

Monitoring and Evaluation in the Enhanced Integrated Framework: Guidance Notes

Prepared for the Interim Board of the Enhanced Integrated Framework, Executive Secretariat, Trust Fund Manager and EIF Partners

By

Murray G. Smith
Ticon Development Consulting

The support of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in financing this work is gratefully acknowledged but the analysis is independent. The views expressed are those of the author for consideration of the Board, Executive Secretariat and EIF Partners. The draft has benefited from consultations with Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF) partners.

9 February 2009

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | |
|--------|---|
| AfT | Aid for Trade |
| BLS&EE | Baseline Study and External Evaluations |
| CG | Consultative Group |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee |
| DF | Donor Facilitator |
| DTIS | Diagnostic Trade Integration Study |
| ED | Executive Director |
| EDPRS | Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy |
| EGPRS | Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy |
| EIF | Enhanced Integrated Framework |
| ES | Executive Secretariat |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| FP | Focal Point |
| GRPP | Global and Regional Partnership Program |
| EIF | Enhanced Integrated Framework |
| IAs | Implementing Agencies |
| IFIs | International Financial Institutions |
| IFSC | Integrated Framework Steering Committee |
| IMF | International Monetary Fund |
| ITC | International Trade Centre |
| LDC | Least Developed Country |
| MfDR | Managing for Development Results |
| MIEs | Main Implementing Entities |
| NIA | National Implementation Arrangement |
| NIU | National Implementation Unit |
| NSC | National Steering Committee |
| ODA | Official Development Assistance |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| OVI | Objectively Verifiable Indicators |
| PAF | Performance Assessment Framework |
| PAR | Performance Assessment Report |
| PRS | Poverty Reduction Strategy |
| PRSP | Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper |
| RT | Round Table |
| TAC 1 | Tier 1 Appraisal Committee |
| TAC 2 | Tier 2 Appraisal Committee |
| TFM | Trust Fund Manager |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| TRA | Trade Related Assistance |
| TRTA | Trade-related Technical Assistance |
| UNCTAD | United Nations Conference on Trade and Development |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNIDO | United Nations Industrial Development Organisation |
| UNOPS | United Nations Office for Project Services |
| WB | World Bank |
| WTO | World Trade Organization |

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Draft Logical Framework at the Programme Level. | 5 |
| 2. Draft Logical Framework at the Country Level | 11 |
| 3. Draft Logical framework template at the Tier 1 Project Level | 15 |
| 4. Draft Logical framework template at the Tier II Project Level..... | 16 |
| 5. Checklist for Tier 1 pre-DTIS project..... | 17 |
| 6. Checklist for DTIS and DTIS up-dates..... | 19 |
| 7. Guidance Note for Terms of Reference for the Baseline work and/or to feed into TOR for full time M&E person. | 21 |
| 8. Guidance Note for Terms of Reference for External Monitoring..... | 23 |
| 9. Guidance Notes for the Terms of Reference for the Midterm Evaluation..... | 24 |
| 10. Guidance Notes for Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation | 28 |

1. Draft Logical Framework at the Programme Level

This draft framework needs to be validated across the EIF Partnership and against the baseline study to ensure indicators are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound (SMART).

| EIF Programme Logical Framework (Summary Logic) | | | EIF Purpose To support mainstreaming of trade into national development strategies and to enhance the capacity of LDCs to formulate and implement national development strategies into which trade has been mainstreamed | Overall Goal: To support integration of LDCs into the global trading system in order to contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable development |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Activities <i>(project-level only)</i> | Outputs <i>(project level only)</i> | Short-term Programme Outputs <i>(Project, country and programme level results meet at this level)</i> | Medium-term Outcomes (Purpose) <i>(program/country level – for the country level, all LDCs will be expected to work towards the achievement of these expected result. (i.e results will be the same, while means to achieve will vary.</i> | Long-term Outcomes (Goal) |
| <p>Tier 1 Activities will be different for each country, but should support greater in-country capacity and ownership, specifically focusing on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building the human resource capacity of the IF National Implementation Arrangements (NIAs) Providing operation support to NIAs, including some local running costs and equipment Preparing and/or updating of the LDC's Diagnostic Trade Integration Study (DTIS) Facilitating and supporting trade mainstreaming activities <p>As per the Guidelines for Tier 1 projects, projects are to be formulated for a maximum of three years. Each project should be designed to ensure the sustainability of the results.</p> | <p><i>Cannot be measured at the program level.</i></p> <p><i>Will vary for each project</i></p> | <p>1. Successful Tier 1 projects launched/implemented/completed in participating countries that contribute to one or more of the following country/program level expected results (this table phrases expected results at the programme level, but each country-level logframe should include these components. Further, each project level logframe will have one or more of these expected outcomes as an expected medium-term outcome)</p> <p>1.1 Representative and sufficiently senior-level NIAs are established (key ministries, private sector, civil society, development partners)</p> <p>1.2 NIAs have the capacity and skills necessary to undertake EIF roles and responsibilities, including assuming a proactive role in mainstreaming trade at the national, sectoral and institutional levels</p> <p>1.3 NIAs have clear understanding and ownership of the key trade opportunities and challenges in their respective countries, including a solid understanding of the link to development</p> <p>1.4 NIAs have clearly defined their trade/development priorities and prioritized required actions</p> | <p>a. LDCs have enhanced capacity to formulate and implement trade related policies and development strategies</p> <p>b. LDCs effectively mainstream trade policies and strategies into their national development plans and strategies</p> <p>c. LDCs demonstrate achievement of expected results outlined in their DTIS/Action Plan/country level frameworks</p> <p>d. Delivery of AFT is coordinated in accordance with the identified and prioritised needs of LDCs.</p> | <p>I. LDCs integrated into global trading system</p> <p>II. LDCs achieve poverty reduction and sustainable development through trade</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | 1.5 NIAs secure buy-in for DTIS, including Action plan, from other Government Institutions, the private sector, civil society and other IF stakeholders | | |
| | | 1.6 NIAs able to facilitate greater in-country collaboration and consultation on trade and development issues (both inter-ministerial and donor coordination) | | |
| | | 3. Donor community in LDCs demonstrate coordinated approach to trade around priorities identified in the Action Matrix and ensure coordination of trade is aligned with other coordination work on broader economic development and growth issues in the country. | | |
| | | 4. Additional resources leveraged in support of LDC AFT initiatives prioritized in the DTIS/Action Plans | | |
| <p>Tier 2 Activities provide bridging funding to jump start project-related activities identified in the DTIS, its update, and its Action Matrix, such as small priority projects, project development activities, feasibility studies and seed projects. Tier 2 projects should possibly: a) leverage additional resources; and b) contribute to ensure the overall coherence of TRTA interventions.</p> <p>Activities to promote overall coherence will be supported by the work of the DF who will ensure mechanisms for donor-donor and Government-donor coordination are established.</p> | <p><i>Cannot be measured at program level.</i></p> <p><i>Will vary for each project.</i></p> | 2. Successful Tier 2 projects launched/implemented/completed in participating countries. These projects should support priorities outlined in the DTIS/Action Plan and contribute to expected results outlined in country level logframes. | | |
| | | 2. 1 Credible/feasible project proposals developed in support of the priorities outlined in the LDC's DTIS/Action Plan | | |
| | | 2.2 Demonstrated progress in achievement of specific trade and development expected results identified in each country's DTIS/Action Plan/logframe | | |
| | | 3. Donor community in LDCs demonstrate coordinated approach to trade around priorities identified in the Action Matrix and ensure coordination of trade is aligned with other coordination work on broader economic development and growth issues in the country. | | |
| | | 4. Additional resources leveraged in support of LDC AFT initiatives prioritized in the DTIS/Action Plans | | |

Logical Framework

| | Indicator | Source | Responsible/Frequency | Reporting Method | Risk/Assumption |
|--|--|--|--|---|-----------------|
| GOAL | | | | | |
| I. LDCs integrated into global trading system | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range of indicators on LDC performance in trade in goods and services, business environment, trade facilitation, etc | Existing sources of reporting (i.e. annual data from IMF, ITC, WTO, UNDP reports; OECD AFT questionnaire...) | independent evaluator. After 5 years (potentially also at mid-point) | As part of independent evaluations prepared for the Board | |
| II. LDCs achieve poverty reduction and sustainable development through trade | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poverty measures including poverty head count, poverty gap, Human Development Index, etc | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | | | | |

| PURPOSE | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| To support mainstreaming of trade into national development strategies and to enhance the capacity of LDCs to formulate and implement national development strategies into which trade has been mainstreamed | See breakdown below | | | | |
| a. LDCs have enhanced capacity to formulate and implement trade related policies and development strategies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of LDCs that demonstrate increased capacity to advocate for trade reforms and trade mainstreaming (baseline/present) • % of LDCs where NIA activities/functions are sustainable and continue after Tier 1 projects are completed • % of LDCs that feel their capacity has increased (not at all, somewhat, significantly) • No. of stakeholders that perceive capacity within LDCs have increased (DFs, ES, UNOPS, select Gov Departments) (not at all, moderately, significantly) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EIF reports (TFM semi-annual reports, project reports by MIAs, NIU semi-annual reports on progress in-country, ES annual reports, DF annual reports) - participating LDC survey and site visits of sample countries | independent evaluator. At mid-point and end of program | As part of independent evaluations prepared for the Board | |
| b. LDCs effectively mainstream trade policies and strategies into their national development plans and strategies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of national development plans /PRSPs which incorporate trade priorities identified in DTIS (baseline/present) • Perception of level of integration of trade priorities into national development plans (fair, moderate, weak) (baseline/present) • % and no of participating countries where (none, some, or many) other government sector strategies make reference to DTIS or recommendations in action matrix (e.g. macroeconomic, fiscal, social policy, women, youth, etc). • % of stakeholders (civil society, private sector, other Government Departments, that feel DTIS adequately reflects their country's needs | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| c. LDCs demonstrate achievement of expected results outlined in their DTIS/Action Plan/country level frameworks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of LDCs exceeding, achieving and not achieving the collective expected results outlined in their country level frameworks | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| d. Delivery of AFT is coordinated in accordance with the identified and prioritised needs of LDCs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$ and % of TRTA leveraged as a result of trade mainstreaming/DTIS process, as identified under categories of trade policy and regulation, trade development, trade related infrastructure, building productive capacity, trade related adjustment (baseline to present) • % of LDCs that view donor assistance as better coordinated, matches their identified priorities, and overall meeting their needs (not at all, somewhat, completely) | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • | | | | |

| OUTPUTS | | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------|---|--|
| 1. Successful Tier 1 projects launched/implemented/completed in participating countries that contribute to one or more of the following program level expected results: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No and % of Tier 1 proposals developed, submitted, approved, completed No and % of Tier 1 projects meeting, exceeding or failing to meet project milestones % and % of Tier 1 projects fully achieving, partially achieving, or not achieving expected results <p>All broken down by projects approved under following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Establishing NIAs (programme level ST outcome 1.1) ➢ Building capacity of NIAs (ST outcome 1.2) ➢ Preparing quality DTIS/DTIS updates and Action Plans (ST 1.3 and 1.4) ➢ Facilitating better coordination on trade issues in LDCs and ensuring buy-in for DTIS/Action Plan (ST outcome 1.5 and 1.6) | - Tier 1 project reports prepared by Main Implementing Agency (i.e. typically NIU) | TFM Semi-annually | Part of semi-annual report to ES/Board (Note: it is expected that the TFM report will include a narrative on the extent to which current/completed Tier 1 projects are achieving expected results that correspond with short-term outcomes 1.1-1.6) | |
| 1. 1 Representative and sufficiently senior-level NSCs are established (key ministries, private sector, civil society, development partners) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of NSCs established and operational No. of NSCs established that include (strong, moderate, weak or no) representation from other key government Departments, civil society, private sector No. of NSCs that have active participation by all members in EIF process (strong, moderate, weak) | - TFM semi-annual reports (or directly from Tier 1 project reports prepared by Main Implementing Agency) - NIU annual report to ES on overall progress in-country (against country logframe) - ES assessment | ES Annually | Part of Annual report to the Board/IFSC | |
| 1.2 NIAs have the capacity and skills necessary to undertake EIF roles and responsibilities, including assuming a proactive role in mainstreaming trade at the national, sectoral and institutional levels | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of NIAs established No. of NIAs that have sufficient skills and capacity to undertake EIF roles and responsibilities % of NIAs completing required EIF tasks within specified timeframe | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| 1.3 NIAs have clear understanding and ownership of the key trade opportunities and challenges in their respective countries, including a solid understanding of the link to development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of participating LDCs with validated DTISs or DTIS updates No. of DTIS' that clearly outline links to development and poverty reduction No. of NIAs that feel the DTIS adequately reflects their country's needs No. of NIAs that express (strong, medium, weak) ownership of the DTIS | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| 1.4 NIAs have clearly defined their trade/development priorities and prioritized required actions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of NIAs that undertake clear process of prioritization after DTIS/DTIS update No. of NIAs that express (strong, medium, weak) ownership of the Action Matrix and associated prioritization process No. of LDCs with clear country level logframe and | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------------------|--|--|
| | results framework developed and actively implemented/managed by NIAs at the country level. | | | | |
| 1.5 NIAs secure buy-in for DTIS, including Action plan, from other Government Institutions, the private sector, civil society and other IF stakeholders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. and extent of consultation and collaboration with other Ministries and relevant stakeholders on DTIS (e.g. Ministry of Trade, Agriculture, Women's Affairs, Chamber of Commerce, private sector, civil society) Level of seniority of attendance by other key Government Departments on NSCs and during other key cross-ministerial meetings (% official, senior, ministerial level presence) No. of non-trade Ministries and other stakeholders (i.e beyond NIA) that support DTIS prepared No. of other sector strategies with direct reference to the DTIS No of DTIS priorities in national development plans or PRSPs | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| 1.6 NIAs able to facilitate greater in-country collaboration and consultation on trade and development issues (both inter-ministerial and donor coordination) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. and extent of consultation and collaboration with other Ministries and relevant stakeholders on T&D issues as part of trade mainstreaming process (e.g. Ministry of Trade, Agriculture, Women's Affairs, Chamber of Commerce, private sector, civil society) Level of seniority of attendance by other key Government Departments on NSCs and during other key cross-ministerial meetings (% official, senior, ministerial level presence) | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| 2. Successful Tier 2 projects launched/implemented/completed in participating countries. These projects support their identified priorities and contribute to expected results outlined in country level logframes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No of Tier 2 proposals developed, submitted, approved, completed No of Tier 2 projects meeting, exceeding or failing to meet project milestones % of Tier 2 projects fully achieving, partially achieving, or not achieving expected results <p>All reporting on Tier 2 projects will be broken down by projects approved under following categories: a) trade policy; b) trade development; c) trade-related infrastructure; d) building productive capacity; e) trade related adjustment</p> | - Tier 2 project reports prepared by Main Implementing Agency (and reviewed by NIU) - Note: it is expected that the TFM report will include a narrative in results achieved by projects in addition to just these indicators. | TFM Semi-annually | Part of semi-annual report to ES/Board (| |
| 2. 1 Credible/feasible project proposals developed in support of priorities outlined in the LDC's DTIS/Action Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No of credible project proposals developed through Tier 2 projects (as a % of total Tier 2 projects focused on project development) No of credible project proposals developed and funded (as a % of total Tier 2 projects focused on project development) | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| 2.2 Demonstrated progress in achievement of specific trade and development expected results identified in each country's DTIS/Action Plan/logframe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of participating LDCs that show no, some, significant progress in achieving specific expected | - TFM semi-annual report - NIU annual report to ES on | ES Annually | Part of Annual report to the | |

| | results identified in their DTIS/Action Plan/country logframe | progress in country - ES assessment | | Board/IFSC | |
|--|--|---|----------------|------------|---|
| 3. Donor community in LDCs: demonstrate coordinated approach to trade around priorities identified in the Action Matrix; and ensure coordination of trade is aligned with other coordination work on broader economic development and growth issues in the country | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of AFT in LDCs that matches priorities identified in DTIS/Action Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DF annual report to ES on donor activities in country - NIU annual report to ES on progress in-country - OECD CRS | ES Annually | | Part of Annual report to the Board/IFSC |
| 4. Additional resources leveraged in support of LDC trade for development initiatives specified and prioritized in the DTIS/Action Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total amount of funding leveraged as a direct results of Tier 2 project activities (i.e. through production of project proposals in a Tier 2 project). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NIU annual report to ES on progress in country | ES Annually | Annually | Part of Annual report to the Board/IFSC |

2. Draft Logical Framework at the Country Level

This draft framework needs to be validated across the EIF Partnership and against the baseline study to ensure indicators are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound (SMART).

| <i>DRAFT Country Level Logical Framework</i> | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|------------------------|
| | Indicator | Source | Responsible/ Frequency | Reporting Method | Risk/Assumption |
| GOAL | | | | | |
| I. LDCs integrated into global trading system | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range of indicators on LDC performance in trade in goods and services, business environment, trade facilitation, etc | Existing sources of reporting (i.e. annual data from IMF, ITC, WTO, UNDP reports; OECD AFT questionnaire...) | independent evaluator. After 5 years (potentially also at mid-point) | As part of independent evaluations prepared for the Board | |
| II. LDCs achieve poverty reduction and sustainable development through trade | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poverty measures including poverty head count, poverty gap, Human Development Index, etc | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| PURPOSE | | | | | |
| To support mainstreaming of trade into national development strategies and to enhance the capacity of LDCs to formulate and implement national development strategies into which trade has been mainstreamed | See breakdown below | | | | |
| a. LDCs have enhanced capacity to formulate and implement trade related policies and development strategies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of LDCs that demonstrate increased capacity to advocate for trade reforms and trade mainstreaming (baseline/present) % of LDCs where NIA activities/functions are sustainable and continue after Tier 1 projects are completed % of LDCs that feel their capacity has increased (not at all, somewhat, significantly) No. of stakeholders that perceive capacity within LDCs have increased (DFs, ES, UNOPS, select Gov Departments) (not at | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIF reports (TFM semi-annual reports, project reports by MIAs, NIU semi-annual reports on progress in-country, ES annual reports, DF annual reports) participating LDC survey and site visits of sample countries | independent evaluator. At mid-point and end of program | As part of independent evaluations prepared for the Board | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| | all, moderately, significantly) | | | | |
| b. LDCs effectively mainstream trade policies and strategies into their national development plans and strategies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of national development plans /PRSPs which incorporate trade priorities identified in DTIS (baseline/present) • Perception of level of integration of trade priorities into national development plans (fair, moderate, weak) (baseline/present) • % and no of participating countries where (none, some, or many) other government sector strategies make reference to DTIS or recommendations in action matrix (e.g. macroeconomic, fiscal, social policy, women, youth, etc). • % of stakeholders (civil society, private sector, other Government Departments, that feel DTIS adequately reflects their country's needs | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| c. LDCs demonstrate achievement of expected results outlined in their DTIS/Action Plan/country level frameworks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of LDCs exceeding, achieving and not achieving the collective expected results outlined in their country level frameworks | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| d. Delivery of AFT is coordinated in accordance with the identified and prioritised needs of LDCs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$ and % of TRTA leveraged as a result of trade mainstreaming/DTIS process, as identified under categories of trade policy and regulation, trade development, trade related infrastructure, building productive capacity, trade related adjustment (baseline to present) • % of LDCs that view donor assistance as better coordinated, matches their identified priorities, and overall meeting their needs (not at all, somewhat, completely) | Same as above | Same as above | Same as above | |
| | • | | | | |
| OUTPUTS | | | | | |
| 1. Successful Tier 1 projects | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| launched/implemented/completed in participating countries that contribute to one or more of the following program level expected results: | Selected indicators from the programme level framework outputs to be retained (tbd) and adapted to the country level context. Countries will also be required to identify their own specific indicators in collaboration with the Executive Secretariat if so required. | | | | |
| 1. 1 Representative and sufficiently senior-level NSCs are established (key ministries, private sector, civil society, development partners) | | | | | |
| 1.2 NIAs have the capacity and skills necessary to undertake EIF roles and responsibilities, including assuming a proactive role in mainstreaming trade at the national, sectoral and institutional levels | | | | | |
| 1.3 NIAs have clear understanding and ownership of the key trade opportunities and challenges in their respective countries, including a solid understanding of the link to development | | | | | |
| 1.4 NIAs have clearly defined their trade/development priorities and prioritized required actions | | | | | |
| 1.5 NIAs secure buy-in for DTIS, including Action plan, from other Government Institutions, the private sector, civil society and other IF stakeholders | | | | | |
| 1.6 NIAs able to facilitate greater in-country collaboration and consultation on trade and development issues (both inter-ministerial and donor coordination) | | | | | |
| 2. Successful Tier 2 projects launched/implemented/completed in participating countries. These projects support their identified priorities and contribute to expected results outlined in country level logframes. | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2.1 Credible/feasible project proposals developed in support of priorities outlined in the LDC's DTIS/Action Plan | | | | | |
| 2.2 Demonstrated progress in achievement of specific trade and development expected results identified in each country's DTIS/Action Plan/logframe | | | | | |
| 3. Donor community in LDCs: demonstrate coordinated approach to trade around priorities identified in the Action Matrix; and ensure coordination of trade is aligned with other coordination work on broader economic development and growth issues in the country | | | | | |
| 4. Additional resources leveraged in support of LDC trade for development initiatives specified and prioritized in the DTIS/Action Plan | | | | | |

3. Draft Logical framework template at the Tier 1 Project Level

| DRAFT Tier 1 Project Level Logical Framework Template | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Common elements and linkages with the country and programme level frameworks will be developed in the implementation phase of the EIF monitoring and evaluation work. | | | | | |
| | Indicator | Source | Responsible/ Frequency | Reporting Method | Risk/Assumption |
| GOAL | | | | | |
| To support integration of LDCs into the global trading system in order to contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable development | | | | | |
| PURPOSE | | | | | |
| Needs to be linked to the country and programme level purpose. | Needs to be linked to the country and programme level purpose indicators. | | | | |
| OUTPUTS | | | | | |
| Needs to be linked to country and programme level outputs. | Needs to be linked to the country and programme level output indicators. | | | | |

4. Draft Logical framework template at the Tier II Project Level

Common elements and linkages with the country and programme level frameworks will be developed in the implementation phase of the EIF monitoring and evaluation work.

| <i>DRAFT Tier II Project Level Logical Framework Template</i> | | | | | |
|---|------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| | Indicator | Source | Responsible/ Frequency | Reporting Method | Risk/Assumption |
| GOAL | | | | | |
| To support integration of LDCs into the global trading system in order to contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable development | | | | | |
| PURPOSE | | | | | |
| Needs to be linked to the country and programme level purpose. | | | | | |
| OUTPUTS | | | | | |
| Needs to be linked to country and programme level outputs. | | | | | |

5. Checklist for Tier 1 pre-DTIS project¹

Tier 1 pre-DTIS projects will not have a logical framework, but will need to meet the following criteria.

- The Tier 1 pre-DTIS project sensitizes the FP, Members (-to-be) of the NSC, other key Government, Private Sector and Civil Society institutions and representatives on:
 - Linkages between trade and development/poverty reduction;
 - IF programme goal, purpose and objectives;
 - Strategizing and planning for reaching desired country-specific IF objectives;
 - IF processes;
 - IF tools designed to facilitate reaching the country-specific objectives.
- The project sensitizes the FP, Members (-to-be) of the NSC, other key Government, Private Sector and Civil Society institutions and representatives as well as the Donor community on the respective roles of the:
 - FP
 - NIU
 - NSC
 - DF
 - ES
 - TFM
 - IF Board,

and results into the selection of the FP, NSC and DF (if not already in place). NIU can also be set-up during this phase (or the following, NIA-project phase).

- The project focuses on sensitizing the FP, Members (-to-be) of the NSC, other key Government, Private Sector and Civil Society institutions and representatives as well as the Donor community on the role of the DTIS and how to best ensure full country ownership and participation in the DTIS process.
- The project *may* place particular attention in the sensitization / training of the FP, NIU, NSC and / or DF in championing, leading, managing, executing and monitoring achievement of the IF objectives throughout the process.

¹ Provided by the Executive Secretariat

- The project *may* procure initial training or equipment for the FP, NIU and / or the NSC and / or pay remunerations for services by the FP or NIU or consultants as necessary for setting up the IF operations.

- All sensitization work in the project context can take place using various modalities. These include, *inter alia*, national and regional workshops, training in-country and out of the country, sensitization missions to other IF countries and to Geneva, development of written and electronic sensitization material and tools, etc.

6. Checklist for DTIS and DTIS up-dates²

Tier 1 DTIS and DTIS updates will not have a logical framework, but will need to meet the following criteria.

The draft checklist below condenses some of what has emerged as good practice for DTIS. To complete and validate this list, it should be discussed with beneficiary countries and DTIS lead agencies (UNDP, World Bank).

The elements of the checklist aim at

- ensuring a high degree of ownership of the DTIS by the in-country stakeholders,
- avoiding duplication of the diagnostic,
- ensuring high quality of the diagnostic,
- ensuring that the diagnostic provides a good basis for IF implementation.

A non-exclusive of checkpoints is as follows:

- DTIS coverage discussed with stakeholders (NSC meeting, workshop) during pre-mission.
- Government experts identified in for all sectors/themes of the DTIS.
- Staff from the country office of the DTIS lead agency included in DTIS team.
- Team of national consultants identified during pre-mission.
- Concept paper discussed (F2F, video-conference, audio-conference or electronically) with stakeholders (FP, NSC).
- ToRs for DTIS Team shared and discussed with FP, government experts, NSC.
- Kick off meeting (or meetings for each sector/theme) held at the beginning of main fact finding mission to discuss whom the DTIS Team will meet and what information they will gather.
- Wrap up meeting (or meetings for each sector/theme) held at the end of the main mission to discuss/validate some of the preliminary findings by the DTIS Team.
- Draft chapters including priority actions shared and discussed with FP, government experts, NSC (F2F – "pre-workshop", video-conferences, audio-conferences, or electronically).
- Submission of written comments by government teams facilitated through local DTIS Team.

² Provided by the Executive Secretariat

- For validation workshop, chairs for breakout sessions identified in advance and fully briefed on their role.
- List of (recently) completed and planned relevant studies (covers a wide field) prepared DTIS team and validated by government experts and development partners.
- DTIS team leader has relevant experience in trade diagnostics, knowledge of the IF, and experience in comparable multi-stakeholder dialogue in LDCs;
- DTIS team members are proven experts in their field;
- DTIS is prepared timely (according to time-line set out in concept);
- DTIS analytical quality is satisfactory to the client as well as all internal and external reviewers
- ToRs for DTIS Team includes reference to the Action Matrix and IF implementation.
- Other diagnostics covering sectors/themes outside the DTIS coverage reported in the DTIS, and reflected in the Draft Action Matrix.

7. Guidance Note for Terms of Reference for the Baseline work and/or to feed into TOR for full time M&E person.

The objective of the Baseline Study is to validate and to operationalise the Performance Assessment Framework and the underlying logframes, to refine the indicators and data sources for measuring implementation performance and progress to results, and to establish the Baseline levels of the indicators.

The consultant team will develop a Baseline data set, refine the program indicators of the logical framework (adding intermediate indicators where appropriate) and develop a corresponding set of benchmarks to facilitate the monitoring of the implementation and measuring progress toward results. The Baseline, indicators and benchmarks should be integrated features of the data gathering/monitoring system. Indicators and benchmarks will be reviewed once during project implementation, after the mid-term review. Indicators should be Specific, Measurable, Agreed with the EIF implementing partners, Realistic and Time-bound (SMART).

Creation of Data Gathering/Monitoring System. The consultant will develop the specifications of a data gathering/monitoring system either to be built upon the existing databases of the ES, TFM, and NIUs, utilising the data available from development partners or to be developed exclusively for the purpose of monitoring the programme. This will involve the development of a simple yet effective mechanism for collecting information and experiences gained in the course of program execution in order to facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of the operation. The consultant/team will also develop data collection tools. The system will ensure project evaluability in terms of both results and impact, thus serving to inform the preparation of the mid-term and final evaluations.

With the Baseline established, well designed monitoring system will enable the ES and the TFM and the consultant/team to determine the cost/benefit of the monitoring program and the effectiveness implementing the program. The design of the system and development/adaptation of existing software will enable the ES and TFM to compile information on project activities, outputs, outcomes, and potential impacts of the EIF on the program's final beneficiaries.

The Baseline Study will develop tools and templates to facilitate the process of monitoring implementation and progress to ward results. In addition to

guidelines and tools, the consultant will provide training and capacity building for the NIUs and other EIF partners.

Deliverables:

- 1. Revised Logframes and Performance Assessment Framework for the pilot countries and at the program level;**
- 2. Guidelines and tools for selection of indicators and sources of data and the revision of the Performance Assessment Framework;**
- 3. Assessment of the potential contribution of the EIF in the broader context of trade and development;**
- 4. Tools for capacity building by EIF partners to support implementation of the M&E; and**
- 5. Training of EIF partners on M&E.**

8. Guidance Note for Terms of Reference for External Monitoring.

The external monitoring will be conducted annually and comprises a desk review conducted centrally of all project documents and reporting by the NIUs, MIEs, TFM, IAs and the ES. This monitoring would include an analysis of the project portfolio including utilization of resources, activities, delivery of outputs and outcomes achieved. In addition the annual monitoring would conduct an electronic survey and/or telephone survey of the FPs and IAs/MIEs. A short survey questionnaire will be prepared to identify to key issues related to implementation performance and to provide some evidence on results both expected and unexpected.

The level of effort required would be six weeks of work including all the elements of the monitoring:

- Desk review of all project and programme reports and documents;
- Design, administration and analysis of the short electronic and/or telephone survey of FPs/NIAs/MIEs/IAs. Efforts need to be made to ensure a reasonable response to the survey;
- Portfolio analysis of projects and programme activities;
- Preparation of a report analysing key operational issues at the project, country and programme level which could impede progress toward results.

The monitoring will focus on identifying operational challenges which could impede the effective implementation of the EIF and on the measurement of progress toward results.

Deliverable:

The consultant will prepare a report for the EIF Board reviewing the implementation of the EIF, assessing the implementation performance of the EIF partners, commenting on the Performance Assessment Framework and identifying any operational issues or risks that might impede the achievement of intended results.

9. Guidance Notes for the Terms of Reference for the Midterm Evaluation

A consultant will be contracted to conduct and to prepare the mid-term evaluation of the project under international tendering procedures supervised by the Board Working Group on Monitoring and Evaluation.

Goal and objectives:

The goal of the Evaluation is to determine whether the EIF is likely to achieve its goals and objectives.

The evaluation's objectives are to:

1. to assess implementation performance;
2. determine the extent to which the results as defined in the logical framework at the programme, country and project level have been met as of the date of the evaluation, and assess the likelihood of achieving them upon project completion;
3. identify EIF's institutional strengths and weaknesses;
4. identify potential options for improving the program, which could include modification of activities, responsibilities of EIF partners, schedule of activities and budget allocations, among others;
5. assess the Performance Assessment Framework and to recommend improvements; and
6. to evaluate the management and governance structure of the EIF.

Evaluation Standards, Norms and Criteria

The Evaluation will be governed by the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards, the standards and norms of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). The Evaluation will be independent and will respect ethical standards with respect to conflict of interest, confidentiality and transparency. The Evaluation will utilise the OECD/DAC criteria of Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Outcomes and Likely Impacts, and Sustainability. In addition the Evaluation will utilise governance standards to assess governance.

Governance and Organisation of the Evaluation

The mid-term evaluation will be launched within eighteen months of the launch of the EIF and be completed by the execution midpoint (30 months after project activities have commenced).

The evaluation will be conducted under the overall supervision of the Board Working Group on Monitoring and Evaluation composed of a limited number of donor countries (to be defined). The Board Working Group will appoint its own chair. In specific terms the Board Working Group will provide written comments to the service provider on all its deliverables in order to facilitate and enhance the compliance of the evaluation with the agreed TOR and methodology. These comments will address any deviation from the requirements of the TOR, in addition to methodological issues and any factual issues or inaccuracies concerning EIF activities. The Board Working Group on Monitoring and Evaluation will ensure that the Evaluation is conducted in a transparent manner and that the ES, the TFM, and all EIF partners have the opportunity to comment on the reports related to factual matters. However, the Board Working Group shall not interfere into the Evaluation findings and recommendations.

Methodology

The Consultant must propose a detailed methodology in its proposal, which addresses the following points. The Consultant must use a variety of evaluation instruments and techniques adapted to EIF's mandate, the logic of intervention, the EIF's governance and management structure and in conformity with good development evaluation practices and criteria. The Consultant should employ a range of tools and methods including but not limited to following:

- Review of all reporting by the ES, TFM and EIF partners;
- Analysis of reports at the country level;
- Quantitative analysis of statistical data on sector, country and international level;
- Analysis of data on financial utilisation and activities;
- Analysis of questionnaires and e-questionnaires including surveys (all participants – relatively short questionnaires, few questions) and personal interviews – in-depth follow-up to general surveys;
- Analysis of indicators of capacity building;
- Analysis of mainstreaming of trade into development strategies; and
- Ongoing dialogue with development partners

The Evaluation should attempt to find innovative methodologies and new approaches. Where possible qualitative methods should complement quantitative analysis in order to ensure the soundness and reliability of findings.

One key methodological question is the selection of 10 countries for field studies and evaluation of all projects in those countries. The Consultant will propose criteria for selection of the 10 countries in its proposal and this will issue will addressed during the inception phase.

Evaluation Questions

The midterm evaluation will address the following aspects:

1. Results in terms of outputs achieved vis-à-vis projected targets: Has the program reached the expected number of beneficiaries (individuals, firms, industries) within the expected time frame? Are the program's activities in line with the schedule of activities defined by the annual work plans? Are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with expected budgetary plans?
2. Achievement of projected performance indicators and targets: What has the performance been of the EIF partners with respect to their projected performance indicators? What internal and external factors have influenced delivery of services to meet these targets? Recommendations for improving the execution of the program should be provided if deemed necessary.
3. Preliminary assessment of outcomes/ potential impacts: Has the program generated activities and outputs that could indicate that the assistance has achieved results in mainstreaming of trade and co-ordination of AFT? Have outcomes identified in the logframe been achieved? Have development partners responded to the initiatives made by the EIF? What is the likelihood that intended results will be achieved?
4. Assess the governance and management of the EIF partnership based on seven generally accepted principles of good governance: legitimacy, accountability, responsibility, fairness, transparency, efficiency, and probity.

The mid-term evaluation will evaluate the Performance Assessment Framework and make recommendations about possible changes in logframes at the project, country or programme level and possible improvements in the monitoring processes.

Finally the mid-term evaluation will make recommendations for improved delivery of the programme at the project, country and programme level, improve the likelihood of achieving results, and shall draw lessons learned which can be shared among EIF partners.

Deliverables and milestones

The deliverables of the Evaluation process correspond to the main tasks described above. These deliverables will be produced according to the following outline plan:

1. Deliverable 1 is an inception report and detailed workplan required within one month of the award of the contract;
2. Deliverable 2 is the desk study report, required within three months of the award of the contract;
3. Deliverable 3 is a summary of the field studies of EIF interventions in selected recipient countries and will be submitted within six months after the award of the contract;
4. Deliverable 4 is the draft final synthesis report, to be submitted no later than nine months after the award of the contract; and
5. Deliverable 5 is the final report, required within eleven months of the award of the contract.

10. Guidance Notes for Terms of Reference for the Final Evaluation

The consultant will be contracted to undertake a final evaluation of the EIF program under international tendering procedures supervised by the Board Working Group on Monitoring and Evaluation.

Goal and objectives:

The evaluation's main goals are to:

1. determine whether the objectives, outcomes and impact as stated in the logical framework were achieved or are likely to be achieved;
2. to identify lessons learned and provide recommendations for future operations; and
3. assess the EIF's role and the performance of the implementing agencies.

The Evaluation will evaluate the implementation of the EIF by all development partners at the project, country and programme level. The evaluation at the project and country level will draw on a sample of projects and countries and all the reporting available from the EIF partners, monitoring reports and evaluation reports. In the selected countries, the Evaluation will analyse in depth the results achieved both intended and unintended either directly or indirectly as a result of EIF activities.

Evaluation Standards, Norms and Criteria

The Evaluation will be governed by the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards, the standards and norms of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). The Evaluation will be independent and will respect ethical standards with respect to conflict of interest, confidentiality and transparency. The Evaluation will utilise the OECD/DAC criteria of Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Outcomes and Likely Impacts, and Sustainability. In addition the Evaluation will utilise governance standards to assess governance.

Governance and Organisation of the Evaluation

The mid-term evaluation will be launched within 48 months of the launch of the EIF and be completed by the execution completion (60 months after project activities have commenced).

The evaluation will be conducted under the overall supervision of the Board Working Group on Monitoring and Evaluation composed of a limited number of donor countries (to be defined). The Board Working Group will appoint its own chair. In specific terms the Board Working Group will provide written comments to the service provider on all its deliverables in order to facilitate and enhance the compliance of the evaluation with the agreed TOR and methodology. These comments will address any deviation from the requirements of the TOR, in addition to methodological issues and any factual issues or inaccuracies concerning EIF activities. The Board Working Group on Monitoring and Evaluation will ensure that the Evaluation is conducted in a transparent manner and that the ES, the TFM, and all EIF partners have the opportunity to comment on the reports related to factual matters. However, the Board Working Group shall not interfere into the Evaluation findings and recommendations.

Methodology

The Consultant must propose a detailed methodology in its proposal, which addresses the following points. The Consultant must use a variety of evaluation instruments and techniques adapted to EIF's mandate, the logic of intervention, the EIF's governance and management structure and in conformity with good development evaluation practices and criteria. The Consultant should employ a range of tools and methods including but not limited to following:

- Review of all reporting by the ES, TFM and EIF partners;
- Analysis of reports at the country level;
- Quantitative analysis of statistical data on sector, country and international level;
- Analysis of data on financial utilisation and activities;
- Analysis of questionnaires and e-questionnaires including surveys (all participants – relatively short questionnaires, few questions) and personal interviews – in-depth follow-up to general surveys;
- Analysis of indicators of capacity building;
- Analysis of mainstreaming of trade into development strategies; and
- Ongoing dialogue with development partners

The Evaluation should attempt to find innovative methodologies and new approaches. Where possible qualitative methods should complement quantitative analysis in order to ensure the soundness and reliability of findings.

One key methodological question is the selection of 10 countries for field studies and evaluation of all projects in those countries. The Consultant will

propose criteria for selection of the 10 countries in its proposal and this will issue will addressed during the inception phase.

Evaluation Questions

The report will take into account the following issues and questions:

1. Results in terms of outputs achieved: Did the program reach the expected number of beneficiaries (individuals, firms, industries)? Are the beneficiaries satisfied with the quality and delivery of services? If not, in what way did the services not meet with beneficiary expectations and why? What concrete improvements and changes have taken place as a direct result of the program?
2. Achievement of projected performance indicators and targets: What has been the performance of the ES/TFM and NIUs with respect to their projected performance indicators and agreed responsibilities with respect to program implementation in the logical frameworks at the project, country and programme levels? What internal and external factors have influenced the (delivery of services) to meet these targets?
3. It the program relevant to country needs? Has the design of the EIF projects and programs been appropriate and relevant to development needs at the project, country and programme level? Has management and governance of the EIF been appropriate and effective?
4. Assessment of outcome/impact: The outcomes and potential impacts should be evaluation according to the Performance Assessment Framework and the logical frameworks at the project, country and program level. Have key results been achieved? Has trade been mainstreamed? How has the program contributed towards supporting trade negotiating processes or implementation of agreements? Has the coordination of AfT been improved? Has the capacity to develop trade or to remove supply side constraints been enhanced? How could the program's impact have been improved? Has the EIF at the country and program level contributed to the overall goal of supporting sustainable development, poverty reduction and addressing cross cutting issues including gender equality and environmental sustainability?
5. Problems encountered: Difficulties faced by the EIF and EIF partners, and actions taken to overcome them (administrative, operational, financial, political or macroeconomic, etc.). The consultants should present a brief overview of the policy environment and the economic and business

conditions that have had an impact on the EIF during the program implementation period.

6. Lessons learned: The consultant/team should provide information on how economic/political/financial context has influenced programme delivery and the achievement of results. What has been learned about the qualifications and capacities of the executing agencies, required stakeholder participation, and other elements that should be in place for the purpose of informing the design of future initiatives?

Deliverables and milestones

The deliverables of the Evaluation process correspond to the main tasks described above. These deliverables will be produced according to the following outline plan:

6. Deliverable 1 is an inception report and detailed workplan required within one month of the award of the contract;
7. Deliverable 2 is the desk study report, required within three months of the award of the contract;
8. Deliverable 3 is a summary of the field studies of EIF interventions in selected recipient countries and will be submitted within six months after the award of the contract;
9. Deliverable 4 is the draft final synthesis report, to be submitted no later than nine months after the award of the contract; and
10. Deliverable 5 is the final report, required within eleven months of the award of the contract.