015*, New York, 2015, p. 272

² UNDP, FAO, UNICEF, WHO, WFP, UNFPA, UNHCR and UNAIDS

³ OHCHR, UNESCO, UNIDO, OCHA, UNCTAD, IFAD, UNODC, ILO, UN-HABITAT and UNWOMEN

on the detailed Terms of Reference (TOR) presented in Annex 1. The Evaluation considers the UNDAF's relevance, its achievements and progress against planned results, the sustainability of its results, and its effectiveness as a coordination and partnership framework and as a resource mobilization mechanism. Although the 2017-2021 Gambia UNDAF has already been signed⁴, the findings and recommendations from the 2012-2016 UNDAF evaluation are also intended to inform UN programming, results and coordination in the upcoming UNDAF period.

The primary audiences for whom the evaluation is intended are the UN Country Team (both resident and non-resident) and key GoTG counterparts, as well as other Development Partners, including donors, the private sector, NGOs and civil society.

Evaluation Scope and Limitations. The turnover of staff in both UN agencies and in GoTG offices since the inception of the current UNDAF has hampered the collection of background information on its formulation and early implementation phase. Moreover, the absence of baselines for many of the indicators for UNDAF outputs and the inclusion of several poorly articulated indicators, as well as a paucity of systematic progress reporting, hindered the assessment of progress against planned outcome targets.

Major Findings of the UNDAF Final Evaluation:

- The design of the 2012-2016 UNDAF would have aligned better with the GoTG's PAGE had its formulation been synchronized with the design of the PAGE.
- At end of the UNDAF implementation period, progress toward the achievement of its outcome targets is mixed: 41.8% have been partially achieved; 19.8% have been achieved; and 38.3% have not been achieved. The low rate of progress towards planned results is due in part to the fact that thirty-three of the UNDAF's eighty-eight output indicators were either not well-defined, or they lacked baselines. Consequently, they do not capture a number of results which were actually achieved.
- One of the constraints to progress most frequently cited by UN respondents was a shortfall in funding. However, according to the outcome budget figures provided to the evaluation, the area with the greatest funding gap proportionately, *HIV Prevention, Care and Services*, which had an approximately 33% funding shortfall, was also the area showing the greatest progress towards plan, at 57%.
- The largest disbursements in the UNDAF were under the areas of *Pro-Poor Sustainable Growth and Economic Development*, *Health Services* and *Environmental Sustainability and Disaster Risk Reduction* (DRR). As this UNDAF was formulated at the time of the 2011 regional drought, it is not surprising that the largest portion of its planned budget was accounted for by food security, agriculture and resilience building-related activities.
- The MDGs have been well integrated into the UNDAF outcome areas, and the UN has well- leveraged its comparative advantage to advocate for their achievement, as demonstrated through The Gambia MDG progress reports and the country's achievement of MDG 4.
- The integration of the five Programming Principles has been mixed. Capacity Development is the most visible Principle: it has been well-integrated into each of the UNDAF thematic areas, and it is well-appreciated by national partners. The integration of Gender Equality, including the disaggregation of data, is noticeably incomplete. To date there have been no UNDAF-wide assessments of the results of Capacity Development or of the other Programming Principles, nor have any tools been developed to monitor or measure Programming Principle integration.

⁴ The 2017-2021 UNDAF was validated and signed on 20 October 2016.

- The effectiveness of the UNDAF as a coordination and partnership framework is mixed. Its governance and coordination infrastructure has not functioned as anticipated. At the highest level, the UNDAF Policy Committee was never convened, and the UNDAF Steering Committee met infrequently until the end of 2013. At the meso-level, it was expected that the Thematic Groups (TGs) would operationalize UNDAF. However, the TGs were not active for most of this UNDAF cycle, and their functions were subsumed by their respective Pillar Groups. GoTG participation in the Pillar Groups was variable, due in part to the high rate of staff turnover in partner ministries. National ownership of and commitment to the UNDAF process has also been hindered by the lack of workplace recognition of UNDAF-related tasks and the fact that UN allowances are lower than those of other DPs.
- The UNDAF has proven effective as a platform for the mobilization of funding for responses to the Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) and to the 2011-12 regional drought. However, the level of funding received for the UNAIDS Joint Programme, the sole Joint Programme under this UNDAF, was disappointing; and most of the other resources for the UNDAF were mobilized at the agency level. There is as yet no Joint Resource Mobilization Strategy for the UNDAF; and there remains a great potential for exploration by the UN of additional partnerships and collaborations beyond traditional DPs, particularly with non-traditional funders who are already present in The Gambia and with the private sector.
- Although the UNCT intends to operationalize the Delivering as One (DaO) approach in the upcoming UNDAF, there is an incomplete understanding of this approach among the Gambia UN agencies, even after the DaO training and self-assessment exercises in 2015; and programme planning, implementation and resource mobilization continue to be agency-driven.

Best Practices. The 2012-2016 UNDAF offers some best practices for Delivering as One (DaO) in a non-DaO country. These include PCG, OMT and UNCG management tiers which support UNDAF processes and operational cohesion. Although there is not yet a Joint Resource Mobilization Strategy for the UNDAF, the use of the UNDAF as a platform for the successful raising of funds for emergency response is a best practice. The WFP-FAO-UNICEF joint programming approach for the school feeding programme and the multi-agency EVD response led by WHO also constitute best practices.

Lessons Learned. Key lessons learned from the 2012-2016 UNDAF which can inform the 2017-2021 UNDAF cycle include:

- **Governance structure:** The four-tiered governance and coordination structure envisaged for the 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF was overly cumbersome for such a small country office. A two-tiered structure with an UNDAF Steering Committee and Pillar Groups, guided by informal, bilateral exchanges at the RC/OP-SG level, could yield better cohesion and coordination, particularly if supported by clear internal and bilateral communication and a strong knowledge management system.
- **Ownership:** Greater national commitment to and ownership of the UNDAF will require ongoing induction of government officials on UNDAF/ UN system processes and procedures and their value added for the GoTG, as well as a much closer alignment of UNDAF and Government priorities to the point where there is no obvious division between UN and GoTG tasks.
- **Gender:** There is no strategic approach for the integration of the Gender Programming Principle across the UNDAF outcome areas. Gender must be fully integrated into UNDAF activities in order to achieve planned results. The incomplete integration of gender in the 2012-2016 UNDAF hampered

the realization of outcomes under the Gender Thematic Area as well as the measurement of progress under other Thematic Areas.

- **DaO:** The “DaO culture” is new to The Gambia; and further training and orientation on this approach and its implications for operations, programming, resource mobilization and partnership, is key for buy-in from all of the UN agencies, and for all UN staff, especially as DaO is to be operationalized in the 2017-2021 UNDAF. It will be crucial for the UN to develop its DaO approach prior to marketing it to the GoTG. Teambuilding exercises which are inclusive of all UN staff can contribute to transforming the current siloed, single agency mindset into a DaO team approach.

Conclusion and Recommendations. The UN’s advocacy and high level technical expertise has been demonstrated in each of this UNDAF’s outcome areas at both the service delivery and policy levels. However, the actual achievements of the 2012-2016 UNDAF have been under-reported, due to a poorly designed results matrix which incompletely captures results; and progress against plan, as assessed through this matrix, is mixed. As resource mobilization, programme implementation and monitoring were primarily conducted as agency-specific activities and not with a DaO approach, transaction costs were increased for UN agencies, the GoTG and donors in terms of greater staff time required for UNDAF-related work. Moreover, the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNDAF governance structure was less than anticipated; and its four-tiered structure was too cumbersome for such a small country office.

As the current UNDAF cycle winds down, there are emerging results, best practices and lessons learned which should inform coordination, communication, implementation, monitoring and resource mobilization in the 2017-2021 UNDAF. The selected recommendations below are presented towards these objectives; and they have been categorized either as priorities to be undertaken immediately or for implementation over the next twelve to twenty-four months:

Recommendations to be undertaken as priorities

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
Resource Mobilization	Develop a joint resource mobilization strategy in collaboration with the GoTG through the MoFEA, including other forms of development financing beyond traditional aid such as non-traditional funders and corporate community investments	UNCT, MoFEA-Aid Coordination Unit, UNCG, consultant
UNCG: oneun website; Working Smarter	1) Launch the planned oneun website as soon as possible; and 2) include an intranet option on to which updates on and communication about the UNDAF, including minutes of meetings, can be uploaded and shared	UNCG, RCO
UNDAF Calendar and Knowledge Management	1) Develop a joint UN/GoTG calendar for UNDAF meetings, joint monitoring and other UNDAF activities which clearly indicates the parties responsible for the organization and follow up of each event, as well as the expected participants; and 2) Ensure that the minutes and any other documents resulting from these activities are archived with the RCO, to strengthen UNDAF knowledge management	RCO, OP/SG

Recommendations to be implemented during 2017

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
------	----------------	---------------------

Gender Strategy	Develop a UNCT-wide gender strategy to articulate a strategy for the integration of the Gender Programming Principle into all of the UNDAF thematic areas	UNCT, Gender Working Group, consultant
Programming Principles: Gender	To improve the integration of gender as a Programming Principle, designate a roving Gender WG expert to move between other WGs to ensure inclusion of gender in programming and M&E	M&E WG, Gender WG, DRM WG
UNDAF national ownership	Conduct induction sessions on the UNDAF and relevant UN system processes and procedures on a six-monthly basis for national partners from grassroots level up to and including policy makers, to strengthen understanding of UNDAF processes and procedures as well as the UNDAF's value-added (see also recommendation below, "UNCG: Communications Strategy")	UN M&E WG; Gender WG; DRM Working Group
UNCG: Communications Strategy	Develop a strategic communications strategy which sensitizes GoTG on UNDAF and its VA at all levels, in order to increase national ownership	UNCG, RCO
UNCG: oneun website support	Engage full-time support to manage and update the oneun website once it has been launched, and explore the cost-effective option to engage a fully-funded professional UNV or a corporate volunteer with communications experience	UNCT, UNCG, RCO

Recommendations to be implemented during 2017 and 2018

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
UNDAF Capacity Building Assessment	Conduct an UNDAF-wide assessment of institutional and individual capacity building support to the GoTG during the 2012-2016 UNDAF to ascertain the outcomes of these efforts, in order to better inform such activities in the 2017-2021 UNDAF. Based on those results, develop an UNDAF-wide strategy for institutional capacity building and human capital development, including identification of gaps, in order to increase possibilities for sustainability of UNDAF capacity building outcomes, and to reduce duplication of other DPs' initiatives	PCG, consultant
Harmonize GoTG partner allowances	Using the DPG as a platform, harmonize UN allowances for GoTG and local partners with those of other DPs.	RC, OP/SG, DPG

Recommendations to be implemented on a continuous basis from 2017 onwards

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
DaO Team Building	Hold annual retreats inclusive of all of the UN Gambia team	UNCT, RCO
UNDAF Team Building	Hold joint annual retreats including all UN staff together with all GoTG staff who support UNDAF activities	UNCT, RCO, OP/SG

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 **The Gambia Context and National Development Priorities.** Like many other small states⁵, the West African nation of The Gambia faces particular development challenges due to its high debt burden, limited human capital and narrow resource and export base. Furthermore, due to its reliance on tourism and its high imports of food and other commodities, The Gambia is particularly vulnerable to external shocks, including fluctuations in food prices⁶.

Moreover, The Gambia's economy is not yet diversified. Although some structural transformation is underway, much of the country's rural population still depends on subsistence agriculture and/or fishing for their livelihood⁷. Tourism is The Gambia's largest source of foreign exchange. Growth in any of these sectors could be quickly reversed by the natural hazards to which the country is prone, including floods and drought.⁸

The Gambia is a young and rapidly urbanizing country: 71.8% of its 1.9 million population is under the age of 30⁹; and it is experiencing high population growth.¹⁰ Some 57% of its population lives in urban and peri-urban areas¹¹; and the country's urbanization is progressing quickly at an estimated rate of 3.7% per year¹²

The Government of the Republic of The Gambia (GoTG) is a presidential republic with a unicameral legislature. For most of the past decade, the country has been relatively politically stable. However, from August 2012, a series of human rights violations resulted in domestic protests and international condemnation; and several key bilateral Development Partners have ceased to provide aid to the country.

⁵ In this report, the term "small state" is used to describe a sovereign country with a population of 1.5 million people or less; it is based on the definition used by the Commonwealth (<http://thecommonwealth.org/our-work/small-states>). Various platforms, including the annual World Bank Small States Forum and the Commonwealth's annual Small States Conference, acknowledge the unique development challenges of small states and aim to identify viable means of building their resilience and sustainable growth

⁶ Food security in The Gambia is highly dependent upon imports: African Development Bank and African Development Fund, *The Gambia: African Development Bank/World Bank Joint Assistance Strategy 2012-2015*, October, 2012, p. 2

⁷ Ministry of Youth and Sports, The Gambia, and United Nations Development Programme, *Youth Employment: The Gambia National Human Development Report* (NHDR), 2014, p. 16 and table 7.

⁸ "The Gambia is one of the most vulnerable countries in Africa to the adverse impacts of climate change. With approximately 50% of the total land area being less than 20m above sea level, and about 33% of the country below 10m above mean sea level, any significant global warming-induced sea level rise could submerge much of the country...": African Development Bank and African Development Fund, *The Gambia: African Development Bank/World Bank Joint Assistance Strategy 2012-2015*, October, 2012, p.12

⁹ Ministry of Youth and Sports, The Gambia, and United Nations Development Programme, *Youth Employment: The Gambia National Human Development Report* (NHDR), 2014, p. 23.

¹⁰ It is estimated that the population has grown at a rate of 2.8 % per annum over the last decade: African Development Bank and African Development Fund, *The Gambia: African Development Bank/World Bank Joint Assistance Strategy 2012-2015*, October, 2012, p. 1. The 2014 NHDR places the current rate at 3.3%; p. 23, based on the 2013 provisional census results.

¹¹ African Development Bank and African Development Fund, *The Gambia: African Development Bank/World Bank Joint Assistance Strategy 2012-2015*, October, 2012, p. 1

¹² Gambia Bureau of Statistics, *Population and Housing Census*, 2013, p. 16; Gambia's annual urbanization rate is estimated at 3.7%. Over half of the population is now based in urban or peri-urban areas.

This is reflected in the drop of Official Development Assistance (ODA) to The Gambia from DAC Development Partners since 2012.¹³

More recently, political tension has increased in advance of the Presidential and Parliamentary Elections which are scheduled for late 2016 and early 2017.¹⁴

According to *Vision 2020*, the long-term development plan of the GoTG, the country aspires to achieve middle-income (MIC) status by 2020. However, it still faces significant development challenges. For example, it is estimated that 48.4 % of its people still live below the national poverty line of \$1.25/day.¹⁵ Moreover, the rate of joblessness remains high in both urban and rural areas, particularly among women¹⁶ and youth¹⁷. Youth unemployment is the main factor behind the high rate of migration of young people from Gambia's rural to urban areas, as well as for migration out of the country.

Furthermore, government revenues are not sufficient to provide all essential services, and the health and education sectors are supported to a large extent by Development Partner funds¹⁸. Consequently, The Gambia is still classified as a "low human development" country, with a rating of only 175 out of 187 countries in the 2015 human development index¹⁹, which is a drop from its rank as 172 in 2013.

Gambia's current national development priorities include investment in sustainable solutions in the areas of economic growth and employment; human capital development; social protection and infrastructure. These priorities are presented in its 2012-2015 (extended to 2016) medium term development plan, the *Programme for Accelerated Growth and Employment (PAGE I)* under the following five pillars:

1. Accelerating and sustaining economic growth;
2. Improving and modernizing infrastructure;
3. Strengthening human capital stock and enhancing access to social services;
4. Improving governance and increasing economic competitiveness; and
5. Reinforcing social cohesion and mainstreaming cross-cutting issues.

Approximately 65% of the estimated \$ 943.05 million budget for the PAGE was based on the assumption of available Development Partner and private sector financing.²⁰

¹³ODA from DAC donors to Gambia has dropped from \$139 million in 2012 to \$115 million in 2013, and \$ 98 million in 2014: OECD Statistics on resource flows to developing countries, Table 30: Net Disbursements of ODA to Sub-Saharan Africa by Recipient: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/statisticsonresourceflowstodevelopingcountries.htm>

¹⁴ The presidential election is scheduled for 1 December 2016, and elections for the National Assembly are scheduled for March-April 2017.

¹⁵ Ministry of Youth and Sports, The Gambia, and United Nations Development Programme, *Youth Employment: The Gambia National Human Development Report*, 2014, p. 5, based on the 2010 Integrated Household Survey.

¹⁶ As estimated by the 2012 Labour Force Survey (LFS), the national unemployment rate then was 29.2%, and male and female unemployment rates 20.9% and 38.3% respectively. Rural unemployment was 31.1%, and urban unemployment was 28.4%. The youth unemployment rate, which was not gender disaggregated, was then 38%.

¹⁷The Gambia National Youth Policy categorizes youth as those between the ages of 15 and 30: <http://www.youthpolicy.org/factsheets/country/gambia/>

¹⁸*Mid-Term Evaluation of the Programme for Accelerated Growth and Employment (Draft)*, December 2013, p. 87

¹⁹ UNDP, *Human Development Report 2015*, New York, 2015, p. 272

²⁰ To date, approximately 50% of the PAGE I has been unfunded.

1.2 The 2012-2016 UNDAF. The GoTG and the United Nations Country Team Gambia (UNCT) launched the 2012-2016 Gambia United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in 2012 with the aim of supporting the achievement of the GoTG's development priorities as well as the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The UNDAF presents the United Nations' stated areas of collaboration with national, sub-national and local stakeholders for this period.

The 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF was designed to align with the GoTG's national development priorities, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other key internationally agreed development goals and principles. The Gambia UNDAF provides a common operational framework for development activities based upon which UN organisations can formulate their programmes, either as individual agencies or jointly.²¹

The 2012-2016 UNDAF articulates three interrelated thematic areas through which the UN system can respond most effectively to national development priorities:

1. Poverty Reduction and Social Protection
2. Basic Social Services
3. Governance and Human Rights

The three Pillars include eight outcomes, the activities for each of which are led by one of the eight resident UN agencies, and twenty-three outputs.

The resources required for the 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF at the time of its formulation were estimated at \$ 65.2 million.²² As this UNDAF was formulated at the time of the 2011-2012 drought, it is not surprising that the largest portion of its planned budget was accounted for by WFP and its food security –related activities such as school meals.²³

1.3. The 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF Final Evaluation

1.3.1 Evaluation objectives and scope. The 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF final evaluation has been commissioned by The Gambia UNCT; and it has been overseen by the UNCT's Programme Coordination Group (PCG) during its design, implementation and finalization phases. The UNRCO has supported the day to day management of the evaluation at the technical level. The objective of this consultancy was to conduct the final evaluation of the 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF based on the detailed terms of reference presented in Annex 1.

The evaluation considers the UNDAF's relevance, as well as its achievements against planned results; its efficiency, the sustainability of its results; and its effectiveness as a coordination and partnership framework. Although the 2017-2021 Gambia UNDAF has already been formulated, validated and signed²⁴,

²¹The UNDAF does not capture all UN agencies' activities, as some agencies, including UNHCR, FAO and WHO, have undertaken projects outside of this framework.

²²2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF, p. 13; as of 31 October 2016, which is only two months from the end of this UNDAF, the required resources are \$77,249,887.00. Additional details on the UNDAF budget figures are presented below in the chapter on "Efficiency".

²³ \$17.89 million, op. cit., ibid.

²⁴ The 2017-2021 UNDAF was validated and signed on 20 October 2016.

the findings and recommendations from the 2012-2016 UNDAF evaluation are also intended to inform UN programming, UN results and UN coordination in the upcoming UNDAF period.

The evaluation considers both overall strategic issues related to the UNDAF and to the UN system in The Gambia, as well as the overall progress of the Pillar Groups towards UNDAF outcomes. Its findings are presented according to the criteria provided in the methodology. As an in-depth midterm review of the 2012-2016 UNDAF was conducted in late 2014, this final evaluation's review of the Pillar Groups' progress towards expected outcomes was intended to be light²⁵, and it was meant to focus primarily upon strategic issues.

The primary audiences for whom the evaluation is intended are the UN Country Team (both resident and non-resident) and key GoTG counterparts, as well as other Development Partners, including donors, the private sector, NGOs and civil society.

1.3.2 Evaluation Methodologies. The evaluation has employed an inclusive, participatory approach; and it follows the United Nations Development Group's *Guidelines for UNDAF Evaluations* as well as OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. It also adheres to the United Nations Evaluation Group's *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation* principles.

The evaluation has been informed by a literature review as well as key informant interviews, focus group discussions and a stakeholder validation session. In its consultations with both duty bearers and rights holders, it has utilized a human rights-based approach. Moreover, the use of mixed methodologies in the evaluation has allowed the triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data.

The document review included publicly accessible material as well as selected minutes from UNDAF Steering Committee meetings and from the 2014 and 2015 UNCT annual retreats, and the 2014 and 2016 joint monitoring reports provided to the consultants by the UNRCO. These are referenced in the Select Bibliography, below.

Eighty-eight persons were interviewed for this evaluation. This included key informant interviews with UN staff, GoTG counterparts and Development Partners, and a focus group discussion with local and international NGO and CSO representatives, as well as one with private sector partners (see below, Annex 2, "List of Respondents"). The international consultant also contacted all of the NRAs by email with a questionnaire on 14 October 2016²⁶; and she presented the evaluation findings at the Banjul stakeholder validation session on 26 October 2016.

A systematic purposive sampling approach was employed for the selection of those interviewed. The selection was based on the international consultant's stakeholder mapping exercise undertaken at the start of the evaluation and reflected in the frameworks for questionnaires presented in her evaluation inception report. This selection was further refined during the course of the evaluation, depending upon respondents' accessibility and availability during the data collection phase.

Summary minutes of the validation session and the list of its participants are given in Annex 6, below; and feedback from it has also been included in this report. The evaluation schedule and deliverables are presented in Annex 3, "Evaluation Timetable and Deliverables"; and the evaluation matrix is presented in Annex 4.

²⁵ "The proposed evaluation will be a light one...": *2012-2016 UNDAF Final Evaluation Terms of Reference*, p. 5

²⁶Of the eleven NRAs contacted, there was only one response.

1.3.3 Evaluation Limitations. The turnover of staff in both UN agencies and in GoTG offices since the inception of the current UNDAF has hampered the collection of background information on its formulation and early implementation phase. Moreover, the absence of baselines for many of the indicators for UNDAF outputs and the inclusion of several poorly articulated indicators, as well as paucity of systematic progress reporting²⁷, hindered the assessment of progress against planned outcomes.

In addition, although requested by the Team Leader at the start of the evaluation, the budget figures for UNDAF outcomes were not provided by the UN agencies until two weeks after the evaluation validation session and the end of the data collection phase²⁸. Due to the late receipt of the budget figures, a detailed assessment of resources and results has not been possible.²⁹

Although this evaluation reviews the 2012-2016 UNDAF at its end point, there may be longer term results which have not yet been fully realized, for example, in the areas of human rights and gender, where policies have been enacted but not yet implemented. This limits the extent to which the evaluation can determine the sustainability of results as well as "... the changes in the well-being of individuals, households and communities attributed to the UNDAF"³⁰. The fact that the UNDAF captures only initiatives undertaken by or on behalf of the UN, and it does not include activities by other DPs, further complicates the attribution of results. Moreover, as noted above, the UNDAF does not capture all UN agencies' activities, as some agencies have undertaken projects outside of this framework. Lastly, it is not clear what development results might have been realized in the absence of the UNDAF, due to the lack of counterfactual evidence.

²⁷ The minutes of only one meeting of one of the Pillar Groups was available for this evaluation: the meeting of Pillar 2, dated 12 December 2012. As the TGs were not functional for most of the current UNDAF period, there were no minutes of any TG meetings; as the UNDAF Steering Committee met infrequently until the end of 2013, only minutes from its 2015 meetings were available. Furthermore, The RCO archives only the minutes of meetings of the groups to which it provides secretariat support, that is, the UNDAF Steering Committee, the UNCT and the PCG. It does not collect the records of the Pillar Groups' meetings; these are to be kept by their respective GoTG focal points.

²⁸ During the 2012-2016 UNDAF, the accountability for fund management rested with individual agencies. The development of a Common Budget Framework is planned for the next UNDAF cycle.

²⁹ Issues that such an analysis could have considered include the fact that although most agencies cited lack of funds as a major constraint to the achievement of results, in most outcome areas the actual funding gap was only 10%-15%; and in two outcome areas funds raised were over the budget estimates.

³⁰ See Annex 1, *TOR*, section 5.vi, below.

2. MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE UNDAF EVALUATION

2.1 Relevance

- How well is the UNDAF aligned to National Development Priorities?
- How well is the UNDAF aligned with international goals and treaties?

Table 1
UNDAF Alignment with National Development Priorities

UNDAF Outcome Area	PAGE Pillars and Relevant Sub-Pillar Thematic Areas
Pro-Poor Sustainable Growth & Economic Development	<p>1 Accelerating Growth, Thematic Area: Strengthening the main sources of economic growth</p> <p>3 Strengthening human capital stock and enhancing access to social services, Thematic Area: Better employment opportunities</p> <p>5 Reinforcing social cohesion and mainstreaming cross-cutting issues, Thematic Areas: Food Security; Reinforcing the quality of public financial management</p>
Social Protection	5 Reinforcing social cohesion and mainstreaming cross-cutting issues, Thematic Areas: Social protection, child protection, and disability
Environmental Sustainability & DRR	5 Reinforcing social cohesion and mainstreaming cross-cutting issues, Thematic Area: Environment, disaster risk reduction, and climate change
Health Services	3 Strengthening human capital stock and enhancing access to social services, Thematic Area: Improving access and quality of health services
Education	3 Strengthening human capital stock and enhancing access to social services, Thematic Area: Improving access to education
HIV Prevention, Care, Services	5 Reinforcing social cohesion and mainstreaming cross-cutting issues, Thematic Area: HIV and AIDS
Gender Equality, Women's Empowerment	5 Reinforcing social cohesion and mainstreaming cross-cutting issues, Thematic Area: Gender equality and women empowerment
Human Rights & Governance	4 Improving governance and fighting corruption, Thematic Area: Strengthening governance in the public service
	2 Improving and modernizing infrastructure

2.1.1 The UNDAF Design and Its Alignment with National Priorities

Although the formulation of the 2012-2016 UNDAF was not synchronized with the design of PAGE I, its eight outcomes broadly align with PAGE Pillars or sub-Pillar themes in all areas, save human rights. Moreover, the UNDAF is well aligned with the PAGE in the areas of HIV/AIDS; gender equality; education, health; and environmental sustainability and DRR. There is no direct alignment of any of the UNDAF outcomes with the PAGE Pillar II, “Improving and Modernizing Infrastructure”, although achievements anticipated under this Pillar, such as the construction of feeder roads, support the realization of several UNDAF outcome areas.

In the next UNDAF cycle, the alignment of the 2017-2021 UNDAF with the PAGE is more visible, as these frameworks were designed simultaneously through highly consultative processes.

To ensure national ownership, the UNDAF formulation phase is expected to be an inclusive and participatory process which involves not only government but also civil society partners³¹. From stakeholder interviews as well as from the focus group discussions with TANGO and with The Gambia Chamber of Commerce and Industry (GCCI)³², it was apparent that the involvement of NGOs, CSOs and the private sector in the design of the 2012-2016 UNDAF was primarily limited to its validation. In contrast, all stakeholders expressed their satisfaction that the formulation of the upcoming 2017-2021 UNDAF had been a much more inclusive process.

2.1.2 Integration of the MDGs in the UNDAF

The MDGs and their achievement feature in each of the UNDAF thematic areas. During the 2012-2016 UNDAF cycle, The Gambia identified MDGs 1, *Eradication of Extreme Poverty and Hunger*, 7, *Environmental Sustainability*, and 8, *Global Partnership for Development*, as national priority goals. MDGs 1 and 7 are referenced under UNDAF Outcome Nos. 1, *Pro-Poor Sustainable Growth & Economic Development*, and 3, *Environmental Sustainability and DRR*. MDG 8 is linked to all of the UNDAF outcomes, as the respective partners for each are noted in its results matrix.

The MDG cycle was completed in 2015. Issues from the post-2015 development agenda, including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), are referenced in the 2017-2021 UNDAF, and selected SDGs have been given precedence in alignment with national development priorities.

2.1.3 Integration of UN Programming Principles into the UNDAF

The five UN Programming Principles of Capacity Development, Results-based Management (RBM), Environmental Sustainability, Gender Equality and Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) feature in each of the eight UNDAF outcome areas. The Programming Principles are meant to guide UNDAF planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation (M&E), as well as to focus the UN’s support to national development priorities. The Pillar Groups have not reported on the integration of the Programming Principles during this UNDAF cycle, nor have they developed any tools to monitor or measure the progress of Programming Principle integration.

³¹ For example, the *UNDG Technical Guidance 2010 Checklists*, “Roadmap”, pt. 3; and the *UNDG Guidelines 2010*, Part 1, pp. 2-3.

³² The FGD with TANGO was held on the 12th October; the one with GCCI was on 13th October: see Annex 2, “Evaluation Schedule and Deliverables”, below.

The Programming Principle which was most visible in the 2012-2016 UNDAF was capacity development: it has been well incorporated into each of the UNDAF outcome areas. Capacity development has been conducted under this UNDAF at three levels:

- At the enabling environment level, through the development of policies and legislation;
- At the organisational level, through the strengthening of systems and procedures, as well as the development of standards; and
- At the individual level, through training

These activities have been project-specific. Their results to date have not yet been assessed, nor are there any specific indicators in the UNDAF's results matrix which refer to the scale or the scope of the improvements anticipated through capacity development – or to those expected through the integration of any of the other four programming principles.

In contrast to capacity development, the programming principle of gender equality, which is also a cross-cutting issue, has been less well-integrated into the 2012-2016 UNDAF. This is apparent from stakeholder interviews and from comments at the Evaluation Validation Session (see Annex 6, below), as well as from a review of the results matrix³³. Moreover, although gender has been somewhat better integrated into the 2017-2021 UNDAF, there also remain areas in it where this can be improved³⁴.

The UNCT received trainings on the programming principles of RBM, Gender Equality, HRBA and Environmental Sustainability in conjunction with the preparation of the 2012-2016 UNDAF; and further training on the programming principles was provided in 2015. Nonetheless, assessment of the qualitative results and impacts of the integration of all five of the programming principles into the UNDAF could be improved. In this case, a review of best practices from other Country Offices on how they measure the programming principles, including the use of simple tools, should be informative for The Gambia office.³⁵

2.2 Effectiveness

In this section, the Evaluation considers

- the extent to which planned UNDAF outcomes have been achieved
- To what extent has the UNDAF supported National Development Priorities

2.2.1 Overall Assessment

Under the 2012-2016 UNDAF, UN advocacy, technical and policy advice and capacity building support have catalyzed new policies, regulations and legislation in several areas. However, at end of the UNDAF implementation period, progress toward the anticipated achievement of its outcome indicators is mixed:

³³For example, gender is not desegregated in either the indicators or the results for, among others, Outcome 5: *Access to high quality and relevant education and skills for youth, children and disadvantaged adults enhanced*; the targets for this are “**Basic education: 100; Secondary education: 70**”.

³⁴For example, in Outcome 2.1 for Education: Gross enrolment rate at basic & secondary education levels, the baselines for lower basic, upper basic and secondary education are not gender desegregated: “Lower Basic - 101.2; Upper Basic – 68.3, SSS – 41.6”

³⁵ For example, the Zimbabwe Country Office (CO) has developed a tool to report on the integration of the Programming Principles which is standardized across its TWGs: *2013 ZUNDAF Annual Review Report, Annex*.

41.8% have been partially achieved; 19.8% have been achieved; and 38.3% have not been achieved. The low rate of progress towards planned results is due in part to indicators that are not SMART: of the eighty-eight output indicators, thirty-three were either not well-defined, or they lack baselines. Consequently, their current state of achievement cannot be determined³⁶; and they do not capture a number of actual achievements.

Table 2
2012-2016 UNDAF Results by Outcome Area

Pillar/Outcome Area	% Achieved	% Partially Achieved	% Not Achieved
Pillar 1-Poverty reduction/Social protection			
1-Pro-Poor Growth	33%	29%	38%
2-National Social Protection systems	25%	50%	25%
3-Environment/DRR	25%	25%	50%
Pillar 2 – Basic social Services			
1-M&C healthcare	18%	36%	46%
2-Education	0.1%	70%	29.9%
3-HIV services	57%	14%	29%
Pillar 3-Governance/Human Rights			
1-Gender equality	0%	33%	67%
2-Human rights	0.1%	78%	21.9%
Overall achievement	19.8%	41.8%	38.3%

The constraints to progress towards anticipated outcomes that were most commonly cited by the UN agencies were funding gaps, the high turnover of national counterpart staff and the limited participation of national counterpart staff in UNDAF-related activities. It was also frequently stated that the paucity of accurate and up to date data had hindered the measurement of results. Factors related to funding shortfalls are considered below, in 2.2.6, “Resource Mobilization”; and issues related to limited

³⁶As noted in the minutes to the UNDAF Steering Committee meeting on 19 October 2015: “It is recognize(d) that this is a common problem as it also affects the PAGE. In conclusion, the emerging view is to learn from this and work to prevent it recurring”, p. 3.

participation by national counterparts and to data quality are discussed in 2.2.3, “Coordination”, and 2.2.5, “capacity Building”, below.

2.2.2 Key Achievements by Outcome Area

1. Pro-Poor Sustainable Growth and Economic Development (GoTG Lead: MOFEA; Lead UN Agency: UNDP)

Key achievements under this thematic area include the development and enactment of policies on microfinance, private sector development and aid coordination. The latter policy supported the development of The Gambia’s Aid Management Platform. Capacity development and training activities under this outcome area include the provision of equipment and training to the Gambia Bureau of Statistics (GBoS) for the population and housing census and for the demographic and health surveys; support for the development of the national strategy for statistical development; and training for GoTG staff on transparent public finance management (PFM), aid coordination, medium term expenditure frameworks (MTEF) and on the sector wide approach programme (SWAP). Training was also provided to 75 monitoring and evaluation focal persons from the PAGE on results-based monitoring and evaluation; and 25 senior GoTG officials were trained in policy formulation and strategic planning. Support was also provided towards the formulation of PAGE II, the medium-term development strategy, as well as to build capacity on public-private partnerships, and to strengthen citizens’ engagement in public/national budget formulation processes.

Constraints to the achievement of results under this thematic area include the lack of current, accurate data for evidence-based policy development.

2. Social Protection (GoTG Lead: MOHSW; Lead UN Agency: UNICEF)

Key achievements under the Social Protection thematic area include the National Social Protection Analysis and Assessment; the social protection mapping and fiscal analysis; the development of a National Social Protection Policy for 2015-2025; the development of a Strategic Plan (2013-2017) for Strengthening the Birth Registration System of The Gambia and Achieving Universal Birth Registration; the development of a National Social Protection Policy for 2015-2025; and the enactment of the National Child Protection Strategy. In addition, advocacy efforts by UNHCR have resulted in the issuing of identify cards to refugees by the GoTG; the approval of multi-year residence permits for refugees; the waiver of the expatriate tax on the employers of refugees; and the standardization of health service fees for refugees with those for Gambian nationals.

Capacity development and training activities and tools realized under this outcome area include the development of a training manual for the eradication of child labour and sexual exploitation in the tourism industry; the development of sensitization materials on child protection issues; and a three year TOT in refugee law and protection was provided to 21 trainers from seven state security and law enforcement training; and two workshops for a total of 80 criminal justice practitioners on human trafficking issues. A minimum social protection package has been developed and is soon to be launched.

Constraints to the achievement of results under the Social Protection thematic area include shortfalls in funding and the lack of current, accurate data for programming baselines and the measurement of results.

3. Environmental Sustainability and Disaster Risk Reduction (GoTG Lead: OVP; Lead UN Agency: WFP)

Key achievements under this outcome area include the development of the National Climate Change Policy; the implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan; the development of a

comprehensive National Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan for Avian Influenza; the development and implementation of the National EVD Preparedness and Response Plan, including the rehabilitation of two holding centers in Banjul and Soma, and the construction of six holding centres at border posts with Senegal.

Capacity development and training activities undertaken under this outcome included the provision of training to 25 regional and four community disaster response committees on DRR and Emergency Response.

Constraints to the achievement of results under this thematic area include the lack of current, accurate data for baselines and for the measurement of results.

4. Health Services (GoTG Lead: MOHSW; Lead UN Agency: WHO)

Notable achievements under this outcome area include the successful multi-agency EVD response led by WHO, including the joint resource mobilization of \$ 1.6 million from the Government of Japan; and the development of the costed National Health Sector Strategic Plan 2014-2020. Capacity development and training activities under this outcome area include the provision of trainings on EVD preparedness to medical, immigration and other relevant personnel, e.g. in 2015 training was provided to 60 health workers on EVD surveillance and contact tracing and to an additional 30 on EPI-INFO.

Constraints to the achievement of results under the Health Services thematic area include the lack of current, accurate data for baselines and for the measurement of results.

5. Education (GoTG Lead: MOBSE; Lead UN Agency: WFP)

Key achievements under the Education outcome area include the development of the New Education Policy 2015-2030; the ongoing transfer of the WFP/UNICEF/FAO school meals programme to the GoTG; the programme is expected to be fully transferred to the government by 2020. Capacity development and training activities under this outcome area include the provision of training to the staff of the Ministries Basic and Secondary Education on school feeding related management

Constraints to the achievement of results under the Education thematic area include funding shortfalls. The lack of current, accurate data was also cited as a major constraint for programming and for the measurement of results. The assessment of progress against plan was also hindered by the fact that some of the baselines and output indicators for this outcome were not gender disaggregated.

6. HIV Prevention, Care and Services (GoTG Lead: NAS; Lead Agency: UNAIDS)

Key achievements under this outcome area include the enactment of the first HIV/AIDS Prevention and Control Act as well as a nation-wide sensitization exercise on the Act; the implementation of the Joint HIV/AIDS programme, which includes eight agencies, plus the World Bank and IMF, and which is led by UNAIDS; the development of the First National Comprehensive HIV Treatment and Prevention Guidelines and a Comprehensive HIV/AIDS Training Manual; and the development of the PMTCT Action Plan.

Capacity development and training activities under this outcome area include the provision of training to 190 PLHIVs on the HIV Treatment and Prevention Guidelines noted above under this outcome area.

Some of the constraints to the achievement of results under the HIV Care thematic area were funding shortfalls; the limited capacity of partners; and the high rate of staff turnover in partner institutions.

7. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) (GoTG Lead: Office of the Vice President (OVP) (Women's Bureau); Lead UN Agency: UNFPA)

Key achievements under this outcome area include development of a National Action Plan on the UNSCR 1325; development of the National Plan of Action for Accelerated Abandonment of Female Genital Mutilation 2013-2017; and development of the National Plan of Action on Gender Based Violence 2013-2017. Moreover, UN advocacy for the elimination of FGM/C was an important catalyst to the announcement of a ban on FGM/C by the President in Nov 2015.

Capacity development and training activities under this outcome area included the provision of training to 600 nurses and midwives on FGM/C and the management of FGM/C complications. Moreover, as a result of the social mobilization and training on FGM/C provided to 481 communities, each of those communications has issues declarations that they will abandon these practices.

A major constraint to the achievement of results under the GEWE thematic area is an ongoing shortfall in funding. Moreover, some of the output indicators for this outcome are not well-defined, and they do not capture a number of actual achievements.

8. Human Rights and Governance (HRG) (GoTG Lead: MOJ; Lead UN Agency: UNDP)

Major achievements under the HRG Thematic Area include the establishment of Anticorruption and Human Rights Commissions; the establishment of the National Legal Aid Agency and the establishment of children's courts. Another significant achievement is the participation of The Gambia in the Universal Periodic Review process in December 2014.

Capacity development and training activities include the provision of Child Rights training to police and prison officers; training to police officers on human rights and gender-based violence issues; and training for national partners on human rights and the Universal Periodic Reviews by OHCHR.

Constraints to the achievement of results under the HRG thematic area include the limited capacity and/or willingness of key actors to conduct reporting and other activities as required under international conventions and treaties. Moreover, resources were insufficient to carry out all outputs and activities as planned: this may be related in part to a reluctance by some funders to support activities viewed in the current context as sensitive.

2.2.3 Coordination

- How effectively has the UNDAF been managed?

High Level UNDAF Governance and Coordination Structures

An UNDAF Policy Committee, including the Secretary General and Head of the Civil Service from the Office of the President (SG/OP) and the Office of the UN Resident Coordinator (RC), was established to provide high level, overall coordination between the UN system and the GoTG agencies for the realization of the UNDAF. No meetings of the UNDAF Policy Committee were convened during the course of the 2012-2016 UNDAF. However, the RC and the SG/OP meet frequently on other matters; and these meetings provide opportunities to discuss UNDAF issues on an informal, bilateral basis.

An UNDAF Steering Committee, including the Permanent Secretaries of the primary GoTG ministries, Heads of UN agencies (HoAs), an NGO representative, a private sector representative and bilateral and multilateral Development Partners, was also established to provide strategic guidance to the

implementation of the UNDAF. It was originally intended that the Steering Committee would report to the UNDAF Policy Committee. However, as the latter committee was not convened during this UNDAF cycle, the UNDAF Steering Committee has taken responsibility for the overall, high level coordination of the UNDAF. The Steering Committee has met more frequently since the end of 2013.

UN System Support to the UNDAF

Within the UN system, the Programme Coordination Group (PCG), the Operations Management Team (OMT) and the UN Communications Group (UNCG) support UNDAF coordination and cohesion. The UNRCO provides secretariat support to the UNCT and PCG; the Common Services Associate serves as the secretary to the OMT.

Table 3 below summarizes the membership and meeting frequency of the UNCT, PCG, OMT and UNCG:

Table 3

Management Tier	Membership	Meeting Frequency
UNCT Core Group	Heads of UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes accredited in The Gambia	Monthly
UNCT Expanded Group	The UNCT Core Group plus the Heads of NRAs	Annually
PCG	Heads of programmes/senior programme staff	Twice monthly ³⁷
OMT	Operations Managers and/or alternatives designated by the HoAs of the UN Agencies resident in The Gambia, and the UN Chief Security Advisor	Monthly
UNCG	The officer responsible for communications in each of the UN agencies resident in The Gambia	Monthly

The PCG was formed by the UNCT to ensure the successful rollout, implementation and monitoring of the UNDAF, including support to improved coordination among UN agencies. The PCG is intended to have a quality assurance role: it promotes areas for joint programming; it provides guidance and follow up on UNDAF M&E processes; and it coordinates reviews, joint site visits and other data collection and analysis tasks.³⁸

The OMT, which supports the “Operating as One” Pillar of the DaO approach, aims to increase efficiency and reduce transaction costs associated with the implementation of the UNDAF.³⁹In this connection, the OMT has already realized cost savings through the UN House Common Premises and for fuel and travel costs through common procurement. It has also led the Harmonization of Cash Transfers (HACT) process, which is intended to build the capacities of national partners. In The Gambia, the HACT has been adopted

³⁷ Until recently the PCG met on a weekly basis.

³⁸ United Nations The Gambia, *Programme Coordination Group Terms of Reference*, March 2016, pp. 1-2

³⁹ United Nations The Gambia, *Operations Management Team Terms of Reference*, n.d., pp.1-2.

by UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA, and micro-assessments of local contractors have already been conducted.⁴⁰ Moreover, OMT's support will be key to the development of the Common Budget Framework planned for the 2017-2021 UNDAF. The OMT has not yet finalized a Business Operations System (BOS); and the UNinfo, the new online strategic planning and reporting system in support of the UNDAF and the BOS process now being piloted by UNDOCO, could be a very useful tool for the OMT as The Gambia BOS is finalized.⁴¹

The UNCG, as the “One Voice” of the DaO approach, is intended to act as the focal point for communication within the UN system as well as for coherent messaging from the UN to external Development Partners and the general public. By communicating on UNDAF results and raising the visibility of the UN system, the UNCG is also intended to play a key role in supporting resource mobilization.

The Gambia UNCG has developed a “One UN Gambia” website which aims to further increase public awareness of the UN's policies, programmes and results, as well as to provide a vehicle for internal UN knowledge management (KM). An intranet or password protected portal may be added to the website to support the internal KM function by allowing minutes and other UNDAF-related documentation to be uploaded on to it. At the time of this writing, the website had not yet been launched.⁴²

The RCO plays a key role in liaison between the UNCT, the GoTG and Development Partners. RCO staffing currently consists of a Coordination Specialist and an M&E Specialist, both of whom provide full-time support to the office. Support from a Communications Specialist is provided to both the RCO and UNDP on a 50% time basis to each.

In addition to coordination, the RCO also carries out some UNDAF related M&E functions, although the UN M&E WG, which is responsible for UNDAF monitoring and monitoring tools, is led by UNFPA. The RCO also supports knowledge management (KM) by archiving the minutes of meetings of the UNCT, PCG and UNDAF Steering Committee. However, it does not record or archive the minutes of the Pillar Groups which are produced by the GoTG Pillar co-chairs, although this would be a very useful KM function, particularly as there is a high staff turnover rate generally in government offices. Pro-actively collecting these and other UNDAF-related documents would increase opportunities for knowledge sharing and learning not only within the UN system, but also with national partners and with DPs. Moreover, it is a function for which the RCO, in at least some other Country Offices, are responsible.

During the 2012-2016 UNDAF cycle, the RCO collected budget information for UN programming by specific agency rather than by UNDAF outcome; The collection of UNDAF resource mobilization and budget figures by outcome would support both communication and resource mobilization efforts with DPs; and it is understood that this will be done in the next UNDAF cycle.

⁴⁰ Issues of compliance at the national level current hinder full HACT implementation in The Gambia.

⁴¹ For further information on the UN Info, see “UN Info: Digitizing the UNDAF in 2017”, at https://undg.org/main/undg_document/the-un-development-system-in-country-what-the-data-and-evidence-shows/

I would like to thank Mr. Frederik Matthys, UNDOCO, for bringing this to my attention: Annette Ittig

⁴²The launch of the website was planned for United Nations Day, 24th October 2016, but it has been postponed.

Meso-Level UNDAF Coordination Structures

Three Pillar Groups were formed around the three UNDAF pillars. Each was co-chaired by the lead UN agency and the lead GoTG ministry. The Pillar Groups were intended to be responsible for coordinating and reporting on implementation. It is not clear how often the Pillar Groups met: only one set of Pillar meeting minutes for this UNDAF cycle was available to the evaluation⁴³. Several of the UN agencies stated that GoTG participation in the Pillar Group meetings which were held was inconsistent and limited. However, due to the lack of Pillar Group meeting minutes available to the evaluation, it was not possible to document this through meeting attendance records.

Below the Pillar Groups, a Thematic Working Group (TWG) was established for each of the eight UNDAF outcomes, with the intention that the UNDAF would be operationalized by the TWGs. Each TWG was to also be co-chaired by the lead UN agency and the lead GoTG ministry for that outcome. However, the TWGs were not functional in this UNDAF cycle⁴⁴; and their meetings were subsumed into those of their respective Pillars. In the absence of functional TWGs, the UNDAF was primarily operationalized by the individual UN agencies responsible for the lead of the respective outcomes. The reporting of results and fund management was also undertaken on an agency basis.

From interviews with GoTG partners, the evaluation found that their understanding of UNDAF mechanisms and processes was uneven. In addition, many of the GoTG staff interviewed felt that the UNDAF was a solely UN-designed and driven initiative, rather than a collaborative UN-government process. National counterparts' variable understanding of and participation in UNDAF-related activities is at least partially due to a high rate of GoTG staff turnover, and an on-going induction for GoTG staff on UNDAF processes to address the resultant knowledge gaps has not been provided by the UN.

Many of the GoTG respondents also stated that the transaction costs for their undertaking of UNDAF coordination activities are high in terms of the time required, and that that compromised their ability to carry out their core work duties. In addition, they said that the duplication of activities by and requests for data by UN agencies⁴⁵ is also not an efficient use of their time – this is also not a best practice for DaO.

Moreover, all of the GoTG and local NGO staff interviewed for the evaluation stated that the travel allowances provided by the UN to national partners are considerably lower than those offered to them by other Development Partners⁴⁶. There is, therefore, less of an incentive for them to participate in UN activities than in events sponsored by other DPs.

Given the variable understanding of the UNDAF process, the perception of UNDAF-related tasks as additional, non-core work, and the comparatively lower allowances offered to national partners by the UN, the lack of national commitment to and ownership of the UNDAF is not surprising; and this is an issue which was also noted in reviews of the previous UNDAF⁴⁷. During the evaluation, it was suggested that

⁴³Minutes of the meeting of Pillar 2 held on 12 December 2012.

⁴⁴TWGs were also formed for the 2007-2011 UNDAF, but they were also non-functional during that cycle as well: *Final Review of the 2007-2011 UNDAF: An Assessment of UNDAF Outcomes*, May 2012, p.

⁴⁵ For example, the duplication of TVET training by different UN agencies under a youth project implemented by MoYS; the different requests for the same data for baselines.

⁴⁶ Within the UN system in The Gambia, allowances for GoTG staff have been standardized: Office of the Resident Coordinator, United Nations Gambia, *UN Policy on Payment of Allowance to Government Staff for Meetings, Workshops, Training, Conferences, etc., Effective 1st June 2016*, May 2016

⁴⁷*Midterm Evaluation of the 2007-2011 UNDAF; Final Review of the 2007-2011 UNDAF*

adding UNDAF-related duties to the job descriptions of the GoTG staff responsible for them would increase national ownership of the UNDAF. While this would certainly increase workplace recognition, a more holistic response to the national ownership issue would be to much more closely align UNDAF and Government priorities, to the point where there would be no obvious division between UN and GoTG tasks.

2.2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

- Was there appropriate monitoring and evaluation mechanism put in place to monitor progress?

Some of the monitoring and reporting deficiencies seen in this UNDAF have been noted above in section 2.1, “Overall Assessment”. For example, of the eighty-eight output indicators in the UNDAF, thirty-three were either not well-defined, or they lack baselines. Consequently, their current state of achievement cannot be determined; and they do not capture a number of actual achievements. Moreover, the current UNDAF was designed at the project level, and as a result the number of indicators is unreasonably high. These indicator issues were noted as early as the first year of the UNDAF’s implementation⁴⁸, but they were not addressed. The consequent under-reporting of results in the 2012-2016 UNDAF may detract from the UN’s credibility in demonstrating its added value and, in turn, its ability to mobilize resources for future activities.

In addition to the poorly designed results framework, the monitoring of the 2012-2016 UNDAF programmes and projects was not conducted on as regular a basis as planned; and the undertaking of joint M&E exercises between UN agencies⁴⁹ as well as between UN agencies and GoTG partners⁵⁰ was limited. As a result, there is a paucity of systematic progress reporting. Moreover, where such reports do exist, they may not be easily accessible: as the RCO does not collect and archive all UNDAF-related reports, there is no central repository for them.

Furthermore, although there was a UN M&E WG, there was no Joint UN-GoTG M&E Group. Finally, it is notable that not all of the UN Gambia agencies have dedicated M&E staffing and/or expertise.

It is hoped that once the UNinfo, UNDOC’s new online strategic planning and reporting system, is available in early 2017, its use will be considered by The Gambia Country Office, as that may ameliorate some of the above-noted M&E issues in the 2017-2021 UNDAF.

2.2.5 Partnerships

Partners in the UNDAF process in The Gambia include the UN, the GoTG, DPs, NGOs, CSOs and the private sector. According to the UNDG *Guidelines*, it is expected that national ownership in the UNDAF will be ensured during its formulation through the inclusion and participation of all of these stakeholders. However, GoTG, NGO and private sector representatives interviewed for the evaluation remarked that their inclusion in the planning and design phase of the 2012-2016 UNDAF was limited to its validation.

⁴⁸ See minutes from the Pillar 2 Group meeting of 12 December 2012.

⁴⁹ *Final Review of the 2007-2011 UNDAF*, p. 27

⁵⁰ Both UNHCR and UNFPA have conducted monitoring jointly with their respective Government counterparts.

In contrast, each of the stakeholder groups interviewed also stated that the recent formulation of the 2017-2021 UNDAF was a far more inclusive process than the one for the current UNDAF; and they were optimistic that their participation and inclusion in the UNDAF process would continue into its next phase.

The current UNDAF Steering Committee membership includes both NGO and private sector presentation through TANGO and GCCI, respectively.⁵¹ However, it appears that NGOs' involvement in the UNDAF's implementation has primarily been as contractors rather than as partners, and private sector engagement in the UNDAF has been nominal. This could be improved through the inclusion of representatives from both the private sector and from civil society in relevant Results Groups in the 2017-2021 UNDAF.

The partnership between the UN and the GoTG has been considered above, in "Coordination".

The partnership between the UN and the European Union is key to the implementation of the UNDAF, as it is the most significant provider of development assistance to the UN in The Gambia. The EU is a member of the UNDAF Steering Committee.

2.2.6 Resource Mobilization

- To what extent has the UNDAF been an effective platform for the mobilization of resources?

As of October 2016, the total funding requirement for the 2012-2016 UNDAF was \$77,249,887.00 of which \$72,339,714.00 had been mobilized.⁵² The table below presents the summary of the UNDAF budget by outcome area⁵³:

UNDAF OUTCOME AREA	Budget	Actual	Gap
Pro-Poor Sustainable Growth & Economic Development	20,898,231	23,833,803	-2,935,572
Social Protection	4,174,776	3,154,479	1,020,297
Environmental Sustainability & DRR	11,445,324	12,901,968	-1,456,644
Health Services	18,452,048	13,590,847	4,861,201
Education	13,660,581	11,724,098	1,936,483
HIV prevention, care, services	1,533,961	1,024,618	509,344
Gender Equality, Women's Empowerment	2,249,673	1,952,402	297,272
Human rights & Governance	4,835,293	4,217,499	617,793
TOTAL	77,249,887	72,399,714	4,850,173

According to these figures, the funding gap for the UNDAF overall was approximately 9.3%. It is not known what percentage of UNDAF funding was mobilized from DPs and what percentage was raised internally through agencies' core funding.

⁵¹ See, for example, "(List of those) Present", UNDAF *Steering Committee Meeting Minutes*, 19 October 2015.

⁵² Although requested by the International Consultant during the evaluation inception phase, the UNDAF outcome figures were not provided by the UN agencies until 8th November, that is, two weeks after the validation session and after the end of the data collection phase. Although the agencies cited lack of funds as a major constraint to the under achievement of results, for most of the outcome areas the actual funding gap was less than 10%. Due to the late receipt of the budget figures, further analysis of this issue for the evaluation was not possible.

⁵³ This table is presented with figures provided by courtesy of the UNRCO: Annette Ittig

Although there was no Joint Partnerships and Resource Mobilization Strategy in the 2012-2016 UNDAF, the UNDAF has proven effective as a platform for the mobilization of funding for emergency response and resilience building initiatives, including the Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) and the 2011-12 regional drought. For example, in 2012, CERF provided \$4.8 million for humanitarian response to food insecurity and malnutrition in The Gambia in multi-agency funding to WFP, FAO, UNFPA, UNICEF and WHO⁵⁴; and in 2014 it provided \$2.47 million to WFP, WHO, FAO and UNICEF⁵⁵. The Government of Japan supported the multi-agency EVD response led by UNDP in The Gambia in 2015 with \$1.6 million; and the European Union approved funding proposals for \$11,500,000 for the joint FAO/UNICEF/WFP 'Envelope B' initiative.

In contrast, most of the resource mobilization for other activities under the UNDAF was agency-driven, and agencies certainly do not “present as One” when meeting with DPs about funding.⁵⁶

The largest disbursements in this UNDAF were in the Thematic Areas for Pro-Poor Sustainable Growth and Economic Development, Health Services and Environmental Sustainability and DRR. As this UNDAF was formulated at the time of the 2011-2012 regional drought, it is not surprising that the largest portion of its planned budget was accounted for by food security, agriculture and resilience building-related activities.

One of the constraints to progress most frequently cited by UN respondents was a shortfall in funding. However, according to the outcome budget figures provided to the evaluation, the area with the greatest funding gap proportionately was Outcome 6, *HIV Prevention, Care and Services*, which had an approximately 33% funding shortfall; but this is also the area showing the greatest progress towards plan, at 57%. Gender and Human Rights/Governance, which were areas with the lowest percentage of achievement, had lower funding gaps in proportion to their estimated budgets, at 13% and 12%, respectively.⁵⁷

One of the factors related to these funding shortfalls is the withdrawal of several key multilateral donors from The Gambia after August 2012, when a series of human rights violations there resulted in domestic protests and international condemnation. This is reflected in the drop of Official Development Assistance (ODA) to The Gambia from DAC Development Partners since 2012. Another factor is the increased donor focus on and funding for high profile emergencies in Syria, Iraq and elsewhere. Given these constraints, the mobilization of the \$207 million estimated budget for the 2017-2021 UNDAF may be challenging.

In this connection, as The Gambia UNCT intends to operationalize DaO in the 2017-2021 UNDAF, the One Fund modality, in which un-earmarked funds are pooled, could be introduced and used to support unfunded UNDAF activities.

In addition to traditional aid, there are other types of funding that have been successfully explored by UNCTs elsewhere and which could be appropriate for consideration and adaptation by The Gambia UNCT. Some examples of innovative development financing are the UNDP crowdfunding initiative in

⁵⁴ <http://www.unocha.org/cerf/cerf-worldwide/where-we-work/gmb-2012>

⁵⁵ <http://www.unocha.org/cerf/cerf-worldwide/where-we-work/gmb-2014>

⁵⁶ Annette Ittig, DP interviews.

⁵⁷ See above, footnote 50: Due to the late receipt of the budget figures, a detailed assessment of resources and results has not been possible

Bangladesh⁵⁸ and diaspora bonds in India⁵⁹. There is as well a great potential for exploration by the UN of additional partnerships and collaborations, particularly with the non-traditional funders already present in The Gambia. Moreover, the UN's long-standing relationship with the GCCI offers a window of opportunity through which to investigate linkages with private sector actors in the Chamber's local and regional networks.

2.3 EFFICIENCY

- To what extent has the UNDAF reduced transaction costs?
- How well has the UNDAF promoted joint programming between UN agencies?

As resource mobilization, programme implementation and monitoring were primarily conducted as agency-specific activities and not as DaO, transaction costs⁶⁰ were increased for UN agencies, the GoTG and donors in terms of greater staff time required for UNDAF-related work. It is notable that one of the findings of the 2012 Global UNDAF Study was that the UNDAF has in many cases actually increased programme transaction costs for UN agencies.⁶¹

The lack of harmonization of the business processes followed by the different UN agencies has also reduced efficiency and increased transaction costs. This is a major constraint to the efficiency of joint programming under the UNDAF. It therefore seems that the additional staff time required for UNDAF-related tasks, as well as a lack of harmonized business processes, are likely to be the greatest drivers of the perceived increase in transaction costs under the UNDAF.

Although the OMT has already realized cost savings through the UN House Common Premises and for fuel and travel costs through common procurement, neither a Common Budgetary Framework (CBF) nor a Business Operations Strategy have yet been finalized. As resources are primarily allocated according to individual agency mandates, the development and implementation of a CBF will be a key step towards strengthening DaO in The Gambia UN.

2.4 SUSTAINABILITY

- How sustainable are UNDAF-supported results and strategies as a contribution to national development?

Results achieved through the UNDAF could be sustained where those results align with national partners' priorities and policies, and where the partner organizations have the requisite staff capabilities and

⁵⁸<http://www.bd.undp.org/content/bangladesh/en/home/ourwork/youth/YES/>

⁵⁹ World Bank, *Innovative Financing for Development*, Washington, D.C., 2009, pp. 59 ff.

⁶⁰ Transaction costs are defined as "...the cost associated with the processes and activities that the UN development system engages in, to deliver its programmes at the country level, and which are internal to the UN agencies, as well as those that are incurred by its national partners and donors when interacting with the UN development system: United Nations Development Group, *Definition, Identification and Measurement of In-country Transaction Costs in the Context of 'Delivering as One' Pilot Countries*, New York, 3 October 2010, p. 17:

https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/UNDG_incountry_transaction_costs_FINAL3.pdf

⁶¹ The study also found that the extent to which the UNDAF has reduced the transaction costs of government partners was not clear: Paul Balogun, *The relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF): A report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs*, New York, May 2012, pp. viii, 56.

institutional capacities. The fact that UN advocacy for human rights, gender equality, social protection and other issues has resulted in the enactment of relevant national policies and legislation (see above, “Key Achievements”) points to the sustainability of those efforts.

However, UN exit plans and risk management strategies for business continuity in the UNDAF are not well-defined, and this could hamper the sustainability of results achieved during this UNDAF cycle.

Moreover, although the UN has undertaken considerable capacity building of government counterparts throughout the course of this UNDAF, these activities were carried out on project-specific bases rather than as an UNDAF-wide strategy for institutional strengthening. As the focus has been primarily on the training of individuals, the results of the UN’s capacity building initiatives will be sustainable only if the capacitated staff are retained⁶².

Finally, GoTG stakeholders have limited financial resources – the realization of the PAGE will require at least 50% of its funding from international donors – and it is very likely that the government will continue to require support from the UN and other DPs over the medium to longer term in order to achieve and maintain development results.

2.5 UN COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

- How valid are the stated comparative advantages of the UN System?

At the time of the formulation of the 2012-2016 UNDAF, the UNCT identified several comparative advantages (CAs) of the UN in The Gambia⁶³. The Evaluation found that not only were most of these still valid, but also that the UN had strategically leveraged other significant CAs towards the achievement of UNDAF outcomes, the MDGs and national development priorities.

As an Enabler between the GoTG and Donors

As a consequence of reported human rights violations in The Gambia since 2012, several key bilateral Development Partners have ceased to provide assistance directly to the GoTG. As a result, the UN has become an even more important conduit for ODA to the country; and the UN is seen as a trusted enabling partner both by the GoTG and by DPs.

High Level Technical Expertise and Policy Support

The high level technical expertise of the UN has been demonstrated in each of the UNDAF outcome areas, including health, education, agriculture, economic development, governance, gender equality and disaster risk reduction, as noted above in “Key Achievements”. The UN has played a key role throughout

⁶² Higher paid employment with NGOs, the UN. This is an issue usually considered under civil service reform programmes and beyond the scope of this UNDAF evaluation.

⁶³ These were:

“a. The capacity to influence The Gambian context and its strong relationship with line ministries, as well as the high ability to advocate on sensitive issues.
b. The strength and prestige to mobilize technical support and financial resources and build bridges and links between partners and donors.
c. The UN’s experience in agenda setting and aid coordination.
d. High level technical expertise and international and intercultural staff with high motivation.
e. Networking and knowledge management (information sharing) with the Government.”

The 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF, p. 7

the 2012-2016 UNDAF in building both institutional and individual capacity wide range of topics in each of these areas, at both the service delivery and policy levels.

Advocacy for the Achievement of the MDGs

The UN has well-leveraged its comparative advantage to advocate for the achievement of the MDGs, as demonstrated through the successive MDG progress reports from The Gambia. Indeed, the awareness raising and support of the UN has significantly contributed to the positive results achieved, particularly in the areas of education, gender equality, sanitation, and access to improved water supply, as well as to the achievement of MDG 4, the reduction in infant mortality.⁶⁴

Advocacy on sensitive issues

The UN has demonstrated its ability to influence The Gambian context through its strong and constant advocacy on sensitive issues like human rights and gender equality and empowerment, resulting in the enactment of new legislation, policies and national action plans, for example, the National Plan of Action for Accelerated Abandonment of Female Genital Mutilation 2013-2017 and the National Plan of Action on Gender Based Violence 2013-2017.

2.6 DaO Coherence

The UN system in The Gambia intends to operationalize self-starter DaO status in the 2017-2021 UNDAF. The extent to which there was DaO coherence in the 2012-2016 UNDAF will provide the foundation and lessons learned upon which DaO in upcoming UNDAF will be built.

DaO training was offered to The Gambia UNCT, PCG, OMT and all UN staff in February 2015. The training included a self-assessment exercise which demonstrated that The Gambia team's overall understanding of the DaO approach is incomplete, and that DaO has been only partially realized under the current UNDAF⁶⁵

Only some components of some of the five UNDAF SOPs are functional. There was only one joint programming in this UNDAF cycle, and some agencies implemented projects outside of the UNDAF. Implementation, M&E and resource mobilization were primarily agency-driven rather than DaO. As resources are primarily disbursed according to individual agency mandates, a key step in strengthening DaO in The Gambia UN will be the development and implementation of a Common Budget Framework.

Furthermore, teambuilding exercises which are inclusive of all UN staff may also be one option towards transforming the current siloed, single agency mindset into a DaO "Team Gambia" approach.

3 BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

Best Practices

The 2012-2016 UNDAF presents some aspects of best practices for Delivering as One (DaO) in a non-DaO country. These include PCG, OMT and UNCG management tiers which support UNDAF processes and

⁶⁴ MDG 2014 Report, p. 6

⁶⁵ The training was held from 3-6 February 2015.

operational cohesion; some of the functional elements of the One Leader, Operating as One and Communicating as One SOPs; and one component of the One Programme SOP.⁶⁶

Although there is not yet a Joint Resource Mobilization Strategy for the UNDAF, the use of the UNDAF as a platform for the successful raising of funds for emergency response to the 2012 regional drought and for the EVD is a best practice. The WFP-FAO-UNICEF joint programming approach for the school feeding programme and the WHO-led EVD joint programming response also constitute best practices.

Lessons Learned

This evaluation has identified several crucial lessons learned from the current UNDAF which can inform coordination, cohesion and implementation in the upcoming 2017-2021 UNDAF, including

- **Coordination:** There is a requirement for a good core capacity for coordination and knowledge management within the RCO, even if the UNDAF is relatively small financially.
- **Governance:** The four-tier governance and coordination architecture envisaged for the 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF was overly cumbersome for such a small country office. A two-tiered structure with an UNDAF Steering Committee and Pillar Groups, guided by informal, bilateral exchanges at the RC/OP-SG level, could yield better cohesion and coordination, particularly if supported by clear internal and bilateral communication and a strong knowledge management system.⁶⁷
- **Ownership:** Greater national commitment to and ownership of the UNDAF will require ongoing training on UNDAF processes and on their value added for the GoTG, as well as a much closer alignment of UNDAF and Government priorities to the point where there is no obvious division between UN and GoTG tasks.
- **DaO:** The “DaO culture” is relatively new to The Gambia; and further training and orientation on this approach and its implications for operations, programming, resource mobilization and partnership, is key for buy-in from all of the UN agencies, and for all UN staff, especially as DaO is to be operationalized in the 2017-2021 UNDAF. It will be crucial for the UN to develop its DaO approach prior to marketing it to the GoTG. Teambuilding exercises which are inclusive of all UN staff can contribute to transforming the current siloed, single agency mindset into a DaO team approach.
- **Gender:** There is no strategic approach to the integration of the Gender Programming Principle across all of the UNDAF outcome areas. Gender must be fully integrated into UNDAF activities in order to achieve planned results. The incomplete integration of gender in the 2012-2016 hampered the realization of outcomes under the Gender Thematic Area as well as the measurement of progress under other Thematic Areas.

4 CONCLUSION

Under the UNDAF, the UN’s advocacy and high level technical expertise has been demonstrated in each of its outcome areas at both the service delivery and policy levels. However, its achievements have been under-reported, due to a poorly designed results matrix which incompletely captures results; and progress against plan assessed through this matrix is mixed. As resource mobilization, programme implementation and monitoring were primarily conducted as agency-specific activities and not as DaO, transaction costs

⁶⁶ The RC, UNCT, OMT and UNCG components of the One Leader SOP are functional, but the Results Group component is not; and no components of the CBF are yet finalized: see <https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/The-UN-Development-System-in-country-What-the-data-and-evidence-shows.pdf>

in were increased for UN agencies, the GoTG and donors in terms of greater staff time required for UNDAF-related work.

The effectiveness and efficiency of the UNDAF governance structure was less than anticipated; and its four-tiered structure was too cumbersome for such a small country office. A simplified two-tier structure might function better, particularly if supported by clear internal and bilateral communication and a strong knowledge management system; and a simplified governance structure has been proposed in the draft of the 2017-2021 UNDAF.⁶⁸

The UNCT intends to operationalize DaO in the 2017-2021 UNDAF, and DaO cohesion has been partially developed under the 2012-2016 UNDAF. However, there is still an incomplete understanding of this approach among the UNCT, and further training and orientation on this approach and its implications for operations, programming, resource mobilization and partnership, is key for buy-in from all of the UN agencies. Teambuilding exercises which are inclusive of all UN staff offer one option towards transforming the current siloed, single agency mindset into a DaO team approach.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

Many of the challenges noted in the 2012-2016 UNDAF are seen in UNDAFs in other countries, and the current UNDAF offers several emerging results, best practices and lessons learned which can inform coordination, communication, implementation, monitoring and resource mobilization in the forthcoming UNDAF. The recommendations below are presented towards these objectives; and they have been categorized either as priorities to be undertaken immediately or for implementation over the next twelve to twenty-four months:

Recommendations to be undertaken as priorities

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
UNDAF Calendar and Knowledge Management	1) Develop a joint UN/GoTG calendar for UNDAF meetings, joint monitoring and other UNDAF activities which clearly indicates the parties responsible for the organization and follow up of each event, as well as the expected participants; and 2) Ensure that the minutes and any other documents resulting from these activities are archived with the RCO, to strengthen UNDAF knowledge management	RCO, OP/SG
Resource Mobilization	Develop a joint resource mobilization strategy in collaboration with the GoTG through the MoFEA, including other forms of development financing beyond traditional aid such as non-traditional funders and corporate community investments	UNCT, MoFEA-Aid Coordination Unit, UNCG, consultant
UNCG: oneun website; Working Smarter	1) Launch the planned oneun website as soon as possible; and 2) include an intranet option on to which updates on and communication about the UNDAF, including minutes of meetings, can be uploaded and shared	UNCG, RCO

⁶⁸ The simplified three-tier governance structure proposed in the draft 2017-2021 UNDAF would include an expanded Policy Committee, a Steering Committee and the Results Groups

RCO	Develop a TOR for the RCO to ensure all the functions expected of this office, including UNDAF knowledge management, are referenced; and that the responsibilities for those functions are shared by the RCO staff	UNCT, PCG, RC, RCO
-----	--	--------------------

Recommendations to be implemented during 2017

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
Gender Strategy	Develop a UNCT-wide gender strategy to articulate a strategic approach to the integration of the Gender Programming Principle into all of the UNDAF thematic areas	UNCT, Gender Working Group, consultant
Programming Principles: Gender	To improve the integration of gender as a Programming Principle, designate a roving Gender WG expert to move between other WGs to ensure inclusion of gender in programming and M&E	M&E WG, Gender WG, DRM WG
UNCG - Communications Strategy	Develop a strategic communications strategy which sensitizes GoTG on UNDAF and its VA at all levels, in order to increase national ownership	UNCG, RCO
UNCG – oneun website support	Engage full-time support to manage and update the oneun website once it has been launched, and explore the cost-effective option to engage a fully-funded professional UNV or a corporate volunteer with communications experience	UNCT, UNCG, RCO
Programming Principles	Through the RDT, explore simple M&E tools already developed in other COs for assessment of gender and other programming principles	RCO M&E, Regional UNDOCO
OMT/M&E	Designate an OMT representative to attend the M&E WG meetings	OMT, M&E WG
National Ownership of the UNDAF	1. Conduct induction sessions on the UNDAF and relevant UN system processes and procedures on a six-monthly basis for national partners from grassroots level up to and including policy makers 2, In the 2017-2021 UNDAF, ensure that there is clear and close alignment of Government and UNDAF priorities, and 3. Articulate and explain this alignment and its value-added for both the UN and the GoTG on a continuous basis through a “One Voice” strategy (see also above recommendation on “UNCG Communications Strategy”)	UN M&E WG; Gender WG; DRM Working Group
RBM	Integrate awareness raising of RBM and the other programming principles into the inductions which are to be offered on the UNDAF to national partners	UN M&E WG; Gender WG; DRM Working Group
RCO	Strengthen the capacity of the RCO to work smarter: solicit guidance from RDT and UNDOCO on systems and processes that would reduce staff time and enable	RCO

	working smarter, such as the adaptation of M&E tools that have proved useful in other COs; UNDOCO's soon-to-be-launched online JWP and the UNinfo tool	

Recommendations to be implemented on a continuous basis from 2017 onwards

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
DaO Team Building	Hold annual retreats for entire UN staff	UNCT, RCO
UNDAF Team Building	Hold joint annual retreats including all UN staff together with all GoTG staff supporting UNDAF activities	UNCT, RCO, OP/SG

Recommendations to be implemented during 2017 and 2018

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
UNDAF Capacity Building Assessment	Conduct an UNDAF-wide assessment of institutional and individual capacity building support to the GoTG during the 2012-2016 UNDAF to ascertain the outcomes of these efforts, in order to better inform such activities in the 2017-2021 UNDAF. Based on those results, develop an UNDAF-wide strategy for institutional capacity building and human capital development, including identification of gaps, in order to increase possibilities for sustainability of UNDAF capacity building outcomes, and to reduce duplication of other DPs' initiatives	PCG, consultant
Harmonize GoTG partners' allowances	Using the DPG as a platform, harmonize UN allowances for national stakeholders with other DPs.	RC, OP/SG, DPG, OMT
Mobile money payment of GoTG partner allowances	Explore mobile money/fund transfer by phone to pay national partners' allowances	OMT

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Sources

Resident Coordinator, United Nations Gambia, *Annual Report*, 2014

Resident Coordinator, United Nations Gambia, *Annual Report*, 2015

UNDAF Steering Committee, Minutes of Meeting, 19 October 2015

United Nations Gambia Country, *Terms of Reference – Programme Coordination Group*, March 2016

United Nations Gambia Country Team, *Development Partners Consultative Meeting*, Dakar, 16 March 2016

United Nations Gambia Country Team, *The Gambia UNDAF/DaO 2017-2021 Road Map*, January 2015.

United Nations Gambia Country Team, *Report on PCG Joint Field Monitoring Visit, 9TH - 11TH March 2016*

United Nations Gambia Country Team, *Report on PCG Joint Field Monitoring Visit, 26TH - 28TH November 2014*

Office of the Resident Coordinator, United Nations Gambia, *UN Policy on Payment of Allowance to Government Staff for Meetings, Workshops, Training, Conferences, etc., Effective 1st June 2016*, May 2016

Published Sources

African Development Bank and African Development Fund, *The Gambia: African Development Bank/World Bank Joint Assistance Strategy 2012-2015*, October 2012.

Backson, Sibanda et al., *Gambia UNDAF 2012-2016: Midterm Report*, December 2014

Balogun, Paul, *The relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework(UNDAF): A report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs*, New York, May 2012

Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, Gambia, *Programme for Accelerated Growth and Employment 2012-2015*, Banjul, 2011.

Gambia Bureau of Statistics, *The Population and Housing Census Preliminary Results, 2013*: <http://www.GBoS.gov.gm/uploads/census/The%20Gambia%20Population%20and%20Housing%20Census%202013%20Provisional%20Report.pdf>

Government of The Gambia and the United Nations Development Programme, *The Gambia Common Country Assessment*, September 2015.

Government of The Gambia and the United Nations Development Programme, *The Gambia National Human Development Report*, 2014.

International Development Fund and African Development Bank, *Second Joint Assistance Strategy For The Republic Of The Gambia For Fiscal Years 2012-2015*, October 9, 2012: <http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/Gambia - 2012-2015 - AfDB-World Bank Joint Assistance Strategy.pdf>

Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, The Republic of the Gambia, *Level of Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs): MDG Status Report*, Banjul, June 2014.

Nshimyumuremyi, Adalbert and Yemesrach Assefa Workie, *Africa Economic Outlook: Gambia* (a joint African Development Bank and UNDP Gambia publication), 2015

United Nations Development Group, *Common Principles for Measuring Capacity* (Draft), March 2016

United Nations Evaluation Group, *Guidance Note on the Application of Programming Principles to the UNDAF*, 2010

United Nations Gambia Country Team, *2012-2016 Gambia United Nations Development Assistance Framework*

United Nations General Assembly, *A life of dignity for all: accelerating progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and advancing the United Nations Development agenda beyond 2015*, A report by the Secretary-General, 26 July 2013

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, *The Gambia: Humanitarian Needs Overview*, December 2015: <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/node/118000>

United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 2015*, New York, 2015

World Bank, *Gambia Overview*, 4 October 2016: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/gambia/overview>

World Bank Group, *Financing for Development Post 2015*, Washington, D.C., October 2013.

ANNEX 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Title:	UNDAF Final Evaluation
Location:	Banjul, The Gambia
Application deadline:	10 th June, 2016
Type of contract:	Individual Consultant/Firm
Post level:	International
Languages required:	English
Duration of contract:	35 work days, between July 1 to 31 August 2016

1. Background

This United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) outlines the strategic direction and results expected from cooperation between the Government of The Gambia (GoTG) and the UN Country Team (UNCT) for the period 2012-2016. The UNDAF represents a collective response of the UN system (resident and non-resident UN agencies) to the national development priorities as per the SDGs and the draft PAGE2012-2015, as well as the Vision 2020 document. The UN in The Gambia is made up of 11 Agencies, 8 resident (namely UNDP, FAO, UNICEF, WHO, WFP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNAIDS) and 13 Non-resident (namely OHCHR, UNESCO, UNIDO, OCHA, UNCTAD, IFAD, UNODC, ILO, UNWOMEN).

It also reflects The Gambia's changing economic, social and environmental conditions. This UNDAF was developed in partnership with the Government and civil society, and it builds on lessons from UNDAF (2007 – 2011) cycle and the assessment of the comparative advantages of the UNCT. Overall, it is designed to enhance the UN's focus on results in The Gambia. Under this UNDAF, the UNCT has been working with the GoTG, civil society and other development partners on 3 strategic priorities and objectives as follows:

1. Poverty Reduction and Social Protection: Rights-based poverty reduction and social protection strategies and systems are established that enable vulnerable groups, in particular the poor, women and youth to overcome poverty, increase their productive capacities and generate sustainable livelihoods while protecting the environment.

2. Basic Social Services: Improved access to quality basic social services with particular attention to the vulnerable and marginalized.

3. Governance and Human Rights: Economic and political systems utilise transparent, accountable, participatory and inclusive decision-making processes at national and decentralized levels.

These priorities are referred to as the UNDAF pillars which are supported by 8 outcomes and 23 outputs. The UNDAF resources and technical support are devoted to the achievement of these outcomes and outputs as a guarantee for the delivery of the UNDAF. These outcomes, outputs and indicators and budgets are provided in the Results Matrix. Across the 3 priorities, the UNCT has focused its technical support, resources and advocacy to make tangible contributions to the outcomes. These are critical institutional and behavioural changes that were expected to help achieve national development goals and related MDGs. The GoTG and the UNCT are mutually accountable for the outcomes. Each UN Agency is accountable for its contribution to selected outcomes as per agency mandate and agreed country programmes or projects (CPAPs). This is the

case because, the result matrix of the this UNDAF was formulated by a collection of individual agency plans making it difficult to bring them together in a coherent manner and to ensure “necessary and sufficient” programme logic in the results chain and resource requirements.

While the UNDAF interventions target the whole country, the UN decided to adopt the equity approach with emphasis being placed on selected sectors, regions and target groups in order to achieve sustainable gains in food and nutrition security, education, health care, employment, the environment, economic growth and implementation of international conventions.

To coordinate the implementation of the UNDAF, UNCT established several structures including the UNDAF Policy Committee comprising the Office of the President (the Secretary General and Head of the Civil Service) and the Office of the Resident Coordinator of the UN-system responsible for overall coordination and assuring the interface between the different government agencies and the UN-system; an UNDAF Steering Committee, comprising Permanent Secretaries of key Government Ministries, UN-system agencies, Civil Society representative (TANGO) and bilateral and multilateral Development Partners were established to provide overall direction and guidance at all stages of the UNDAF implementation process and were to report to the UNDAF policy committee; and an UNDAF thematic groups for each outcome co-chaired by the Lead UN agency and the Lead Government ministry responsible for monitoring the implementation of programmes and activities under the UNDAF outcomes. In addition to the above, the Programme Coordination Group (PCG) was established and tasked to technically support the UNCT and consistently ensure that agencies work programmes/plans are aligned to the UNDAF outcomes, coordinate annual reviews and the final review and oversee and arrange joint field visits and other data gathering activities to analyse UNDAF programmes and projects as required.

2. Country Context

The Location and People

The Gambia is located on the West African coast and extends about 500 km inland, with a population density of 174 persons per square km. The width of the country varies from 24 to 28 km and has a land area of 10,689 square kilometres. The Gambia is the smallest country in continental Africa, and is bordered on the North, South and East by the Republic of Senegal and on the West by the Atlantic Ocean.

Overall, provisional results of the 2013 population and housing census show that 1,882,450 persons were enumerated in The Gambia, and revealed that there are more females than males in the country; 50.5% female compared to 49.5% male. The population primarily comprises of youth due to a high fertility rate and low life expectancy. Nearly 40% of the population is below 15 years, 21% between 15-24 years, and only 3.2% above 65 years. This demographic trend contributes to a high dependency ratio, given that the average household size is 8.3. The country is also undergoing rapid urbanization, characterized by significant rural to urban migration. The urban population increased from 50% in 2001 to 58%, with an annual rate of urbanization of 3.7% (MoFEA, 2011). The DHS 2013 preliminary report shows maternal mortality ratio at 433/100,000 live births; annual population growth rate is 3.3%, Crude Birth Rate and Crude Death Rates are estimated at 46.2 and 19.2 per 100,000 respectively. Infant Mortality Rate is 34 per 1000 live births (DHS 2013) while Under 5 Mortality Rate is 109 per 1000 live births (MICS 2010). The country has a high fertility rate estimated at 5.8 births per woman, resulting in a very youthful population structure. About 42% of the population is below the age of 15 and 22% is between 15 and 24 years.

The Gambia is multi-ethnic and multi-religious society, exhibiting a high degree of ethnic and religious tolerance. The country's main ethnicities are the Mandinka (42%), Wolof (16%), Fula (18), Jola, Serer and Sarahule groups (2003 Census). The population is predominantly Muslim at 90%, Christians (8%), and indigenous African beliefs (2%) (2003 Census). Although a certain degree of diversity exists in cultural beliefs and practices among ethnic groups, similar overarching traditions contribute to strong social cohesion. This has important bearing on informal, community-based social protection, which is the main source of support for the poor and vulnerable.

The Gambia is a patriarchal society characterized by gender inequality. Though slowly changing, gender inequality is still pervasive. The Gambia has a Gini coefficient value of 0.594, ranking it 128 out of 148 countries in the 2012 index (HDI, 2013). Although women play a major socio-economic role in Gambian society, their access to land, productive resources, healthcare and education remains very limited due to discriminatory gender cultural bias and practices. This has prompted the Government to focus attention on women's empowerment through a gender policy framework. In 2010, the Government enacted the Women's Act. New women's empowerment initiatives have been explored to impact on gender stereotypes as a key driver of discrimination against women and girls leading to poverty and social vulnerability.

The Political context

The Gambia is a multi-party parliamentary democracy with a government divided into executive, legislative, and judicial branches. A coup d'état in 1994 deposed the first president, who had ruled since independence in 1965, and suspended the country's 1970 Constitution. A presidential election in 1996 brought in the then Military leader, retired Col. Yahya A.J.J. Jammeh as Head of State with 56% of the vote. The Alliance for Patriotic Reorientation and Construction (APRC) won the legislative elections in January 1997 with 33 of the 45 seats in the National Assembly. The APRC led by President Jammeh have dominated the political sphere since 1994.

The Gambia continues to enjoy relative stability and peace. However, the human rights context came under strong scrutiny with the lifting of the moratorium on the death penalty in August, 2012 and the subsequent execution of 11 prisoners. In July 2015, The President in exercise of his prerogative of mercy pardoned over 200 prisoners including death row inmates. In November 2014, two Special Rapporteurs on extrajudicial executions and on torture and inhuman treatment made a joint mission to The Gambia on the invitation of the government. The mission was however suspended as the two Rapporteurs claimed they were denied unrestricted and confidential access to "restricted areas" of the central prison, which was contrary to the agreed TORs of the mission. The reports of both rapporteurs have been released. On 30 December, 2014 there was an attempt to overthrow the government. Alleged plotters, and persons suspected to be involved were arrested and detained. The Minister of Justice presented The Gambia's human rights record at the Universal Periodic Review of the UN Human Rights Council in October, 2014 and received 171 recommendations from 62 countries on various issues.

Preparation for the 2016/2017 presidential and parliamentary elections has started. A UN Needs Assessment Mission (NAM) was fielded in July, 2015. In general, the NAM recommends a flexible UN support to the elections. It also recommends that government introduces measures to create a more conducive environment for the conduct of elections and establish opportunities for dialogue with the opposition parties. The Gambia anticipates peaceful, free and fair elections to take place in 2016 and 2017,

The Economy and Economic Context

The Gambia is classified as a low-income economy country, with Gross National Income (GNI) per capita of US\$ 500 in 2012. Low-income economies by World Bank Classification are countries with GNI US\$ 1,025 or less. The Gambia has an open economy with limited natural resources, and is ranked 172 out of 187 in the United Nations Development Programme's Human Development Report (HDR), 2014. The main drivers of economic growth for The Gambia remain the agriculture sector and tourism industry⁶⁹. Agriculture accounted for around 25% of GDP over 1994-2013 and provides work for 70% of the labour force. The industrial sector accounted for about 15% of GDP over the same period, and consisted mostly of construction and agro-processing activities. Services accounted for 60% of GDP, with trade and transport, and communications being the two largest components. Tourism is Gambia's primary foreign-exchange earner.

While mixed, there has also been progress in the areas of public sector, economic and fiscal management, civil service and justice, anti-corruption and public procurement as a result of various reforms implemented by the Government. However, The Gambia remains vulnerable to external shocks as the main sources of domestically generated foreign exchange come from tourism and re-exports trade, activities heavily dependent on exogenous factors; and agriculture, which employs the majority of the labour force, and is most vulnerable to weather conditions.

The Gambian economy had been generally strong in the past decade, with an average annual real GDP growth rate of about 6% during 2003-2006, and a slight reduction to 5.3% during 2006-2010. Despite the global economic crisis in 2007-2008, economic growth has remained robust, mainly owing to the good performance in the agricultural and service sectors. Indeed, the service sector's contribution to GDP is becoming increasingly dominant, having contributed 60% of GDP in 2011 (African Economic Outlook, 2013). Of concern is that the long term GDP growth in The Gambia, which from 1994 through 2013 has been undulating and quite unstable, averaging a modest 3.5% a year, against an average of 4.1 percent for sub-Saharan Africa. The performance of the agriculture sector, which in itself depends on weather conditions, and the ability of the other sectors of the economy, especially tourism, to eventually counterbalance swings in output are key elements that explain growth variability. Current investment in these promising sectors is weak and requires substantial mid- to long-term planning and investment. For some time, The Gambia has faced challenging and unpredictable macroeconomic policy environment, characterized by sudden policy shifts, extra-budgetary spending, excessive borrowing, weak institutions, and efficient resource utilization, which negatively affected growth. This has generated uncertainty and hampered economic activity, and over the long term could undermine confidence in the economy. The persistent fiscal deficits have largely been financed by short-term domestic borrowing, pushing up interest rates and crowding out private sector investments⁷⁰.

The Gambia's economy and macroeconomic stability is also vulnerable to various risks and structural constraints. The two most critical channels of vulnerability include the heavy debt burden and susceptibility to macroeconomic shocks and environmental risks (African Economic Outlook, 2013).

Household Poverty and Vulnerability

The Gambia is among the poorest countries in Africa. Poverty remains widespread in spite of a decline in the last decade. Income poverty and household food insecurity are widespread with nearly half of the population (48.4%) living below the absolute poverty line of US\$1.25 per day; while 36.7% live in extreme poverty (2010). About 40% of people are considered 'working poor'; meaning that their earning capacity

69. Programme for Accelerated Growth and Employment (2012-15)

70. THE GAMBIA: Policies to Foster Growth – Volume Two (World Bank, p52)

and standard of living is inadequate to meeting basic needs. Despite being a service led economy, about 46% of rural households fall below the food poverty line (MoFEA, 2011). Poverty is higher in rural as opposed to urban areas mainly due to a reliance on agriculture for income and exclusion from economic opportunities and social services. The highest incidences of poverty are in Kuntaur (79%), Janjanbureh (73.2%), as compared to Banjul (16.4%) and Kanifing (26%) (IHS, 2010). Notably, urban poverty is also rising because of increasing urbanization; almost one-third of the population in Kanifing is classified as poor (26%). Poverty disproportionately affects populations of young people and the elderly. IHS data (2010) shows higher poverty rates among children 0-5 years (55.6% headcount rate) and 6 -14 years (55.8%), as well as those aged 65 years and above (57.9%), indicating a high dependency rate, requiring substantial investments in reproductive care and social services. This high dependency burden and rapidly urbanizing population are creating new poverty and welfare challenges, including growing demands on access to reproductive care in both urban and rural localities and pressure on basic services in urban areas. Consequently, these issues have important implications for social protection policy and programming.

When assessed from a multidimensional poverty perspective, the poverty headcount is even higher, as 60.4% of the population live in multi-dimensional poverty, while 17.6% are vulnerable to multiple deprivations in education, health and broader standard of living (Multiple Poverty Index, 2006; HDI 2013). Poverty in The Gambia is concentrated in rural areas, among very young and elderly populations, and is strongly associated with the education level and sector in which the head of household is employed. The multidimensional poverty study (2015) found the households where the head has no formal education or did not complete lower basic cycle, being twice more likely to be poor compared to households where the head has completed primary school. Households headed by subsistence farmers and unskilled workers have significantly high rates of poverty (79.3 per cent and 65.4 per cent respectively).

3. UNDAF Evaluation Context

Since the formulation of the UNDAF, a number of internal reviews have taken place. These are as follows:

1. UNDAF Mid-Year Review, 2014
2. UNDAF Annual Review, 2012

For each of these reviews, findings and lessons learnt have been documented, debated and converted into recommendations for improved programming and programme implementation. In addition to these UNDAF specific reviews, the following reviews, assessment and evaluations of the UN have also taken place:

1. MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF), 2014
2. Post 2015 National Consultations, 2013
3. UNICEF Mid-Term Evaluation, 2014
4. UNFPA Mid-Term Evaluation, 2014
5. Post 2015 National Consultations
6. UNDP CPAP Mid-Term Evaluation, 2014
7. WFP, Mid-Term Evaluation of the Capacity Development Programme, 2014
8. Universal Periodic Reviews, 2012 and 2014

The Government has conducted a midterm evaluation of its medium term development strategy – the PAGE 2014/15 and has produced MDG Reports for the years 2012, 2013 and 2014. In addition to these, a

number of sector specific reviews, assessments and evaluation have been conducted as well as a range of national surveys conducted by or in conjunction with The Gambia Bureau of Statistics (GBOS). These include the Population Census 2013; Demographic Health Survey (DHS) 2013; SMART Nutrition Survey 2015; and the Food Security Assessments 2013, 2014 and 2016.

The proposed evaluation will reference these studies, as well as sector-specific reviews and evaluations. It will focus primarily upon the UNDAF period, i.e. 2012 - 2016. It will provide an independent assessment of the specific short- to medium-term results achieved and UN The Gambia's contribution to national development priorities. It will consider what has worked, what has not worked and why. It will therefore be expected to provide concrete recommendations and information for strengthening UN programming, UN results and UN coordination in the future.

The primary users of the evaluation findings at the country level will be the UN Country Team (resident and non-resident, management and technical level staff), key government counterparts, Development Partners, NGOs and civil society, alongside. On the global stage, the evaluation should contribute to knowledge regarding good programming and programme delivery practices.

4. Purpose, Objectives and Scope of the evaluation

4.1. Purpose

The UN Development Group (UNDG) requires all UN country offices to undertake an evaluation of their Programme of Cooperation (UNDAF) in the penultimate year of the programming cycle. To this end, the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) in collaboration with UN Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO) has issued guidance on the required Management Structure and Terms of Reference to ensure quality standards are maintained. The planned UNDAF evaluation must observe the parameters of the UNEG/DOCO guidance, whilst ensuring an inclusive approach which involves stakeholder representation in key decision-making processes. This is critical to ensure the Evaluation is nationally owned, encompasses topics of national interest and has application in the wider national sphere.

The purpose of the evaluation is twofold:

- i) To support greater accountability of the UN to stakeholders – The evaluation will enable the various stakeholders in the UNDAF process, including national counterparts and Development Partners, to hold the UNCT and other parties accountable for fulfilling their roles and commitments.
- ii) To support learning – the evaluation must provide clear recommendations for strengthening programming and results at the country level, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next UNDAF programme cycle and for improving United Nations coordination at the country level. The UN, the Government of The Gambia and UNDAF stakeholders should be able to learn from the process of documenting good practices and lessons learned which can then be shared with UNDOCO and used for the benefit of other countries.

4.2 Objectives

The evaluation has four key objectives:

1. To assess the contribution of the UN through the UNDAF to national development priorities and results, including international and regional commitments on human rights and gender equality,

and achievement of the MDGs through making judgements using evaluation criteria based on evidence.

2. To identify the factors that have affected the UN's contribution, identifying, understanding and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks that influenced this contribution (learning).
3. To reach conclusions concerning the UN's contribution across the scope being examined.
4. To provide actionable recommendations for improving the UN's contribution, especially for incorporation into the new UNDAF. These recommendations should be logically linked to the conclusions and draw upon lessons learned identified through the evaluation, including a review of the UNDAF management structure and processes to identify good practice going forward.

4.3 Scope

The UNDAF encompasses both development and humanitarian assistance, with a focus on building the capacity of the Government of The Gambia to undertake its responsibilities as the primary duty bearer as well as support and empower rights-holders to claim their rights. In response to national priorities, the UN in The Gambia supports the Government in three inter-linked and mutually reinforcing priority areas: Poverty Reduction and Social Protection, Basic Social Services and Governance and Human Rights. The three priority areas include the following 8 programme/outcome areas:

1. Poverty Reduction and Social Protection
 - a. Capacities of institutions strengthened and policies in place for pro-poor and equitable distribution of economic growth, employment, planning and budgeting;
 - b. National Social Protection system and services developed and implemented
 - c. Environmental Sustainability and Disaster Risk Reduction systems and services operationalised.
2. Basic Social Services
 - a. Increased equitable access and coverage of quality reproductive, maternal, new-born and child health services and improved response to the main diseases.
 - b. Access to high quality and relevant education and skills for youth, children and disadvantaged adults enhanced.
 - c. Improved national capacity in coordinating and delivering quality HIV prevention care and support services, including access to PCGCT services.
3. Governance and Human Rights
 - a. Improved gender equity, equality and women empowerment for social transformation and national development.
 - b. Institutions and capacities of state actors, non-state actors and oversight bodies enhanced to promote accountability, human rights, equitable access to justice for all and people's participation in decision-making processes at all levels.

The evaluation will review delivery and achievement of results across all 8 programme Outcomes and 23 outputs, contributed to by the UN system in The Gambia. It should also include analysis of the level of mainstreaming of the five UN programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) in the programme. With respect to timeframe, this evaluation should be completed out over a 35 day period.

5. Evaluation Questions and Methodology

The evaluation should be a programmatic evaluation that assesses performance against the given programme framework. The UN contribution should be against national development outcomes contained in the results framework that specifies its strategic intent and objectives. As such, and in line with the UN System's mandate to promote national ownership and capacity development, the evaluation is country-led, with national partners, both within Government and civil society, co-determining what is to be evaluated, jointly assessing the quality of the evaluation and its application to the wider national sphere. The overall approach should be participatory and orientated towards learning how to jointly enhance development results at the national level. The Evaluation should also be gender and human rights responsive and should conform to UNEG norms and standards for evaluations, as well as ethical guidelines. It will be carried out by a lead international and a local consultant.

The evaluation will assess delivery of the UNDAF outcomes and broader contribution to The Gambia PAGE 2012 - 2015. Given that the realisation of UNDAF outcomes involves a number of partners, establishing a causal linkage between the development intervention and the observed result (attribution) may prove problematic. The evaluation will therefore consider the contribution of the UN to the UNDAF Outcomes in light of national strategies and actions designed to support the planned change.

The primary focus of the evaluation will be at the Outcome level. As the assessment will be undertaken during the penultimate year of the UNDAF, it will not be a standard summative evaluation and will require some degree of anticipation in terms of the likelihood of outcome delivery. It will be for the Consultant to establish in the Inception Report how they plan to manage this challenge, without compromising the quality.

The standard set of evaluation criteria across all UNDAF evaluations is to be used, namely:

- i) Relevance - The extent to which the objectives of UNDAF are consistent with country needs, national priorities (including National Strategy for Gender Development) the country's international and regional commitments, including on human rights (core human rights treaties, including International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination, Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Convention on the Rights of Children etc.) and the recommendations of Human Rights mechanisms (including the treaty bodies, special procedures and UPR), sustainable development, environment, and the needs of women and men of all ages, young people, boys and girls and most vulnerable groups in the country. To what extent was the UNDAF informed by substantive human rights and gender analyses that identified underlying causes and barriers to Human Rights and Gender Equality?
- ii) Effectiveness - The extent to which the UN contributed to, or is likely to contribute to, the outcomes defined in the UNDAF and to the degree to which were the results were equitably distributed among the targeted groups. To what extent was a human rights-based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the UNDAF? Did the intervention contribute to empowerment of rights holders, especially women and young people, to claim and duty bearers to fulfil Human Rights and Gender Equality standards? The evaluation should also note how the unintended results, if any, have affected national development positively or negatively and to what extent have they been foreseen and managed.

- iii) Efficiency - The extent to which outcomes were achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.). The extent to which resource allocation took into account or prioritised most marginalised groups including women and girls. To what extent were adequate resources provided for integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in the UNDAF?
- iv) Sustainability - The extent to which the benefits from a development intervention have continued, or are likely to continue, after it has been completed. In particular, if the transition from developing *individual* capacity in the short-term to creating *institutional* capacity in the long-term has been made. The range of requirements should be considered, including creation of technical expertise, financial independence and mechanisms through which rights-holders may participate in and assert the fulfilment of their rights. To what extent did the UNDAF contribute to developing an enabling environment (including capacities of rights holders and duty bearers) and institutional changes to advance Human Rights and Gender Equality issues?
- v) The involvement of government in the implementation of UNDAF can be a proxy for sustainability of outcomes, especially if they are processes
- vi) Impact –Assess the changes in the well-being of individuals, households and communities attributed to the UNDAF. Identify the contribution of UNDAF to the PAGE Outcomes. Identify the changes that have occurred and provide accountability of the UN system. It will also provide feedback to help improve the design of the next UNDAF.

During assessment, using the above criteria, the evaluators should identify the various factors that explain performance. Where these factors have been identified as UNDAF outcomes in their own right, they should be considered as both results and enabling factors. The evaluators must include reference to:

- i) UN Coordination - The extent to which UN Coordination created or encouraged synergies among agencies, optimal results and avoidance of duplication? The extent to which harmonisation measures at the operational level contribute to improved efficiency and results?
- ii) UN Programming Principles - To what extent were the UNDAF programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) considered and mainstreamed in the chain of results? Were any shortcomings due to a failure to take account of programming principles during implementation? Were adequate resources allocated to enable the application and implementation of UNDAF programming principles and related results?
- iii) How well did the UN use its partnerships (with civil society/private sector/local government/parliament/national human rights institutions/gender equality advocates/international development partners) to improve performance? To what extent was the “active, free, and meaningful” participation of all stakeholders (in particular vulnerable groups including women and girls) ensured in the UNDAF process?
- iv) Did the UN undertake appropriate risk analysis and take appropriate actions to ensure that results to which it contributed are not lost?
- v) How well do the indicators of the current UNDAF depict the results and inform decision making process.

- vi) Responsiveness - How adequately did the UN during planning and implementation of the UNDAF respond to changes in national priorities and to additional requests from national counterparts, as well as to shifts caused by major external factors and evolving country context (e.g. natural disaster, elections)?
- vii) To what extent did the UNDAF Governance and Management Structures promote or challenge delivery? Could outcome groups be better defined and operationalised in future?
- viii) Involvement of Government

The evaluation will not use a pre/post comparison design and, therefore, does not lend itself to specifically attributing effects to the UNDAF. The UNDAF evaluation should draw on a variety of data collection methods, including but not limited to:

- document review;
- semi-structured key stakeholder interviews;
- surveys;
- focus groups;
- outcome mapping; and,
- Observational visits.

These should be identified based upon availability, logistical constraints (travel, costs, time, etc.) and ethical considerations. Data should be systematically disaggregated by sex, age, geographical region, and to the extent possible, other contextually-relevant markers of equity. It is anticipated that the inception report will include an evaluation matrix linking the data collection methods to the evaluation criteria and questions. Analysis should combine qualitative and quantitative tools, triangulating information sources and findings where possible for validation purposes.

6. Management and Conduct of the Evaluation

6.1 Evaluation Management Structure

UNDAF evaluations are country-level evaluations. As such, they are jointly commissioned by the UNCT and the national government. The Consultant is expected to work under the supervision of a dual-tiered evaluation management structure.

1. Direct supervision will be provided by the UN Programme Coordination Group (PCG), with specific guidance provided by the M & E Group. For this purpose, the PCG will be expanded to include two representatives from the national counterparts (the Heads of the Policy Analysis Unit and the Directorate of Development Planning). The group will be responsible for the day-to-day oversight and management of the evaluation. The key roles of the PCG are:
 - To prepare the terms of reference for the evaluation in coordination with the Evaluation Steering Committee (UNCT);
 - To lead the hiring of the team of external consultants, reviewing proposals and approving the selection of the Consultant;
 - To supervise and guide the Consultant in each step of the evaluation process;
 - To review, provide substantive comments and approve the inception report, including the work plan, analytical framework and methodology;

- To review and provide substantive feedback to the draft and final evaluation reports, for quality assurance purposes;
 - To ensure the quality and independence of the evaluation and to guarantee its alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines;
 - To identify and ensure the participation of relevant stakeholders in coordination with the UNCT throughout the evaluation process;
 - To ensure the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable; and,
 - To contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response.
2. The decision-making organ for the UNDAF Evaluation will be the UNCT. For purposes of the evaluation, the UNCT will be expanded to include two national counterparts. Other key stakeholders such as national civil society organizations and Development Partner representatives may also be added.

6.2 Consultant Profile

The consultant should have the following profile:

- a. Minimum 10 years' experience of conducting complex evaluations, including at least one UNDAF evaluation and one Gender Equality and Human Rights responsive evaluation.
- b. Master's degree in International Development, Public Administration, Evaluation or related field
- c. Extensive experience of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods
- d. A strong record in designing and leading evaluations, using a wide range of evaluation approaches
- e. Process management and facilitation skills, including ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders
- f. Strong understanding of the United Nations system and UNDAF programming processes and procedures
- g. Ability to assess the application of the five UN Programming Principles: human rights (the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system), gender equality (especially gender analysis), environmental sustainability, results-based management, and capacity development.
- h. Familiarity of national planning processes.
- i. Experience of The Gambia context is desirable.
- j. Strong management, communication, interview and writing skills.
- k. Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.
- l. Proficiency in English.

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. In particular, evaluators must be free and clear of perceived conflicts of interest. To this end, interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly and substantively involved, as an employee or consultant, in the formulation of strategies and programming relating to the UNDAF under review.

7. Evaluation Process and timeframe

The Consultant must prepare an inception report that operationalizes the design elements of the ToRs. The report should include the results of a desk review, description of evaluation methodology/methodological approach, data collection plan, additional data collection tools and analysis methods, key informants, evaluation questions, performance criteria, issues to be studied, work plan and reporting requirements. The report should also include an evaluability assessment, foreseen limitations and risks, team composition and distribution of tasks, resource requirements and logistic support. To facilitate the development of the inception report, a list of documents will be provided in to the evaluator. The PCG will review and provide substantive comments to the report and submit to the UNCT for approval.

The next stage will be the data collection and analysis process, which should be in close consultation with the Resident Coordinator's Office who will ensure coordination with the PCG and the UNCT. Preliminary findings and draft report should be presented to the PCG and UNCT. Feedback received should be taken into account when preparing the final report. The evaluators will produce an 'audit trail' indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the final report. The final will be produced in accordance with UNEG Norms and Standards

Once the evaluation report has been validated by the UNCT, it will be made publicly available through posting on the UNDG and UNCT websites. The UNCT will develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations within 4 weeks after completion, including a timeframe and responsibilities for follow up. Lessons learned from the evaluation will be extracted and disseminated in order to contribute to strategic planning, learning, advocacy and decision-making at all levels, including for the formulation of the UNDAF successor document.

ANNEX 2

EVALUATION TIMETABLE AND DELIVERABLES

Date	Time	Name/Group/Institution	Location	Persons Met
20-22 September	Home-based document review by Consultants			
Wednesday, 21 September	15:30	Introductory Skype call with Mustapha	Dubai	Mr. Mustapha Yarbo, M&E Specialist, RCO; Annette
Thursday, 22 September				
Friday, 23 September				
Monday, 26 September		International Consultant arrives in Banjul		
Tuesday, 27 September	09:30	Orientation meeting with consultants	UNDP	Mustapha; Mr. Yusupha Dibba, National Consultant; Annette
	11:45		UNICEF	Mustapha; Ms. Sara Beysolow Nyanti, Assistant Representative, UNICEF; Annette
	13:00	Security Briefing	UNDSS	Mr. Paul Mendy, UN Security Assistant, UNDSS; Mustapha; Annette
	14:30	UNDP courtesy call	UNDP	Mustapha, Annette; Mr. Fernando Abaga Edjang, Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP;
Wednesday, 28 September	08:30	Review of questionnaire framework; inception report	Ocean Bay Hotel	Annette, Yusupha
Thursday, 29 September	09:00	PCG meeting	UNDP	Mustapha, Annette, Yusupha
		DP meeting	UN House	
Friday, 30 September	09:30	Pillar 2, Social Protection; aid coordination; DaO	UNHCR	Mr. Sekou K. Saho, Head of Office; Mr. Alieu Marr, Community Service Assistant; Ms. Isatou E. Gillen-Dibba, Public Health Assistant; Mr. Buramanding Jaiteh, Protection Associate; Annette; Yusupha; Sekou
Monday, 3 October	08:30		WFP	Ms. Angela Cespedes, Representative/Country Director, WFP; Mr. Francis Abanzi, Head of Programme, WFP; Mr. Mustapha Jammeh, M&E Officer, WFP; Annette; Seikou
	12:00		UNDP	Mr. Fernando Abaga Edjang, Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP; Annette; Seikou
	15:00		UNAIDS	Ms Sirra. Ndow, Head Country Office; Annette; Seikou
Tuesday, 4 October	11:00	Outcome 4	UNFPA	Mr. Kunle Adeniyi, Head of Office; Mr. Momodou Mboge, Assistant Resident Representative; Mr. Alieu Sarr, National Programme Officer M&E; Fatou Kinteh, Gender Working Group Focal Point Annette; Seikou

Tuesday, 4 October	2:30	Pillar 2	WHO	Dr. Charles Sagoe-Moses, Country Representative; Mr. Momodou Ceesay, N PO/ Health Economist; Kebba M.S Jiba, NPO/EPI; Bakary Jargo, NPO/Family Health; Momodu Gassama, NPO/Health Promotion; Dr. Sharmila Lareef Jah, NPO/ Disease Control Surma Bajaha, AO; Sally Ceesay; WR Secretary Annette; Seikou
Wednesday, 5 October	09:30	PCG	UNDP	Mustapha, UNDP; Rupert Leighton, Deputy Country Representative UNICEF; Annette, Seikou
	11:00		FAO	Mariatou Njie, Assistant Resident Representative; Mustapha Ceesay, Agronomist; Yankuba Sawo, Nutritionist Annette; Seikou
	14.30	Pillar 2	UNICEF	Mr. Rupert, UNICEF; Annette; Seikou
Thursday, 6 October	10.00	UNDAF Coordination	MOFEA	Mr. Alagie Fadera, Director, Development Planning; Mr. Muhamadou Lamin Jaiteh, Deputy Permanent Secretary; Ebrima M.B.S. Kinteh, Principal Planner; Lamin Jobe, M & E Specialist; Aisha Camara, Principal Planner; Samba Sowe, Senior Economist; Mariama Bah, Assistant Secretary; Richard Gomez, Planner; Rene Anthony Gomez, Planner; Abdoulie Nyass, Cadet Planner Annette, Seikou
Thursday, 6 October	12:00	GoTG Aid Coordination	MOFEA	Juldeh Ceesay, Deputy Permanent Secretary; Bai Madi Ceesay, Director of Budgeting; Mustapha Samateh, Director of Public Private Partnership; Pa Manneh, Deputy Director of Loans; Sulayman Gaye, Principal Economist; Isatou F. Camara Principal Development Planner; Mariama Jeng, Senior Economist; Kebba Touray; Economist; Abdoulie Jeng, Cadet Economist Annette; Seikou
Thursday, 6 October	15:00	Contextual background	UNDP	Economic Advisor; Annette
Monday, 10 October	11.00	Outcome 7	PS, Vice President's Office	Nancy Nyang, Permanent Secretary; Bintou Gassama, Deputy Permanent Secretary; Binta Jammeh, Executive Director Women's Bureau; Omar Kanteh M & E Coordinator

				Seikou
Wednesday, 12 October	10.00	Civil Society Partners	TANGO Office	Ousman Yabo, Director; Kebba K. Barrow, Programme Officer Networking; Tabu Njie Sarr, Programme Officer Training; Yadicon Njie Eribo, Head of FAWEGAM; John C. Njie, Head of YMCA; Burang Danjo, Programme Officer Concern Universal; Bakary Fadera Programme officer, Action Aid Education Unit Annette, Seikou
Thursday, 13 October	13.00	Private Sector Partners	GCCI Office	Alieu Secka, Chief Executive Officer; Beatrice A. Mboge, Director, Corporate Services Annette, Seikou
	15:00	Operations Management Team	UNICEF	Mr. Alpha Cisse, OMT Focal Point; Annette
	16:00	Overview of aid ecosystem in Gambia	US Embassy	Ms. Patricia Alsop, Ambassador, Annette
Friday, 14 October	12:30	Gender WG	UN House	Ms. Fatou Kinteh., Gender WG Focal Point, Annette
	23:00	NRA questionnaire emailed to all NRAs		Annette
Monday, 17 October	11:30`	M&E Working Group	WFP	Mustafa Jammeh, M&E Officer, WFP Annette
	11.00	Outcome 8	Solicitor General's Office	Safie Sankareh, Solicitor General; BafoJeng, State Council Seikou
	15:00	Pillar 3	UNDP	Basirou Jahumpa, Programme Specialist, UNDP Annette
Tuesday, 18 October	10.00		Department of Youth and Sports	Musa Mbye, Director, Planning and Programmes; Sainey Drammeh, Executive Director, PIAS; Alajie Jarju; Programme Manager, youth Council; Mariama Sima, Programme Officer Seikou
	16.30	UN Communications Group	UN House	Ms. Sally; Communications, UNICEF; Annette
Wednesday, 19 October	9:30	DRM Working Group	WFP	Frances, Head of DRM Working Group; Annette
	13.00	Ministry of Water Resources, Environment and Natural Resources	Ministry	Bubacar Jallow, Principal Climate Change officer; Ebrima Colley, Senior Planner; Hadijatou Njie, Administrative Officer Seikou

Thursday, 20 October	9:30	Scheduling, invitation to validation	RCO	Thomas, Resident Coordinator Specialist Annette, Seikou
	15:00	Ministry of Education	Regional Office, Kanifing	Andrew Gomez, Head M & E Unit; Ousman Bah, Acting Director Region 5; Abdoulie N. Baacha, Senior Budget Officer; Musa Susa; Director, Region 4 Seikou
	16:00	UNDAF funding	EC	Jossalin Amalfi, Programme Officer Annette
Friday, 21 October	9:30	Ministry of Health activities in UNDAF	UN House	Mr. Baboucar Joof, Principal Health Planner Annette
	9:30	Ministry of Agriculture in UNDAF	UN House	Mr. Bakary Sanyang, Head of Planning Services Unit Seikou
	11:00	UNCT briefing	UN Library	UNCT; Annette; Seikou
Tuesday, 25 October	12:00	GoTG briefing	UN Library	Mr. Alagie Fadera, Director, Development Planning; Mr. Muhamadou Lamin Jaiteh, Director, Development Planning Annette; Seikou
Wednesday, 26 October	9:00	Validation Session	UN Library	See Annex 6, “Summary Minutes of Validation Session”, below, for list of attendees
Tuesday, 8 November		Amalgamated UNDAF Outcome figures received from RCO		Annette
		Submission of draft report		Annette
	RCO circulates draft report to stakeholders for comments – to be received within two weeks			
	RCO consolidates comments from stakeholders and returns to Team Leader to finalize report			
		Submission and approval of final report		Annette

ANNEX 3

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Institution	Name	Title
Government		
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Mr. Alagie Fadera	Director, Development Planning
Office of the President	Mr. Muhamadou Lamin Jaiteh	Deputy Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Ebrima M.B.S. Kinteh	Principal Planner
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Lamin Jobe	M & E Specialist
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Aisha Camara	Principal Planner
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Samba Sowe	Senior Economist
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Mariama Bah	Assistant Secretary
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Richard Gomez	Planner
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Rene Anthony Gomez	Planner
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Abdoulie Nyass	Cadet Planner
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Juldeh Ceesay	Deputy Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Bai Madi Ceesay	Director of Budgeting
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Mustapha Samateh	Director of Public Private Partnership
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Pa Manneh	Deputy Director of Loans
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Sulayman Gaye	Principal Economist
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Isatou F. Camara	Principal Development Planner
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Mariama Jeng	Senior Economist
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Kebba Touray	Economist
Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Abdoulie Jeng	Cadet Economist
Vice President's Office	Nancy Nyang	Permanent Secretary
Vice President's Office	Bintou Gassama	Deputy Permanent Secretary
Women's Bureau	Binta Jammeh	Executive Director Women's Bureau

Women's Bureau	Omar Kanteh	M & E Coordinator
Ministry of Justice	Mrs. Safie Sankareh	Solicitor General
Ministry of Justice	BafoJeng	State Council
Ministry of Youth & Sports	Musa Mbye	Director, Planning and Programmes
Ministry of Youth & Sports	Sainey Drammeh	Executive Director, PIAS
Ministry of Youth & Sports	Alajie jarju	Programme Manager, youth Council
Ministry of Youth & Sports	Mariama Sima	Programme Officer
Ministry of Water Resources	Bubacar Jallow	Principal Climate Change officer
Ministry of Water Resources	Ebrima Colley	Senior Planner
Ministry of Water Resources	Hadijatou Njie	Administrative Officer
Ministry of Justice	Safie Sankareh	Solicitor General
	BafoJeng	State Council
Ministry of Education	Andrew Gomez	Head M & E Unit
Ministry of Education	Ousman Bah	Acting Director Region 5
Ministry of Education	Abdoulie N. Baacha	Senior Budget Officer
Ministry of Education	Musa Susa	Director, Region 4
Ministry of Agriculture	Bakary Sanyang	Head of Planning Services Unit
Ministry of Health	Baboucar Joof	Principal Health Planner
UN Agencies		
UNRCO	Ms. Ade Mamonyane Lekoetje	UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative
UNRCO	Mr. Thomas Njuiri Kimaru	UN Resident Coordination Specialist
UNRCO	Mr. Mustapha Yarbo	Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist
UNDP	Mr. Fernando Abaga Edjang	Deputy Resident Representative
UNDP	Mr. Basirou	Programme Specialist Governance and Human Rights
UNDP	Mr. Abdoulie A. Janneh	National Economist
UNDSS	Mr. Paul Mendy	UN Security Assistant
UNHCR	Mr. Sekou K. Saho	Head of Office
UNHCR	Mr. Alieu Marr	Community Service Assistant
UNHCR	Ms. Isatou E. Gillen-Dibba	Public Health Assistant
UNICEF	Ms. Sara Beysolow Nyanti	Assistant Resident Representative
UNICEF	Mr. Rupert Leighton	Deputy Resident Representative
UNICEF	Mr. Alpha Cisse	Operations Management Group Focal Point
UNICEF	Ms. Sally Sadie Singhateh	Communications Specialist

WFP	Mr. Francis Abanzi	Head of Programme
WFP	Mr. Mustapha Jammeh	Monitoring & Evaluation Officer
WFP	Ms. Angela Cespedes	Representative/Country Director
UNAIDS	Ms. Sirra Ndow	Country Representative
FAO	Mariatou Njie	Assistant Resident Representative
FAO	Mustapha Ceesay	Agronomist
FAO	Yankuba Sawo	Nutritionist
UNFPA	Mr. Kunle Adeniyi	Head of Office
UNFPA	Mr. Momodou Mboge	Assistant Resident Representative
UNFPA	Mr. Alieu Sarr	National Programme Officer M&E
UNFPA	Ms. Fatou Kinteh	Gender Working Group Focal Point
WHO	Dr. Charles Sagoe-Moses	Representative
WHO	Mr. Momodou Ceesay	N PO/ Health Economist
WHO	Kebba M.S Jiba	NPO/EPI
WHO	Bakary Jargo	NPO/Family Health
WHO	Momodou Gassama	NPO/Health Promotion
WHO	Dr. Sharmila Lareef Jah	NPO/ Disease Control
WHO	Surma Bajaha	AO
WHO	Sally Ceesay	WR Secretary
NGOs		
TANGO	Ousman Yabo	Director
TANGO	Kebba K. Barrow	Programme Officer Networking
TANGO	Tabu Njie Sarr	Programme Officer Training
FAWEGAM	Yadicon Njie Eribo	Head of FAWEGAM
YMCA	John C. Njie	Head of YMCA
Concern Universal	Burang Danjo	Programme Officer CU
AAITG	Bakary Fadera	Programme officer Education Unit
Private Sector		
GCCI	Mr. Alieu Secka	Chief Executive Officer
GCCI	Ms. Beatrice A. Mboge	Director, Corporate Services
Donors		
US Embassy	Ms. Patricia Alsop	Ambassador
EU	Mr. Jossalin Amalfi	Programme Officer

ANNEX 4

EVALUATION MATRIX

Objective	Key Questions	Means of Verification
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well is the UNDAF aligned to National Programmes and international goals and treaties? • Was the design of the UNDAF adequate to properly address the issues envisaged in the formulation of the programme? • Has it remained relevant? • How responsive has the UNDAF been to issues which have emerged since its launch? • Has the Results Matrix been flexible enough to incorporate these emerging issues? • To what extent was the UNDAF informed by substantive human rights and gender analyses that identified underlying causes and barriers to Human Rights and Gender Equality? 	<p>Document review, including 2012-2016 UNDAF; annual reviews of UNDAF and Pillar Groups; PAGE; Gambia MDG report; CEDAW; CRC; Resident Coordinator Annual Reports</p> <p>Interviews with UNCT; Development Partners; GoTG partners</p>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has there been progress towards the achievement of UNDAF outcomes? • To what extent were these results equitably distributed among the targeted groups? • How well has UNDAF supported national development priorities? • How well have national capacities been strengthened? • How could these be further improved? • How effectively has the UNDAF been managed? • How effectively has the UNDAF been managed from an operational perspective? • How can the effectiveness of the support to the UNDAF programme be strengthened going forward? • How effective were UN agencies in using the UNDAF process as a mechanism for mobilizing resources and for minimizing transaction costs for UN, GoTG and Development Partner partners? • Was the UNDAF fully funded? If not, which outcomes were not? • To what extent have crosscutting issues and programming principles been integrated into UNDAF reviews, UN agency assessments and evaluation processes? • What is the UN contribution towards national development outcomes? 	<p>Document review, including 2012-2016 UNDAF; annual reviews of UNDAF and TGs; PAGE; Resident Coordinators Annual Reports</p> <p>Interviews with UN Pillar Groups; Development Partners; GoTG stakeholders</p>
Efficiency	<p>Were the agency supported programmes mutually reinforcing towards realization of UNDAF outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has UNDAF promoted joint programming by UN agencies? • To what extent were adequate resources provided for integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in the UNDAF? • How efficient were the implementation modes employed for delivery of UNDAF programmes/project 	<p>Interviews with UN Pillar Groups; Development Partners; GoTG stakeholders; annual reviews</p>

Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How sustainable are UNDAF-supported results and strategies as a contribution to national development? • To what extent did the UNDAF contribute to developing an enabling environment (including capacities of rights holders and duty bearers) and institutional changes to advance Human Rights and Gender Equality issues? 	Interviews and discussions with GoTG stakeholders, agencies, Development Partners
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have there been changes in the well-being of individuals, households and communities that can be attributed to the UNDAF? • What are some of the key success stories/challenges in UNDAF Implementation 	Interviews and discussions with UNCT, UNRCO, Pillar Group Chairs, GoTG stakeholders, Development Partners; and UN agencies' reports
Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have relationships with key partners functioned as planned and intended? • Were resources mobilization efforts sufficient to meet UNDAF activities' requirements? • How can partnerships be enhanced to provide the best possible support to the UNDAF? • How valid is the stated collective advantage of the UN System in regard to partnership brokerage and maintenance? 	Interviews and discussions with UNCT, UNRCO, Pillar Group Chairs, GoTG stakeholders, Development Partners; UN agencies, RC reports, Development Partners

ANNEX 5

FRAMEWORK FOR INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRES

Respondents include the UNCT, Non-resident Agencies (NRAs), UNDAF TG Co-Chairs and NGO, CSO and private sector partners. Questions will be tailored to category of respondent.

A. FOR UN respondents (resident agencies)

1. For how long have you been with the UN in Gambia?
2. UNDAF Design: Were you involved in the current (2012-2016) UNDAF design phase (if with UN since 2011)? If so, please describe the thinking behind its design – what were seen as the key issues at that time?
3. How well does the timing of the formulation and implementation of the UNDAF cycle align with your planning cycle (CPD and CPAP for ex comm. agencies; Strategic Plan, etc. for other agencies). To what extent have there been retrofitting issues?
4. National Priorities: How well do you see the 2012-2016 UNDAF aligning with the GoTG strategies and plans? Given the contextual changes since the current UNDAF formulation in 2011, to what extent do you think the UNDAF has been flexible in responding to those? Looking forward, how would you suggest that the alignment be strengthened?
5. How well would you say that the current UNDAF has served as a platform for UN positioning? Are there any UN agencies/programmes/sectors where this works better than others? If so, how would this be adjusted in the next (2017-2021) UNDAF?
6. DaO Approach: How well do you think the Country Team overall understands the DaO approach? How could this be improved?
7. In support of One UN, how well do you think the current UNDAF has encouraged/contributed to greater policy and programming consistency? An improved “common voice” for the UN through the UNIC? Are there any sectors/programmes in which this has worked better than in others? How could this be adjusted in the next (2017-2021) UNDAF?
8. UN Comparative Advantages: There are a number of stated UN comparative advantages, e.g. its permanent presence in Gambia; its wide range and depth of technical expertise; its role as a trusted convener and honest broker of partnerships. What do you think are the most visible UN CAs in Gambia? How well does the UNDAF serve as a tool to both enhance and promote these CAs? What might be improved?
9. One UN: How well do you feel that the UNDAF reflects the UN’s common voice – at the policy level? At the operational level?
10. Pillar Groups: How would you describe the functionality of your PG in terms of coordination and effectiveness? What percentage of UN members usually attend Pillar meetings? What percentage of GoTG members usually attend Pillar meetings? Are the UN/GoTG attendees the actual members or are they delegates?
11. How much buy in to your Pillar Group is there from national partners? How could this be improved? From the UN members?

12. Out of your relationship with national stakeholders, what has gone well and what could be improved? With CBOs and other community groups? What have been the particular challenges with regards to national stakeholder expectations? How do you manage expectations?
13. What have been Pillar major achievements and/or best practices?
14. Does your Pillar have any non-DAC Development Partners? If yes, who and how do they support your activities?
15. Are there any NRAs in your Pillar? If yes, how has their expertise/data been integrated?
16. To what extent do you expect your Pillar targets to be met by the completion of this UNDAF (at the end of 2016)? If they will not be met, why not? How could that be improved?
17. How well do the current UNDAF outcomes align for your Pillar? How could they be improved?
18. What would you say are the key programmes from other Development Partners in Gambia which are relevant to your Pillar? What are your linkages with those programmes? Are those reflected in the current UNDAF?
19. What – if any – are the other national level coordination mechanisms for your area of activities?
20. Do you have any private sector partners (PSPs)? If yes, who are the key PSPs and how do they support TG activities? If no, what are your strategies to engage PSPs?
21. Who are your Pillar's primary NGO/CSO IPs?
22. Your Recommendations. What would be your recommendations for the next UNDAF cycle, e.g. on relevance of current themes; other themes; coordination, South-South cooperation; resource mobilization and other kinds of support, private sector partnerships/PPPs, others?

B. For Non-Resident UN Agencies

1. For how long has your agency been an NRA in The Gambia UNCT?
2. UNDAF Design: Were you involved in the current (2012-2016) UNDAF design phase (if part of Gambia UNCT since 2011)? If so, how were you involved – virtually? Meetings in Gambia? Meetings in Dakar? At validation?
3. If you were involved in the 2011 formulation process, please describe the thinking behind its design – what were seen as the key issues at that time that influenced programming and decisions on outcomes? Drought of 2011? National priorities expressed in the (draft) PAGE I? Others?
4. Your agency's role. To which Pillars (1-3) and outcomes (1-8) does your agency contribute?
5. How many times has your agency carried out project site visits during the 2012-2016 UNDAF period?
6. Funding. What is your agency's financial commitment for those activities? To what extent has there been a shortfall in funding? Would you please share these figures with the evaluation team?
7. If there has been a shortfall in funding for any of your Gambia UNDAF activities, to what extent has this affected implementation?
8. Please list any other constraints to implementation.

9. Resource Mobilization. The 2012-2016 UNDAF budget was \$65 million. There were shortfalls in funding which affected its rate of achievement (Approximately 19.8% of the current UNDAF outcomes have been achieved). The estimated cost of implementing the 2017-2021 UNDAF is some \$140 million. Given the over 40% decrease in ODA from DAC donors since 2012, from where would you anticipate the funding for the new UNDAF will come?
10. Future Presence in The Gambia. Does your agency plan to open an office in Banjul during the next UNDAF period (2017-2021)? Why? With which GOTG entity would you work most closely?
11. One UN - In support of One UN, how well do you think the current UNDAF has encouraged/contributed to greater policy and programming consistency? An improved "common voice" for the UN at the policy level? At the operational level? Are there any sectors/programmes in which this has worked better than in others? How could this be adjusted in the next (2017-2021) UNDAF?
12. DaO. The UNCT Gambia received DaO training in 2015. How well do you think the DaO approach is currently understood among the UNCT? What do you think might be the largest obstacles to actually Delivering as One in The Gambia?
13. Programming Principles. Which of the five programming principles is most visible in the activities that you support? Which are least visible?
14. UN Comparative Advantages – There are a number of stated UN comparative advantages, e.g. its wide range and depth of technical expertise; its role as a trusted convener and honest broker of partnerships. What do you think are the most visible UN CAs in Gambia? How well does the UNDAF serve as a tool to both enhance and to promote these CAs? What might be improved?
15. Your recommendations. What would be your recommendations for the next UNDAF cycle, e.g. on, for example, coordination; South-South cooperation; resource mobilization and other kinds of support, private sector partnerships/PPPs, any other areas?

C. FOR NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS

1. UNDAF Design. At what point did your Ministry/unit become involved in the current (2012-2016) UNDAF? Was your Ministry/unit involved with the UNDAF design phase?
2. How well does the timing of the formulation and implementation of the UNDAF cycle align with your planning cycle?
3. National Priorities. How well do you see the current UNDAF aligning with the GoTG strategies and plans? Given the contextual changes since the current UNDAF formulation in 2011, to what extent do you think the UNDAF has been flexible in responding to those? Overall, what are your expectations from the UNDAF as a mechanism to support national development priorities, e.g. those articulated in the PAGE?
4. Pillar Groups. How would you describe the overall level of UN collaboration with your Pillar Group? (for example, is there joint monitoring?) How often does your Pillar Group meet? What

percentage of your Pillar meetings do the UN attend? Given your schedule, how often are you able to attend Pillar meetings? How often do you have to delegate this to another Ministry colleague?

5. How would you describe the overall level of UN collaboration with GoTG counterparts generally? Out of your relationship with UN partners what has gone well and what could be improved?
6. One UN. In your dealings with the UN partners, to what extent do you think there is a “One UN Voice”? Are there any sectors/programmes in which this has worked better than in others? If so, how could this increased in the next UNDAF cycle (2017-2021)?
7. Comparative Advantage. There a number of stated UN comparative advantages, e.g. permanent presence in Gambia; its wide range and depth of technical expertise; its role as a trusted convener and honest broker of partnerships - What do you think is the UN’s most critical CA? What might be improved?
8. Who are the key INGOs/LNGOs/CSOs supporting the implementation of your Pillar activities?
9. Your Recommendations. Given contextual changes since 2011, what would be your recommendations for the next (2017-2012)UNDAF cycle, e.g. on relevance of current themes; other themes; coordination, South-South cooperation; resource mobilization and other kinds of support, private sector partnerships/PPPs, others?

D. FOR NGO/CSO Partners

1. UNDAF Design. How has your organization been involved in/consulted on the current (2012-2016) UNDAF – in its formulation, implementation, M&E, resource mobilization, partnership and/or coordination? How was your organization engaged in this process? Has this changed with the formulation of the next UNDAF (2017-2021)?
2. Alignment with GoTG Priorities. How well do you think the current UNDAF aligns with national strategies and plans?
3. Collaboration. How would you describe the overall level of UN collaboration/partnership with your organization? Who is your primary UN partner agency?
4. What are your expectations regarding the current UNDAF outcomes generally and the projects more specifically? Are the targets for the project(s) you support realistic? Is implementation on track?
5. Impact. How are communities likely to benefit from these project activities? What are the economic and social changes that are likely to be produced by the project? Are there any “snapshots” you can mention?
6. Sustainability. What will happen when the Development Partner support for your project comes to an end?
7. Your Recommendations What would be your recommendations for the next (2017-2021) UNDAF cycle, e.g. on relevance of current themes; other themes; coordination, South-South cooperation; resource mobilization and other kinds of support, private sector partnerships, others?

ANNEX 6

Summary Minutes of Stakeholder Validation Session 26th October 2016 UN Library, 10 am Banjul, The Gambia⁷¹

The meeting was attended by 26 participants consisting of institutions of National partners, External Donors and UN Agencies.

ATTENDANCE: Ade Mamonyane Lekoetje (UN Resident Coordinator & UNDP Resident Representative), Muhamadou Lamin Jaiteh (Deputy Permanent Secretary, Office of The President) Alagie Fadera (Director, Planning Department, MoFEA), Isatou F. Camara, Principal Development Planner, MoFEA), Yusupha Dibba (Lecturer, University of The Gambia), Alieu Sarr (NPO, P&D, UNFPA), Beatrice A. Mboge (Director, Corporate Services, GCCI), Abdoulie Janneh (National Economist, UNDP), Gibril Jagne (Deputy Executive Director, Women's Bureau), HaddyJatou Njie (Administrative Officer, Ministry of Environment Climate Change and Natural Resources), Kunle Adeniyi (UNFPA Head of Office), Cecilia Senghore (Executive Associate and Communication Focal Point, UNDP), Dr. Annette Ittig (International Evaluation consultant), Seikou S. Sanyang (National Evaluation Consultant).

Welcome Remarks/ Opening Statements

In her opening statement, the UN Resident Coordinator informed participants that in 2014 the Mid-Term Review was done and that the report was presented and discussed. She however noted that even though the next UNDAF is already signed, the Final Evaluation is mandatory. With regard to UN-Government relation, she motioned that Mr. Jaiteh been the pillar of the relationship and hopes that this will continue during the implementation of the next UNDAF 2017-2021. On a final note, she thanked all participants for coming to the meeting and thanked the consultants for the work.

Meanwhile, the meeting was chaired by Mr. Muhammad Lamin Jaiteh, Deputy Permanent Secretary, Office of the President. Mr. Jaiteh in his brief remark mentioned that the UN Resident Coordination had said it all and his role is just to facilitate the remaining part of the meeting process.

Presentation of Evaluation Findings by International Evaluation consultant

Dr. Annette Ittig, the International Consultant, presented the evaluation findings and recommendations. She began by thanking Mr. Seikou Sanyang, National Consultant for his support during the consultancy and also thanked the representatives of the partner institutions for their response to the series of questions asked during the individual and group discussions with them.

Dr. Ittig used 42 power point slides to present details based on the following talking Points: Evaluation Objectives and Methodologies, Key Findings, Constraints, Best Practices, Lessons Learned and Recommendations.

With regard the findings concerning the design stage of UNDAF 2012-2016, the formulation of the 2012-2016 UNDAF and that of the PAGE were not synchronized. The alignment was generally less than anticipated, but there was alignment in the health and education sectors. Nevertheless, the alignment is

⁷¹ I am indebted to Mr. Seikou Sanyang, the national consultant, for his write-up of this section: Annette Ittig, Lead Consultant, UNDAF evaluation

clearer in the new UNDAF 2017-2021. On the other hand, UNDAF 2012-2016 supports MDG achievement in each thematic.

Capacity building was the most visible programming principle undertaken at the following levels, such as: enabling environment level (legislation, regulations), organisational level (strengthening systems and procedures, developing standards), and individual level (training). However, capacity building activities were not yet assessed. On the other hand, Integration of gender as a programming principle in the 2012-2016 UNDAF is incomplete, for example, gender is not desegregated in either the indicators or the results, among others.

In terms of effectiveness, the level of achievements of the results was as follows: 19.8% overall progress towards achievement of UNDAF outcome indicators, 41.8% partially achieved and 38.3% not achieved. Generally, there was low progress rate due in part to indicators that are not SMART in that they don't capture some of the actual achievements, e.g. in Gender.

Some achievements were recorded through joint efforts between the UN agencies, for example, tripartite school feeding programme (WFP, UNICEF, FAO), Ebola Virus Response (WHO, MoHSW). UN advocacy led to changes in regulations, policy in several areas, e.g. gender, refugee rights, others.

With regards effectiveness, in terms of coordination, information on aid financing, coordination, accountability is divided among different Government entities. At highest level strategic decisions on UNDAF are being made jointly by UNCT, Office of the President/Secretary General. Internal UN Support to UNDAF is being done through PCG, OMT, UNCG, and RCO.

On the other hand, RCO has not been able to perform all of its functions as effectively as anticipated especially in the area of Knowledge Management; not all UNDAF-related reports and other information outcome-specific resources mobilized, and disbursed figures are not deposited with RCO.

During the 2012-2016 UNDAF, DaO approach was mixed and generally UN agencies do not present as one to Government of The Gambia and Development Partners. Single agency financing or fund raising/resource mobilization seems to be the biggest cause of fragmentation.

With regard effectiveness in terms of coordination of UNDAF is operationalised at meso-level within and between Thematic Groups (TGs). Government TG members' commitment to and understanding of UNDAF processes and mechanisms is uneven. GoTG's low level commitment is a long standing issue; also noted in previous UNDAF reviews. Generally, there has not been any induction on UNDAF given to GoTG partners by UN.

Effectiveness in terms of partnerships, some partnerships were good but UN relation with Private Sector was minimal in 2012-2016 UNDAF with some exceptions like ILO/GCCI. This is opportunities missed for growing corporate partnerships and support.

Effectiveness in terms of Partnerships and Resource Mobilization, no UNCT Joint Partnership and Resource Mobilization strategy exists.

A lot has been done in building both institutional and human capacity which lays good foundation for sustainability. However, national, local financial resources are limited, and GoTG may require ongoing donor support over medium to longer term.

With regard constraints reported by national partners, it was widely reported as follows: non inclusive 2012-2016 UNDAF design process, delays in planning, implementation, fund disbursement coupled with duplication of activities and requests by UN agencies. Generally, UN allowances are lower than those of other Development partners. On the side of UN agencies, high turnover of government staff, limited participation, limited national ownership, funding shortfalls and unavailability of accurate and up to date data was widely reported by many agencies.

Some of the lessons learned have to do with the need for core capacity for coordination within the RCO, greater ownership of UNDAF process by meso-level government partners and an incomplete gender mainstreaming hindered progress in the sub-sector.

In terms of recommendations

- there is need for increased government ownership and buy-in,
- a more proactive RCO with clear terms of reference,
- to assess results of UN's capacity building support to GoTG during 2012-2016 and respond as may be required,
- need to have smarter - R/TWGs and communications.
- Need to develop a UNCT-wide gender strategy, put in place a roving Gender WG expert within the M&E Team and TWGs and
- Use simple M&E tools as in the case of other country office.
- The UNCT should develop a joint resource mobilization strategy in collaboration with the GoTG and explore resource mobilization beyond traditional aid.

The presentation concluded with a suggestion for team building for DaO within the UN system together with government.

Discussions

Generally, responses from the floor were received in the form of comments and suggestions:

- There are challenges in getting gender disaggregated data and that there is need for capacity building in this area.
- Gender mainstreaming has to do with encouraging the use of tools targeting programme staff.
- GBoS has no gender focal person and this needs to be addressed.
- Attention was drawn to the inclusion of UNDP in the list of UN agencies that responded to Ebola crisis
- The issue of retention should be given due attention in the ongoing training and capacity building.
- In the section on recommendation there is the need to give an indication of time frame for each action and by whom?
- Give an indication of financial implications of recommendations, resource mobilization strategy and communication specialist.
- Figures on expected and mobilizes resources for UNDAF have to indicated and give an explanation why such a status. However, in response from the floor, it was noted that such figures are not available.

- Need to indicate how much have been achieved in harmonization and collaboration and what more needs to be done.
- Allowances need to be harmonized in order to address the concerns raised by national partners.
- It was emphasized that it is not UN work, its UN supporting government work; hence national ownership is the key issue here. Therefore, there will not be any salary top up; government staff can be accepted on secondment to address urgent project tasks.
- EU is considering signing an agreement with the UN to deliver as one, that is, to create one basket of funding. However, the UN takes time to line up administrative requirements even after EU releases the funds.
- More involvement of the private sector is required and GCCI needs support to address the limitations of the SMEs. More capacity building for GCCI for them to meet the concerns and needs of SMEs as all their transactions come through GCCI. Private sector in Gambia is so small and GCCI should request pay for the services they offer to others and the public at large. GCCI should harmonize with government priorities in order to receive government or any other support.
- In whatever is being done it should be done in partnership with government. With regard to capacity building, there is need to have a better understanding of what we are and what we do. There is need to map out government role in and after capacity building and should have holistic understanding of capacity building needs.
- EU presently channels their support through NGOs and UN as there are challenges in engaging the government side.
- UN related work should be integrated in the normal job of the staff in government institutions.

In her closing remarks RC noted that transparency, accountability and efficiency cannot be compromise in UN work. Government needs to pull partners to support national priorities in the name of ownership and take leadership in running the affairs of development work.

The RC finally thanked everyone who managed to be to attend and extended special thanks to the consultants for a job well done.