

UNICEF Libya Country Programme

Evaluability Assessment – Final Report

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Title</i> | <i>UNICEF Libya Country Programme 2023-2025: Evaluability Assessment Final Report</i> |
| <i>Date of Report</i> | <i>9th November 2023</i> |
| <i>Geographic Region of the Programme</i> | <i>Country</i> |
| <i>Country</i> | <i>Libya</i> |
| <i>Evaluability Assessment timeframe</i> | <i>August-November 2023</i> |
| <i>Evaluability Assessment consultant</i> | <i>Kirsty Milward</i> |
| <i>Commissioned by</i> | <i>UNICEF MENA Regional Office</i> |

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| UNICEF Libya Country Programme | 1 |
| Evaluability Assessment – Draft Report | 1 |
| Contents | 2 |
| Acronyms | 4 |
| Executive Summary | 5 |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1. Purpose and scope of the evaluability assessment | 1 |
| 2. Evaluability Assessment Methodology | 1 |
| 2.1 Approach to the EA | 1 |
| 2.2 EA Questions | 1 |
| 2.3 Data collection and analysis | 2 |
| 2.4 Limitations of the study | 3 |
| 3. Country Programme structure | 4 |
| 4. Key findings | 5 |
| O1: Objectives, logic, programme rationales and Theories of Change | 5 |
| O2: Results framework, indicators and verification | 9 |
| Outcome-Output | 9 |
| Indicators | 10 |
| Targets | 11 |
| Verification | 11 |
| O3 Documentation and information systems | 14 |
| Baselines: | 15 |
| Information/ monitoring systems | 15 |
| O4: Human resources and financial documentation | 17 |
| O5: Cross Cutting Issues | 18 |
| Disability | 19 |
| SBC | 20 |
| Youth: | 20 |
| Gender | 21 |
| 5 Conclusions | 22 |
| 6 Recommendations | 24 |
| 6.1 For LCO leadership | 24 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 6.2 PME team (with section chiefs): | 24 |
| 6.3 As part of the upcoming annual review..... | 25 |
| 6.4 For the Terms of Reference for a Country Programme Evaluation | 25 |
| 6.5 For section chiefs: | 26 |
| H&N..... | 26 |
| Education | 27 |
| Child Protection | 27 |
| Wash | 28 |
| Social Policy..... | 28 |
| Annex 1: Documents Consulted..... | 30 |
| Annex 2: List of stakeholders consulted | 32 |
| Annex 3: Evaluability assessment question matrix: Key Questions for stakeholders: | 33 |
| Annex 4: Full results Framework with suggested revisions | 36 |
| Annex 5: Terms of Reference..... | 51 |

Acronyms

| | |
|---------|--|
| ADAP | Adolescent Development and Participation |
| CP/D | Country Programme / Document |
| CPE | Country Programme Evaluation |
| CRC | [UN] Convention on the Rights of the Child |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| EA | Evaluability Assessment |
| EMIS | Education Monitoring and Information System |
| FO | Field Office |
| GNS | Government of National Stability |
| GNU | Government of National Unity |
| H&N | Health and Nutrition |
| HMIS | Health Monitoring and Information System |
| HoR | House of Representatives |
| IDP | Internally Displaced Person |
| INGO | International NGO |
| JMP | Joint Monitoring Programme |
| KAP | Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices |
| L/CO | Libya Country Office / Country Office |
| MICS | Multi Indicator Cluster Survey |
| MNH | Maternal and New-born Health |
| MoE | Ministry of Education |
| MoH | Ministry of Health |
| PHC | Primary Health Centre |
| PME | Planning Monitoring and Evaluation |
| PR | Programme Rationale |
| R&R | Rest and Recuperation |
| RAM | Results Assessment Module |
| RF | Results Framework |
| RO-MENA | Middle East and North Africa Regional Office |
| SBC | Social and Behaviour Change |
| SP | Social Policy |
| ToC | Theory of Change |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |
| UNCT | UN Country Team |
| UNSDCF | United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework |
| WASH | Water Sanitation and Hygiene |

Executive Summary

This Evaluability Assessment (EA) of the 2023-25 Country Programme (CP) was conducted for the UNICEF Libya Country Office (LCO) between August and November 2023. It was commissioned by the UNICEF Middle East and North Africa Regional Office (RO-MENA) and aimed primarily to assess how well the LCO is prepared for a country programme evaluation, provisionally expected to take place in late 2024, and to offer recommendations for strengthening the programme logic and monitoring systems to improve evaluability.

The EA therefore assesses how far country programme objectives are adequately defined, causal linkages are clarified; whether indicators supporting the results framework are validated and measurable, and whether systems and relevant capacities are in place to measure and verify results.

The EA methodology was based on UNEG norms and standards and referred to UNEG and UNICEF guidance materials. The approach was guided by an analytic framework which used the twin ideas of 'evaluability in principle' and 'evaluability in practice'. Key questions for the EA were developed and mapped to EA core objectives, which were stated as:

- O1: Assess the clarity of objectives, alignment, logic and coherence of the country programme and programme rationales, and their alignment to the country context and UNICEF Strategic Plan
- O2: Assess the adequacy and validity of results, indicators, tools and systems for monitoring, measuring and verifying results
- O3: Assess the availability and quality of the documentation, information and data needed to measure and monitor results (including the availability and sufficiency of baselines and targets) and conduct a useful Country Programme Evaluation.
- O4: Review the adequacy of human resources available for monitoring and generating information; and the appropriateness of financial documentation for assessing effectiveness
- O5 Assess the way gender, disability, SBC and youth cross cutting issues have been documented

A mix of primary and secondary data was collected and analysed to form the basis for the assessment and key informant interviews were conducted remotely with 18 informants internally at the LCO and Benghazi FO.

The assessment articulated 19 findings related to the five objectives:

O1: Objectives, logic, programme rationales and Theories of Change

Finding 1: The section/outcome theories of change are useful expressions of how the CP is expected to work, but articulations of assumptions could be strengthened, especially assumptions regarding what [is expected to] work as a causal pathway or causal web and why.

Finding 2: Flexibility in the ToC which allows the Sections to respond to a context with several unpredictable dimensions is key to its success as a guiding document. This has been established by expressing downstream and upstream intermediate changes; and a range of key interventions which can guide selection of activities appropriate to an evolving on-the-ground situation.

Finding 3: Climate change related risks are inadequately reflected in all of the ToCs; the recent humanitarian situation in Derna clearly demonstrates how these risks are not only highly relevant to the WASH outcome but to all outcome areas.

Finding 4: the CP is *in principle* well aligned with the global Strategic Plan, and in particular with the emphasis on risk informed humanitarian and development nexus programming. However, in practice alignment will take more integration e.g. of intersectional approaches and a focus on disability (see also Finding 16).

O2: Results framework, indicators and verification

Finding 5: Indicators are mostly coherent, comprehensive and relevant, but there are some weaknesses which should be reviewed. Geographical targeting is mostly not specified by the indicator – this is a weakness which should be rectified where possible. Indicators organising reported data of people reached also mostly do not specify disaggregation by gender, disability or age group as routine.

Finding 6: Targets are in need of review to align them with previously adjusted indicators and to add denominators wherever feasible.

Finding 7: Verification of Output Indicators is mostly reasonably valid, but for Outcome indicators there are strong factors negatively affecting evaluability. This will need to be taken into account when articulating the terms of reference for an evaluation, and in its design.

Finding 8: In practice, the timeline of the MICS means that it will not provide data appropriate for use either as baseline or as endline data for this Country Programme.

Finding 9: Except for the H&N outcomes, **evaluability of CPD outcomes** is weak. Suggested approaches to mitigating these weaknesses will improve evaluability to some degree but not fully.

O3 Documentation and information systems

Finding 10: Quality data is a challenge in Libya generally, therefore **baseline** data is mostly not strong, especially at outcome level. Some simple actions can be taken to optimise the RF as far as possible.

Finding 11: Monitoring systems for work through CSO partners has undergone regular strengthening when weaknesses have been identified. Accessing regular monitoring information from government partners is generally a greater cause for concern among staff.

Finding 12: Digital monitoring systems have exacerbated challenges in accessing data by external service providers / consultants, including – potentially – evaluation consultants.

O4: Human resources and financial documentation

Finding 13: The combination of high staff turnover and temporary gaps in the PME team potentially constitutes an evaluability risk because routinized and systematic documentation / synthesised monitoring is especially necessary in contexts where institutional memory is weak / not guaranteed.

Finding 14: Cost effectiveness analysis is likely to be very challenging, and therefore not productive as part of the evaluation for this CPD.

O5: Cross Cutting Issues

Finding 15: There has been some lack of clarity and consistency across LCO documentation about what the cross cutting issues are, which should be rectified.

Finding 16: Focused work on embedding **disability** as a dimension of cross-cutting “inclusion” issues has begun to make progress but this is not well integrated in the results framework or tracked by monitoring systems.

Finding 17: As it is a strategy expected to accelerate results across the programme, understanding what and how far **SBC** interventions contribute to results could fill some of the gaps about ‘what works’ to secure results for children in the Libyan context. Close flagging and tracking of these interventions would therefore be warranted to facilitate synthesising the role of SBC during or prior to an endline evaluation.

Finding 18: The **youth** cross cutting issue is reasonably well integrated into the results framework and indicators, but data is not routinely disaggregated by age groups, and the recently developed Youth Strategy suggests a number of priority actions to strengthen the inclusion of a youth focus across the sections.

Finding 19: Although the programme statements include strong attentiveness to **gender**, disaggregating data by gender at the top level of the RF and RAM reporting is weak. Strengthening this is a simple way to visibilize the gender-relevant work being done by the programme, and would immediately enhance awareness of this dimension in all aspects of the programme.

Recommendations

1. For LCO leadership

Immediate priority

- Priority should be given to filling gaps in the PME team as quickly as possible.
- Corporate opportunities to strengthen knowledge management should be taken.

Medium term priority

- Establish a common language / terminology for cross cutting issues relevant to this CPD which distinguishes between the common strategies driving programme objectives (such as SBC) and dimensions of the objectives themselves (such as gender equality).
- Consider integrating Climate Change as a cross cutting issue, and integrate into each outcome area on the basis of the CLAC analysis.

2. For PME team (with section chiefs):

Immediate priority

- Urgently align baselines and targets with all indicators that were adjusted / changed to meet global indicators during the early part of the CPD. This includes indicators for H&N, Education, WASH and SP.
- Review indicators in the light of any new activities resulting from the Adolescent and Youth Strategy so that monitoring of achievements with and for young people is maximised to the extent possible.
- Systematise schedules / targets for field monitoring visits so that a balance of visits is carried out across geographies and outcome areas.
- For cross cutting issues which are dimensions of the CP objectives, ensure these are fully integrated into all aspects of documentation and monitoring about the programme.

- Consider integrating Climate Change as a cross cutting issue, and integrate into each outcome area on the basis of the CLAC analysis.

Medium term priority:

- Include in visit report templates sections for documenting any concerns about data reliability.
- Include synthesising field visit reported data in routine PME workplans.
- Institute a systematic plan for tracking the outcomes and impact of capacity building initiatives, across the programme. This would involve documenting needs assessments, training design and pre and post-tests; and collecting qualitative or in-depth survey data on how new skills are used in the subsequent months/years. With this plan in place, including indicators in the overall RF to document capacity building would be a useful addition to measuring the upstream work.
- Facilitate the opportunity to track the effectiveness / contribution of SBC as a strategy by clearly flagging SBC driven activities at workplan level; collating pre and post testing around awareness campaigns and other activities as part of output measurements; and supporting the synthesis of SBC related monitoring information from the sections it supports as part of an overall SBC monitoring plan.

3. As part of the upcoming annual review / MTR

Immediate priority

- Ensure that the annual review includes a formal review / reflection process on the ToCs and follow this up by updating documentation.
 - As part of this, include a review of **assumptions** as listed in the section ToCs, with a focus on articulating some causation ('why do we think this will work?') type assumptions.
 - Take care to maintain the current **flexibility** of the ToC though the structure of key interventions and strategies, but begin to document which strategies have been prioritised.
 - Integrate climate-related hazards more clearly in the **risks** to the programme articulated in the ToC and responses to these in the key interventions of all outcomes.
 - Reflect on the implications of an increasingly **conservative context for gender equality** and girls and women's rights for the implementation of the CPD, and its likely achievements. Include this as a risk factor to the ToC for each Outcome, as considered appropriate. Also consider where and how far a 'reasonably conducive environment for working towards gender equality' is in fact an assumption underpinning likely achievements towards outputs / outcomes.

4 For the Terms of Reference for a Country Programme Evaluation

Medium term priority

- Articulate ToR for an evaluation which takes a theory based approach, focused on what strategies work [in what kind of contexts]. This may also propose select Outcome areas for an effectiveness against targets assessment (E.g. for H&N Outcome which has stronger

outcome data). The ToR should specify that the evaluation approach should situate achievements within a picture of the long term context of UNICEF work.

- Anticipate the reconstruction of a programme level ToC in advance of or in the early stages of an endline evaluation, and gather engagement across the programme for this process if possible.
- Do not specify cost effectiveness assessment as a central objective of evaluation in the ToR. Rather, the focus for the Efficiency criteria for evaluation could be on operational efficiency, in particular how far CO HR and systems are supportive of a flexible transition from humanitarian to developmental approaches.
- The ToR should also emphasise systematic document review, given the added significance of documentation to anchor institutional memory.
- The ToR should specify relatively long data collection period, given the challenge of scheduling in the context of the R&R cycle.
- Consider including an EQ on the integration of disability issues in the ToR for evaluation, in order to generate qualitative information and documentation of what progress has been made.

Preparations for evaluation should include either or both of:

- Considering providing digital access to evaluators to LCO monitoring and document storage platforms.
- Allocating internal staff responsibility to support evaluators to access information from the digital platforms.

Detailed recommendations are also given, bringing together Action Points for each of the Section teams: Health and Nutrition; Education; Child Protection; WASH and Social Policy.

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose and scope of the evaluability assessment

This document reports on an Evaluability Assessment (EA) of the 2023-25 Country Programme (CP) conducted for the UNICEF Libya Country Office (LCO) between August and October 2023. The EA was commissioned by the UNICEF Middle East and North Africa Regional Office (RO-MENA) about 8 months into the CP cycle. It aimed to assess how well the LCO is prepared for a country programme evaluation, provisionally expected to take place in late 2024.

The EA therefore assesses how far country programme objectives are adequately defined, causal linkages are clarified; whether indicators supporting the results framework are validated and measurable, and whether systems and relevant capacities are in place to measure and verify results. On the basis of this assessment, it sets out recommendations for how the results framework, monitoring systems and documentation could be strengthened to support an endline country programme evaluation (CPE). The EA is intended to be used internally at regional and country level. Recommendations are relevant at country level to programme staff, as well as to the PME team and staff anchoring cross cutting issues and strategies.

2. Evaluability Assessment Methodology

2.1 Approach to the EA

The EA methodology was based on UNEG norms and standards and referred to UNEG and UNICEF guidance materials such as the guidance on integrating human rights and gender into evaluations, and on Core Commitments to Children. The approach was guided by an analytic framework which uses the twin ideas of ‘evaluability in principle’ and ‘evaluability in practice’. To assess evaluability in principle, a document analysis was undertaken to assess programme logic ‘in principle’, cross checked with primary data concerning actual roll out of the programme. Assessing evaluability in practice involved mapping and exploring data sources related to the monitoring system to cross check how far these match the data requirements for the results framework; alongside an analysis of what documentation supporting evaluability is available, or likely to be available based on samples of equivalent documentation.

Developing findings drew on a mapping of internal and external narrative coherence across document and primary data sources (interviews). This approach incorporated both triangulation, and attention to the details of coherence or gaps in this. In other words, the approach seeks patterns across different sources to filter the strength of various tentative findings.

2.2 EA Questions

Key questions for the EA were developed for the Terms of Reference against each of the four objectives and adapted /adjusted during the inception process. An EA question matrix was developed (Annex 3) to guide documentary analysis and interview questions. The EA questions are given in Table 1.

| Table 1: EA questions mapped to EA core objectives | | |
|---|----|--|
| O1: Assess the clarity of objectives, alignment, logic and coherence of | 1. | Is there a well-articulated theory of change for the country programme and programme rationales? |

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| the country programme and programme rationales, and their alignment to the country context and UNICEF Strategic Plan | 2. | Is the theory of change flexible and responsive to external factors? Have there yet been any modifications to the intervention logic and why? Are the causal linkages between the different levels of the intervention logic clear? Have risks and assumptions identified and are adequate? |
| | 3. | What general adjustments should be made, applicable to all or most of the Outcome level theories of change? |
| O2: Assess the adequacy and validity of results, indicators, tools and systems for monitoring, measuring and verifying results. | 4. | Are the indicators reliable for decision making for the programme improvements? |
| | 5. | Are means of verification clearly identified and reliable for all the outcome and output indicators? |
| | 6. | Have the indicators been defined (e.g. numerators and denominators) without an ambiguity? Has a target value for the indicator been provided, including for any necessary disaggregation? |
| O3: Assess the availability and quality of the documentation, information and data needed to measure and monitor results (including the availability and sufficiency of baselines and targets) and conduct a useful Country Programme Evaluation. | 7. | Are baselines in place for indicators? If not, are activities planned to generate the baseline? |
| | 8. | Will the monitoring system generate data/information at reasonable intervals to help monitoring and documenting progresses over time? |
| O4: Review the adequacy of human resources available for monitoring and generating information; and the appropriateness of financial documentation for assessing effectiveness. | 9. | Are there mechanisms and adequate human and financial resources in place to collect relevant data in a consistent manner? |
| | 10. | Are financial resources clearly aligned with deliverables? |
| O5 Assess the way gender, disability, SBC and youth cross cutting issues have been documented | 11. | Are measures, tools, and mechanisms in place to measure crosscutting priorities such as gender, disability, SBC, and youth? |

2.3 Data collection and analysis

A mix of primary and secondary data was collected and analysed to form the basis for the assessment. Data collection consisted of:

- I. A document retrieval process – which was iterative and protracted (See Annex 1). It involved

- a. Initial mining of accessible SharePoint folders for relevant information by RO-MENA staff assisted by LCO staff.
 - b. Seeking and requesting information about further documentation as part of remote interviews
 - c. Following up information gained with requests for documentation orally and by email; and by searching common databases at RO level.
- II. Formal document analysis of key documents, including the CPD, programme rationales and Theories of Change; key strategies such as the Youth Strategy and Gender Programmatic Review; and an updated results framework.
- III. Key informant interviews were conducted remotely with 18 informants covering the 5 relevant sections; PME team; operations and programmes leadership; focal points for cross cutting issues; and the Benghazi Field Office (See Annex 2).

Analysis was then conducted of documentation and primary data. Primary data was coded against the EA questions; specific documentation such as donor proposals / reports was lightly sampled for in depth analysis to provide insight into what level of information could be expected from full document analysis in an evaluation process.

2.4 Limitations of the study

- As noted in Finding 13, rotations in Libya for international staff are for two years with options to move after one year. This presents a challenge to institutional memory, for instance concerning the process of developing the CPD / high level strategy and theories of change which was carried out during early 2022. This knowledge gap was to some degree compensated by consulting national staff, some of who have been very long serving.
- For this EA, documentation was limited as a source of data / information about the programme, as it was carried out in the early stages of the CP cycle. An early EA was a useful approach here because it allows changes to be made to the RF before major data collection reference points, and therefore a more consistent set of data at endline. But it also means that in comparison with evaluability assessments carried out later in the cycle, there was more reliance on primary data for guidance on key issues to raise. Nevertheless, some available documentation, such as the Programme Rationales and the Summary Programme Rationale were of good quality and were carefully reviewed in order to orientate the assessment appropriately.
- Data collection was a fully remote exercise, due to a range of considerations including the security situation in Libya. While every effort has been made to understand the context to and to integrate this understanding into the interpretation of information presented here, it is possible that a more fine-tuned perception of on the ground realities in the working environment would have improved the relevance and pertinence of the findings articulated here.
- Data collection was interrupted by the humanitarian emergency in Derna in early September, following which UNICEF staff were extremely busy adjusting plans and responding to the immediate situation, and were at times not available for interview. This was mitigated as far as possible by extending the data collection period by about 2 weeks.

3. Country Programme structure

The [Country Programme Document \(2023-2025\)](#) was designed and approved during 2022, to begin implementation / preparation in January 2023. In the event, the process of finalising workplans has been slower than anticipated, and was completed during August and September 2023. The CPD design built on the on the achievements of the previous country programme and aims at supporting Libya's progress towards its Sustainable Development Goals, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The Programme directly aligns with and contributes to the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) for Libya (2023-2025) contributing specifically to pillars 3 and 4 on Social and Human Capital Development and on Climate Change, Environment and Water.

The CPD covers five key sectors: 1) Health & Nutrition, 2) Education, 3) Child Protection, 4) Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH), and 5) Social Policy¹ Cross-cutting issues include attention to gender equality, disability and youth, as well as Social and Behavioural Change (SBC), Advocacy, Communication, and Gender (integrated into the adolescent and youth focus areas).² Focus on the youth and SBC cross cutting issues have recently seen the development of an Adolescent and Youth Strategy³, and a draft SBC cross sectoral strategy. Approaches to programming include the following seven change strategies: systems strengthening, addressing gender inequality, leveraging partnerships, evidence-based decision making, community engagement, and social and behavioural change interventions to facilitate positive social and gender norms.⁴

Part of the CP is implemented via the Field Office in Benghazi, which was fully established by 2021 and strengthened UNICEF's footprint and partnerships with authorities in the east of the country. The relationship between Benghazi FO and the CO is guided by an Accountability Framework established in 2022.⁵ The south of Libya remains the most deprived and LCO scaled-up programming in this region during 2021, largely through partners and third-party contractors. The 2023-25 CP includes an objective to scale up operations in the south and east and the CO developed in 2023 a full programme for the South embedded in CPD and HAC but emphasising the need to focus on most of the indicators lagging behind in the region.

Building on findings and recommendations from the evaluation of the 2019-2020 CP, published in late 2021, planning for the 2023-25 CP recognised the importance of the humanitarian-development-peace nexus in programmes strategies, and emphasised strengthening partnerships and building national capacity.

In January 2023 Libya remained in political crisis, with competing parallel power bases in the West and East of the country. A ceasefire agreement was signed in late 2020 and it was agreed to hold national elections in December 2021, but these were postponed and the country lacks a timeline and an agreed

¹ UNICEF Libya. Country Programme Document (2023-2025). Pgs. 6-9

² Ibid. Pg. 10

³ Unicef Libya Adolescent and Youth Strategy, June 2023

⁴ Ibid. Pg. 11

⁵ UNICEF Libya Country Office, 'Accountability Framework Between Libya Country Office and Benghazi Field Office' September 2022.

constitution framework for electoral politics.⁶ The Tripoli based interim Government of National Unity (GNU) formed in March 2021 and the Tobruk based House of Representatives (HoR), which has endorsed new leadership under the Government of National Stability (GNS), remain in competition over basic governance and management of government finances.⁷⁸ Recurrent clashes in Tripoli, such as in August 2022 and August 2023 continue to manifest underlying conflict.

It also prioritised building national data management systems, in particular for health and education. Across the five sections, plus programme effectiveness, the budget needs were anticipated as given in Table 1 below.

| <i>Programme component</i> | <i>Regular resources</i> | <i>Other resources</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Health and nutrition</i> | 200 | 15 500 | 15 700 |
| <i>Education</i> | 200 | 15 500 | 15 700 |
| <i>Child protection</i> | 200 | 12 000 | 12 200 |
| <i>Water, sanitation and hygiene</i> | 150 | 7 500 | 7 650 |
| <i>Social policy</i> | 150 | 7 200 | 7 350 |
| <i>Programme effectiveness</i> | 1 752 | 5 000 | 6 752 |
| Total | 2 652 | 62 700 | 65 352 |

Thematic priorities were also identified as:

- Children on the move (migrants, refugees and IDPs)
- Youth and adolescents
- Violence against children
- Climate change and water scarcity
- Basic health services
- Data production

A HAC was retained for 2023 focusing on migrants / refugees, IDPs and emergency preparedness. This is seen as complementing the CPD, in spite of a lack of an overall inter-agency Humanitarian Response Plan.

4. Key findings

O1: Objectives, logic, programme rationales and Theories of Change

Assess the clarity of objectives, alignment, logic and coherence of the country programme and programme rationales, and their alignment to the country context and UNICEF Strategic Plan

- Is there a well-articulated theory of change for the country programme and programme rationales?

⁶ [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2022/738207/EPRS_ATAG\(2022\)738207_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2022/738207/EPRS_ATAG(2022)738207_EN.pdf)

⁷ <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099827108242214841/pdf/IDU0bcfa457e01cab04e2208e9505546e774cc87.pdf> Pg. 15, 34

⁸ See Unicef Libya Adolescent and Youth Strategy, June 2023

- Is the theory of change flexible and responsive to external factors? Have there yet been any modifications to the intervention logic and why? Are the causal linkages between the different levels of the intervention logic clear? Have risks and assumptions identified and are adequate?
- What general adjustments should be made, applicable to all or most of the Outcome level theories of change?

Finding 1: The section/outcome theories of change are useful expressions of how the CP is expected to work, but articulations of assumptions could be strengthened, especially assumptions regarding what [is expected to] work as a causal pathway or web and why.

A brief, narrative ToC is given in the CPD outlining the three focus areas of strengthened national capacities, social services, and community/caregiver behaviours to support the fulfilment of children's and adolescents' rights.⁹ Detailed programme level Theories of Change for the CPD are no longer required, as per global guidance. This summary programme ToC in turn articulates with the four pillars of the UNSDCF, which has a high level ToC relating to work across the UNCT: these strategic priorities are 1) Peace and Governance; 2) Sustainable Economic Development; 3) Social and Human Capital Development; and 4) Climate Change, Environment, and Water.¹⁰ The UNICEF Outcomes align with pillars 3 and 4 of the UNSDCF.

The brief programme level ToC for the CPD is reiterated to frame the emerging 'South Programme' which focuses on responding to the particular vulnerabilities and deprivations in Southern Libya.¹¹

A summary Programme Rationale document also brings together the separate Outcome level Programme Rationales which describe the context and objectives for each of the 5 Outcomes of Health and Nutrition (H&N), Education, Child Protection, WASH and Social Policy (SP). These map clearly on to the 5 Goal Areas of the UNICEF global [Strategic Plan](#). The Programme Rationales and the summary Programme Rationale express the high level context and overarching strategic direction, noting the need to work both upstream and downstream, and a shift towards system strengthening and away from humanitarian assistance.

More detailed and substantive ToCs are provided at outcome/section level. These were articulated during 2022 as part of the Programme Rationales for each outcome/section in preparation for the CPD. These articulate overall and intermediate changes sought through each outcome (Health and Nutrition, Education, Child Protection, WASH and Social Policy); change strategies (selected from a 'basket' of change strategies identified for the CP level); bottlenecks; risks and assumptions for each section. These ToCs represent good quality depictions of the circumstances and causal factors of change in many respects. However, assumptions are in some cases not strongly articulated. For most

⁹ The country programme is based on the following theory of change:

- If national capacities are strengthened to develop and implement high quality, gender-responsive, equitable, evidence-based and risk-informed child and adolescent-centred development programmes;
- If there is increased access, quality and equity of shock-resilient essential social services for children, adolescents, women and families, including in humanitarian contexts
- If communities, parents/caregivers, children and adolescents practise healthy, protective, nurturing behaviours and seek basic social services;
- Then children and adolescents, especially the most vulnerable including children on the move, will have their rights progressively fulfilled in an inclusive and protective environment and have increased resilience to shocks.

18. The underlying assumption is that the Government commitment to child rights will remain. Although Libya may continue to experience political and economic fragility, UNICEF assumes that the security situation will allow programme delivery across the country. The strategies for this programme were designed to reduce and mitigate risks, including the prolonged impact of the COVID-19 pandemic; political, security, economic and environmental dynamics; and harmful social and gender norms and practices.

¹⁰ United Nations Libya, UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework Libya 2023-2025

¹¹ UNICEF Libya: South Programme 2023-25

Outcomes, assumptions listed identify the **context and external factors that influence the programme** – the ‘conditions’ needed for successful implementation (e.g. There is a stable and conducive environment); and in some cases the programme implementation conditions (such as There are trained staff). There is less articulation assumptions about causality / identifying hypotheses about how change happens (e.g. Why do we think that change will happen that way? What is underlying our rationale?).¹² These represent important dimensions of ‘assumptions’ and recognising them can be very helpful in fine tuning successful causal pathways.

Finding 2: Flexibility in the ToC which allows the Sections to respond to a context with several unpredictable dimensions is key to its success as a guiding document. This has been established by expressing downstream and upstream intermediate changes; and a range of key interventions which can guide selection of activities appropriate to an evolving on-the-ground situation.

Although developed some time ago, the ToCs have been referred to and used by most Sections, for instance when developing funding proposals and the two year rolling work plans. There has not yet been any formal ToC review, but a visioning exercise in June 2023 reviewed situational assumptions and developed some further prioritisation. The mid-year review, scheduled for early September 2023, which would also have reviewed the ToCs, was cancelled due to the emergency in Derna which unfolded from 11th September.

Section staff agree that the ToCs remain relevant, and that the ToCs are sufficiently flexible to allow for a non-linear pathway in the transition from humanitarian to developmental operational modes. The flexibility is in part ensured by a ‘new’ level of key interventions expressed in the ToC, which sits between Output and Activity level. This broad set of interventions allows for appropriate strategies at different times. This flexibility has been well proven in the recent response to the humanitarian situation in Derna as a result of catastrophic flooding. While all Outcomes had been moving towards an ‘upstream’ focus, as expressed in the ToCs, most sections had included a downstream output which has allowed for a pivot towards emergency response, at least in the short term, when necessary. An Emergency Preparedness Plan also supports and gives guidance to this flexibility.

The switch in focus during September 2023 towards responding to the Derna situation has been deeply felt by the CO, and has enduring significance for the CP. However, while there are concerns that there are temporary gaps in the developmental dimension of the programme, and rapid redeployment to the East of the country has left gaps elsewhere, the overarching perspective is that there will be a successful transition back to a developmental mode after a few months, and that the emergency response is being operationalised with a clear emphasis on the opportunity to rebuild with climate resilience in mind. An updated Humanitarian and Recovery Response Plan for the East (HRRP) was prepared in October 2023, encompassing HAC and CPD results.

Other shifts in contexts that reflect to some degree on the shape of the CPD as it is actually implemented include:

- A stronger push back on both arriving and departing migrants, plus potential additional push contexts with increasing instability in the neighbouring countries of Niger and Sudan.
- Changing government approaches to permissions for INGOs to work in the country
- An increasingly conservative context for progression gender equality and women’s rights (see more in Finding 19).

¹² For analysis of different types of assumption pertinent to change theories, see Isabel Vogel, Review of the use of ‘Theory of Change’ in international development, Review Report for UK Department of International Development, April 2012

- Increased donor engagement as a result of the humanitarian crisis in Derna, giving more likelihood to that all CPD outputs will be fully implemented.

Finding 3: Climate change related risks are inadequately reflected in all of the ToCs; the recent humanitarian situation in Derna clearly demonstrates how these risks are not only highly relevant to the WASH outcome but to all outcome areas.

There is agreement that the risks articulated in the ToCs remain relevant, with the emphasis in all Outcomes of political / security based risks of high importance, and reflecting the humanitarian and development nexus programming framework for the ToCs. To support this understanding of risk, there is also a comprehensive risk register, and an emergency response plan / disaster preparedness plan. However, analysis of these ToC listed risks in the light of the Derna emergency suggests, that climate-change related risks are insufficiently articulated in all of the ToCs: the WASH ToC briefly mentions a risk of water scarcity, but the full breadth of climate-change related hazards is nowhere adequately reflected. A Climate Landscape Analysis for Children in Libya (CLAC) was prepared in 2023, headlining specific climate related risks and their implications for children, but there has not yet been explicit application of this analysis to the CP.

Finding 4: the CP is *in principle* well aligned with the global Strategic Plan, and in particular with the emphasis on risk informed humanitarian and development nexus programming. However, in practice alignment will take more integration e.g. of intersectional approaches and a focus on disability (see also Finding 16).

Flexibility in the ToC in part underpins the CPD's alignment with some 'new' focus areas in the global Strategic Plan – in particular the focus on risk-informed humanitarian and development nexus programming, which is listed as a change strategy in the ToCs of all 5 outcomes. Indeed, the change strategies in general reflect these new SP focus areas¹³; of these, the greatest challenge facing the CP is perhaps integrating an 'intersectional approach to inequality and discrimination' given in particular contextual challenges to transformational approaches to gender relations (see more under Finding 19).

Actions:

- Ensure there is a formal review / reflection process on the ToCs – e.g. as part of the annual review process.
- Include a further review in particular of assumptions as listed in the section ToCs, - as was carried out during the June 2023 visioning. This should focus in particular on articulating causation ('why do we think this will work?') type assumptions.
- Integrate climate-related hazards more clearly in the risks to the programme articulated in the ToC and responses to these in the key interventions of all outcomes, using the CLAC as guidance.

¹³ The nine new focus areas are: Focus on transformational systemic changes; Reinvigorate partnerships and amplify resource mobilization; Engage and partner with children and young people; Integrate bold actions on climate action and mental health; Be bold about recovery from the impact of COVID-19 pandemic; Focus on risk-informed humanitarian and development nexus programming; Harness digital technologies; Lead the momentum for achieving progress on the United Nations reform agenda; Focus on intersectional approach to inequality and discrimination.

- Anticipate the reconstruction of a programme level ToC in advance of or in the early stages of an endline evaluation, and gather engagement across the programme for this process if possible.
- In the review process, maintain the flexibility of the ToC.

O2: Results framework, indicators and verification

Assess the adequacy and validity of results, indicators, tools and systems for monitoring, measuring and verifying results.

- Are the indicators reliable for decision making for the programme improvements?
- Are means of verification clearly identified and reliable for all the outcome and output indicators?
- Have the indicators been defined (e.g. numerators and denominators) without an ambiguity? Has a target value for the indicator been provided, including for any necessary disaggregation?

Outcome-Output

The ToCs map simply and clearly onto the results framework (RF), as the 'Change' and 'intermediate change' levels of the ToC correspond exactly to the Outcome and Output statements in the RF.

In general, there is a reasonable level of **coherence** from Output to outcome, with a few exceptions:

- For **Child Protection**, the outcome is stated at a high level, and indicator 1.1 is a national level behavioural indicator on violence against children. This level of change is not clearly coherent with the outputs which aim at a national / broad level for improved child protection systems (not behaviour change), alongside highly targeted interventions for change in community attitudes and implementation of specific services. These both cover only small numbers of the population.
- For **Social Policy**, the outcome for reducing child deprivations is at a similarly high national level, with indicator 1.1 specifying a reduction in the number of children living in poverty. Outputs meanwhile aim at 1) generating data through the MICS survey and 2) strengthening capacity of national SP systems to respond to shocks and stresses, with direct interventions targeting only small numbers of people (1050 households to be reached by cash transfers through UNICEF-supported programmes, according to the RF). It is therefore not clear how the outputs might in principle achieve any outcome measurable at the national level within the CP timeframe.

Action: Review Outcome statements (and corresponding indicators) for Child Protection and Social Policy; consider making these more specific in terms of target area or particular populations, so that progress towards them will be visible and measurable.

Staff verify that outputs as stated are **comprehensive**, with a new emphasis for this CPD on basing new donor proposals very closely to the CPD plan. Very little work is reported as taking place which does not have immediate relevance to the CPD.

Indicators

Finding 5: Indicators are mostly coherent, comprehensive and relevant, but there are some weaknesses which should be reviewed. Geographical targeting is mostly not specified by the indicator – this is a weakness which should be rectified where possible. Indicators organising reported data of people reached also mostly do not specify disaggregation by gender disability or age group as routine.

Output indicators are in general well defined to support decision making, but there are a few weaknesses:

Some indicators could be strengthened for their **outcome focus**, thereby strengthening their utility for ongoing decision making. The following changes could be considered to strengthen these:

Action:

- For indicator 1.3 under H&N, consider focusing on / measuring the implementation of the Newborn Action Plan rather than simply its availability and endorsement
- For Output indicator 1.1 under Education, consider including implementation of the strategy as part of the target,
- For Output indicator 1.3 under Child Protection, consider changing wording in indicator from 'exists' to 'is implemented'.

A few indicators have been identified by staff as **not highly relevant** to actual work envisaged by the work plans, and therefore in need of review. These include:

Action:

- Output Indicator 1.1 under WASH requires review as developing a finance strategy requires several prior steps including advocacy and influencing, and more maturity in the sector, so this target is unlikely to be achieved in this CP timeline.
- Output Indicator 2.1 under WASH requires review as health care facilities are not in fact the target locations for the WASH section.

Geographical targeting is mostly not clearly expressed in the CPD or in the RF, in part because data to guide explicit / formal geographical targeting of vulnerable and deprived areas is mostly out of date and not reliable (reliable and extremely relevant data for this purpose will be available from the MICS in about 3rd quarter 2024: this will provide a stronger basis for specific targeting in 2025). Exceptions are for Output indicator 2.1 under Education and Output indicator 2.1 under WASH. A result of this is that how or where targets are being met is not clear without referring to the activity level in workplans. Information available for decision-making is impoverished through this absence: monitoring information for indicator targets would be much richer if it specified relevant geographical areas and levels of intervention. At a less formalized level, there are *in practice* different dimensions of geographical targeting:

- A focus on municipal levels in the WASH outcome
- A new emphasis on working in the particularly deprived areas of Southern Libya
- A tendency to focus on known deprived municipalities in the East of Libya via the Benghazi Field Office (FO)

Action: consider tagging activities and outputs as relevant to East, South or other areas in the RF wherever relevant; and consider specifying geographical information in monitoring data and targets specifically for:

- H&N Outcome indicator OI3
- H&N Output indicator 3.1
- Child Protection Output indicator 2.1

Disaggregation of monitoring data for gender and disability is also not integrated to the optimum extent. Recommended adjustments are given in Findings 16 and 19 below.

Targets

Finding 6: Targets are in need of review to align them with previously adjusted indicators and to add denominators wherever feasible.

a) Targets have been set for all but one indicator. These are annual targets for Output indicators and overall CP (3 year) targets for Outcome indicators.

Targets (and a baseline) should be set as soon as possible for indicator 2.2 under Child Protection: Number of people engaged through community platforms in reflective dialogue towards eliminating discriminatory social and gender norms and harmful practices that affect girls and women through UNICEF-supported programmes

More urgently, a number of indicators have been changed after the original RF was agreed, in order to align with the new global Core Standard Indicators (CSIs). In this process, CSIs most closely aligned with the original indicator were chosen. However, baselines and targets have not clearly been adjusted to reflect these new/ adjusted indicators. This applies to 8 of 11 of the Outcome indicators, and two of 39 Output indicators and is therefore particularly urgent to address at Outcome level (see also Finding 9 below).

Action: Urgently align baselines and targets with all indicators that were adjusted / changed to meet global indicators during the early part of the CP – This includes indicators for H&N, Education, WASH and SP.

b) For most Output indicators, denominators are not given and numerical targets have been set. It is important to acknowledge that in many cases, reliable and up to date situation data is not available at this point, which might make an estimate of the denominator value possible (i.e. the number of people who need eventually to be reached). For a limited number of indicators, it would be helpful and possible to include a denominator. This would then allow for a sense of relative progress and the scale of further work. This includes the following:

Action: Consider including denominators, where data is available or reasonable estimates can be made, for the following indicators:

- H&N Output indicator 3.2
- Education Output indicator 2.1
- Child Protection indicator 3.2 and 3.4
- WASH Output indicator 2.1

Verification

Finding 7: Verification of Output Indicators is mostly reasonably valid, but for Outcome indicators there are strong factors negatively affecting evaluability. This will need to be taken into account when articulating the terms of reference for an evaluation, and in its design.

Data sources for Output indicators are on the whole reasonable reliable, with data sourced from the implementation carried out by CSO/INGO partners; from Section reports based on observation of implementation by government stakeholders; and processed / synthesised by the PME team.

For the verification / data sources of Outcome indicators, there are a number of deeper challenges.

First, Education, WASH and Child Protection outcomes include some indicators to be verified by MICS data. Previous national scale household survey data is from 2014, so generating up to date data is a high priority for all Sections and will greatly enhance the evidence base underpinning all of UNICEF’s work. Implementation of the MICS is an output under Social Policy; on its initial planned timeline, it was expected that this might provide reasonable baseline data for key elements of the country programme. However, the timeline has been delayed to some degree, in part due to the Derna emergency and other factors. Data collection is expected to go ahead in the first months of 2024, between January and April/May. Data is expected to be cleaned and made available by 3rd quarter 2024.

Finding 8: In practice, the timeline of the MICS means that it will not provide data appropriate for use either as baseline or as endline data for this Country Programme.

Unfortunately – while the long term significance of this data should not be underestimated – this timeline means that in the short term the MICS data will provide neither high quality baseline data, nor high quality endline data. This is because the reference period – when the data is collated – is approximately 1 to 1.5 years after the start of the CP (almost in the middle, since it is a 3 year programme). Whether used as baseline or endline, any outcome level change identified would reflect only a part (about half) of the CP timeline. MICS data IS expected to be useful to refine geographic or other types of targeting for the last year of the programme in 2025, and may be considered useful for baselines for the next CPD from 2026.

Finding 9: Except for the H&N outcomes, evaluability of CPD outcomes is weak. Suggested approaches to mitigating these weaknesses will improve evaluability to some degree but not fully.

This and other factors are taken into account in the assessment of evaluability of Outcomes given in Table 2 below. The assessment also uses an overview of stated baseline sources as well as endline data to estimate whether any change covering the CP period will be measured.

| Key: Good Moderate to good Moderate Poor to moderate Poor | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Section | Outcome indicator Indicators adjusted to meet global indicators (GSIs) in red. | Reliability of baseline | Data Source | Will data be available? | Likelihood of outcome evaluable? | Possible strategy for improvement / mitigation |
| Health and Nutrition | OI1: Children < 1 year receiving measles-containing vaccine at national level (IND0000235) | Good (JMP from MoH data) | Expanded Programme on Immunisation data from MoH | Paper system from gov sources – may not arrive on time. Working in CP for MIS in vaccine centres – should be ready by end of CP. | Moderate to good | |
| | OI2: Percentage of children that are vaccinated with three doses of DTP / Penta | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|--|--|------------------|--|
| | containing vaccine (IND0000241) | | | | | |
| | OI3: District or equivalent administrative unit with at least 80% coverage of measles-containing vaccine for children < 1 year receiving | Good (JMP from MoH data) | Expanded Programme on Immunisation data from MoH | Paper system from gov sources – may not arrive on time. Working in CP for MIS in vaccine centres – should be ready by end of CP. | Moderate to good | |
| | OI4: Percentage of children under five who are stunted (Std RAM) | Good SMART survey data 2022: 8.2% | SMART survey 2022 | Unlikely to have comprehensive updated data after 2022 | Moderate | Conduct follow up SMART survey (in 2024-5) as per 2022 survey recommendations ¹⁴ |
| Education | OI1: Primary school gross enrolment ratio (IND0000343) OI2: Secondary school gross enrolment ratio (IND0000319) | Moderate Quality of Baseline data unclear; currently government estimates awaiting MICS update | MICS/EMIS | EMIS may be in place by 2024 | Poor | Prioritise EMIS Assess progress using samples of reliable district data, MICS, and available EMIS data. |
| | OI3: Extent to which the education system is inclusive and gender equitable for access to learning opportunities | Moderate Unclear where baseline is from | MICS | MICS data captures only 1 relevant year of CP | Poor | Generate qualitative data at endline for sample of education system to compare with baseline and MICS data |
| CP | OI1: Percentage/ number of mothers (or primary caregivers) who think that physical punishment is necessary to raise/educate children (survey based) (SP Outcome 3.2) | Moderate to good Timing not ideal: 2018 Gov study | MICS | Baseline to MICS endline weak overlap with CP period | Poor to moderate | Check KAP survey results – reported but not made available here. Prepare endline KAP survey to verify. |
| | OI2: Level of development of the mechanism to track delivery and referral information related to mental health and psychosocial support services for children and adolescents (SP Outcome 3.8) | Moderate Limited survey from Etools | Partners | | Moderate | |
| WASH | OI1: Proportion of population using at least basic drinking water services | Moderate Estimate from JMP 2018 data | MICS | Baseline to MICS endline weak overlap with CP period | Poor to moderate | Use JMP estimates for 2024-25 |
| | OI2: Proportion of population using basic sanitation services | Moderate Estimate from JMP 2018 data | MICS | Baseline to MICS endline weak overlap with CP period | Poor to moderate | Use JMP estimates for 2024-25 |
| SP | OI1: Number of children living in poverty according to (a) International extreme poverty line; (b) National monetary poverty lines or (c) National multidimensional poverty lines” | Poor Estimate from 2014 data | MODA | MODA report will not be ready on evaluation timeline | Poor | Change indicator? |

¹⁴ Libya National Nutrition Smart Survey Report, BoSC-Libya, Primary Health Care Institute, UNICEF, WFP, AAH

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|------------------------|--|------|--|
| | O12: Ability of the social protection system, including cash transfer capacities, to effectively respond to humanitarian crises | Good. | HACT and annual report | | Good | |
|--|--|-------|------------------------|--|------|--|

As this assessment suggests, Health and Nutrition is the only Outcome that has good prospects for endline evaluability. Education and WASH outcomes will be particularly challenging, and Child Protection and Social Policy will face challenges in some indicators.

Possible partial or full solutions to these challenges are suggested in the end column (and below). Implementing all of these suggestions will strengthen evaluability to a good degree, but some weakness will remain.

Actions:

- Consider conducting a follow up SMART survey on Nutrition in 2024-5 to capture any change in rates of stunting and / or arrange for sample stunting data from MoH to provide evidence of progress at endline.
- Assess progress in enrolment ratios using a combination of samples of reliable district data, MICS, and available EMIS data.
- Generate qualitative data at endline or during the evaluation process for a sample of inclusiveness of education system to compare with baseline and MICS data
- Prepare endline KAP survey to verify any shift in attitudes to physical punishment of children as suggested by the RF.
- Consider whether using JMP estimates for 2024-25 would strengthen WASH outcome data.
- Consider changing the child poverty indicator for Social Policy.

Conclusion for evaluability: Low levels of reliable / quality outcome level data mean that an evaluation focused on assessment of effectiveness as per the achievement of outcome level targets is not recommended. With measures to strengthen this data as suggested, an evaluation using a mixed assessment of effectiveness against outcome targets and progress towards change using a theory based approach could be designed.

Action: Articulate ToR for an evaluation which takes a theory based approach, focused on what strategies work in what [kind of contexts]. This may also propose select Outcome areas for an effectiveness against targets assessment (E.g. H&N Outcome). The ToR should specify that the evaluation approach should situate achievements within a picture of the long term context of UNICEF work.

O3 Documentation and information systems

To assess the availability and quality of the documentation, information and data needed to measure and monitor results (including the availability and sufficiency of baselines and targets) and conduct a useful Country Programme Evaluation.

- Are baselines in place for indicators? If not, are activities planned to generate the baseline?
- Will the monitoring system generate data/information at reasonable intervals to help monitoring and documenting progresses over time?

Baselines:

Finding 10: Quality data is a challenge in Libya generally, therefore baseline data is mostly not strong, especially at outcome level. Some simple actions can be taken to optimise the RF as far as possible.

Reflecting the overall picture of data in Libya, baseline data for the CP is in general not strong.

For two indicators, the baseline is missing / has not yet been established:

- H&N Output Indicator 2.1 (UNICEF supported measles vaccinations)
- Child Protection Output Indicator 2.2 (people engaged in dialogue on social and gender norms)

For others, the data anchoring the baseline is out-of-date: as seen in Table 2 above, such as from the 2014 PAPFAM survey, or estimates based on JMP 2018 data.

Several Output baselines refer to UNICEF 2021 monitoring data from the previous country programme. For upstream strategy development or policy outputs, baselines refer to the current absence of the strategy/ document.

Actions:

- Establish baselines for the two indicators where baselines are missing.
- Use MICS data, when available, to retrospectively triangulate JMP estimates for WASH Outcome indicators OI1 and OI2 baselines and government estimates for Education Outcome indicators OI1 and OI2.
- Verify baseline value for Child Protection Outcome indicator 1 using recent KAP survey data

Information/ monitoring systems

Finding 11: Monitoring systems for work through CSO partners has undergone regular strengthening when weaknesses have been identified. Accessing regular monitoring information from government partners is generally a greater cause for concern among staff.

Internal monitoring systems for UNICEF implementation through CSO/INGO partners are reported to be, and appear to be, quite robust, with reported information collected on the Etools systems and checked by programme managers before it is cleaned and synthesised by the PME team.

While data as reported from partners is not usually in doubt, occasional concerns about the veracity and quality of reported data have driven recent changes in the verification systems. 3rd party monitoring has largely been replaced in recent months with monitoring visits by programme staff (see also below). This was in part because it has been difficult to establish standards for a results focus in 3rd party monitoring (e.g. it is easier to check that equipment exists than how it is used).

Basic systems for reporting / documenting monitoring staff field visits are in place, and templates include data input opportunities and actions to take forward. It is reported that there is as yet no specific schedule for making visits which therefore depends on the schedules /work plans of

programme officers, therefore there may be space to improve the frequency and balance of monitoring visits.

The PME team are responsible for synthesising data from partner reports and monitoring visits; the main platform for this synthesis is the LCO specific [results dashboard](#).

Monitoring with government partners is a cause of greater concern than with CSO/INGO partners. These concerns pose a greater evaluability risk for Sections (such as H&N) that work primarily with government partners.

Implementation data may be available on request, drawing from paper based monitoring systems in the ministries, but may not be available on the timeline required for UNICEF reporting. Activities that involved direct engagement or training are monitored directly; and in some cases, joint monitoring visits with government counterparts have been initiated.

Both H&N and Education have prioritised support to developing EMIS and HMIS systems to improve national data flows in the longer term, and these systems will also greatly enhance the data available to UNICEF as well as the frequency with which it can be accessed.

Actions:

Some improvements could be made to upstream monitoring by instituting a systematic plan for tracking the outcomes and impact of capacity building initiatives, across the programme. This would involve documenting needs assessments, collating and analysing training design and pre and post tests; and collecting qualitative or in-depth survey data on how new skills are used in the subsequent months/years. With this plan in place, including indicators in the overall RF to document capacity building would be a useful addition to measuring the upstream work.

Actions:

- Systematise schedules / targets for field monitoring visits so that a balance of visits is carried out across geographies and outcome areas.
- Include in visit report templates sections for documenting any concerns about data reliability.
- Include synthesising field visit reported data in routine PME workplans.

Finding 12: Digital monitoring systems have exacerbated challenges in accessing data by external service providers / consultants, including – potentially – evaluation consultants.

The LCO, like other UNICEF offices, has been undergoing a rapid digitalisation of monitoring information and reporting systems. These systems have streamlined internal knowledge flows and provided opportunities for analysing and synthesising information. However it has also had the unintended consequence of exacerbated challenges in accessing data by external service providers / consultants who do not automatically have access to the digital platforms (as part of business processes of contracting). This presents a risk to evaluability if it not properly planned for.

Action: Preparations for evaluation should include either or both of:

- Considering providing digital access to evaluators
- Clarifying the role as focal point for the Information Management Officer and allocating sufficient staff time for supporting evaluators to access information from the digital platforms.

O4: Human resources and financial documentation

Review the adequacy of human resources available for monitoring and generating information; and the appropriateness of financial documentation for assessing effectiveness.

- Are there mechanisms and adequate human and financial resources in place to collect relevant data in a consistent manner?
- Are financial resources clearly aligned with deliverables?

Finding 13: The combination of high staff turnover and temporary gaps in the PME team potentially constitutes an evaluability risk because routinized and systematic documentation / synthesised monitoring is especially necessary in contexts where institutional memory is weak / not guaranteed.

Human resources

Libya is a category E duty station¹⁵. This means that turnover of international staff is high with duration of service often between one and two years – presenting a challenge to institutional memory, and increasing the importance / significance of written documentation and documented monitoring for smooth staff transitions – as well as for evaluation purposes. As a Category E duty station, it has a four-week R&R cycle, which means that staff availability for consultation is limited.

The PME team is designed to consist of 9 positions plus the PME Specialist, who sits under the Deputy Representative – Programmes. At the time of this assessment, there are significant gaps in the PME team, with 4 of 10 positions vacant including that of the PME Specialist and a Planning and Monitoring Officer who both moved on during September 2023. These gaps are currently being addressed, with a Monitoring NOB and a UNV recently recruited, and a newly recruited PME Specialist in place as this assessment was closing.

In combination, when PME staff is low, this situation presents some risk to evaluability of the CP. Where the programme is not fully monitored – due to gaps in the team – this would in any circumstances present some risk; in this case where institutional memory – which might informally cover document gaps - can also be thin, the risk is more intense. In other words, the role of the PME team has additional significance in situations where staff move on quickly and institutional memory is low.

Action:

- Priority should be given to filling remaining gaps in the PME team as quickly as possible. Corporate opportunities to strengthen knowledge management should be taken.
- ToR for evaluation should specify relatively long data collection period, given the challenge of scheduling in the context of the R&R cycle.
- ToR should also emphasise systematic document review, given the added significance of documentation to anchor institutional memory.

Financial documentation

Finding 14: Cost effectiveness analysis is likely to be very challenging, and therefore not productive as part of the evaluation for this CPD.

¹⁵ OIAI Audit Report, May 2021

It is acknowledged that maintaining some operational flexibility is critical in situation of high levels of uncertainty regarding political and economic stability, security, as well as climate related uncertainty. Therefore some financial flexibility is also required, currently captured through budgeting at output levels, with the key interventions level below this able to draw on the output budget as required. Expenditure is in turn tracked at intervention level – but tracking precisely from budget to delivered activities currently complex.

Libya’s economic crisis that has reduced liquidity and limited cash availability in the market has resulted in restrictions by the Libyan Central Bank on cash distribution. Cash distribution to implementing partners is therefore complex and time-consuming: usually, cash transfers are made to accounts in Tunisia in US\$ and then brought back to Libya where partners procure local currency.¹⁶

In addition, the separate authority in the East means there are two ministries of Finance to clear cash transfers. This is said to cause considerable delays.

In combination, these factors mean that specific analysis of cost effectiveness with the endline evaluation is unlikely to be productive for this CPD (or indeed cost effective), given the challenging finance context. Output level financial documentation can be and mapped to donor project funding and used to verify or triangulate / sense check an assessment of effectiveness according to output and outcome. This analysis should not form the main direction of assessment.

Action:

- Do not specify cost effectiveness assessment as a central objective of evaluation in the ToR. The focus for the Efficiency criteria for evaluation could be on operational efficiency, in particular how far CO HR and systems are supportive of a flexible transition from humanitarian to developmental approaches.

O5: Cross Cutting Issues

Assess the way gender, disability, SBC and youth cross cutting issues have been documented

- Are measures, tools, and mechanisms in place to measure crosscutting priorities such as gender, disability, SBC, and youth?

Finding 15: There has been some lack of clarity and consistency across LCO documentation about what the cross cutting issues are.

For example, in the CPD, **priority themes** are identified as Children on the move (migrants, refugees and IDPs); Youth and adolescents; Violence against children; Climate change and water scarcity; Basic health services; and Data production

Meanwhile in analysis from May 2023¹⁷ underpinning the statement of support to the South, **cross cutting priorities** are stated as: Accountability to affected populations; Social and behaviour change; Gender equality lens; and Adolescent’s engagement and emergency preparedness and response.

The Summary Programme Rationales document states **cross cutting programmes** as: Children on the move; Gender; Adolescents and Youth. **Cross cutting priorities** are identified as: Emergency

¹⁶ This was the case at least until 2021: OIAI Audit Report, May 2021

¹⁷ “Situation in the South of Libya, Sectoral Analysis’ May 2023”; “UNICEF – Libya: Support to the South Region, May 2023” – PowerPoint presentations.

preparedness and response; Data, research, evaluation, and evidence-driven advocacy and communications; Community engagement and social behaviour change; Accountability to Affected Populations.

For this assignment, following early consultations, focus cross cutting *priorities/issues* were agreed as: Gender; Disability; SBC and Youth.

It is of note that over the course of 2023, and particularly in the context of the Derna emergency, climate change has increasingly been acknowledged as an important cross cutting issue which requires stronger integration into each of the Outcome areas.

Action:

- Going forward, and as part of the annual review, establish a common language / terminology for cross cutting issues which distinguishes between the common strategies driving programme objectives (such as SBC) and dimensions of the objectives themselves (such as gender equality).
- For issues which are dimensions of the CP objectives, ensure these are fully integrated into all aspects of documentation and monitoring about the programme.
- Consider integrating Climate Change as a cross cutting issue, and integrate into each outcome area on the basis of the CLAC analysis.

Disability

Finding 16: Focused work on embedding disability as a dimension of cross-cutting “inclusion issues has begun to make progress but this is not well embedded in the results framework or tracked by monitoring systems.

While disability is not clearly stated as a priority cross cutting theme in early CP documentation, some progress has been made in embedding disability as an issue in the functioning of the office and the implementation of the CPD. These include the establishment of a working group; progress on operationalising a disability marker in the budget documentation; and progress on establishing criteria for identifying and counting different types of disabilities among people currently reached by the programme. During 2022, UNICEF also partnered with UNHCR to conduct Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with those living with different disabilities (vision, hearing, communication, mobility, and emotional/behavioural) to understand their experiences, challenges, and needs with regard to accessing services. The focus was primarily on refugees and asylum seekers over the age of 18 from other countries; and the aim was to inform an awareness raising and advocacy campaign, as well as improve education and child protection services to those with disability.¹⁸

Disability is only visible in the RF under Education Output 2 which specifies inclusive education and skills development and itemises disaggregation by disability (among other factors) in the corresponding indicator 2.1. With this limited window for monitoring, it is clear that more monitoring information on disability would better visibilise the achievements in reaching persons with disability currently being made, as well as increasing office accountability to stronger work on this axis of inclusion.

The following actions would strengthen the CPD alignment with the global Strategic Plan by working towards elevated programming on disability rights, as well as opening the door for an intersectional approach to inequality and discrimination.

¹⁸ Youth Strategy.

Actions:

1. Integrate disaggregation by disability into all feasible indicators, at the outset including:
 - Outcome indicator 1.1 under Education
 - Output Indicators 2.2 and 2.3 under Education,
 - Output indicators 1.3.1, 1.3.2 , 1.3.3 and 1.3.4 under Child Protection
 - Output indicator 1.1.4 under WASH
 - Outcome indicator 1.1 under Social Policy
2. Consider including an EQ on the integration of disability issues in the ToR for evaluation, in order to generate qualitative information and documentation of what progress has been made.

SBC

Finding 17: As it is a strategy expected to accelerate results across the programme, understanding what and how far SBC interventions contribute to results could fill some of the gaps about 'what works' to secure results for children in the Libyan context. Close flagging and tracking of these interventions would therefore be warranted to facilitate synthesising the role of SBC during an endline evaluation.

SBC is a strategy supporting and accelerating results for all sections, rather than a dimension of the results in itself. It is used to support 4 of the 5 outcome areas: H&N, Education, Child Protection and WASH, specifically through H&N Outputs 1, 2 and 3; Education Output 1 (out of school children); WASH through Output 1 with an awareness campaign on water scarcity and climate change; and Child Protection through Output 2 on work with caregivers and communities.

For some outputs, the contribution of SBC to the result is quite explicit, as the result sought is behaviour / attitude change (e.g. Output 2 and Outcome 1, Child Protection). For others, SBC makes a less explicit contribution to the result by creating the enabling environment for the change to take place (such as for vaccination and diet behaviours; and for inclusion of out of school children).

Pre and post rapid assessment are used for awareness campaigns and used as a basis for RAM annual reporting to track the attitude/behaviour changes driven by SBC interventions in both direct and indirect contributions. KAP surveys have also been carried out to track behaviour change on some issues (perceptions of legitimacy of corporal punishment for children). Understanding the effectiveness of SBC as a strategy supporting results under each Outcome will depend both on synthesising these pre/post-test assessments, as well as on clarity at workplan level on which activities are SBC –related. An overall coherent M&E plan should be developed, bringing these scattered indicators together to work towards an assessment of the role of SBC as a strategy.

Action:

Facilitate the opportunity to track the effectiveness / contribution of SBC as a strategy by below. flagging SBC driven activities at workplan level; collating pre and post testing as part of output measurements; and synthesising SBC related monitoring information from the sections it supports as part of an overall SBC monitoring plan.

Youth:

Finding 18: The Youth cross cutting issue is reasonably well integrated into the results framework and indicators, but data is not routinely disaggregated by age groups, and the recently developed Youth Strategy suggests a number of priority actions to strengthen the inclusion of a youth focus across the sections.

In the CPD, the Education section takes the lead on adolescent and youth work and in the organogram, an ADAP Specialist reports to the Chief of Education. However, although all sections specify attention to adolescents in their outcome statements. The H&N Outcome also specifies attention to adolescents in Outputs 2 (on vaccination) and 3 (on primary health care system capacity); and WASH in Output 2 (on service provision in targeted areas).

Adolescents are specified as a target group through the following indicators:

- H&N Output Indicator 3.3 on Extent to which Gender-responsive programmes to prevent anaemia in adolescent girls and boys through school- and community-based approaches are implemented
- Education Output Indicator 2.1 on Number of out-of-school children and adolescents who accessed education through UNICEF-supported programmes.
- Child Protection Outcome indicator OI2 on Level of development of the mechanism to track delivery and referral information related to mental health and psychosocial support services for children and adolescents and Output Indicator 3.3 on Number of UNICEF-targeted children, adolescents, parents and caregivers provided with community-based mental health and psychosocial support services
- WASH Output indicator 1.4 on Children, adolescents and young people are engaged in action and advocacy to address climate change, unsustainable energy use and/or environmental degradation with UNICEF support

However, this specification is not consistently carried into disaggregated targets.

Action: Disaggregation to monitor how young people are being reached by the programme could be strengthened in:

- H&N output indicator 2.1
- Education Output Indicators 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3
- Child Protection output indicators 2.2, 3.1 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4
- WASH output indicator 1.4

A Youth Strategy was developed in the early months of the CP and completed by June 2023. This lists a number of priority actions for each Section to integrate more strongly a focus on young people (See Annex 5). Once decisions have been finalized about which priority actions will be taken forward under which Output, it will be important to briefly review indicators for these outputs to ensure that new activities are coherent with the output aim, and that the focus on youth is reflected in disaggregated targets wherever possible.

Action:

Review indicators in the light of any new activities resulting from the Adolescent and Youth Strategy so that monitoring of achievements with and for young people is maximised to the extent possible.

Gender

Finding 19: Although the programme statements include strong attentiveness to gender, disaggregating data by gender at the top level of the RF and RAM reporting is weak. Strengthening this is a simple way to visibilize the gender-relevant work being done by the programme, and would immediately enhance awareness of this dimension in all aspects of the programme.

A Gender Programme Review was undertaken in May 2021 just before the development of the new CPD. This process contributed to the subsequent CPD design in which the pursuit of gender equality has been well integrated into the results framework at the level of output and outcome statements. These include an awareness of the need for gender responsive policies, services and activities, and specify particular attention to girls, boys, adolescent girls etc. It is less well integrated into specifying

gender disaggregation in indicators and targets: this gap simply makes less information explicitly available about how the programme is potentially affecting gender relations or supporting girls and boys differently.

It is reported that the data received from partners, and the MIS systems that will soon be available, include gender disaggregation, and can therefore support greater visibility of disaggregated data at the top level. The dedicated Libya CO results dashboard ¹⁹ developed and maintained by the PME team also routinely disaggregates by gender (as well as location, disability, IDPs, USAC and more) but discussion are ongoing concerning how this disaggregation can be framed so that it maps onto the predefined disaggregation required by the RAM system.

Action: Make more visible gender disaggregation at the top level of the RF and Ram reporting in particular for:

- H&N output indicator 2.1. Output indicator 3.3 if it is changed to measure implementation and monitors children reached.
- Education Outcome indicators OI1 and OI2; Output Indicators 2.2 and 2.3
- Child Protection output indicators 2.2, 3.1 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4
- WASH output indicator 1.4
- Social Policy Outcome Indicator OI1 (Or its replacement if it is changed).

Office stakeholders report that contextual changes have recently made using the language of gender and therefore addressing gender relations explicitly all the more challenging for LCO. This conservative trajectory was not articulated in any risks associated with the ToC or risk register – yet it is a risk for any activities which include aims to change gender norms or target girls / young women in ways that aim to strengthen their rights – such as through education and skills development; SBC activities addressing gender; activities to reduce violence against children; and to promote girls’ leadership in youth advocacy.

Action:

Include in the ToC review process reflection on the implications of an increasingly conservative context for gender equality and girls and women’s rights for the implementation of the CPD, and its likely achievements. Include this as a risk factor to the ToC for each Outcome, as considered appropriate. Also consider where a ‘reasonably conducive environment for working towards gender equality’ is in fact an assumption underpinning likely achievements towards outputs / outcomes.

5 Conclusions

In a context of ongoing instability and potential risks to the programme, the current CPD of UNICEF LCO represents an overall effort to transition away from a primarily humanitarian-driven programme. The 2023-25 programme sets out to balance the solid upstream work supporting and strengthening government capacity to deliver services for children in a context of respect for their rights with sufficient flexibility to be able to respond to crises of various kinds which could emerge over the course of the CPD timeframe. The need for this flexibility is real, as the recent crisis in Derna has so amply demonstrated, and the CO’s ability to respond in humanitarian mode while also

¹⁹<https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiNDkYjI3OGItMWVkYy00MTlwLTg4YzYtNWQ4MWNmZmM4ZDY3IiwidCI6Ijc3NDZlMTk1LTU0ZTEtNGZiOC05MDRiLWFiMTg5MjAyMzY2NyIsImMiOiJh9&pageName=ReportSection4bd651cd65f82193b318>

keeping firm sight of a more developmental context to feed into from the beginning, suggests that the CPD structure has got this balance about right.

This ability to pivot in the immediate term while also designing for the long term is key to the relevance of the programme. But is not so easy to monitor systematically in ways that provide regular, reliable information about progress to support ongoing decision making to respond to evolving contexts, and to fine tune the programme. While the structures of the programme and the monitoring system collecting and processing this information appear broadly robust and appropriate, the process of this EA has revealed some key areas in which fine tuning can strengthen some weaker links.

First, the EA process has identified an important **risk where short institutional memory and gaps in the team documenting information meet**. The adaptive programming needed to maintain continual relevance to the context requires close documentation if decision making through short duty stints is to remain coherent – and this is challenging when there are longstanding or even short term gaps in the PME team. To secure a coherent stream of information and maintain evaluability, these gaps need to be filled as quickly as possible.

Second – and on the same theme – a crucial support in this context is having the **in-built capacity to keep adapting and updating monitoring to the changing contexts**, using the flexibility built into the programme. This capacity to revisit live documentation and continuously update must be available in the PME team, as a support function to the adaptive decision making made by the sections. Currently, the necessary updates include documenting the final changes to indicators and targets in the RF – but additional routing updating is likely to continue to be necessary as the programme evolves.

Third, there is some enduring **lack of clarity about what exactly are the key cross cutting issues** which represent dimensions of the results sought by the programme. This requires urgent attention. Nevertheless it is clear that these include at least youth and gender. On both of these, the LCO has made strong progress for this CPD through processes to guide stronger integration of these priorities: through the Gender Programmatic Review in 2021, and developing the Adolescent and Youth Strategy in 2023. Nevertheless, there is still space for strengthening these approaches in the monitoring system. This is both so that the CO's achievements on these priority areas are properly tracked and understood, and so that any gaps where attention to these could be more strongly focused can be identified. The first step towards this is to **more systematically and visibly disaggregate by gender and age group in all monitoring that counts people/children** targeted and/or reached. In addition, the real risk to initiatives which aim to shift gender relations (transformative approaches) posed by an increasingly threatening approach to women's rights must be adequately acknowledged by the programme in statements of risks to the ToC, as well as the risk register used for routine planning.

Disability has not generally been identified as a cross cutting issue in documentation associated with the programme so far. Nevertheless, the LCO has begun to do some strong work on disability in the context of this programme, and this is clearly well aligned with the priorities of the global Strategic Plan. Therefore it will be important to clearly document the progress made; and a step towards this will be – as for the other issues – to **systematically and visibly disaggregate all monitoring that counts people/children by disability** as well. This step has recently been made more realistic by work within the office to support clearer identification of different types of disability among rights holder-beneficiaries already reached.

Finally, low levels of timely and good quality outcome level data mean that this cannot be relied upon for evaluation purposes. Therefore an evaluation focused on assessment of effectiveness as per the achievement of outcome level targets is not recommended. With measures to strengthen this data as suggested here, **an evaluation using a mixed assessment of effectiveness against outcome targets and progress towards change using a theory based approach** could be designed. In this context, attention could productively be paid to a selection of the 'key strategies' referred to in the ToCs, **bringing together the evidence on 'what works' (which strategies show promise, in what circumstances) in this context to achieve results for children**. In particular this could include putting in place systems so that the impact of capacity building initiatives supporting government can potentially be tracked. Putting in place systematic needs assessment processes (as 'baseline') and post tests for training /orientations are important initial tools for this.

6 Recommendations

This section brings together 'Action' statements in the Findings Section, and organises these according to priority and responsibility.

6.1 For LCO leadership

Immediate priority

- Priority should be given to filling gaps in the PME team as quickly as possible.
- Corporate opportunities to strengthen knowledge management should be taken.

Medium term priority

- Establish a common language / terminology for cross cutting issues relevant to this CPD which distinguishes between the common strategies driving programme objectives (such as SBC) and dimensions of the objectives themselves (such as gender equality).
- Consider integrating Climate Change as a cross cutting issue, and integrate into each outcome area on the basis of the CLAC analysis.

6.2 PME team (with section chiefs):

Immediate priority

- Urgently align baselines and targets with all indicators that were adjusted / changed to meet global indicators during the early part of the CPD. This includes indicators for H&N, Education, WASH and SP.
- Review indicators in the light of any new activities resulting from the Adolescent and Youth Strategy so that monitoring of achievements with and for young people is maximised to the extent possible.
- Systematise schedules / targets for field monitoring visits so that a balance of visits is carried out across geographies and outcome areas.

- For cross cutting issues which are dimensions of the CP objectives (gender, youth, disability, ensure these are fully integrated into all aspects of documentation and monitoring about the programme.
- Consider integrating Climate Change as a cross cutting issue, and integrate into each outcome area on the basis of the CLAC analysis.

Medium term priority:

- Include in visit report templates sections for documenting any concerns about data reliability.
- Include synthesising field visit reported data in routine PME workplans.
- Institute a systematic plan for tracking the outcomes and impact of capacity building initiatives, across the programme. This would involve documenting needs assessments, training design and pre and post-tests; and collecting qualitative or in-depth survey data on how new skills are used in the subsequent months/years. With this plan in place, including indicators in the overall RF to document capacity building would be a useful addition to measuring the upstream work.
- Facilitate the opportunity to track the effectiveness / contribution of SBC as a strategy by clearly flagging SBC driven activities at workplan level; collating pre and post testing around awareness campaigns and other activities as part of output measurements; and supporting the synthesis of SBC related monitoring information from the sections it supports as part of an overall SBC monitoring plan.

6.3 As part of the upcoming annual review

Immediate priority

- Ensure that the annual review includes a formal review / reflection process on the ToCs and follow this up by updating documentation.
 - As part of this, include a review of **assumptions** as listed in the section ToCs, with a focus on articulating some causation ('why do we think this will work?') type assumptions.
 - Take care to maintain the current **flexibility** of the ToC though the structure of key interventions and strategies, but begin to document which strategies have been prioritised.
 - Integrate climate-related hazards more clearly in the **risks** to the programme articulated in the ToC and responses to these in the key interventions of all outcomes.
 - Reflect on the implications of an increasingly **conservative context for gender equality** and girls and women's rights for the implementation of the CPD, and its likely achievements. Include this as a risk factor to the ToC for each Outcome, as considered appropriate. Also consider where and how far a 'reasonably conducive environment for working towards gender equality' is in fact an assumption underpinning likely achievements towards outputs / outcomes.

6.4 For the Terms of Reference for a Country Programme Evaluation

Medium term priority

- Articulate ToR for an evaluation which takes a theory based approach, focused on what strategies work [in what kind of contexts]. This may also propose select Outcome areas for an effectiveness against targets assessment (E.g. for H&N Outcome which has stronger outcome data). The ToR should specify that the evaluation approach should situate achievements within a picture of the long term context of UNICEF work.
- Anticipate the reconstruction of a programme level ToC in advance of or in the early stages of an endline evaluation, and gather engagement across the programme for this process if possible.
- Do not specify cost effectiveness assessment as a central objective of evaluation in the ToR. Rather, the focus for the Efficiency criteria for evaluation could be on operational efficiency, in particular how far CO HR and systems are supportive of a flexible transition from humanitarian to developmental approaches.
- The ToR should also emphasise systematic document review, given the added significance of documentation to anchor institutional memory.
- The ToR should specify relatively long data collection period, given the challenge of scheduling in the context of the R&R cycle.
- Consider including an EQ on the integration of disability issues in the ToR for evaluation, in order to generate qualitative information and documentation of what progress has been made.

Preparations for evaluation should include either or both of:

- Considering providing digital access to evaluators to LCO monitoring and document storage platforms.
- Allocating internal staff responsibility to support evaluators to access information from the digital platforms.

6.5 For section chiefs:

H&N

Immediate priority

- Establish baselines for H&N Output Indicator 2.1
- Consider including geographical information in monitoring data and targets for:
 - H&N Outcome indicator OI3
 - H&N Output indicator 3.1
- Consider including denominators, where data is available or reasonable estimates can be made, for H&N Output indicator 3.2.
- Make more visible gender disaggregation at the top level of the RF and RAM reporting in particular for H&N output indicator 2.1 and Output indicator 3.3 if it is changed to measure implementation and monitors children reached.
- Add disaggregation to results data to monitor how young people are being reached by the programme e.g. for H&N output indicator 2.1.

Medium term priority

- For H&N output indicator 1.3, consider focusing on / measuring the implementation of the Newborn Action Plan rather than simply its availability and endorsement

- Consider conducting a follow up SMART survey on Nutrition in 2024-5 to capture any change in rates of stunting.

Education

Immediate priority

- For Output indicator 1.1 under Education, include implementation of the sector plans and strategies – as in the output statement - as part of the targets. These currently go only as far as development of the strategy.
- Consider including denominators, where data is available or reasonable estimates can be made, for Education Output indicator 2.1 (number of out of school children).
- Integrate disaggregation by disability into all feasible indicators, at the outset including:
 - Education Outcome indicator 1.1
 - Education Output Indicators 2.2 and 2.3
- Make gender disaggregation more visible at the top level of the RF and RAM reporting for Education Outcome indicators OI1 and OI2; Output Indicators 2.2 and 2.3.
- Strengthen disaggregation to monitor how young people are being reached by the programme through Education Output Indicators 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3

Medium term priority

- Generate qualitative data at endline for sample of inclusiveness of education system to compare with baseline and MICS data.
- Consider assessing progress in enrolment ratios at endline using a combination of samples of reliable district data, MICS, and available EMIS data.
- Use MICS data, when available, to retrospectively triangulate JMP estimates for WASH Outcome indicators OI1 and OI2 baselines and government estimates for Education Outcome indicators OI1 and OI2.

Child Protection

Immediate priority

- Set targets and a baseline as soon as possible for indicator 2.2 under Child Protection (people engaged in dialogue on social and gender norms)
- Verify baseline value for Child Protection Outcome indicator 1 using recent KAP survey data
- Consider including geographical information in monitoring data and targets for Child Protection Output indicator 2.1
- Consider including denominators, where data is available or reasonable estimates can be made, for Child Protection indicator 3.2 and 3.4.
- Integrate disaggregation by disability into all feasible indicators, at the outset including Child Protection Output indicators 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3 and 1.3.4.
- Make gender disaggregation more visible at the top level of the RF and RAM reporting in particular for Child Protection output indicators 2.2, 3.1 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4.
- Strengthen disaggregation to monitor how young people are being reached by the in Child Protection output indicators 2.2, 3.1 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4

Medium term priority

- Prepare an endline KAP survey to verify any changes attitudes to physical punishment of children
- Review Outcome statements (and corresponding indicators) for Child Protection; consider making these more specific in terms of target area or particular populations, so that progress towards them will be visible and measurable.
- For Child Protection Output indicator 1.3 consider changing wording in indicator from 'exists' to 'is implemented'.

Wash

Immediate priority

- Review WASH Output Indicator 1.1, as developing a finance strategy requires several prior steps including advocacy and influencing, and more maturity in the sector, so this target is unlikely to be achieved in this CP timeline.
- Review WASH Output Indicator 2.1 as health care facilities are not in fact the target locations for the WASH section; develop an alternative, relevant indicator which reflects work planned.
- Consider including denominators, where data is available or reasonable estimates can be made, for WASH Output indicator 2.1
- Consider whether using JMP estimates for 2023-24 would strengthen WASH outcome data.
- Integrate disaggregation by disability into all feasible indicators, at the outset including WASH Output indicator 1.1.4.
- Make gender disaggregation more visible at the top level of the RF and RAM reporting in particular for WASH output indicator 1.4.
- Strengthen disaggregation to monitor how young people are being reached by the programme in WASH output indicator 1.4

Medium term priority

- Use MICS data, when available, to retrospectively triangulate JMP estimates for WASH Outcome indicators OI1 and OI2 baselines and government estimates for Education Outcome indicators OI1 and OI2.

Social Policy

Immediate priority

- Review Outcome statements (and corresponding indicators) for Social Policy Outcome 1. Consider replacing this indicator with one that is directly connected with the outputs planned and which is measurable. This could be done by specifying the geographical

target area where change in poverty levels may have had a contribution from the programme and where a limited survey could be carried out.

- For any changed indicator, integrate disaggregation by gender, age group and disability.

Annex 1: Documents Consulted

1. Lattanzio KIBS, Country Programme Evaluation Libya, Final Evaluation Report, December 2021
2. Libya – UNICEF country programme of cooperation, 2023–2025, Costed evaluation plan
3. Libya Country Programme Document 2023-2025, 2022 First Regular Session of the Executive Board ‘What’s at stake for UNICEF?’ 2022
4. Libya Humanitarian Situation Report No. 4 Reporting Period 1 January to 31 December 2022
5. Libya Humanitarian Situation Report No.1, Reporting Period 1 January to 30 June 2023
6. Libya Humanitarian Situation Report No.2, Reporting Period 1 January to 30 June 2022
7. Libya Humanitarian Situation Report No.3 - 1 Jan - 30 Sep 2022
8. Libya Humanitarian Situation, Overview No.1 2022 Reporting Period: 1 January 2022 to 31 March 2022
9. Libya National Nutrition Smart Survey Report, Libya Ministry of Planning and Bureau of Statistics and Census (BSC), 2022
10. MENAR- Libya CO Environmental Footprint and Accessibility Assessment performance report, January 2022 to December 2022.
11. MICS Libya 2023-24 timeline (19072023)
12. MICS Libya 24-9-23 MICS 7 Indicators and Definitions (draft)
13. Office of Internal Audit and Investigations (OIAI) Internal Audit of Libya Country Office, May 2021
14. UN Common Country Analysis, Libya, 2023 Update.
15. UNICEF Libya – Situation of the South of Libya: Sectoral Analysis, basic services, 2022
16. UNICEF Libya – Support to South Region, May 2023
17. Unicef Libya Adolescent and Youth Strategy, June 2023
18. UNICEF Libya Country Office – Risk Register
19. UNICEF Libya Country Office Programme Rationale Outcome 1: Health and Nutrition Component, January 2022
20. Unicef Libya Country Office, A Climate Landscape Analysis for Children in Libya
21. UNICEF Libya Country Office, ‘Accountability Framework Between Libya Country Office and Benghazi Field Office’ September 2022.
22. Unicef Libya Country Office, Education Multi-year Workplan 2023-24
23. UNICEF Libya Country Office, Evaluation Management Response Document, 2022.
24. UNICEF Libya Country Office, Gender Programmatic Review, 2021
25. UNICEF Libya Country Office, Guidance Note and Generic Template, Programme Monitoring and Reporting for HACT Programme Monitoring Visits

26. Unicef Libya Country Office, Head of Sections Meeting – LCP Implementation Status, 2nd July 2023)
27. Unicef Libya Country Office, Mid-Year Review Agenda 2023
28. UNICEF Libya Country Office, Programme Rationale, Outcome 3: Child protection component, January 2022
29. UNICEF Libya Country Office, Programme Rationale, Outcome 4: WASH and climate change component, January 2022
30. UNICEF Libya Country Office, Programme Rationale, Outcome 5: Social Policy component Summary, January 2022
31. UNICEF Libya Country Office, Programme Rationale. Outcome 2: Education and Young people Component, January 2022
32. UNICEF Libya Country Office, Programme Rationales (2023-2025), 15 May 2022
33. UNICEF Libya Country Office, Summary Programme Rationale (2023-2025), 15 May 2022
34. UNICEF Libya Country Office, Summary Programme Rationale (2023-2025) 15th May 2022
35. Unicef Libya Country Office, Visioning Together for Country Programme Document 2023-2025, CMT meeting 4th June 2023
36. UNICEF Libya Country Office, What’s at stake for UNICEF? Libya CPD 2023-25, 2022 First Regular Session of the Executive Board.
37. UNICEF Libya Country Programme, Head of Sections Meeting, Implementation Status 02nd July 2023, presentation
38. UNICEF Libya Facility Assessment Tool.
39. UNICEF Libya, Country Programme Document 2023-2025
40. UNICEF Libya, Country Programme of Cooperation (2023-2025), 2023 Mid-year Review, 5th of September 2023, Agenda
41. UNICEF Libya: South Programme 2023-2025
42. UNICEF, Funding Proposal to the Embassy of Norway ‘Improving access to quality child protection services for children on the move in Libya’, March 2022
43. United Nations Libya, UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework Libya 2023-2025

Annex 2: List of stakeholders consulted

| | Name | Role |
|-----|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Michele Servadei | Representative |
| 2. | Nuzhat Rafique | Chief of Field Office, Benghazi |
| 3. | Abdulsalam Al-Souhigi | Deputy Representative, Operations |
| 4. | Marie-Consolee Mukangendo | Deputy Representative, Programmes |
| 5. | Dr Ahmed Ejeadi | Health and Nutrition Officer |
| 6. | Abdikadir Dahir | Health and Nutrition Officer |
| 7. | Abdoulaye Fall | Chief of WASH |
| 8. | Vanessa Lee | Chief of Education |
| 9. | Abraheem Alshareef | Reports officer; previously Social Protection Officer |
| 10. | Yosra Benlamin | Child Protection Officer |
| 11. | Mohamed Mutasim Abdall Mahmoud | Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist |
| 12. | Ali F Ali Madwa | Information Management Officer and KM focal point |
| 13. | Yahia Mostafa Taher Elrayes | Planning and Monitoring Officer |
| 14. | Rasha Moh Ibr Elabdali | SBC Officer |
| 15. | Asraa Elghali | Disability focal point |
| 16. | Camilla Pante | Donor Relations Specialist |
| 17. | Hammad Masood | Regional planning specialist, RO-MENA |
| 18. | Amanullah Khan | International consultant for MICS |

Annex 3: Evaluability assessment question matrix: Key Questions for stakeholders:

| Key questions | KII questions | Doc analysis | High level | Programme | Planning and Monitoring team | Field office | Operations |
|--|---|--------------|------------|-----------|------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Objective 1: Assess the clarity of objectives, alignment, logic and coherence of the country programme and programme rationales, and their alignment to the country context and UNICEF Strategic Plan | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a well-articulated theory of change for the country programme and programme rationales? | Is there a programme level ToC? How is this developed and used? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| | How are section level ToCs developed and used? | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | Is there a programme level Programme Rationale document? Does this successfully synthesise the section level PRs? | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| | What is the connection, if any, between the ToC and the results framework? Do they ever get analysed together? Do they refer to each other? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the theory of change flexible and responsive to external factors? | Does the ToC refer to context and align with any situation analysis? Does the ToC allow for changing strategies / changing situations? | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| | What external / contextual factors have affected the programme so far? Has there been any response to these from the CP? | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have risks and assumptions identified and are adequate?? | Does the ToC include an articulation of assumptions / risk? | ✓ | | | ✓ | | |
| | Have any new challenges emerged that suggest other risks / incorrect assumptions about the causal process? | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the causal linkages between the different levels of the intervention logic clear? | Does the ToC express a reasonable causal process? Have any missing steps / links been identified so far? | ✓ | | ✓ | | | |
| | How far does the results framework reflect the ToC logic? | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | Are combined outputs likely to contribute to outcomes? | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | Are planned activities likely to lead to outputs? | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Are there separate results frameworks at field level? | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| • Were there modifications to the intervention logic and why? | How does the results framework get updated? Have there been any modifications so far? | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | What changes have been made so far? What was the reason for these? | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Objective 2: Assess the adequacy and validity of results, indicators, tools and systems for monitoring, measuring and verifying results. | | | | | | | |
| • Are the indicators reliable for decision making for the programme improvements? | Are indicators critical, comprehensive, coherent? Do they capture information about all major activities of the sections? | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| | Do indicators provide enough and pertinent information about the programme to support ongoing decisions? | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| | What alternative indicators might be more useful for this? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| • | Which indicators would be improved by including criteria for quality? | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| • Are means of verification clearly identified and reliable for all the outcome and output indicators? | Are the verification sources realistic? Will the information arrive at the right time? What problems might there be with actually getting the information? | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| | Which indicators might have challenges to source the data? What can be done to help / solve challenges? | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| • Do they generate data/information at reasonable intervals to help monitoring and documenting progresses over time? | When and how is information sourced for each indicator? | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| | Are there indicators where information is only available annually / towards the end of the CP? | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | Which indicators do partners report on? Is their reporting aligned to the LCO reporting cycle? | | | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| | How / how often is data / reporting synthesised for outcome / section level results? Who does this? | | ✓ | | ✓ | | |
| • Have the indicators been defined (e.g. numerators and denominators) without an ambiguity? | How clearly are geographic target areas specified? Or particular target groups? Which indicators would benefit from more precision? (Geography, target population, time scale) | ✓ | | ✓ | | | |
| • Has a target value for the indicator been provided, | Do annual targets reflect required disaggregation? | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| including for any necessary disaggregation? | | | | | | | |
| Objective 3: assess the availability and quality of the documentation, information and data needed to measure and monitor results (including the availability and sufficiency of baselines and targets) and conduct a useful Country Programme Evaluation . | | | | | | | |
| Are baselines in place for indicators? If not, are activities planned to generate the baseline? | Which indicators have missing baselines? Is baseline data sufficiently close to the CP start to be relevant? | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | What plans are there to collect baseline information? | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | Are there any quality issues with partner reports | | | | ✓ | | |
| | Have there been quality issues with 3 rd party monitoring? | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | Is existing data and documentation organized and accessible? | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| Assess the adequacy and quality of information available from current monitoring systems to conduct useful Country Programme Evaluation | What challenges do you see for the evaluation? | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| | When will data be available at outcome level / how? | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | How far does the monitoring system track HOW results are achieved (methods / causation) | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| | What is the cycle for producing monitoring information and documenting progress? How well does this cycle work for documenting reliable information? | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Objective 4 Review the adequacy of human resources available for monitoring and generating information; and the appropriateness of financial documentation for assessing effectiveness. | | | | | | | |
| | Is financial information accessible and updated to enable financial analysis? | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ |
| | Are costed activities and desired outputs precisely defined so that they allow an assessment of total cost for producing the output? | ✓ | | | | | |
| Objective 5: Assess the way gender, disability, SBC and youth cross cutting issues have been documented | | | | | | | |
| Are measures, tools, and mechanisms in place to measure crosscutting priorities such as gender, disability, SBC and, youth? | Which are the prioritised cross cutting issues? Through which work are they mainly addressed? | | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| | How are these reflected in reporting? Are there report sections with these headings? How far to partners report on these issues? | ✓ | | | ✓ | | |
| | How are these reflected in indicators and targets? | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |

Annex 4: Full results Framework with suggested revisions

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|----------------------|---|---|---|--|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Health and Nutrition | Outcome: By 2025, girls, boys, adolescent girls and women have increased access and utilization of quality primary health care and nutrition services and adopt healthy practices. | Percentage of surviving infants who received (a) first dose and (b) three doses of diphtheria, tetanus and pertussis (DTP) vaccine (SP) This was replaced with the following 2 indicators: OI 1: Children < 1 year receiving measles-containing vaccine at national level (IND0000235) OI2: Percentage of children that are vaccinated with three doses of DTP / Penta containing vaccine (IND0000241) | 93% (2021) | CP Target: 96% 2023 Target: 94% 2024 Target: 95% 2025 Target: 96% | EPI annual coverage report | MoH (NCDC), WHO, IOM | Outcome indicators all for small children, but adolescent girls and women are specified in outcome statement. Add indicator covering older and adolescent children? |
| | | Reach 90% national coverage and 80% in every district or equivalent administrative unit with two doses of measles containing vaccines (Std RAM) OI3: District or equivalent administrative unit with at least 80% coverage of measles-containing vaccine for children < 1 year receiving (IND0000238) | 96.2% national coverage (2018) and 89-98% (2018) coverage on district level ²² | CP Target: 98% national and 98% for district level 2023 Target: 97% national and 95% for district level 2024 Target: 97% national and 97% for district level 2025 Target: 98% national and 98% for district level | EPI annual coverage report and JRF | MoH, WFP, IOM, WHO, ACF, Bureau of Statistics | Easy place for more geographical targeting FN says emphasis on quality and equity because coverage is high – why not specify quality and equity in the indicator? |
| | | OI4: Percentage of children under five who are stunted (Std RAM) | 2022 8.2% | New target: 6.6 2023: 7 2024: 6.8 2025: 6.6 | Reports from MoH and SMART survey | MoH, WFP, IOM, WHO, ACF, Bureau of Statistics | |
| | Output 1: Improved health system capacity at national and sub-national level for | 1.1 Primary Health Care facilities providing clinical care to children under five using the IMNCI approach (Std RAM) | 0% of health facilities (2021) | CP Target: 15% of health facilities 2023 Target: 5% of health facilities 2024 Target: 7% of health facilities 2025 Target: 15% of health facilities | MoH reports | MoH (PHCI), WHO | Not clear how the equitable and gender sensitive objective in output statement is tracked by these indicators. |

²⁰ Please mention the type of indicator such as standard RAM or HAC indicator or non-standard indicator. In case of non-standard indicator, please mention brief justification.

²¹ Please explain source of baseline

²² The administrative coverage is usually high in the country, hence the baseline and target are higher than the standard indicator. The approach will be **to ensure equity and quality in immunization.**

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|--|---|--|------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | equitable and gender-sensitive policies for health care and nutrition services. I | 1.2 A nutrition policy or strategy to prevent undernutrition and micronutrient deficiencies in children under 5 years exists (CSI) | No strategy (2021) | CP Target: Strategy endorsed 2023 Target: Strategy development initiated 2024 Target: Final strategy 2025 Target: Strategy endorsed | National strategy available and endorsed | MoH (PHCI), WHO, ACF, WFP | Specify equity focused and gender sensitive strategy developed |
| | | 1.3 Existence of Newborn Action Plan (ENAP) (RAM non-std IND1010448) | No ENAP (2021) | CP Target: ENAP endorsed 2023 Target: ENAP development initiated 2024 Target: Final ENAP 2025 Target: ENAP endorsed | ENAP available and endorsed | MoH (PHCI), WHO | Implemented instead of endorsed? |
| | Output 2: Improved capacities of the health system to ensure that girls and boys under 5, and adolescents girls (including the most vulnerable) are vaccinated against vaccine preventable diseases and the eligible population is vaccinated against COVID-19 | 2.1 Number of children vaccinated against measles through UNICEF-supported programmes ²³ (CSI) | To be established | CP Target: 97% increase above the baseline in 24 municipalities 2023 Target: 97% increase above the baseline in 24 municipalities 2024 Target: 97% increase above the baseline in 24 municipalities 2025 Target: 97% increase above the baseline in 24 municipalities | EPI annual coverage report and DHIS | National Center for Disease Control (NCDC), WHO, IOM | Establish baseline Disaggregate indicator for adolescence / youth |
| | | 2.2 UNICEF-supported roll-out of COVID-19 vaccines is effective (CSI) ²⁴ | 7 criteria met | CP Target: 7 criteria met 2023 Target: 7 criteria met 2024 Target: 7 criteria met 2025 Target: 7 criteria met | NCDC reports | National Center for Disease Control (NCDC), WHO, IOM | If baseline criteria are same as target, this does not represent the 'improvement' specified in the output. |
| | | 2.3 Percentage of vaccinators and supervisors trained on cold chain and vaccine management (non-std) | 0% (2021) | CP Target: 100% (2,100) 2023 Target: 50% 2024 Target: 75% 2025 Target: 100% | Training reports | MoH (NCDC), WHO, IOM | |
| | | 2.4 Effective Vaccine Management (EVM) composite country score | 0 | CP Target: improved plan developed against 9 EVM criteria 2023 Target: n/a 2024 Target: n/a 2025 Target: improved plan developed against 9 EVM criteria | | | Specify how criteria will be verified and partners |
| | Output 3: Increased capacity of the Primary Health Care (PHC) system to provide access to quality and resilient services, including nutrition, mental and | 3.1 Number of children benefiting from UNICEF-supported integrated management of childhood illnesses services (CSI) | 0 (2021) | CP Target: 81,000 (same children) 2023 Target: 81,000 2024 Target: 81,000 2025 Target: 81,000 | DHIS | MoH, WHO | Precision of target implies there is some geographical target but not stated. State target locations in indicator and targets |
| | | 3.2 Number of health workers receiving the skills and support for delivering | 71 (2021) | CP Target: 150 2023 Target: 50 | Training reports and | PHCI, WHO, IOM | Include adolescent health in indicator? |

²³ Two doses; the second dose received at 18 months.

²⁴ As per SP guidance baselines set in line with seven criteria: 1) Procurement of COVID-19 vaccines; 2. Procurement of supplies to support COVID-19 vaccination (e.g. PPE, hand hygiene etc.); 3. Cold chain strengthening, including ancillary supplies (e.g. generators, air conditioners etc.); 4. COVID-19 vaccine logistics management (e.g. storage, transportation, etc.); 5. Demand creation and trust building for COVID-19 vaccination (social mobilization/C4D, risk communication and community engagement); 6. Delivery support (e.g. planning, budgeting and coordination, trainings, outreach etc.); 7. Monitoring and evaluation of COVID-19 vaccine roll-out.

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|-----------|---|--|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | school health, to children under 5, adolescents, pregnant and lactating women in target areas | essential maternal, newborn and child health services through UNICEF-supported programmes (CSI) | | 2024 Target: 50 2025 Target: 50 | training needs assessment | | Consider adding denominator |
| | | 3.3 Extent to which Gender-responsive programmes to prevent anemia in adolescent girls and boys through school- and community-based approaches are implemented (CSI) ²⁵ | i and iii (2021) | CP Target: i, ii, iii 2023 Target: i and iii 2024 Target: i, ii, iii 2025 Target: i, ii, iii | School health facility reports | PHCI, MoE | Targets measure approach developed but indicator specifies implemented. Change target to count no. or places / locations implemented or number of boys and girls reached. |
| | | 3.4 Extent to which Strategies and programmes to improve diet diversity among children aged 6 to 23 months are implemented | No | CP Target: yes 2023 Target: yes 2024 Target: yes 2025 Target: yes | | | Lack of precision in targets – specify number of strategies or programmes, implemented in which places, |
| | Levels of Results | Global Indicators ²⁶ with disaggregation | Baseline ²⁷ | CP Target | Means of verification (MOV) | Partnerships | |
| Education | Outcome: By 2025, girls, boys, and adolescent girls have increased access to inclusive, uninterrupted, quality, relevant and safe learning opportunities, including skills | Primary and lower secondary education gross enrolment rate (GER)) NOTE: this indicator is split in RAM and added as two standard indicators: one for primary and one for lower secondary as follows: OI1: Primary school gross enrollment ratio (IIND0000343) OI2: Secondary school gross enrollment ratio (IND0000319) | 98% ²⁸ (2021) | CP Target: 98% | EMIS/MICS | MoE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Align baseline with new indicator Ensure targets exceed baseline Disaggregate baseline and targets by gender and disability, migrant status where possible. |
| | | OI3 Extent to which the education system is inclusive and gender equitable for access to learning opportunities NOTE: this is a CSI but mapped to the output – we will report on it in CSI as outcome | 1 (2021) ²⁹ | CP Target: 2 | MICS | MoE | MICS timeline not ideal for endline verification. |
| | 1.1 Evidence-based education sector plans and strategies addressing inequities and | Dimension 1: Evidence based | CP target: | EMIS Report, ESP document | MoE | Output statement states implementation but targets for | |

²⁵ As per SP guidance, baselines and targets set in line with three criteria: i. Sex Disaggregated data for anaemia is available; ii. A gender barrier analysis has been conducted for adolescent nutrition programmes; iii. Country gender action plan includes programme specifically addressing differential nutritional needs and risks among girls and boys

²⁶ Please mention the type of indicator such as standard RAM or HAC indicator or non-standard indicator. In case of non-standard indicator, please mention brief justification. -

²⁷ Mention the source of baseline. Is progress from the last CPD baseline in this case?

²⁸ Government estimation to be revised during CPD as new data becomes available (MICS)

²⁹ As per the SP guidance, the score indicates the extent of inclusiveness of the education system based on four dimensions (children with disabilities, gender, ECE and children on the move), where 4 represents the highest level of inclusiveness. Score's calculation: [2.1.1. Inclusive and gender-equitable system for access \(sharepoint.com\)](#)

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|--|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------|--------------|--|
| | Output 1: Increased education system capacity to ensure uninterrupted, gender-equitable quality learning opportunities for girls and boys | mainstreaming SDG indicators are implemented (CSI 2.1.3) ³⁰ | ESP/Education strategy (0/3) Dimension 2: Mainstreaming of SDGs indicators in the ESP/Education strategy (0/2) Dimension 3: Data/EMIS (0/3) ³¹ (2021) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dimension 1:³² Evidence based ESP/Education strategy (3/3)³³ - Dimension 2:³⁴ Mainstreaming of SDGs indicators in the ESP/Education strategy (1/2)³⁵ - Dimension 3: Data/EMIS (0/3)³⁶ 2023 Target: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dimension 1: Evidence based ESP/Education strategy (0/3)³⁷ - Dimension 2: Mainstreaming of SDGs indicators in the the ESP/Education strategy (0/2)³⁸ - Dimension 3: Data/EMIS (1/3)³⁹ 2024 Target: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dimension 1: Evidence based ESP/Education strategy (0/3)⁴⁰ - Dimension 2: Mainstreaming of SDGs indicators in the ESP/Education strategy (0/2)⁴¹ - Dimension 3: Data/EMIS (0/3)⁴² 2025 Target: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dimension 1:⁴³ Evidence based ESP/Education strategy (3/3)⁴⁴ - Dimension 2:⁴⁵ Mainstreaming of SDGs indicators in the ESP/Education strategy (1/2)⁴⁶ | | | <p>dimensions 1 and 2 target only strategy development.</p> <p>State implementation in targets; specify number of facilities reached?</p> |

³⁰ As per SP guidance baselines and targets have been set in line with criteria 7 criteria across 3 dimensions: a) Evidence based ESP/strategy (based on an updated ESA or SitAn); b) Address inequities in access, participation and retention; c) Address inequities in resource allocation; d) Mainstreaming of SDGs indicators in the ESP; e) Quality and timeliness; f) Disaggregation; g) Attendance and dropout

³¹ EMIS currently in pilot stage

³² Evidence based ESP/strategy (based on an updated ESA or SitAn); Address inequities in access, participation and retention; Address inequities in resource allocation

³³ Strategy developed

³⁴ Mainstreaming of SDGs indicators in the ESP

³⁵ Strategy developed

³⁶ EMIS rolled out in 30% of schools

³⁷ Evidence generation initiated and coordination mechanism established

³⁸ Draft strategy developed

³⁹ EMIS rolled out in 10% of schools

⁴⁰ Draft strategy under development

⁴¹ Draft strategy developed

⁴² EMIS rolled out in 20% of schools

⁴³ Evidence based ESP/strategy (based on an updated ESA or SitAn); Address inequities in access, participation and retention; Address inequities in resource allocation

⁴⁴ Strategy developed

⁴⁵ Mainstreaming of SDGs indicators in the ESP

⁴⁶ Strategy developed

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|--|-------------------|---|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | 1.2 Holistic skills development is institutionalized to support learning, personal empowerment, environmental sustainability, active citizenship, social cohesion and/or employability and entrepreneurship (CSI 2.2.6) ⁴⁸ | Dimension 1: Mainstreaming skills development within the national education/ training: 0/2 | <p>- Dimension 3: Data/EMIS (0/3)⁴⁷</p> <p>CP Target:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dimension 1: Mainstreaming skills development within the national education/ training: 1 / 2 - Transferable skills development⁴⁹ <p>2023 Target:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dimension 1: Mainstreaming skills development within the national education/ training: 0/2⁵⁰ <p>2024 Target:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dimension 1: Mainstreaming skills development within the national education/ training: 1 / 2 - Transferable skills development⁵¹ <p>2025 Target:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dimension 1: Mainstreaming skills development within the national education/ training: 1 / 2 - Transferable skills development⁵² | UNICEF monitoring reports, MoE reports, Life Skills Curriculum, teachers' training package | MoE, service providers | |
| | | 1.3 Effective teacher development systems are implemented (CSI 2.2.1) ⁵³ | <p>Teachers development: 1/5</p> <p>Teacher professional development⁵⁴</p> <p>Teaching: ½</p> <p>Teachers pedagogy⁵⁵</p> | <p>CP Target:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers development: 3/5 - Teachers professional development⁵⁶ - Teacher MHPS - Teachers peace building and social cohesion - Teaching: ½ - Teachers pedagogy⁵⁷ <p>2023 Target:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers' development: 1/5 | | | |

⁴⁷ EMIS rolled out in 30% of schools

⁴⁸ As per SP guidance, baselines and targets have been set in line with 2 criteria across 1 dimension: a) Transferable skills development; b) Digital skills and literacy. Dimension 2: Responsiveness of skills to the demands of the labour market was deemed not applicable.

⁴⁹ Roll-out of curriculum

⁵⁰ Curriculum development: distance learning and teacher training

⁵¹ Piloting of curriculum

⁵² Roll-out of curriculum

⁵³ As per SP guidance baselines and targets have been set in line with criteria for teacher development and teaching across 7 points: a) teacher professional development; b) School leadership; c) incentives; d) Teacher MHPSS; e) Teachers peace building and social cohesion; f) teacher pedagogy; and g) accountability

⁵⁴ Teacher professional development exists but requires enhancements in terms of quality

⁵⁵ Pedagogy exists but requires enhancements in terms of quality

⁵⁶ Teacher professional development is of enhanced quality

⁵⁷ Pedagogy exists but requires enhancements is of enhanced quality

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|--|---|--|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers' professional development⁵⁸ - Teaching: ½ - Teachers' pedagogy⁵⁹ <p>2024 Target:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers' development: 3/5 - Teachers' professional development⁶⁰ - Teacher MHPS - Teaching: ½ - Teachers' pedagogy⁶¹ <p>2025 Target:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers' development: 3/5 - Teachers' professional development⁶² - Teacher MHPS - Teachers' peace building and social cohesion - Teaching: ½ - Teachers' pedagogy⁶³ | | | |
| | | <p>1.4 UNICEF-led cluster/sector coordination mechanisms meet satisfactory performance for established functions: (b) Education (CSI H8.4 a-d)⁶⁴</p> <p style="color: red;">NOTE: this is a CSI under change strategies but for now, the system does not allow change strategy indicators to be mapped to programme outcome/output so we will leave it in CSI without mapping but will report on it</p> | Satisfactory (2021) | <p>CP Target: Good</p> <p>2023 Target: Good</p> <p>2024 Target: Good</p> <p>2025 Target: Good</p> | Sector Performance Reports. | | |
| | Output 2 Increased capacities of education providers to deliver inclusive, gender-responsive and quality | 2.1 Number of out-of-school children and adolescents who accessed education through UNICEF-supported programmes. Disaggregation: Disability, geography, humanitarian contexts, level of education, sex. (CSI 2.1.4) | 0 (2021) | <p>CP Target: 24,000</p> <p>2023 Target: 8,000</p> <p>2024 Target: 8,000</p> <p>2025 Target: 8,000</p> | CO internal monitoring systems. | MoE, I/NGOs | <p>Good disaggregation specified here . Baseline at 0 implies this is new work. Ensure disaggregation as specified is visible in targets</p> <p>Add age / youth for disaggregation</p> |

⁵⁸ Teacher professional development exists but requires enhancements in terms of quality

⁵⁹ Pedagogy exists but requires enhancements in terms of quality

⁶⁰ Teacher professional development is of enhanced quality

⁶¹ Pedagogy exists but requires enhancements is of enhanced quality

⁶² Teacher professional development is of enhanced quality

⁶³ Pedagogy exists but requires enhancements is of enhanced quality

⁶⁴ As per SP guidance, targets and baselines have been set in line with four criteria: a) don't know; b) unsatisfactory or weak; c) satisfactory; d) good

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|------------------|--|---|---|--|---|------------------------------------|---|
| | education and skills development to children and young people. | | | | | | Consider adding denominator |
| | | 2.2 Number of children who are benefiting from improved learning environments (RAM Std. IND1008743) | 0 (2021) | CP Target: 7,500 2023 Target: 2,500 (5 schools) 2024 Target: 2,500 (5 schools) 2025 Target: 2,500 (5 schools) | CO internal monitoring systems. | MoE | Disaggregate by gender disability and age / youth specify locations/ regions |
| | | 2.3 Number of children provided with individual learning materials through UNICEF-supported programmes (CSI 2.2.7) | 0 (2021) | CP Target: 7,500 2023 Target: 2,500 (5 schools) 2024 Target: 2,500 (5 schools) 2025 Target: 2,500 (5 schools) | CO internal monitoring systems. | MoE | Disaggregate by gender disability and age . youth and specify locations/ regions |
| | Levels of Results | Global Indicators ⁶⁵ | Baseline | CP Target | Means of verifications | Partners | |
| Child Protection | Outcome: <i>By 2025, boys, girls, and adolescents (including migrants and asylum-seeking children) are better protected from violence, abuse and exploitation and benefit from strengthened child protection systems and improved practices.</i> | OI1: Percentage/ number of mothers (or primary caregivers) who think that physical punishment is necessary to raise/educate children (survey based) (SP Outcome 3.2) | 75% | CP target: 50% | Baseline survey and Endline survey and/or MICS | MOSA, MOE, CSO partners | Specify source for baseline MICS reference period early 2024 – not useful for endline. Very high level indicator – direct causal link only with Output 2 in which target numbers are limited. Review CP target – maybe ambitious unless substantial non-UNICEF work underway |
| | | OI 2 Level of development of the mechanism to track delivery and referral information related to mental health and psychosocial support services for children and adolescents (SP Outcome 3.8.) ⁶⁶ | Score:13 +2 =15 ⁶⁷ (2021) | CP target: 21+5=26 ⁶⁸ 2023 target: 13+2=15 ⁶⁹ 2024 target: 16+3=19 ⁷⁰ 2025 target: 21+5=26 ⁷¹ | Mid-year and End Year review of RWP E-tools (UNICEF IPs) and Activity Info of CPSS partners; and Quarterly reports | MOSA, MOE, MOI/FCPOs, CSO partners | |

⁶⁶ As per SP guidance, baselines and targets have been set on the basis of a point system covering: 1. Maturity of tracking services: extent to which quality country-wide, multi-layer, multi-sectoral MHPSS services are tracked; 2. Quality of referral mechanisms: extent to which referral mechanisms are operational and meet quality standards. Important to note that the assessment has been done on the basis of the inter-agency coordination mechanism on MHPSS (eTools specifically); rather than a countrywide national information or routine monitoring systems.

⁶⁷ Service tracking system operational with limited scope & quality; Referral mechanism planned but not operational or below quality standards

⁶⁸ Service tracking system operational with full scope and quality; Referral mechanism operational with limited scope and not meeting quality standards

⁶⁹ Service tracking system operational with limited scope & quality; Referral mechanism planned but not operational or below quality standards

⁷⁰ Service tracking system operational with limited scope & quality; Referral mechanism operational with limited scope and not meeting quality standards

⁷¹ Service tracking system operational with full scope and quality; Referral mechanism operational with limited scope and not meeting quality standards

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | | | from UNICEF Partners | | |
| | Output 1: Improved Government financial and institutional capacity to plan, coordinate and manage child protection systems | 1.1 Extent of development of specialized justice- for-children systems (low, medium, high) (CSI 3.2.1) ⁷² | 1 out of 6 (2021) | CP target: 4 out of 6 2023: 2 out of 6 2024: 3 out of 6 2025: 4 out of 6 | Mid-year and End Year review of RWP E-tools (UNICEF IPs) and Activity Info of CPSS partners; and Quarterly reports from UNICEF Partners | MOI, MOSA, MOJ | |
| | | 1.2 Level of the quality assurance system for social service workforce (<i>no development, early development, mid-level development, well developed</i>) (CSI 3.2.4) ⁷³ | Early development (Score 11) (2021) | CP target: Mid-level development (Score 22) 2023: Early development (Score 15) 2024: Early development (Score 17) 2025: Mid-level development (Score 22) | Mid-year and End Year reviews etc. | MOSA, MOE, MOI, CSO partners | |
| | | 1.3 Legislative and policy frameworks exist to end the corporal punishment of children (CSA 3.1.1a) ⁷⁴ replaced with ""Extent of legal prohibition of corporal punishment of children in all settings" | 1 out of 6 criteria fulfilled (in schools) (2021) | CP target: 3 out of 6 (In schools, alternative care and homes) 2023: 1 out of 6 (in schools) 2024: 2 out of 6 (in schools and alternative care) 2025: 3 out of 6 (In schools, alternative care and homes) | Mid-year and End Year review of RWP; and draft laws | HCC, MOSA, MOE, MOI, MOJ, HOR | Implementation needed if it is to contribute to outcome indicator 1.1 Change indicator 'exists' to 'implemented' |
| | | 1.4 Child protection systems strengthening levels Sub-domain 2.1 (lead Ministry/Agency with responsibility and mandate to strengthen CP systems) | Level 1: system building (level 1) | CP target: system enhancement (level 2) 2023: system building (level 1) 2024: system building (level 1) 2025: system enhancement (level 2) | | | |
| | Output 2: Targeted communities (including caregivers and children) | 2.1 Number of mothers, fathers and caregivers reached through parenting | 0 (2021) | CP target: 55,000 2023: 10,000 2024: 15,000 | Mid-year and End Year review of RWP | MOSA, MOE, Selected Municipalities CSO partners | Parenting programmes coverage is low to get a 25% change in attitudes at national level as an outcome result. |

⁷² As per SP guidance, baselines and targets have been set on the basis of a point system covering six criteria to assess the extent to which the justice for children system is in line with relevant international norms and standards (score out of 6): a) a minimum age of criminal responsibility set above 14 years, b) children have access to justice and legal aid, both by law and in practice, c) child-friendly investigation, prosecution, and adjudication (police, prosecutorial, and court procedures), d) child-specialized trained professionals, e) a multidisciplinary approach, and f) special measures for children victims and witnesses of crime

⁷³ As per SP guidance, baselines and targets have been set on the basis of a point system covering several criteria to assess the degree of progress towards having a quality assurance system for the social service work in place: a) National leadership group formed and made functional; b) Social workforce assessment/analysis completed/validated; c) National strategic plan on social service workforce strengthening; d) Normative/regulatory framework in place for social service work force; e) Supervision and Support system in place (MOSA); f) National data collection system in place

⁷⁴ In line with SP guidance, assessment based on extent to which laws prohibit corporal punishment in six settings (score out of 6): a) schools, b) home, c) alternative care, d) day care, e) penal institutions, f) sentence for crime.

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| | and service providers have improved knowledge and skills to prevent and respond to violence, abuse and exploitation., | programmes through UNICEF-supported programmes (CSI 3.1.2) | | 2025: 30,000 | E-tools (UNICEF IPs) and Activity Info of CPSS partners; and Quarterly reports from UNICEF Partners | | Geographic targets for these programmes should be specified. Disaggregate mothers and fathers. |
| | | 2.2 Number of people engaged through community platforms in reflective dialogue towards eliminating discriminatory social and gender norms and harmful practices that affect girls and women through UNICEF-supported programmes (CSI 3.3.2) | TBD (through baseline survey) ⁷⁵ | | Mid-year and End Year review of RWPs E-tools (UNICEF IPs) and Activity Info of CPSS partners; and Quarterly reports from UNICEF Partners | MOSA, Selected Municipalities, CSO partners | Incorporate baseline numbers from KAP survey Plan endline survey 2024 Disaggregate by gender and age /youth |
| | Output 3: Child protection services have increased capacity to provide multi-sector and inclusive services for girls and boys that prevent, detect, refer and respond to violence in and around schools and in humanitarian settings | 3.1 Number of children who have experienced violence, exploitation, abuse and neglect reached by health, social work or justice/law enforcement services through UNICEF-supported programmes (CSI 3.1.3) | 0 (2021) | CP target: 6,200 2023: 1,200 2024: 2,000 2025: 3,000 | Mid-year and End Year review of RWPs E-tools (UNICEF IPs) and Activity Info of CPSS partners; and Quarterly reports from UNICEF Partners | MOSA, MOE, MOI, CSO partners | Disaggregate by gender age/youth and disability |
| | | 3.2 Percentage /Number of UNICEF-targeted girls and boys in humanitarian contexts who have received individual case management (CSI 3.2.8) | 0 (2021) | CP target: 13,500 2023: 3,000 2024: 4,500 2025: 6,000 | Mid-year and End Year review of RWPs E-tools (UNICEF IPs) and Activity Info of CPSS partners; and Quarterly reports from UNICEF Partners ¹¹ | MOSA, MOE, CSO partners | Disaggregate by gender, age/youth and disability Consider adding denominator |
| | | 3.3 Number of UNICEF-targeted children, adolescents, parents and caregivers provided with community-based mental health and psychosocial support services (CSI 3.2.7) | 0 (2021) | CP target: 180,000 2023: 40,000 2024: 60,000 2025: 80,000 | Mid-year and End Year review of RWPs E-tools (UNICEF IPs) and Activity Info of CPSS partners; and Quarterly reports | MOSA, MOE, Municipalities, CSO partners | Disaggregate by gender age/youth and disability |

⁷⁵ During 2022 a baseline study will be conducted with the objective of establishing baseline measures associated with Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices around violence against children as well as map Community Engagement Mechanisms. This will be followed up with an Endline survey in 2025.

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|------|---|---|------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | 3.4 Number of UNICEF targeted unaccompanied and separated boys and girls in humanitarian contexts who were provided with alternative care and/or reunified | 0 | CP target: 225 2023: 50 2024: 75 2025: 100 | from UNICEF Partners | | Disaggregate by gender, age/youth and disability Consider adding denominator |
| | Levels of Results | SP Indicators | Baseline | Targets CP | Means of verification | Partners | |
| WASH | Outcome: By 2025, boys, girls, and adolescents have improved access to and use of equitable, sustainable, climate resilient, gender-responsive WASH services and live in a safe and healthy environment | Proportion of population connected to public water network NOTE: this was replaced with: O11: IND0022006 - Proportion of population using at least basic drinking water services | 65% (2021) | CP Target: 73% | MICS/JMP | MoW, MMRP, GCWW, MMRP, NCDC, MoLG, , MoEnv, Civil Society Organizations Academy institutions and Private sector | MICS timeline not ideal – combine with JMP Baseline and targets need updating for changed indicator |
| | | Proportion of the population which uses safely managed sanitation services NOTE: this was replaced with: O12: IND0000496 - Proportion of population using basic sanitation services | 22% ⁷⁶ | CP Target: 40% 2023 Target: 28% 2024 Target: 34% 2025 Target: 40% | | | Baseline and targets need updating for tweaked indicator |
| | Output 1:1: WASH systems have increased capacity to legislate, finance, plan and coordinate climate resilient initiatives for equitable safe, and sustainable WASH services | 1.1 A costed and inclusive WASH financing strategy has been prepared and implemented with UNICEF support (CSI 4.2.1) | No | CP Target: Plan and Strategy endorsed and implementation initiated 2023 Target: Costed plan and financing strategy developed 2024 Target: Roadmap for implementation developed 2025 Target: Plan and strategy endorsed and implementation initiated | Programmatic Visits, Third Party Monitoring Reports, and Partners Report. | Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Planning, and CSOs. | Reported that this indicator is not very relevant as not much emphasis is being given to financing strategy. |
| | | 1.2 Existence of functioning sector coordination mechanism for water, sanitation and hygiene (RAM Std. IND0001486) ⁷⁷ | Weak ⁷⁸ | CP Target: Established 2023 Target: Weak 2024 Target: Initiating ⁷⁹ 2025 Target: Established ⁸⁰ | Programmatic Visits, Third Party Monitoring Reports, and Partners Report. | UN Agencies, International NGOs, Development partners, Local NGOs, Ministry of Water Resources and other Public Water Institutions | |

⁷⁶ JMP, Joint Monitoring Programme, WHO/UNICEF, 2020;

⁷⁷ As per RAM guidance notes on WASH, baselines and targets have been set on the basis of four criteria – weak, initiating, established, championing.

⁷⁸ Government-led coordination mechanism does not exist at national or subnational level and needs UNICEF support to lead, co-lead or provide more than 50% resources for sector coordination (2021)

⁷⁹ Functioning government-led coordination mechanism exists and needs UNICEF support to lead, co-lead or provide more than Source: Government and sector project/programme reports and records Responsible unit: country WASH team Frequency of update: Annually Disaggregation: Not applicable 22 Indicator Definition and method of calculation Source Frequency of update, disaggregation, and target setting process 25% resources for sector coordination role,

⁸⁰ Functioning government-led coordination mechanism exist at national and/or subnational level and need advisory support for government to carry out sector coordination

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|--|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | 1.3 Water, sanitation and hygiene sector plans integrating climate resilient development and/or risk management strategies available (RAM Std. IND0001506) ⁸¹ | Weak ⁸² (2021) | CP Target: Established 2023 Target: Weak 2024 Target: Initiating ⁸³ 2025 Target: Established ⁸⁴ | Programmatic Visits, Third Party Monitoring Reports, and Partners Report. | Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Environment, UN Agencies, Academic Institutions, and Public Water Institutions. | This output said to be ambitious because integration of climate responsive programming is challenging. More modest targets might be preliminary research established (rather than full strategies with integrated climate resilience). |
| | | 1.4 Children, adolescents and young people are engaged in action and advocacy to address climate change, unsustainable energy use and/or environmental degradation with UNICEF support (CSI 4.3.2) | 0 | CP targets: 66,12585 (via social media) and 10,000 (via schools) 2023 Target: 50,000 (via social media) 2024 Target: 57,500 (via social media) and 1,000 (piloted in schools across three regions) 2025 Target: 66,125 (via social media) & 9,000 (via schools) | Programmatic Visits, Third Party Monitoring Reports, and Partners Report. | Ministry of Education, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Youth and CSOs. | Disaggregate by gender age/youth and disability where possible (via schools dimensions) |
| | Output 2: WASH services providers have increased capacity to provide equitable, gender-transformative and climate resilient services in targeted areas to girls, boys, adolescents | 2.1 Number of health-care facilities reached with basic WASH services, through UNICEF-supported programmes Geography (region, urban/rural), humanitarian contexts, service type (climate resilient services) (CSI 4.1.5.) | 0 | CP Target: 60 2023 Target: 20 2024 Target: 20 2025 Target: 20 | Programmatic Visits, Third Party Monitoring Reports, and Partners Report. | Ministry of Health, Ministry of Water Resources, General Company of Water and Wastewater, and Ministry of Environment. | Specify geography as per indicator. 'maintaining' would be more results focused than 'reached' . Indicator does not capture gender transformative or climate resilient dimensions. Consider adding denominator |
| | Levels of Results | Global Indicators | Baseline | CP Target | Means of verifications | Partners | |

⁸¹ As per RAM guidance notes on WASH, baselines and targets have been set on the basis of four criteria – weak, initiating, established, championing.

⁸² Climate resilient not integrated into national or subnational strategies and plans, and not being developed

⁸³ Climate resilience integration into national and subnational strategies and plans being developed

⁸⁴ Climate resilience integrated in national and subnational strategies and plans and not regularly appraised

⁸⁵ Recalling that facebook is limited to persons about 18, social media target is set for persons 18-25 and is based on an average of 15% increase of followers per year

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|---------------|---|---|---|--|--|---------------------------|--|
| Social Policy | 1. Outcome: By 2025, boys, girls and adolescents in Libya have improved access to inclusive social protection services to reduce child deprivations | Number of children living in monetary or multidimensional poverty (OC3) NOTE: this was replaced with similar standard indicator as follows: OI1: Number of children living in poverty according to (a) International extreme poverty line; (b) National monetary poverty lines or (c) National multidimensional poverty lines ⁸⁶ | 36.4% (MODA 2021, based on 2014 PAPFAM) (2021) | CP Target: 29% 2023 target: 34% 2024 target: 31.5% 2025 target: 29% | MODA report (to be available in 2025) 2030 Target SDG 1.2: 18.2% | BoS/MoP | MODA report will be late for evaluation purposes. Review baseline and targets in line with new indicator Disaggregate baseline and reporting by gender and disability 6 % drop in multidimensional poverty unlikely to be achieved on UNICEF CT reach alone – not clear where systemic interventions arrive at implementation or scaling up which might achieve this. |
| | | National social protection system is ready to respond to a crisis (RAM Standard Indicator IND 0000508) ⁸⁶ NOTE: replaced with CSI 5.2.4 OI2: Ability of the social protection system, including cash transfer capacities, to effectively | Not ready ⁸⁷ 1. (2021) | CP Target: Partially ready ⁸⁸ 2023 Target: Not ready ⁸⁹ 2024 Target: Not ready ⁹⁰ 2025 Target: Partially ready ⁹¹ | HACT and UNICEF Annual report | NESDB MOSA/SSF CMWG | Review baseline and targets in line with new indicator |

86 As per RAM guidance notes on Social Inclusion and Policy, baselines and targets have been set on the basis of three criteria: ready, partially ready, not ready.

87 (1) No national CT (or pilot) or considered too weak to scale up, and or; (2) No working database; (3) May or may not have frontline social workers who can support emergency CT implementation; (4) May or may not have used national CTs previously in emergency response

88 (1) Has a national CT (2-10%) considered strong enough for scale up; (2) Has a working database; (3) May or may not have frontline social workers who can support emergency CT implementation; (4) May or may not have used national CTs previously in emergency response

89 (1) No national CT (or pilot) or considered too weak to scale up, and or; (2) No working database; (3) May or may not have frontline social workers who can support emergency CT implementation; (4) May or may not have used national CTs previously in emergency response

90 (1) No national CT (or pilot) or considered too weak to scale up, and or; (2) No working database; (3) May or may not have frontline social workers who can support emergency CT implementation; (4) May or may not have used national CTs previously in emergency response

91 (1) Has a national CT (2-10%) considered strong enough for scale up; (2) Has a working database; (3) May or may not have frontline social workers who can support emergency CT implementation; (4) May or may not have used national CTs previously in emergency response

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| | | respond to humanitarian crises (CSI0000092) - the datapoint matching this indicator is " Do the social protection and disaster risk management (DRM) policy, strategy or legal framework support the scale up of social protection (i.e. expansion, adjustment, adding new programmes etc.) in humanitarian contexts? (DP0000037)" but it was mapped to the output in the system – we will still report on it as outcome | | | | | |
| | Output 1: By 2025, increased national capacity to generate and use child-related SDG indicators and child deprivations to inform evidence-based policy dialogue and budget decisions | 1.1 Action plan to support Government to improve the availability and quality of child-related Sustainable Development Goal indicators is being implemented (CSI H3.2) NOTE: this will not appear in RAM because it's a CSI under change strategies which cannot be mapped to results for now but we still report on it in the CSI H3.2 | The most recent household survey used for SDGs is from 2014. (2021) | CP Target: A MICS report with most child-related SDG indicators is published and validated by MoP and BoS. 2023 Target: Preparatory activities for MICS data collection are launched. 2024 Target: MICS data collection is finalized. 2025 Target: A MICS report with most child-related SDG indicators is published and validated by MoP and BoS. | UNICEF Annual Report | MoP/BoS | Close to output if indicator measures government capacity to implement the MICS. |
| | | 1.2 Policies and programmes are influenced by analysis and advocacy to reduce child poverty (RAM Standard Indicator IND 000 1570) ⁹² | Not yet initiated ⁹³ (2021) | CP Target: Work underway ⁹⁴ 2023 Target: Not yet initiated ⁹⁵ 2024 Target: Not yet initiated 2025 Target: Work underway ¹⁷ | Annual Report/Policies or Programmes | MoP/NEDB/BOS | Review baseline and targets in line with new indicator |

92 As per RAM guidance notes on Social Inclusion and Policy, baselines and targets have been set on the basis of three scores – not yet initiated, work underway, accomplished – to assess the extent to which child poverty analysis and advocacy by UNICEF have led to a change in a national policy or programmes.

93 Child Poverty Analysis or advocacy has not yet influenced discussions or activities to introduce or scale up policies and programme to reduce child poverty

94 Discussions or activities to introduce, improve or scale up policies and programmes to reduce child poverty are ongoing but have not yet seen actual changes in the policies or programmes

95 Child Poverty Analysis or advocacy has not yet influenced discussions or activities to introduce or scale up policies and programme to reduce child poverty

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|--|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| | | NOTE: replaced with CSI 5.1 Extent to which measurement, analysis or policy advice has informed policies and programs to reduce child poverty. the CSI is mapped but to the outcome | | | | | |
| | Output 2: By 2025, increased capacity of comprehensive national social protection systems to prevent and protect boys and girls from deprivations and vulnerabilities before, during and | 2.1 Level of coordination among the key stakeholders to facilitate the scale up of cash transfer programme (SMQ-25-02-5.b.2-12.) ⁹⁶ | Absent ⁹⁷ (2021) | CP Target: Medium ⁹⁸ 2023 Target: Low ⁹⁹ 2024 Target: Low ²⁰ 2025: Medium ¹⁹ | Annual Report/Policies and Programmes | NESDB/MOSA UNHCR/UNDP/WFP | |
| | | 2.2 Elements of the national cash transfer programme/s can support the scale up (i.e expansion and adjustment) of social protection in a timely manner (SMQ- 25-02-5.b.2-13.) ¹⁰⁰ | 1101 | CP Target: 1, 2, 3, 4 ¹⁰² 2023 target: 1,2,103 2024 target: 1,2,3,104 2025 target: 1, 2, 3, 4 ¹⁰⁵ | Annual Report/Policies or Programmes | MoSA, CMWG, WFP, UNHCR | |

96 As per SMQ Guidance – GA5 baselines and targets have been set on the basis of a five-point scale: 1. Absent: No coordination exists; 2. Low: Informal coordination mechanism exists between Ministries responsible for DRM and social welfare; 3. Medium: Formal coordination mechanism exists to coordinate between ministries and local government to scale up of social protection in emergencies ; 4. High: Formal coordination mechanism exists for intragovernmental coordination and to coordinate between government and humanitarian cash coordination

97 No coordination exists

98 Formal coordination mechanism (e.g. Response plans, SOPs, agreements etc) exists to coordinate between ministries and local government to scale up of social protection in humanitarian contexts.

99 Informal coordination mechanism exists between Ministries responsible for DRM and social welfare

100 As per SMQ Guidance – GA5 baselines and targets have been set on the basis of 5 available criteria: i) Beneficiary database already includes potential beneficiaries and/or provisions exist to share beneficiary list with UNICEF/other humanitarian stakeholders; ii) Cash payment mechanism can rapidly expand coverage and increase the volume of cash transacted; iii) MIS system can add information on emergency cash payments, monitor access to services and grievance redressal; iv) Social workers can be deployed from other locations and some social workers are trained in emergency response; v) Contingency budget/allocations exist either at the Ministry or local government/decentralized level to support scale up

101 (1) beneficiary database/social registry includes the most vulnerable to the impacts of a crisis.

102 (1) beneficiary database/social registry includes the most vulnerable to the impacts of a crisis; (2) Cash payment mechanism can expand coverage and cope with an increase in the volume of cash transacted; (3) MIS system can track and provide information on emergency cash payments, grievances/feedback received/addressed and where applicable, monitor access to services. (4) Grievance mechanism is functional and accessible to people vulnerable to the impacts of a crisis.

103 (1) beneficiary database/social registry includes the most vulnerable to the impacts of a crisis; (2) Cash payment mechanism can expand coverage and cope with an increase in the volume of cash transacted;

104 (1) beneficiary database/social registry includes the most vulnerable to the impacts of a crisis; (2) Cash payment mechanism can expand coverage and cope with an increase in the volume of cash transacted; (3) MIS system can track and provide information on emergency cash payments, grievances/feedback received/addressed and where applicable, monitor access to services.

105 (1) beneficiary database/social registry includes the most vulnerable to the impacts of a crisis; (2) Cash payment mechanism can expand coverage and cope with an increase in the volume of cash transacted; (3) MIS system can track and provide information on emergency cash payments, grievances/feedback received/addressed and where applicable, monitor access to services. (4) Grievance mechanism is functional and accessible to people vulnerable to the impacts of a crisis.

| | Levels of Results | Standard Indicators ²⁰ and disaggregation | Baseline ²¹ | Target for CP & Milestones | Means of Verification (MOV) | Key partners | Comments / Suggestions for strengthening (Actions in BOLD) |
|--|----------------------------|---|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| | after shocks and stresses. | 2.3 Number of households reached by cash transfers through UNICEF-supported programmes (CSI 5.2.5) | 259 households (2021) | CP Target: 1,050 2023 Target: 150 2024 Target: 300 2025 Target: 600 | UNICEF annual report | MOSA, WB, UN-HCR, WFP | |
| | | 2.4 Policy/Strategy: Existence of valid national social protection strategy and/or policy (RAM Std. IND0001583) ¹⁰⁶ NOTE: HQ suggested to replace this with CSI 5.2.1 because there's similar datapoint under this CSI and since this standard indicator was retired in 2021 | Weak ¹⁰⁷ | CP Target: Good ¹⁰⁸ 2023 Target: Weak 2024 Target: Weak 2025 Target: Good | UNICEF annual report | NEDB/MoSA, UNDP, WB, WFP, UNHCR | Review target and baseline on the basis or revised indicator. |

¹⁰⁶ As per RAM guidance notes on Social Inclusion and Policy, baselines and targets have been set on the basis of three scores – weak, good, strong – to assesses whether or not the country has as a strategy document or policy on social protection that outlines government responses to prevent and reduce poverty and vulnerability.

¹⁰⁷ There is no policy/strategy or it is out of date

¹⁰⁸ The policy or strategy is drafted but not approved

Annex 5: Terms of Reference

- By 2025, girls, boys and adolescents have improved access to and use of equitable, sustainable, climate-resilient, gender-responsive water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) services and live in a safe and healthy environment.
- By 2025, girls, boys and adolescents have improved access to inclusive social protection services to reduce child deprivations.

B. Purpose of Activity/Assignment:

UNICEF Libya Country Office (LCO) is seeking a knowledgeable evaluator/consultant to conduct the evaluability assessment of the Country Programme Document 2023-2025 (CPD) for Libya CO (LCO).

The purpose of an evaluability assessment for UNICEF is to provide the country office with an independent assessment on how well the country office is prepared for a country programme or strategic framework evaluation. It will highlight what is required to improve documentation so that the questions of the various evaluation domains can be answered. Specifically, the process will assess whether objectives are adequately defined, causal linkages are clarified, its indicators are validated and measurable, and systems and relevant capacities are in place to measure and verify results.

C. Objectives:

The objectives of the evaluability assessments are,

- Assess the clarity of objectives, alignment, logic and coherence of the country programme and programme rationales, and their alignment to the country context and UNICEF Strategic Plan. Propose relevant adjustments to the Theory of Change in programme rationales based on the assessment conducted.
- Assess the adequacy and validity and availability of documentations, results, indicators, tools and systems for monitoring, measuring and verifying results.
- Assess the availability and quality of the data needed to measure and monitor results (including the availability and sufficiency of baselines and targets).
- Assess the adequacy and quality of information available from current monitoring systems to conduct useful Country Programme Evaluation.
- The evaluability assessment will pay particular attention to assessing the way equity, innovation, gender and humanitarian action have been documented.

E. Scope

The individual consultant will answer the following key questions under the objectives of the assessment. The questions will be discussed and refined with the consultant recruited to conduct the evaluability assessment at the inception phase.

- Is there a well-articulated theory of change for the country programme and programme rationales?
- Is the theory of change flexible and responsive to external factors? Were there modifications to the intervention logic and why? Are the causal linkages between the different levels of the intervention logic clear? Have risks and assumptions identified and are adequate?
- Are baselines in place for indicators? If not, are activities planned to generate the baseline?
- Are the indicators reliable for decision making for the programme improvements?
- Are means of verification clearly identified and reliable for all the outcome and output indicators? Do they generate data/information at reasonable intervals to help monitoring and documenting progress over time?
- Are there mechanisms and adequate human and financial resources in place to collect relevant data in a consistent manner?
- Have the indicators been defined (e.g. numerators and denominators) without an ambiguity? Has a target value for the indicator been provided, including for any necessary disaggregation?
- Are measures, tools, and mechanisms in place to measure crosscutting priorities such as gender, human rights, SBC, youth, and normative principles?
- Are financial resources clearly aligned with deliverables?

D. Work Assignments:

The assessment will involve three phases: Inception, Data Collection and Validation/Reporting. I. Inception Phase

The inception phase will involve a briefing with the manager of the assignment and UNICEF Libya Country Office (via video conference). This phase will also involve an initial desk review to review relevant background documents, and the further refining of the initial list of evaluability questions. During this phase the consultant will produce an inception report that confirms if the questions in the ToR can be answered, and if applicable suggests changes to the scope (items missed or items unrealistic to be answered) based on the experience of the consultant and the preliminary screening of the documentation.

II. Data collection and Analysis

The second phase of the evaluability assessment will involve an extensive desk review, interviews with key staff members at various levels (country - regional) and other key stakeholders as applicable. For the country office consultations, the consultant will review the design, technical and management aspects of the program, the M&E and reporting systems in place at the country level and assess the constraints, opportunities, contextual and substantive issues in operationalizing the program and the monitoring and evaluation work. During this phase the consultant will produce a draft assessment report that includes a detailed analysis of the documentation and processes reviewed, as well as conclusions and recommendations for an informed management response. The report should be between 15- 20 pages maximum (excl. Annexes). The report should have recommendations on how to improve the evaluability of the country programme.

III. Validation and finalization

The draft report will be circulated for comments and the consultant is expected to address all comments received

F. Major responsibilities:

- Take direct responsibility for all deliverables being of satisfactory quality.
- Ensure that the deliverables emerge in a timely fashion, following a high-quality in-depth analytic process, as well as ongoing consultation with the UNICEF Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist.
- Conduct all parts of the evaluability assessment, being directly accountable to UNICEF.