



TERMINAL EVALUATION

GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRATIC
PARTICIPATION PROGRAMME

2022



TERMINAL EVALUATION

GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRATIC
PARTICIPATION PROGRAMME

2022

Contents

Table of Contents	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	6
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	7
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
Section1.	
Introducing The Evaluation	12
1.1. Background	12
1.2. Purpose, scope and objectives	12
1.3. Evaluation framework and methodology	13
1.4. Evaluation ethics and data protection	14
1.5. Limitations of the evaluation	14
Section2.	
The Country Context	16
2.1. Development context:	16
2.2. Key elements of the GDPP	17
2.3. Alignment of GDPP to National Policies and Strategies	18
2.4. Validity of Theory of Change	19
Section3.	
Findings Of The Evaluation And Assessment Against Evaluation Criteria	21
3.1. Overview	21
Section4.	
Conclusions	30
Section5.	
Recommendations For A New Iteration Of The Gdpp	32
Section6.	
LESSONS LEARNED	34

ANNEX1. PROGRAMME ACHIEVEMENTS AGAINST OUTPUTS, SUB-OUTPUTS AND TARGETS BY ACTIVITY.	35
ANNEX2. LIST OF INTERVIEWEES	44
ANNEX3. EVALUATION MATRIX	46
ANNEX4. TERMS OF REFERENCE TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAMME (GDPP) – JUNE 2017 – DECEMBER 2021. ABRIDGED VERSION	51
ANNEX5. REFERENCES	57

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Undertaking this terminal evaluation of the Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP) would have not been possible without the conscientious involvement of a wide range of stakeholders. In particular, our thanks go to the representatives of the Governance team at the Ethiopia Country Office who provided the important context of the Programme and supported the gathering of data and information necessary to complete the review. Most importantly, the Implementing Partners and Development Partners freely shared their time and knowledge with the evaluation team and their contributions are central to this report.

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ARTS	Audit Report Tracking System	PMB	Programme Management Board
AWPs	Annual Work Plans	ProDoc	Programme Document
CCI	Council of Constitutional Inquiry	PTC	Programme Technical Committee
CO	Country Office	PWB	Programme of Work and Budget
COVID	Corona Virus Disease	RBM	Result Based Management
CPD	Country Programme Document	RECs	Regional Councils
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations	SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor	TE	Terminal Evaluation
DARS	Digital Asset Registration System	ToC	Theory of Change
Dis	Democratic Institutions	ToR	Terms of Reference
DIP	Democratic Participation Programme	UN	United Nations
DPs	Development Partners	UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
EA	Evaluability Assessment	UNDP	United Nations Development Program
EACC	Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission	UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
EBA	Ethiopian Broadcasting Authority	UPR	Universal Periodic Review
EHRC	Ethiopian Human Rights Commission	VAWCs	Violence Against Women & Children
EIO	Ethiopian Institute of the Ombudsman		
EMA	Ethiopian Media Authority		
EQ	Evaluation Questions		
ET	Evaluation Team		
FEACC	Federal Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission		
FGDs	Focus Group Discussion		
GDPP	Governance and Democratic Participation Program		
GESI	Gender and Social Inclusion		
GoE	Government of Ethiopia		
HCPWs	High Conflict Prone Woredas		
HoF	House of Federation		
HoPR	House of Peoples' Representative		
IPs	Implementing Partners		
JC	Judgement Criteria		
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews		
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation		
MoF	Ministry of Finance		
MoJ	Ministry of Justice		
MoP	Ministry of Peace		
MTR	Mid-Term Review		
NEBE	National Electoral Board of Ethiopia		
NIM	National Implementation		
OAG	Office of the Attorney General		
OFAG	Office of Federal Auditor General		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

UNDP in close collaboration with Ethiopian government stakeholders established the Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP) in 2017 to “capitalize on existing momentum and opportunities to further advance good governance and entrench democratic principles at all levels and across the country.” UNDP Ethiopia commissioned an independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the GDPP for the full implementation period of the programme (July 2017-December 2021). The evaluation was conducted between January-April 2022 by a team of three consultants. The Terminal Evaluation included the original x11 Implementing Partners and aims to serve as an important learning and accountability tool, providing UNDP, donors, national stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results generated by the GDPP to date. In reviewing progress towards the achievement of the programme’s results and outcomes, the TE sought to identify signs of success and areas for improvement that will guide its future direction; in particular, regarding the potential for a next phase of the programme. This report brings together the findings, conclusions and recommendations from the various processes of the evaluation.

Evaluation objectives, framework and methodology

The evaluation’s key objectives were to examine how, and the extent to which, the GDPP complemented the UNDP country programme’s objectives in addressing national priority needs in terms of governance and democratic development and thereby help maintain UNDP’s position as an effective partner of the Government of Ethiopia. The evaluation sought to address these broad objectives through the lens of five key evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, and two cross-cutting issues: human rights and gender equality. A mixed-methods approach combining key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions, remote interviews, desk review of relevant documents and field visits to intervention sites was the basis of the evaluation. In total, 87 (24 female) structured individual interviews, and eight Focus Group Discussions (FGD), were conducted by the Evaluation Team.

Findings of the evaluation, Key findings by evaluation criteria:

Relevance

Overall, the ET identified many strengths in the programme design. It targeted strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks critical to the delivery of results. This entailed addressing the gaps in laws and the institutional capacities and synergies. Participatory approaches were adopted in policy formulation and institutional reforms. The evaluation has determined that the GDPP is highly relevant to the GoE’s governance and democratic participation agenda and to the needs and interests of the various IPs. However, although it embodies, under NIM, a process whereby the GoE is in the lead in choosing its direction, in effect the GDPP is highly centralised and does not adequately address people’s needs. It is also too reliant on political stability and falls short in addressing gender equality in particular at regional and local levels. Although it contributes ostensibly to sustainable development goals 5, 10 and 16, it is not evident that these are objectives the programme pursues deliberately

Effectiveness

Based on the analysis of the accomplishment of activities, the ET has determined that the GDPP has effectively achieved the identified outputs. The overall management structure and operational context of the GDPP is appropriate and regarded by implementing partners (and stakeholders) as being professional, accessible, efficient and effective. However, several interviewees have flagged their concerns over the centralisation of decision making, the lack of outreach to the regions and the virtual absence of CSOs in project planning and implementation. In fact, there was no regional or local interaction/participation factored into the design of the programme. Delays in project implementation have been quite common for reasons attributed in part to UNDP’s cumbersome funds disbursement and procurement policies. In addition, movement restrictions surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic have been challenging to the effective and efficient implementation of programme activities and objectives. This has been compounded by the security crisis in the country. This illustrates the fact that implementation delays are not necessarily the “fault” of UNDP or the GDPP. Rather, they reflect the complex situation on the ground and show that “politics” and unforeseen events can often stall much needed progress.

Efficiency

Based on analysis of budget allocations versus expenditures per Output, the ET has determined that the GDPP used its resources efficiently and effectively. The GDPP has also efficiently combined resources from the four main donors to support a single programme, thereby avoiding duplication of effort. Notwithstanding the above, programme efficiency is not just a question of proficiently distributing resources. There have been numerous cases of staff turnover in the IPs which have negated institutional memory and compromised efficient programme delivery. Moreover, there are clear indications that some IPs are less committed and motivated than others to support the issues promulgated by the GDPP. Accordingly, the ET supports the GDPP's Option Paper proposal that future funding allocations should be based on performance.

Impact

The impact of the programme is difficult to assess given that it provides “soft support” that is problematic to measure in real terms. Nevertheless, the ET through desk review and stakeholder consultations captured significant immediate results that have the potential of contributing to the realisation of the desired impact level results. An important impact has been that there is now a basis for the public to demand accountability in the democratic governance sector. Although the transformative gains at the citizenry level are still low, this approach has potential to yield greater benefits for the general population both in the medium and long term. Overall, the GDPP impacted the country's democratic governance landscape by promoting, cultivating, and capacitating national/and regional forums, platforms, and coalitions thereby positively impacting improved governance and human rights.

Sustainability

There are several areas where the GDPP has created capacity that bodes well for the future sustainability of the kinds of activities developed to date. Policies and guidelines have been developed which, along with the various training exercises, should place the GoE in a stronger position to further develop and expand its programmes and services in the areas of democratisation and governance. Given that the support given to the IPs directly builds capacity to enable government officials and staff to implement and manage projects, and enhance the accountability and effectiveness of services that address the governance priorities of Ethiopia, they are inherently “sustainable.” However, a simple analysis of what underpins sustainability indicates that the activities delivered would face significant challenges when it comes to their long-term viability without continued financial support, and that is in question. The continued instability in the north of the country, and the erosion of human rights norms in particular, has been flagged by donors as a major problem affecting their commitment to continue funding the GDPP.

Cross-cutting issues

It is not evident that cross-cutting issues - gender and human rights - are fully integrated into all programme activities, nor is there a clear understanding of what this would involve. That said, there has been slow but steady progress on legislative and policy reform on gender-related issues. On human rights, the GDPP, by enhancing people's access to basic information, e.g., about elections, supports the aim of strengthening good governance and increasing citizens' engagement in areas that respond to their needs.

Conclusions

The ET concludes that the strategic priorities and areas of focus identified in the programme document have been a good fit with the national needs and UNDP's position as a trusted partner of the GoE. The NIM modality ensures strong convergence with the country programme and Strategic Plan of UNDP as well as in ensuring national ownership and capacity over time. Moreover, the core objectives of the GDPP provide a good framework for supporting the governance and democratic development priorities of the government. Performance has been mixed in different output areas, with the capacity building of officials to strengthen institutions being one of the more successful elements. A major weakness of the programme design has been the lack of CSO engagement as well as the absence of a concerted effort to reach out to regional, local and community levels. The participation of communities in the design and delivery of activities that address their needs holds the promise of contributing to the success of the GDPP in a future iteration but this needs to be linked to the broader development effort.

There has been no direct support to the SDGs under any of the activities funded by the GDPP and therefore no attempt to use the SDGs as an entry point to solidify the programme's strategic objectives. Raising awareness of the SDGs through focused campaigns will help the attainment of SDG targets and should be an inclusive and participatory process, e.g. through initiating dialogue with members of civil society, the private sector, government officials and marginalised groups, especially women, youth and people with special needs. It is clear that until 2030, UNDP Ethiopia needs to seek transformative, integrated and sustainable policy and programming options for SDG implementation that are localised and embedded in institutions.

Also, in order to ensure services, reach to lower levels, and are accessible to citizens across the country, UNDP needs to mobilise funds to continue established interventions such as the DARS in FEACC, the ARTS in OFAG and interactive citizens' information and feedback centers at HoF, EIO, CCI, etc. To support individual accessibility and use, this should be prioritised in a new iteration of the GDPP and in any follow-up collaborations with the IPs.

Contextually it is important to recognize that in Ethiopia gender inequality is still prevalent in a largely in a highly patriarchal society where public discourse about gender equality remains challenging. In the case of GDPP efforts to enhance women's socio-economic and political rights have not progressed exponentially at the programme level and gender equality has not been prioritised. In part this stems from the failure of UNDP to recruit a gender specialist until two years into the programme which prevented any meaningful attempt to develop a gender-inclusive programming strategy from the outset. Collaboration on gender with the IPs has been wanting and the projects which do have something of a gender component tend to be gender-responsive, rather than gender-transformative. They have contributed little to addressing the root causes of gender inequalities. Now that a gender specialist is appointed greater progress should be made in any future programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A NEW ITERATION OF THE GDPP:

Broad Programmatic Level Recommendations:

R.1 Significant progress has been made under the GDPP in enhancing good governance and democratic development in Ethiopia. In order not to lose the gains made thus far, a follow-on programme (GDPP Phase II) is recommended to build on the achievements and lessons learned. A second phase of the GDPP should give considerable attention to both the national level as well as to the regional level partners and activities.

R.2 It is important for IPs at national and regional levels, selected CSOs, traditional leaders and other key stakeholders to participate in programme design meetings of GDPP II.

R.3 Building on its Governance experience, UNDP should develop a comprehensive SDG support strategy to guide and assist Ethiopia's attainment of the SDGs highlighting those where UNDP has or can mobilise top-class expertise. In conjunction, UNDP should support an awareness raising campaign to help attain the SDG targets.

R.4 For a future GDPP II, develop a clearly defined results framework, including identification of clear and measurable sub-output, output and outcome level indicators, baselines and targets based on quick assessments involving relevant IPs, Ministries and regional departments, sectoral bureaus, research, training and knowledge institutions for each key sector.

R.5 In designing a future programme, establish stronger and more robust risk assessment/management mechanisms, in terms of short/medium/long-term risks; and, include comprehensive mitigation measures in programme planning.

R.6 Monitoring and evaluation functions of a follow-on programme should be well considered through support by qualified and professional team members through secondment and across IPs. A budget line equivalent to at least 5% of the total budget should be accorded to the M&E function to ensure adequate facilitation of its activities.

R.7 Ethiopia has 11 regions and two city administrations. A new programme should pilot interventions in a few regions by representing both pastoral and agro-pastoral communities and clearly demonstrate how the interventions translate at the regional level by relating these results back to the federal level. We propose Oromia, Amhara and Afar. Local level democratic institution forums (at Zonal and Woreda level) and ethics and anti-corruption clubs (at schools) should be included and further strengthened featuring social media as a powerful tool.

Governance and Capacity Building

R.8 Through advanced training, coaching and/or secondment from other UNDP offices, as well as where possible fresh recruitment, develop high-level staff skills, especially in the IPs but also in UNDP as necessary, in the following core areas:

- Developing theories of change and enhancing knowledge of their importance in programme design and results management.
- Strengthening internal monitoring and data collection systems focusing on results;
- Strengthening documentation, reporting and dissemination of collaboration interventions along thematic sectors leading to policy briefs, dialogue and position papers, etc.

R.9. GDPP should strengthen the collaboration and management mechanisms of PMB and PTC to promote harmonious and complementary support and ensure IPs' programme ownership. Because of the high turnover in IPs, thorough induction of new staff should be systematic.

R.10 Senior management inputs need to go into exploring synergistic partnerships with other UN agencies which may have technical capacity in specific areas of relevance to the GDPP.

R.11 Ensure that when undertaking capacity building interventions, there is a clear baseline of the capacity gaps identified and a defined pathway to change before embarking on the process.

Resource Mobilisation, Monitoring and Reporting

R.12 Use Service User Feedback Surveys to elicit people's views on public service delivery, rule of law, accountability and transparency to identify where efforts to improve performance should best be applied.

R.13 UNDP should work with specialized institutions, including advocacy CSOs and higher research institutions in the country, to publish evidence of trends in policy and strategic information.

R.14 UNDP needs to develop a robust resource mobilisation strategy to strengthen the GDPP. In particular, UNDP needs to explore funding opportunities with other donors apart from the initial 4 (Austria, Denmark, Norway and Sweden) as well as explore options with the private sector.

R.15 UNDP should explore citizen-based funding – as in the experience of Indonesia, for example, where citizens contribute to the anti-corruption commission. In Ethiopia, the context of citizens (dissatisfied by certain government services) is fertile and such funding can be sustainable and independent in order to support areas which the government sees as “thorny” and doesn't want to touch. This would also increase citizen demands for greater participation in decisions that affect their lives.

R.16 Given the variation in the capacity and experience of IPs, GDPP should create experience sharing opportunities, for example, during joint monitoring visits, regular meetings or capacity strengthening trainings.

Cross-Cutting Issues

R.17 UNDP should seek to learn from the experiences of other countries, and strong gender organisations in Ethiopia, in developing gender-specific programming strategies through virtual workshops or other kinds of information exchanges

R.18 UNDP needs to cascade the gender tools and frameworks of the UN system to the specific programme and project level in order to better monitor and track results based on gender indicators.

R.19 At the local level, UNDP should seek opportunities to support social networks and movements aimed at advancing women's rights, gender inclusivity, marginalized groups and persons with disabilities (special needs). (In the context of Ethiopia, this is a meaningful and critical recommendation in the sense that minority voices and rights are not heard; and these groups are increasingly marginalized, even currently, in context where more reforms are the “talk” of the day).

Section 1.

Introducing The Evaluation

1.1. Background

1. UNDP in close collaboration with Ethiopian government stakeholders established the Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP) in 2017 to “capitalize on existing momentum and opportunities to further advance good governance and entrench democratic principles at all levels and across the country.”¹ As such, the programme aimed to promote an all-inclusive and sustainable development agenda by strengthening public institutions, mechanisms and processes to facilitate and promote transparency, accountability, rule of law and access to justice, and wider civic participation, dialogue, national cohesion and peace.²
2. The GDPP was designed based on progress made and lessons learned from the former Democratic Institutions Programme (DIP) and other interventions to support initiatives aimed at addressing governance bottlenecks, and to nurture the development of a more responsive system of governance and peaceful coexistence. The launch of the GDPP in 2017 was at a time when there were significant risks attached to a fairly restricted governance environment. However, changes instituted in 2018 demonstrate that provision of democratic governance support needs to be adaptive to changes in the political landscape in order to capitalize on emerging opportunities.

1.2. Purpose, scope and objectives

1. UNDP Ethiopia commissioned an independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the GDPP for the full implementation period of the programme (July 2017-December 2021).³ The evaluation was conducted between January-April 2022 in accordance with the methodology and process as described in the Terms of Reference (see Annex 4). The evaluation team comprised an international Team Leader and two national subject matter experts. The evaluation focal point at the UNDP Country Office helped to identify appropriate key informants, facilitated interviews and focus groups and provided field data collection support. Field research was based on the following criteria: a balanced representation of issue areas by outcome, geographical coverage, security issues and inclusion of both successful and challenging interventions. Specifically, the overall purpose of the evaluation was to:
 - Review validity of programme assumptions and the theory of change of the programme to map the results pathways and also assess cause - effect relationships for highlighting, based on lessons learned, how should the theory of change and results’ pathways of a second programme cycle of GDPP be defined.
 - Assess the design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the programme interventions.
 - Identify implementation issues and challenges/bottlenecks which constrain programme and financial delivery.
 - Provide evidence whether the programme has been able to accomplish the intended results/outputs and identify attributed factors.
 - Identify lessons learned, best practices & recommendations, and document knowledge basis from the programme design & implementation, based on evidence and reliable information, so as to improve a design, scope, and implementation strategies/arrangements of a new iteration of democratic governance support which will be formulated in early 2022.
 - Identify strengths and weaknesses of the programme in the application of rights-based approaches, gender mainstreaming and social inclusion plus clearly identify recommendations to be applied in any future iteration of democratic governance support.
 - Review risk assessment & mitigation measures taken for ensuring progress on implementing the programme’s interventions. Also comment on their effectiveness and identify lessons learned about the adaptability/flexibility exhibited by the Programme.⁴
2. The Terminal Evaluation aims to serve as an important learning and accountability tool, providing UNDP, donors, national stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results generated by the GDPP to date. In reviewing progress towards the achievement of the programme’s results and outcomes, the TE sought to identify signs of success and areas for improvement that will guide its future direction; in particular, regarding

1 Programme Document, June 2017, p.12.

2 Ibid.

3 The GDPP had been granted a 6-month extension, to June 2022, at the time of the evaluation.

4 ToR, p.5.

the potential for a next phase of the programme. The primary users of the evaluation are the UNDP country office (CO), Regional Bureau for Africa, the Government of Ethiopia (GoE), implementing partners (IPs) and key donor agencies supporting the GDPP and the wider DP community who have been supporting governance but through CSO support. This report brings together the findings, conclusions and recommendations from the various processes of the evaluation.

3. The evaluation's key objectives were to examine how, and the extent to which, the GDPP complemented the UNDP country programme's objectives in addressing national priority needs in terms of governance and democratic development and thereby help maintain UNDP's position as an effective partner of the Government of Ethiopia. The evaluation sought to address these broad objectives through the lens of five key evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, and two cross-cutting issues: human rights and gender equality.
4. In addition, the TE was charged with assessing the GDPP's contribution to the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), especially SDG 16 "Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions." SDG 16 puts emphasis on development policies and programmes as the core of efforts to address the underlying causes of fragility, thereby tying SDG 16 to the international agenda to promote peacebuilding and state building as well as aid effectiveness. SDG 16 also flags the key role strengthening the rule of law, good governance and promoting human rights plays in promoting peaceful, just, and inclusive societies and as an accelerator for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.⁵ The attainment of SDG 16 is therefore highly relevant to the Ethiopian context.

1.3. Evaluation framework and methodology

Approach and method

1. A mixed-methods approach combining key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (FGDs), remote interviews, desk review of relevant documents and field visits to intervention sites were the bases of the evaluation. In total, 86 (24 female) participants were involved. Eight FGDs consisting of 25 males and 10 females were conducted. The remaining 51 individuals participated in structured individual interviews that were conducted by the ET (see Annex 2). Of the 86 interviews, 15 were with UNDP and other UN agencies, 6 with members of development partners/contributors to the GDPP and 65 with Implementing Partners (IPs) and others.⁶ This approach enabled the ET to triangulate information and perspectives by comparing multiple sources and methods to arrive at reliable conclusions, identify lessons learned and develop targeted recommendations. A set of 31 evaluation questions (EQ) in the ToR (see Annex 4) served to build a strong evidence base and formed the foundation for the ET's documentary research and Key Informant Interviews. Some additional questions, focused on the roles and activities of specific stakeholders, were developed as the interviews progressed. Further, it was noted that since the individual EQs were specific enough, most of these rendered themselves to be broken down into specific judgement criteria (JC).
2. Based on the EQs, and criteria provided in the ToR, the ET developed an evaluation matrix (see Annex 3) mapping the EQs and JCs, as well as indicative methods and sources to enable a systematic approach to the data gathering exercise. The JCs were based on various UNDP commitments made in the Country Programme Document, UNDP/UNEG evaluation guidelines, as well as an understanding of the context in the country.
3. At the start of the exercise, it was noted that there were some overlaps between some EQs: sometimes the same question had been articulated differently with little substantive difference. The evaluation therefore combined answers to overlapping EQs but this did not affect the integrity of the evaluation. An evaluability assessment (EA) based on the evaluation matrix was undertaken at the inception stage in order to understand the feasibility of addressing the EQs and the challenges and shortcomings that might be faced during the evaluation.

The EA involved the following steps:

- A rapid scan of documents provided by UNDP, as well as those available in the public domain, was undertaken to assess the availability and quality of evaluable data to contribute to addressing the EQs.

⁵ In September 2015, UN member states adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, a 15-year global framework centred on an ambitious set of 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), 169 targets and over 230 indicators. The 2030 Agenda envisions a secure world free of poverty and hunger, with full and productive employment, access to quality education and universal health coverage, the achievement of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls, and an end to environmental degradation.

⁶ The FGDs and KIIs were selected to provide comprehensive coverage of GDPP activities, including gender, institutional memory (related to the design of the programme), and the relationship to the IPs in terms of their collaboration with important actors such as journalists and CSOs. All IPs were represented and the activities in the regions studied were based on the scope of GDPP outreach and active engagement as agreed with the UNDP/GDPP experts assigned to support the evaluation.

-
- A rapid assessment of each JC for the type of data that will be required and the likely feasibility of the ET being able to gather credible data in the limited time it had.
4. At the programming level, the ET examined the Theory of Change (ToC) underpinning the Project Document and the underlying assumptions. The team reviewed all documents provided by UNDP related to the project, including the Mid-Term Review (MTR), repositioning paper, options paper, audit and progress reports and minutes of Programme Management Board meetings. In addition, the team reviewed the country strategies of the four key donors: Austria, Denmark, Norway and Sweden. During the analysis, particular attention was paid to understanding Ethiopia's unique and evolving country circumstances particularly since April 2018 in terms of the new GoE transformational democratization reform agenda and its possible impact on programme delivery and results. Factors considered included the impact of drought and conflict, demographics and the "youth bulge", as well as Ethiopia's regional geopolitical environment. A literature review of background material pertaining to the situation in Ethiopia provided the necessary context. In-depth consultations were held with numerous stakeholders using the evaluation questions as a basis for discussion. As the evaluation progressed, the interviews became increasingly important to further explore specific aspects of the assignment and to follow up on issues that had emerged in previous discussions.

Data mapping, triangulation and analysis

5. Throughout the evaluation, data collected from both primary and secondary sources were recorded systematically for evidence assessment based on the judgement criteria developed for each EQ as defined in the evaluation matrix. Data and information collected through various means and sources were constantly triangulated to enhance the validity of the findings, mainly through comparing the information gathered in the process. Where discrepancies occurred that could not be resolved, the ET did not use such data for drawing findings or conclusions. The team compared notes and checked for consistencies and patterns with other interviews to arrive at reliable conclusions.

1.4. Evaluation ethics and data protection

1. The evaluators followed the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) ethical guidelines throughout the evaluation process.⁷ Protecting personal data is essential in any evaluation in order to respect dignity and ensure the security of all stakeholders involved. The ET have ensured full confidentiality of data provided, accessed and produced during the course of their work, unless information was obtained from sources that are in the public domain. Any personal data collected has been minimal and anonymised in the report. Although the names and titles of individual interviewees were collected and appear in Annex 2, their names or any other details that could be traced back to them are not presented in the report. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process will also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.
2. The ET members are contractually obliged not to publish or otherwise communicate to third parties, through any medium whatsoever, any information obtained during this evaluation, except those presented in the report. In its communications with stakeholders, the ET explained these commitments and procedures in a transparent way in order for participants to understand the data protection protocol.

1.5. Limitations of the evaluation

1. There were some limitations to data gathering by the ET. For example, as noted in the MTR, programme monitoring has been weak.⁸ Based on a sample review of monitoring reports conducted by the governance team a number of challenges affecting the utility of the exercise are apparent.⁹ The availability of reliable monitoring data is therefore limited. In addition, inadequate programme documentation and reporting at the activity level by a number of the IPs posed a challenge. It is therefore difficult to assign specific changes to the support of GDPP. The ET addressed this by reviewing all available documents, followed up by interviews and focus groups. That said, there were no major impediments to actually gathering data; the team leader, based in Canada, was able

⁷ UN Evaluation Group (2008). UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.

⁸ The MTR noted that the major gap in the programme design lies in its weak monitoring and evaluation framework that is anchored on an incomplete results framework. The document used as a results framework does not have indicators and besides, the baseline values for all indicators are not indicated. "Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP) Ethiopia: Mid-term review, February - July 2020," p. 74. Since the MTR, some joint monitoring visits with donors to IPs were undertaken but the COVID-19 pandemic effectively ended these.

⁹ For example, a review of the Ethiopian National Volunteers Community Service Programme (under the Ministry of Peace) highlighted a couple of instances where the IP claimed that certain activities had been completed but "detailed information was not shared with UNDP." In another instance, when the NEBE initiative was monitored, the staff "supposed to be in front line in the implementation and reporting of the programme were not appeared (sic) for the joint monitoring of the programme's implementation."

to conduct interviews remotely with all donors and UNDP staff, including the former CTA for the GDPP based in Tajikistan. The national consultants were able to conduct field visits to selected implementation sites and to hold interviews with IPs in Addis Ababa. The Country Office provided useful and relevant support. The ET's view is that the broad range of interviews and the available documentation provided adequate opportunities to compare information and ensure data gathered during the evaluation could be corroborated.

Section 2.

The Country Context

2.1. Development context:

1. With a current population of around 115 million in 2020, according to the World Bank,¹⁰ Ethiopia is the second most populous country in Africa after Nigeria. It is estimated that some 46% of the population is under the age of 15 and 51% are between 15 and 64 years old,¹¹ the largest youth population in sub-Saharan Africa.¹² Although the so-called “youth bulge” potentially represents an incredible asset, youth unemployment is estimated at 27%. The need to service this burgeoning population of unemployed youth adds additional pressure on the absorption capacity of the labor market and will necessitate the creation of sufficient new jobs if unemployment issues are not to have serious consequences for the economy and stability going forward.
2. The Government of Ethiopia has over the last two decades shown great commitment to implement policies and programmes aimed at stimulating rapid development transformation largely by prioritizing investments to build and operate social and economic infrastructure, improving capacities within government to broaden access to basic social services such as education, health and water and sanitation, and prioritizing public investments in pro-poor economic sectors such as agriculture, food security and job creation (focusing on micro, small and medium enterprises). Although the country has experienced the fastest growing economy in the region, with a 6.1% growth in FY2019/20, it also remains one of the poorest countries with a per capita gross national income of \$890.¹³
3. Prime Minister Abiy Ahmed, after coming to power in April 2018, introduced ambitious and transformative reforms¹⁴ that opened up political space (included lifting the state of emergency, releasing political prisoners, and announcing plans to revise repressive laws) and economic possibilities (partial privatization of state-owned enterprises).¹⁵ He outlined a renewed vision of development and democratization including revising laws, establishing a system of accountability for serious human rights abuses, accelerating reform of the criminal justice system, addressing recurring ethnic-based clashes, implementing electoral reforms, freeing civil society and independent media. In doing so Abiy envisioned bringing more unity to the state, more dynamism and opportunity to its economy, and more justice to its people.¹⁶ He dismantled the state’s repression machinery, which had weakened the state’s ability to maintain order and emboldened regional nationalists.¹⁷ In general, he made strides towards reforming authoritarianism and fostered regional peace. The PM’s reforms have presented both opportunities (designed and implemented at the right juncture) and challenges (the security and historical dynamics) for the GDPP.
4. On top of the economic and social transformation, improvements have been made in the governance sector, for example, by ratifying a largely progressive constitution, efforts to address inequalities, policies that promote gender equality and the establishment of democratic institutions, etc. Although the policy orientation and commitment has resulted in significant improvements in terms of Ethiopia’s human development, Ethiopia still ranks at 173 out of 189 countries in the 2020 Human Development Report and 31 out of 54 African countries in the 2021 Mo Ibrahim Governance Index. The gains it has made remain fragile and vulnerable to economic shocks stemming from climate-related drought and the COVID-19 pandemic.¹⁸ In addition, the country lies in an area of geopolitical instability and is home to the largest refugee influx in Africa.
5. To compound the structural fragility outlined above, Ethiopia now faces a serious problem of political instability

¹⁰ The World Bank in Ethiopia, October 13, 2021

¹¹ https://countrymeters.info/en/Ethiopia#age_structure

¹² Abriham Ebabu Engidaw, “Youth and Unemployment in Ethiopia”, *Journal of Organizational Culture Communications and Conflict*, Volume 25, Issue 1, 2021, p. 1.

¹³ The World Bank in Ethiopia, October 13, 2021.

¹⁴ Mokaddem, Sara (2019). Abiy Ahmed’s ‘Medemer’ reforms: Can it ensure sustainable growth for Ethiopia and what are the challenges facing the new government? Policy Center for the New South, Policy Brief PB-19/08, March 2019.

¹⁵ Verjee, Aly (April, 2019). Year of Change in Ethiopia, United States Institute of Peace Blog, <https://www.usip.org>, April 2, 2019.

¹⁶ Tokuroi, Tomomi (December, 2019). How Prime Minister of Ethiopia Envision “NEW ETHIOPIA”: Moving Towards People’s Reconciliation and Sustainable Economic Development, Mitsui & Co. Global Strategic Studies Institute Monthly Report, December 2019.

¹⁷ Collins, Tom (August, 2019). Abiy’s reforms embolden Ethiopian regionalists: Can Abiy Ahmed keep the peace? *African Business*, August 19th, 2019.

¹⁸ The World Health Organisation reports that the first confirmed case of COVID-19 in Ethiopia was registered on March 13, 2020. According to the World Bank, Ethiopia’s gross domestic product slowed down in both FY2019/20 and FY2020/21 due to COVID-19, with growth in industry and services being particularly hard hit. However, agriculture, where over 70% of the population are employed, was not significantly affected. The World Bank in Ethiopia, October 13, 2021.

and armed conflicts in various regions of the country. Most notably, the conflicts in the Tigray, Amhara and Afar regions following the Law Enforcement Operation of the Government in Tigray in November 2020, and that in Oromia and Benishangul Gumuz regions, have resulted in the displacement of millions of people and a humanitarian, social and economic crisis. Given heightened international concern over the impact of the conflict on ordinary people, especially in Tigray, it remains to be seen what effect this might have on future international support for programming in Ethiopia, including initiatives such as the GDPP. That said, recent developments in Ethiopia - such as: (1) the recent release of key political figures from prison; (2) initiatives for the establishment of the National Dialogue Forum and (3) the re-rapprochement of the government with donors might improve the space for governance and the democratization process. However, it is too early to judge at this stage.

2.2. Key elements of the GDPP

1. UNDP has been a consistent partner of the GoE since 1981, providing technical expertise and policy advice to implement national strategies and plans, and to localise the Sustainable Development Goals. Programme Priorities in the 2016-2020 Country Programme Document included:
 2. Accelerating Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction
 3. Climate Change and Resilience Building
 4. Strengthening Democratic Governance and Capacity Development Through a partnership approach, UNDP engages with development partners, civil society and the private sector in order to address the development challenges of the country. Within this context, the GDPP, as defined in the Programme Document (June 2017), aimed to reinforce the GoE's desire to improve public governance and deepen democracy by prioritizing "*citizens' participation, transparency and accountability, rule of law and justice, effective service delivery, consensus building and the full expression of the media*". These priorities are also closely aligned with outcomes of the Strategic Plan of the UNDP (2017-2020) and those in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF, 2016-2020) for Ethiopia. They also echo commitments made in Agenda 2030, particularly Goal 16: *promoting peaceful and inclusive societies, access to justice and capable and responsive institutions*.¹⁹
 5. The overarching goal of the GDPP is to capitalise on existing momentum and opportunities to further advance good governance and entrench democratic principles at all levels and across the country. The programme implementation is anchored on a multi-stakeholder approach involving eleven Implementing Partners.²⁰

To achieve this goal, the Programme aimed to contribute to three broad outcome areas, namely:

- a. Improved inclusion, social cohesion and sustainable peace;
- b. Responsive, accountable and inclusive systems of governance; and
- c. *Empowered and responsible citizens*.²¹
6. These objectives were further elaborated on in the 2016/2020 CPD for Ethiopia:

The overarching strategic thrust of the democratic governance and capacity development pillar is to strengthen the capacities of national and subnational institutions. The programme will be framed around a set of interdependent priorities: (a) strengthening transparency, accountability, rule of law and justice targeting women and vulnerable groups, and ensuring adherence to international human rights obligations; (b) addressing awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption measures; (c) consolidation of the democratic process; (d) building national capacities to promote social cohesion and conflict prevention; and (e) advancing local governance and decentralized service delivery, including active citizen engagement.²²

7. In the CPD, UNDP also pledged to support "leadership development and change management at the federal and regional levels of government by focusing on women leaders."²³ This is of particular relevance given the emphasis on gender equality throughout UNDP's programming environment.²⁴

19 Programme Document "Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP), Government of Ethiopia and UNDP, June, 2017, p.12.

20 They are: The House of Peoples Representatives (HoPR), House of Federation (HoF), Federal Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (FEACC), Ethiopian Human Rights Commission (EHRC), Ethiopian Institute of Ombudsman (EIO), Office of Attorney General (OAG), Office of Federal Auditor General (OFAG), Ministry of Peace (MoP), Council of Constitutional Inquiry (CCI), National Election Board of Ethiopia (NEBE) and Ethiopian Broadcast Authority (EBA).

21 Ibid.

22 "Country Programme Document for Ethiopia (2016-2020)," Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Office for Project Services, 27 November, 2015, p. 6.

23 Ibid.

24 Although the government has promulgated policies and embarked on successive national development plans which stipulate gender equality as a priority and have resulted in positive achievements in various socio-economic and political realms, various studies indicate the prevalence of persistent challenges that hinder the promotion of gender equality across sectors and regions. Emezat H. Mengesha and Lealem Mersha. "Gender Analysis for the Governance and Democratic Participation Program (GDPP)", Final Report (2019). Ethiopia ranks 123 out of 189 in the Gender Inequality Index.

8. As mentioned in paragraph 2, above, the GDPP was launched at a time when the official approach to governance in Ethiopia was far less accommodating than it is today. Since then, there has been a significant change in the operational environment resulting in a renewed commitment to political, economic and social reforms. 2018 was a pivotal year in the transformation of the Ethiopian political landscape and ultimately resulted in a change of government. New governance arrangements and policy priorities were established, emphasizing Human Rights, Rule of Law and accountability, peace and stability. GDPP was designed to be about transformational change moving away from the traditional approach of capacity development towards fostering/encouraging IPs to be more innovative in selecting activities to be advanced with GDPP funding.²⁵ The relevance and value added of the GDPP was therefore reconfirmed as a strong enabling platform for transformation through the various achievements recorded by the participating Democratic Institutions.²⁶
9. Building on these positive developments, the GoE and UNDP decided to “refocus” the GDPP and “reposition” it to more effectively address transformational and transitional needs. The result was the presentation of a “repositioning paper” to the Programme Management Board in December 2018. The repositioning paper took note of the lessons learned from the first year of GDPP implementation and laid out key strategic priority areas of focus for 2019 onwards. According to the 2020 MTR, the repositioning exercise allowed all Institutions contributing to the programme and UNDP to reconfirm the relevance of the programme to the current policy priorities and to ensure that identified activities are addressing transformational issues. Subsequently, the results framework of the programme underwent a review and expansion with new sub-outputs included. This mainly involved fine-tuning sub-outputs and activities without changing the original outcomes and outputs. The repositioning exercise has also served the purpose of reconfirming the commitment of IPs.²⁷
10. UNDP’s close relationship with the government gives it space to have dialogue with it on policies and practices. In this role, there is an element of ongoing advocacy that is integral to GDPP implementation, particularly given the NIM modality. Development partners may like to see UNDP taking on a more proactive role in engaging with the GoE on some of the difficult issues of human rights, democratic norms and standards. However, UNDP has not been seen to use its position of trust with the government for leverage or to be even constructively critical of GoE activities, for example, regarding human rights violations in Tigray and other regions such as Afar, Amhara, Oromia and Benishangul Gumuz.²⁸

2.3. Alignment of GDPP to National Policies and Strategies

1. There is no doubt that the GDPP objectives fit well with the UNDAF (2016-2020) outcome 12: that “key government institutions and other stakeholders utilize enhanced capacities to ensure equitable, efficient, accountable, participatory and gender-sensitive development.” Its related strategic plan outcome statement is also relevant: “citizens’ expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.” Further, GDPP outcomes are directly linked with UNDAF (2016-2020) outcome pillar 4 which deals with issues of good governance, participation, and capacity development.
2. The GDPP is consistent with the government development policy objectives, as reflected in the overarching policy documents, notably the Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) and the GTP II. The 1995 FDRE Constitution incorporates most of internationally recognized democratic and human rights principles. GTP II also envisioned the attainment of democracy, good governance, and social justice through people’s participation. One of the seven pillars of the GTP II also relates to the establishment of “democratic and developmental good governance through enhancing implementation capacity of the public sector and mobilization of public participation.” Thus, there is significant alignment between GDPP objectives and government policy objectives enshrined in the FDRE Constitution and GTP II.²⁹
3. The alignment of the GDPP objectives with government policy objectives could further be seen in three different implementation phases: before the 2018 reform; between 2018 and the start of the 2020 Northern Ethiopia war (commonly known as the Tigray war); and after the start of the Northern Ethiopia war. Of course, project design and the first implementation phase were challenged by the country’s political instability and the nation’s restrictive laws. The feasibility of the achievement of the GDPP objectives was questionable when considered in

25 GDPP Programme Management Board – Options Paper June 2021, p. 1.

26 Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP) Repositioning Paper, p. 1.

27 Op Cit., MTR, p. 10.

28 Nor should UNDP be expected to engage in such sensitive issues given the requirement that the UN maintain impartiality. Others have no such difficulty, the U.S. State Department flagged human rights violations as a concern in a briefing on February 22, 2022: “The United States is gravely concerned by the reports of atrocities, including sexual violence, committed by fighters affiliated with the Tigray People’s Liberation Front in the Amhara region of Ethiopia in late August and early September 2021.”

29 The programme also aligns with the UNDAF (2016-2020) in supporting Ethiopia’s ambition to become a middle-income country by 2025, as articulated in the second Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II).

the light of the narrow political space and restrictive governance context that was prevailing during the design of the GDPP. Accordingly, during the initial stages of the programme, major stakeholders (including UNDP and DPs) had lower expectations on the ability of the GDPP to meaningfully achieve its objectives. They supported the GDPP mainly to push the limits by constructively engaging with the government. The intention was to influence from within by maintaining political access and engagement with the government, rather than by staying away.³⁰

4. In the second implementation phase, democracy and rule of law were considered major policy priorities and most of the expected results specified in the document directly align with the GDPP outcome and output areas. Most of the restrictive policies and laws that diverge with the GDPP objectives, such as the laws governing civil society and elections, had been revised and replaced by more enabling policies. The government also issued a new economic policy document called “A Home-Grown Economic Reform Agenda” in September 2019, although it is not directly aligned with GDPP. There was constructive engagement across stakeholders - IPs, DPs and UNDP but the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in implementation challenges, e.g., postponing trainings, and other activities. After the start of the war, the situation changed. The conflict between the Government of Ethiopia and forces in its northern Tigray region has thrown the country into turmoil. Fighting has been going on since November 2020, destabilizing the country, leaving thousands of people dead with millions displaced and a considerably more living in famine conditions. All sides have been accused of atrocities.³¹ Project implementation has continued but donors’ perspectives have changed and concerns are growing.

2.4. Validity of Theory of Change

1. The theory of change model on page 18 of the ProDoc captures the central logic of the programme with its essential components. The model starts with a list of what it called ‘development challenges’ in Ethiopia although most of the indicated issues are at a nexus between governance and development. Next, it shows the strategic interventions designed to address the listed challenges. The model presents the five programme outputs that will lead to its upper three outcomes while the latter are areas supporting the programme impact. Going further right, assumptions are listed which highlight specific risks and conditions that are present in the country and programme context. While the model captures the broad logic of programme interventions and expected outcomes, causal links are not clearly shown and are not systematic.
2. The GDPP original results framework specified the intended output and outcome statements. However, there were several issues in the vertical and horizontal logic of the programme results framework. The MTR team noted the following recommendations pertaining to the overall monitoring and evaluation system:
 - Develop a fully-fledged monitoring and evaluation plan for the remaining period and implement in accordance with the UNDP programming policies and procedures, as envisaged in the programme document.
 - Arrange and undertake periodic joint monitoring of performance that involves DPs, MoF, IPs and UNDP.
 - Improve progress reporting with emphasis on results chain analysis where possible by drawing out a systematic linkage between the baseline situation, programme intervention and results at output and outcome levels. And ensure activity and results linkages across implementation and reporting.
3. In addition, and most importantly, the MTR team recommended revising and refocusing the Theory of Change of the programme in order to address the limitations identified in terms of clarifying the different levels of programme change expected to happen throughout the results chain, particularly, the pathways from programme outcomes to envisaged impact.
4. The ET agrees with the above observations made by the MTR team. Some changes in monitoring and evaluation planning and practices, as well as many recommendations of the MTR team regarding the log-frame, were accepted by the Programme Management Board (PMB). Exceptions to these include revisiting the ToC and developing a full-fledged monitoring and evaluation plan. The justification given for not reviewing the ToC, for example, was that: “a comprehensive revision and refocusing of the ToC of the programme after three years of its implementation may entail changes on the intended results, focus areas and strategic components of the programme and which is impractical.”³² However, this contradicts the existing body of literature which emphasizes that a theory of change is an adaptive management tool.³³ Further, the ToC could have been revised based on recommendations from the mid-term evaluation and the review could have begun to verify lower-level results and their contributions to expected outcomes.

30 UNDP (2020) Midterm Review of Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (2018-2020). Project Document.

31 Ethiopia’s Tigray war: The short, medium and long story - BBC News

32 Management response to the MTR.

33 PEEK, N. and STARR, L. (2019) Theory of Change Review as an Adaptive Management Tool. USAID/KEA/FFP. USAID Learning Lab.

5. Most interviewed respondents indicated that the programme design process adequately considered the views of major stakeholders at federal level and its foundation was based on objective information and analysis of the governance situation in the country. They further stated that these efforts have contributed to enhancing the relevance of the programme and the validity of its design. Embedded in the programme design is its strategy to reach the wider Ethiopian population, i.e., the primary beneficiary, through transforming the governance institutions into vibrant and effective bodies. Although questions have been raised about the lack of a regional focus and the absence of substantive CSO engagement, in general, stakeholders view the GDPP as a useful and valuable initiative.

Section 3.

Findings Of The Evaluation And Assessment Against Evaluation Criteria

3.1. Overview

1. The presentation of the findings of this review is organised in accordance with OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and is consistent with and focussed on answering the evaluation questions listed in the ToR (see Annex 4). The findings form the basis of the lessons learned and recommendations presented in the last section of this report. The evaluation criteria are broken down under five headings, i.e., relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. In addition, two cross-cutting issues - gender and human rights - are also assessed in the TE. The 31 specific evaluation questions (EQ) making up the evaluation criteria in the ToR are shown in Annex 3. From this starting point, the ET has addressed the questions under each evaluation criteria heading. A detailed analysis of programme achievements against outputs, sub-outputs and targets by activity is presented in Annex 1.
2. The GDPP considered that governance issues are interrelated and should be addressed comprehensively. As a result, the GDPP outcomes and outputs were defined in a very broad manner and included a wide range of thematic areas and large number of IPs. However, indicators to measure the achievement of GDPP objectives (outcomes and outputs) were not included in the programme document. A year after programme start up, a separate Results Framework (RF) specifying the results and their corresponding indicators was developed. As also indicated in the MTR report, some indicators were too broad and complex to properly measure the achievement of results. This problem emanates partly from the manner the outputs and outcomes are defined. Overall, the adoption of a comprehensive approach is relevant and appropriate, however, the programme design is highly ambitious, complex, and less focused as it is spread thin across 11 IPs, and reaches out to all regions.
3. The programme design also attempted to be responsive to the needs and priorities of vulnerable groups, particularly to that of women. Some gender issues were identified in the ToC and in the definition of some output areas and activities. However, no separate and comprehensive gender analysis was carried out as part of the initial design of the GDPP, which may have affected appropriate mainstreaming of gender in the programme. This assertion is supported by the findings of the comprehensive gender analysis undertaken under the GDPP in 2019.³⁴ Accordingly, the programme design limitations outlined above have implications for the analysis of the evaluation criteria which follow below.

3.1.1 Relevance

1. The GDPP was conceived to transform the oversight and accountability institutions into dynamic and independent bodies that can deliver on their constitutional mandates to the satisfaction of all stakeholders. The programme design involved IPs and other stakeholders, including donors, to ensure their commitment and participation throughout the programme cycle. The design has also incorporated recommendations and lessons from the DIP as well as governance assessment reports that were done before and for the development of the programme concept. The Ethiopian government's initial interest in the programme was manifested by its request that UNDP present a more in-depth governance study, which leveraged the approach to further implementation.
2. Overall, the ET identified many strengths in the programme design. It targeted strengthening the legal and institutional frameworks critical to the delivery of results. This entailed addressing the gaps in laws and the institutional capacities and synergies. Participatory approaches were adopted in policy formulation and institutional reforms. The involvement of citizens in public perception surveys on the performance of selected governance institutions are cases in point. The approaches further resulted in devising a holistic National Anti-Corruption Policy and Strategy. The design considered capacity building as critical for effective governance institutions to take root and was therefore embedded in each programme output to drive the GDPP results. Relevant institutions in the governance and accountability sector were selected and earmarked to deliver on

³⁴ UNDP (2019) Gender Analysis Report; UNDP (2020) Midterm Review Governance and Democratic Participation programme (2017-2021).

their mandates. Indeed, the GDPP design focused on the key institutions with governance and accountability mandates.

3. However, the programme was conceived at a time when the country faced civil unrest and protests in some parts called for reform and/regime change. This had multiple implications in terms of the government embracing the programme, at least initially. Government policy objectives pursued on the ground, as well as elaborated in several lower-level policy and legal documents such as in laws governing the media, civil society, terrorism, elections, etc., were considered as limiting and not conducive to promoting democracy and good governance. It was partly due to this restrictive political and governance context that the negotiation and preparation of the GDPP took a long time (nearly 2 years).³⁵ As a key informant indicated:

“The programme was designed at a difficult time; governance reforms weren’t there then. They did some contextual analysis to design the programme; it was a very sensitive exercise and was not liked by the government, so it was shelved.”³⁶

In that restrictive and narrow political space, designing such a democratic governance programme document raised the question of its feasibility and applicability. Despite this, GDPP overcame the challenges and secured well-co-ordinated donor support from multiple funding agencies.

4. The GDPP also has relevance in the broader context of the Ten Years Perspective Development Plan (2021 – 2030), in particular:

Pillar 3, Institutional Transformation:

“Build democratic and judicial institutions that ensure elite bargain, national consensus, common vision and government legitimacy”; and,

Pillar 5, Equitable participation of women and children:

“Ensure gender equity in economic and social sectors”;

“Ensure fair participation of women and youth in leadership and decision-making positions”; and,

“Create awareness among citizens about the role of women and youth in the country’s overall development.”³⁷

5. The GDPP has relevance to the demands of people on the ground - for instance, the programme funded activities that promoted social cohesion, expanded dialogue and civic space, etc., and came at a critical time when citizens faced crises across the country.

Specific comments from interviewees confirm that:

- GDPP’s support through trainings, system strengthening and improving institutional and implementation capacity is regarded as highly relevant in addressing gaps in knowledge and capability.
 - GDPP has promoted human rights and democratic governance by establishing systems and structures supportive of democratic institutions.
 - GDPP has promoted key governance issues such as citizens’ participation, transparency, accountability, inclusion, improved service delivery and access to justice.
 - GDPP was able to provide financial support to sustain the governance work of institutions where government funding was not available.
6. In conclusion, the ET has determined that the GDPP is highly relevant to the GoE’s governance and democratic participation agenda and to the objectives and interests of the various IPs. However, although it embodies, under NIM, a process whereby the GoE is in the lead in choosing its direction, in effect it is highly centralised and does not adequately address people’s needs at regional and local levels. It is also too reliant on political stability and falls short in addressing gender equality in particular.³⁸ Although it contributes ostensibly to sustainable development goals 5, 10 and 16,³⁹ it is not evident that these are objectives the programme pursues deliberately.

35 UNDP (2020) Midterm Review of GDPP (2017-2021)

36 Interview with Governance and Capacity Building Advisor

37 “Ethiopia 2030: The Pathway to Prosperity: Ten Years Perspective Development Plan (2021 – 2030).”

38 The ET recognises the particular challenge of addressing gender equality issues in traditional societies. Nevertheless, the fact that a Gender Analysis was not commissioned until two years into the programme suggests that gender was very much an after thought in programme design and development. Thankfully, this is now getting the attention it deserves.

39 SDG 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls; SDG 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries; SDG 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

3.1.2 Effectiveness

1. The overall management structure and operational context of the GDPP is appropriate and regarded by stakeholders as being professional, accessible, efficient and effective. However, several interviewees have flagged their concerns over the centralisation of decision making, the lack of meaningful outreach to the regions and the virtual absence of CSO participation in planning and implementation.⁴⁰ In fact, there was no regional or local interaction/participation factored into the design of the programme.⁴¹
2. In aggregate, the achievements under GDPP may be broken down into the categories of effectiveness as follows. First, GDPP enabled and financed the drafting of enabling tools, frameworks, standards, strategies, laws and mechanisms. Second, the GDPP contributed to awareness on democracy, rights and legal issues. Third, GDPP contributed to capacity building for the IPs and their stakeholders. Fourth, the GDPP contributed in establishing credibility of the IPs as democratic institutions by financing their promotional costs and establishing digital access platforms. Fifth, through the establishment and execution of dialogues, events, conferences and forums the GDPP contributed to the expansion of political and civic space in the country. Finally, in its work with the IPs, the GDPP created a platform for promoting gender, empowerment of women and inclusiveness (including diverse groups with special needs) in Ethiopia.
3. Nevertheless, even under the best conditions of domestic capacity, political commitment and sustained leadership support, progress in governance reform will be measured in increments and there will be no particular end to the process. The benefits will accrue over time and will be marked by steady improvements in the operating and regulatory environment leading, ideally, to more effective and efficient delivery of government programmes. In this sense, the measure of the success of the GDPP is fundamentally tied to the progress it has made in enabling the GoE to develop and implement relevant policies and guidelines on governance reform and democratic development.
4. Delays in project implementation have been quite common for reasons attributed in part to UNDP's cumbersome funds disbursement and procurement policies. In addition, movement restrictions surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic have been challenging to the effective and efficient implementation of programme activities and objectives. This has been compounded by the security crisis in the country. This illustrates the fact that implementation delays are not necessarily the "fault" of UNDP or the GDPP. Rather, they reflect the complex situation on the ground and show that "politics" and unforeseen events can often stall much needed progress.
5. In general, the GDPP achieved its planned sub-outputs, outputs, immediate outcomes, and objectives and the expected results of the program were relatively effectively achieved. The achievements were partly linked to the revision of and repositioning of the program sub-outputs, outputs and the objectives. The improvements in monitoring and back-up expertise from the UNDP, especially after the mid-term review and the revision, aided the achievement of the objectives. The uptake of the mid-term programme review's recommendations improved the results, although to a minimal extent at the regional level. The quality of the programme implementation was relatively good but due to abstract measurement indicators, and the lack of baselines and targets for considerable number of indicators, sub-outputs, outputs and outcomes, the evaluability of implementation was reduced. The results of the programme were also affected to some degree by changes in the political landscape and the funding and resource shortage. However, the reforms underway in the country have also positively enhanced programme implementation and the achievement of results. The following table shows the relationship between activities and target achievements and demonstrates that the programme has been very effective:

40 Some participants in the Validation Workshop argued that they had been very supportive of CSOs in the regions. Be that as it may, the ET could only report on what it had found in its research and evidence of such activities is lacking in programme reporting. This reflects the general weakness of data capture and reporting (see para. 14)

41 According to one interviewee familiar with the process, this was a deliberate design principle. The Programme Document (p. 12) confirms this in stating: "UNDP will work in close collaboration with the two federal houses, the regional state councils, and the specialized democratic institutions, as well as some institutions in the Executive Branch to implement the programme and address governance challenges outlined in this document."

Table 1 – Summary of Evaluation Results Based on Activity Accomplishments and Target Achievements

 Note 1: **Red** (below 75%) **Yellow** (75 - 89%) **Green** = Above 90%

Outputs	Achievement (%)	Rating of the Achievement		
		Red	Yellow	Green
Output 1 – Political processes of federal and regional state legislative bodies are Inclusive and effectively delivering on their constitutional mandates	86.5%			
Output 2: Federal and regional state systems of governance are more accountable, transparent and are delivering services in inclusive and responsive ways	100%			
Output 3: Citizens are empowered to voice their concerns and participate in decision-making and political processes at all levels of governance	97.7%			
Output 4: Systems and mechanisms for promoting social cohesion, managing diversity, preventing, and managing conflicts, fostering dialogues, and building peace are further strengthened at national, regional, and local levels	87.5%			
Output 5: Enhance access to justice and promote and protect human rights in Ethiopia	147.5%			

6. Based on the above, it can therefore be argued that the GDPP has effectively achieved its objective to “further advance good governance and entrench democratic principles at all levels and across the country.” For instance, the guidelines and manuals, laws, new structure, digital systems, promotion materials and assessments funded by the GDPP are implemented and have improved work systems, networking and collaboration among stakeholders, their institutions and internal staffs. However, given the poorly defined results framework, it is difficult to conclusively determine how effective the actual contribution the GDPP has been.⁴²

Specific comments from interviewees:

- Because the GDPP has been implemented at the federal level, it has been less effective in reaching the people in the regions.
- Many initiatives have not been possible to implement at regional levels because of centralised decision making, resource limitations and weak local capacity.
- The programme has not been inclusive in terms of its support for women, youth and people with disabilities.

3.1.3 Efficiency

1. Apart from timelines, efficiency is a function of economy and cost-effectiveness. “Cost” includes financial, human resources and expertise invested. The programme was designed to be implemented with a budget of USD\$40 million over a period of four and a half years (July 2017 and December 2021). However, only 57% of the pledged budget was secured within the stated timeframe. Table 2 below presents a summary of financial support to the five programme components. It reveals that output 1 received the highest level of financial support: 29% (\$ 6,582,235) of the raised budget, followed by output 4 and output 3. Output 5 which comprised support to access to justice and human rights activities [through EHRC/OAG/EBA] received a relatively lower level of financial support at only 12% of the released budget, comparable to output 2 that received 13% of the budget. Summation of the project expenditures in the combined delivery reports indicates that as of December 2021, a total of US \$ 22,383,955 had been spent representing 97% of the programme budget. The largest portion of the programme expenditure (\$22,383,955 or 84%) was channeled through the government system for the 11 IPs while the remaining 14% was utilized for programme management.
2. Analysis of the budget allocation and expenditure further indicates that the programme allocated 17% to UNDP and 11% to EHRC and HoPR each. Only 4% of the programme budget was allocated for OFAG while it utilized only 77%. Budget allocation was based on implementation capacity, budget utilization and prioritization and relevance of activities. Based on the above analysis, the ET has determined that the GDPP used its resources efficiently and effectively.

42 Indeed, assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme is challenging because the Programme Document did not identify any indicators to measure the impact on the three Outcome areas identified: a) improved inclusion, social cohesion and sustainable peace; b) responsive, accountable and inclusive systems of governance; and, c) empowered and responsible citizens.

Table 2 GDPP: Allocation Vs. Expenditure Per Output: 1 July 2017 – 31 December 2021

3. Notwithstanding the above (the detailed rating approach is presented in Annex 1), programme efficiency is not just a question of proficiently distributing resources. A key informant from UNDP asserted that most IPs have shown little progress in the timely implementation of activities and technical and financial reporting. The informant further added that support from UNDP sometimes went to the extent of preparing financial reports for some of them. On the IP side, there have been numerous cases of staff turnover which have negated institutional memory and compromised efficient programme delivery. Moreover, there are clear indications that some IPs are less committed and motivated than others to support the issues promulgated by the GDPP. Accordingly, the ET supports the GDPP's Option Paper proposal that future funding allocations should be based on performance.

Specific comments from interviewees:

- Delays in internal decision making, a lengthy procurement process and limited engagement between local staff in the regions and the centre has impacted programme delivery.
 - The lack of coordination between IPs has led to inefficient programme implementation.
 - GDPP has funded some activities that would not have been financed by the government because of its sensitivity to the topic, e.g., the anti-corruption strategy and related national survey of perceptions of corruption.
4. The GDPP was evidently an appropriate mechanism for achieving the desired objectives and the intended results. Through its disbursements it supported the five outputs of the programme with IPs positively influencing the achievement of most of their set targets. This was aided by the use of the NIM under which the IPs directly assume the responsibility for the related output (or outputs) and carry out all activities towards the achievement of the outputs thereby enhancing programme efficiency.⁴³ Nevertheless, some of the implementing partners had glaring gaps in programme management capacity, particularly regarding donor fund management and reporting. This inevitably led to delays in activity planning, implementation and reporting.
 5. Most importantly, the GDPP mobilized funding from multiple donors: Austria, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, and UNDP. Nearly half of the contribution (48.5%) was from Sweden (SIDA) followed by UNDP (20%). As an interviewee from the MoF said, the GDPP's coordination role was crucial in avoiding potential duplication of effort: "GDPP was efficient in mobilizing funds from the four donors and utilizing them for one programme goal. It would have been a waste of resources if the four donors had funded four different projects/programmes with similar objectives. That would be duplication." In addition, UNDP partnered with other agencies for synergy and complementarity, for example, with UN Women in implementing a gender responsive legislative process that benefited women parliamentarians and strengthened HoPR's internal capacity as well as NEBE's electoral law revision.

⁴³ However, the ET learned that the programme design was challenged by the NIM and restrictive CSO legislation. The former required UNDP to partner only with public institutions and the latter 'systematically' denied CSOs from working in the democratic governance sector. However, programme implementation attempted to include CSOs and citizens through the IPs.

6. Despite the positive signals outlined above, due to the lack of supporting data and information on each itemized cost and payment by the programme, the ET is unable to accurately establish efficiencies of the GDPP in terms of measuring the value, costs, or benefits of the programme investment. Interviews and reviews of different sources however reveal no indication of misappropriation of programme resources by GDPP stakeholders. The ET therefore judges the efficiency of the GDPP to be satisfactory.

3.1.4 Impact

1. An impact evaluation provides information about the impacts produced by a particular intervention - positive and negative - intended and unintended, direct and indirect. The key questions to consider are: What has happened as a result of the programme? What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries? How many people have been affected?⁴⁴ In the absence of credible outcome indicators for the GDPP, it is difficult to judge the actual impact of the programme. Instead, we are left to consider basic information from the kinds of activities that have been supported. These are reflected in areas such as capacity building, the number of trainings delivered, technical financial and material support, e.g., through digitisation of certain services, documents, awareness creation, e.g., on elections and networking, etc.
2. The ToC model on page 18 of the ProDoc indicates that the *impact* of GDPP is to contribute to the country's attainment of a lower middle-income status that is envisioned by 2025. Further, the ProDoc explicitly indicates that transformation requires combined and balanced progress on several fronts: Economic and Political Governance, Environmental Sustainability and Governance, Sustained Peace and Stability. By partnering and working with the leading democratic institutions in the country, GDPP is strategically positioned to contribute to creating an enabling environment that would in turn deliver the country to its desired end: "Lower Middle-Income status." However, as noted in the MTR report, analysis of the programme interventions in line with the impact indicators confirmed that impact aspirations were ambitious. Indeed, the impact of the programme is difficult to assess given that it provides "soft support" that is problematic to measure in real terms. Although this is the case, the ET through desk review and stakeholder consultations captured significant immediate results that have the potential of contributing to the realisation of the desired impact level results, as noted below.
3. Continuous capacity strengthening support coupled with the formulation and adoption of legislative and oversight standards and manuals; constitutional interpretation guidelines and procedures; and secretariat guidelines have stimulated the two legislative houses to uphold and adhere to both international standards and democratic principles in the sector. The criteria and procedures in law making processes potentially inclines HoPR and HoF to respect, observe and defend the human and democratic rights of the population through the application of international norms and standards. Furthermore, through the establishment of a Parliamentary Research Network (PRN) and further development of the network guidelines and standards, local think-tanks, universities, international organizations, and CSOs were brought together to help support MPs with research activities. For example, the first ever Annual Parliamentary Research Conference under the title "Parliament, Democracy and Human Rights" was held in February 2021 in Addis Ababa. 16 research papers were presented by Scholars from the PRN. Informants indicated that MPs were positively impacted by the importance of having evidence-based support in the law-making process. Local level democratic institutions forums and ethics and anti corruption clubs' components were attempted and exercised at zonal and schools' levels in observed regions. This was a good start to directly reach communities and will need critical attention in the future. It is therefore apparent that the GDPP has supported both new systems and structures that will have a positive impact on the human and democratic rights of the wider population.
4. The deployment of democratic institutions' forums, platforms, and coalitions, as well as the capacity strengthening support provided to them, have led to an improvement in the coordination of democratic institutions. Some, including the Speakers Forum, the Federal and Regional Anti-Corruption Agencies Platform, the Civil Society Dialogue Forum, Democratic Institutions Forum, University Ethics Anti-Corruption Club Forum, and University Peace Forum have benefited. In most cases, some of the forums, platforms, and coalitions are anchored by focal points per institutions: one nationally headquartered in Addis Ababa and one headquartered in regional capital, ensuring a deliberate link between national action and regional processes and interests. Others like The Civil Society Dialogue Forum and Democratic Institutions Forum serve as umbrellas for similar like-minded institutions. Through established networks, GDPP created opportunities for capacity strengthening, experience sharing, and guidelines/standards development. That has had an impact in improving restrictive laws and adopting new practices. Although the full effect of such initiatives is still evolving, their transformative potential is apparent even at this early stage. For instance, improved CSO legislation increased the number of beneficiaries

44 DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance.

reached and the quality-of-service delivery while the Speakers Forum has already created conditions for synergy and harmonization of laws passed at federal and regional levels. This will greatly improve service delivery and improvement in legislative practices through promoting respect for the human rights of poor and vulnerable communities, and beyond.

5. The formulation of the new mass-media legislative reform as well as revision of CSO legislation embraced a consultative approach with various social groups making inputs. This has been perceived as the government's explicit commitment and willingness towards transforming the country's media and CSO platforms to be able to respond to the needs of the population. The mass media legislation reform resulted in the birth of the most progressive and liberal media laws and GDPP support contributed to increased visibility, credibility, and independence of key democratic intuitions.
6. The Programme continued supporting democratic and accountability institutions in reinforcing their professional independence with the aim of creating an environment conducive to participation and inclusion. The key element of GDPP's contribution has been on 'inclusion' and ensuring awareness raising for large segments of society on their rights in terms of political and civic participation. For example, democratic institutions and executive organs (such as EHRC, FEACC, EIO and EBA) organized awareness raising sessions for enhancing the participation of civic societies and citizens in political processes, including fighting corruption. A number of citizens' empowerment initiatives have been undertaken through the programme supporting countrywide consultations about governance and accountability. These have coupled with the deliberate involvement of various social groups such as women, youth and Civil Society Organisations to disseminate vital and empowering information. This has great potential for increasing the demand for better services and accountability from duty bearers, which are all critical ingredients of peacebuilding, democratisation, and human rights protection. IPs have contributed by sharing valuable information on governance and accountability issues with the public through newsletters and radio programmes.
7. An important impact has been that there is now a basis for the public to demand accountability in the democratic governance sector. Although the transformative gains at the citizenry level are still low, this approach has potential to yield greater benefits for the general population both in the medium and long term.
8. Overall, the GDPP impacted the country's democratic governance landscape through promoting, cultivating, and capacitating national/and regional forums, platforms, and coalitions thereby positively impacting improved governance and human rights. However, as indicated in paragraph 47, above, major results will only become apparent after many years and it is impossible to measure any significant progress in the short term.

Specific comments from interviewees:

- Training modules will have long-term impact in enhancing personal skills and institutional systems.
- GDPP support has enhanced and triggered positive changes in organisational structures.
- Systems in place improved reporting and data collection.

3.1.5 Sustainability

1. Sustainability is part of a commitment to ensure that programme implementation at all levels is carried out in a productive, transparent and accountable way. In the case of the GDPP, the key issue is whether the resources will be available to maintain progress in the future. There are several areas where UNDP support through the GDPP has created capacity that bodes well for the future sustainability of the kinds of activities developed to date. Policies and guidelines have been developed which, along with the various training exercises, should place the GoE in a stronger position to further develop and expand its programmes and services in the areas of democratisation and governance. Given that the support given to the IPs directly builds capacity to enable government officials and staff to implement and manage projects, and enhance the accountability and effectiveness of services that address the governance priorities of Ethiopia, they are inherently "sustainable." However, a simple analysis of what underpins sustainability indicates that the activities delivered would face significant challenges when it comes to their long-term viability without continued financial support, and that is in question.⁴⁵
2. From the outset of the GDPP, donors have provided generous support to it. However, in interviews, most were non-committal about whether they would (or could) continue their funding when the present programme expires. The continued instability in the north of the country, and the erosion of human rights norms in particular, has been flagged by donors as a major problem affecting their commitment to continue funding the

⁴⁵ The ET estimates that digital platforms such as in FEACC (DARS), Office of Auditor General (ARTS), the EIO (online complaint registration and feedback center), and collaboration and partnerships established should be able to continue after the GDPP expires.

GDPP. Although the sample is small, on balance, there are more who waver than there were those who remain committed. In some cases, pressure has come from donors' headquarters to reassess funding to state institutions because of the ongoing conflict. In general, future funding will depend on the context, i.e., the security situation.

3. Sustainability, at least in terms of external funding, is therefore an uncertain element in the future development of the GDPP. It may not be appropriate to call this donor fatigue but, given that some donors are cutting back on their assistance programmes globally, it could presage a re-evaluation by some of them of their support for the GDPP.

Specific comments from interviewees:

- Discontinuity in funding will end, or reverse, most gains because government support is insufficient to maintain progress.
- It is difficult to say what activities would be sustainable at the local level because there has not been any substantive support to the regions anyway.
- Skills learned from trainings will remain with the recipients but there is a risk that trained people will move to better paying opportunities; the continuity of institutional memory depends on ongoing funding.

3.1.6 Cross-cutting Issues

1. It is not evident that cross-cutting issues - gender and human rights - are fully integrated into all programme activities, nor is there a clear understanding of what this would involve. That said, there has been slow but steady progress on legislative and policy reform on gender-related issues. On human rights, the GDPP, by enhancing people's access to basic information, e.g., about elections, supports the aim of strengthening good governance and increasing citizens' engagement in areas that respond to their needs.

Gender:

1. Although gender was infused in all the work plans, and the IPs were given strong guidance through the technical leads embedded with them, it cannot be said that these initiatives have led to a significant gender impact. It became apparent during the MTR that, despite a number of recommended gender-affirmative interventions, more targeted support was needed to enable the IPs to fully integrate gender throughout their work.⁴⁶ That remains the case.
2. The five GDPP output areas are of particular importance from the perspective of promoting gender equality and women empowerment. Essentially, the programme's focus on areas such as rule of law, participation, accountability, and transparency are supportive of gender equality. However, the ProDoc does not explicitly link these essential governance ingredients with gendered connections.
3. The GDPP took different sub-outputs and activities/indicators to prioritize the needs of women and promote their participation in the programme. For example, some of these include enhancing the role and participation of women and youth in politics, public decision-making and staff capacity development trainings on gender analysis. While the initial programme design was informed by context assessments, gender analysis was lacking which resulted in the failure to develop the identification, design and planning of the most appropriate gender sensitive activities. In some cases, AWP did not list gender disaggregated activities although outputs usually stated "gender disaggregated data."⁴⁷ Moreover, completed activities neglected to provide data and information on gender.⁴⁸
4. The GDPP made strong efforts to hire or engage women in senior management and technical positions and in the seconded or embedded positions of IPs. Some significant efforts have been made to mainstream gender into programme activities. For example, in 2018, the CO initiated a joint programme with UN Women focusing on enhancing the gender responsiveness of the House of People's Representatives with the effective leadership of women parliamentarians.⁴⁹ In 2019, UNDP in collaboration with GDPP IPs undertook a systematic and in-depth Gender Analysis aimed at identifying capacity gaps and recommend strategic and tailored interventions towards promoting gender equality and women empowerment.⁵⁰ Notwithstanding these efforts, gender equality is most often measured in terms of the number of female participants in activities like workshops and there is little indication that women play a significant role in determining gender-related policies and programmes.

46 MTR, p. 70.

47 UNDP (2018) GDPP Annual Workplan, July – December 2018.

48 UNDP (2019) GDPP Annual report (2019, p.31)

49 ROAR, 2018.

50 ROAR 2019.

5. That said, the inadequacy of an overarching gender structure and weak accountability mechanisms are not matters that can easily be addressed at the IP level. This is also the manifestation of the fact that gender inequality in Ethiopia is still prevalent in a largely patriarchal society where public discourse about gender equality remains a challenge. Some GDPP IPs have successfully managed to bridge the gap between policy and application, for example, NEBE and EHRC have both succeeded in recruiting trained staff resulting in measurable progress in gender mainstreaming. In general, however, it has proved difficult for most IPs to advance gender priorities.⁵¹
6. The GDPP's intervention in promoting gender equality and women empowerment evolved throughout the programme implementation period. Based on recommendations from the MTR, a Gender, and Social Inclusion specialist (GESI) was recruited and deployed which was important to help IPs identify the gaps in their approaches to gender and to start implementing a few activities accordingly. This is manifested through continuous capacity building support on gender and conducting gender analysis and gender audits across IPs. However, the idea of mainstreaming gender is still questioned and there is no uniform approach to implementation. In essence the situation reflects the lack of a gender strategy at the outset of the programme and the absence of a gender focal point until well into its second year. Without a defined gender programming structure from the beginning, it has been difficult to address gender issues systematically.

Human Rights

1. The GDPP reinforces and promotes human and democratic rights in Ethiopia through its support for the establishment of systems and structures of democratic institutions. The formulated GDPP strategy has reawakened the country's call to uphold and adhere to human rights principles and standards particularly after the 2018 reform. The design of the programme was adapted to the realities of Ethiopia and to the fact that the government had already adopted international human rights laws, protocols, and standards. The human rights components embedded in Output 5 of the ProDoc and elsewhere in the same document potentially incline individuals, groups and institutions to respect and observe the human rights of the population. In realization for this, GDPP supported EHRC and OAG to strengthen efforts to enhance access to justice and promote and protect human rights across the country. GDPP's support for the two institutions was vital in strengthening their existing capacity and providing leverage to promote the human rights cause. Of the IPs, the Human Rights Commission is widely regarded as the cream of the crop - it "owns" its programme, understands its activities and is not dependent on UNDP to provide guidance and oversight. A key informant from EHRC indicated that GDPP support was vital in making the organization's system more efficient and assisting its wider human rights interventions. The same is true for OAG which made the organization to be more proactive in addressing human rights issues. Among others, the two organizations carried out various awareness creation activities and trainings; facilitated discussion and dialogues; and conducted evidence-based advocacy on a range of human rights issues - the dignity, freedom, and basic human rights of all people. The GDPP is best placed in promoting, supporting and assisting the design, development and promotion of successive National Human Rights Action Plans.
2. The GDPP programme also promoted the rights of persons with disabilities through partnerships with CSOs supporting disabled persons in the regions. The support provided by GDPP enabled access of the laws to the disability fraternity. Specifically, CSOs translated and published the amended laws into Braille and sign language, thereby promoting the right of access to information by Persons With Disabilities (PWD). With support from GDPP, IPs worked with CSOs and reached millions of people through national TVs, radios, pamphlets, brochures, and through a variety of awareness creation forums. In some cases, people living in hard-to-reach areas were accessed through human rights investigation activities and voter education campaigns in both cases focusing on awareness creation and advocacy on human rights.

51 Communication with GESI.

Section 4.

Conclusions

1. The ET concludes that the strategic priorities and areas of focus identified in the programme document have been a good fit with the national needs and UNDP's position as a trusted partner of the GoE. The IPs confirm that they see UNDP as a consistent and long-term partner unlike others who only fund projects at one point in time and exit the partnership when it is completed. The NIM modality ensures strong convergence with the country programme and Strategic Plan of UNDP as well as in ensuring national ownership and capacity over time. Moreover, the core objectives of the GDPP provide a good framework for supporting the governance and democratic development priorities of the government. Performance has been mixed in different output areas, with the capacity building of officials to strengthen the institutions being one of the more successful elements.
2. A major weakness of the programme has been the limited level of CSO engagement as well as the absence of a concerted effort to reach out to regional, local and community levels.⁵² The potential for applying bottom-up planning has not been explored in any detail. The participation of communities in the design and delivery of activities that address their needs holds the promise of contributing to the success of the GDPP in a future iteration, but this needs to be linked to the broader development effort.
3. The sub-output, output and outcome level indicators (baseline and target values) are either TBDs or subject to change or relative scale measures. This has constrained the evaluation of the effectiveness of results and is a major weakness of the GDPP.
4. The most critical factor that has contributed to the success of the GDPP is its well-managed professional team at the CO, including seconded programme officers in the IPs, with strong capacity in technical and programming matters. The major factors limiting the success of the programme and contributing to delays in implementation are: procedural disparities in IPs and the UNDP in resourcing and decision-making, insecurity and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.
5. While interviewees commented favourably on the level of communication between UNDP management and the donors, some IPs described the information-sharing relationship between themselves and UNDP as less than constructive with programming decisions often being sprung on them without discussion.
6. The evaluation found that UNDP's sustained advocacy, training and practical support has contributed to a better awareness and understanding of key issues such as gender and the SDGs but not universally. Efforts to enhance women's socio-economic and political rights have not progressed at the programme level and gender equality has not been prioritised. In part this stems from the failure of UNDP to recruit a gender specialist at the beginning of the programme. Collaboration on gender with the IPs has been wanting and the projects which do have something of a gender component tend to be gender-responsive, rather than gender-transformative. They have contributed little to addressing the root causes of gender inequalities. Now that a gender specialist is appointed greater progress should be made in any future programme.
7. There has been no direct support to the SDGs under any of the activities funded by the GDPP and therefore no attempt to use the SDGs as an entry point to solidify the programme's strategic objectives.⁵³ The evaluation was unable to determine whether there is general awareness and understanding of the SDGs at the community level. Raising awareness of the SDGs through focused campaigns will help the attainment of SDG targets and should be an inclusive and participatory process, e.g., through initiating dialogue with members of civil society, the private sector, government officials and marginalised groups, especially women, youth and people with special needs.
8. It is clear that until 2030, the speed of implementation of the SDGs will have to increase significantly in many countries. UNDP Ethiopia needs to seek transformative, integrated and sustainable policy and programming options for SDG implementation that are localised and embedded in institutions. Also, in order to ensure services, reach to lower levels, and are accessible to citizens across the country, UNDP needs to mobilise funds to continue established interventions such as the DARS in FEACC, the ARTS in OFAG and interactive citizens'

⁵² See Footnote 40.

⁵³ It has been argued by some reviewers of this report, and raised in the Validation Workshop, that SDG attainment is a key objective of the GDPP. However, whereas it may be implied that this is the case, i.e. that all UNDP activities are geared towards the realization of the SDG goals, the ET did not find any evidence that there was an explicit effort to address the SDGs through the GDPP.

information and feedback centers at HoF, EIO, CCI, etc. This should be prioritised in a new iteration of the GDPP and in any follow-up collaborations with the IPs to support individual accessibility and use.

9. The GDPP has emphasized the centrality of good public sector governance and anti-corruption efforts in achieving its overarching programme idea, i.e., “strong, inclusive and responsive democratic institutions are the bedrock to ensure good governance and democracy.” These “supply-side activities” remain essential for improving state capacity and strengthening core country governance systems such as public service delivery. Ultimately, it is the state that is responsible for the sensible policy-making and efficient service delivery necessary to achieve salutary development outcomes. But, in the future, UNDP/GDPP has to widen its analytic and operational lens on governance to include what is being called the “demand-side” of governance. This could be achieved through directly partnering with CSOs and reaching citizens. It could also be achieved by tagging a component of the budget and support to the local level, making local level support by IPs as criteria for funding.
10. The GDPP’s objective is also in line with the SDGs; particularly with Goal 16 which states “Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.” The GDPP outcomes and outputs directly respond to most of the SDG 16 specific targets: promote the rule of law, reduce corruption, develop effective, accountable, and transparent institutions, and ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory, and representative decision-making.

Section 5.

Recommendations For A New Iteration Of The Gdpp

The ET proposes the following key recommendations which are informed by the TE findings and conclusions:

5.1.1 Broad Programmatic Level Recommendations:

R.1 Significant progress has been made under the GDPP in enhancing good governance and democratic development in Ethiopia. In order not to lose the gains made thus far, a follow-on programme (GDPP Phase II) is recommended to build on the achievements and lessons learned. A second phase of the GDPP should give considerable attention to both the national level as well as to the regional level partners and activities.

R.2 It is important for IPs at national and regional levels, selected CSOs, traditional leaders and other key stakeholders to participate in programme design meetings of GDPP II.

R.3 Building on its Governance experience, UNDP should develop a comprehensive SDG support strategy to guide Ethiopia's attainment of the SDGs highlighting those where UNDP has or can mobilise top-class expertise. In conjunction, UNDP should support an awareness raising campaign to help attain the SDG targets.

R.4 For a future GDPP II, develop a clearly defined results framework, including identification of clear and measurable sub-output, output and outcome level indicators, baselines and targets based on quick assessments involving relevant IPs, Ministries and regional departments, sectoral bureaus, research, training and knowledge institutions for each key sector.

R.5 In designing a future programme, establish stronger and more robust risk assessment/management mechanisms, in terms of short/medium/long-term risks; and, include comprehensive mitigation measures in programme planning.

R.6 Monitoring and evaluation functions of a follow-on programme should be well considered through support by qualified and professional team members through secondment and across IPs. A budget line equivalent to at least 5% of the total budget should be accorded to the M&E function to ensure adequate facilitation of its activities.

R.7 Ethiopia has 11 regions and two city administrations. A new programme should pilot interventions in a few regions by representing both pastoral and agro-pastoral communities and clearly demonstrate how the interventions translate at the regional level by relating these results back to the federal level. We propose Oromia, Amhara and Afar. Local level democratic institution forums (at Zonal and Woreda level) and ethics and anti-corruption clubs (at schools) should be included and further strengthened featuring social media as a powerful tool.

5.1.2 Governance and Capacity Building

R.8 Through advanced training, coaching and/or secondment from other UNDP offices, as well as where possible fresh recruitment, develop high-level staff skills, especially in the IPs but also in UNDP as necessary, in the following core areas:

- Developing theories of change and enhancing knowledge of their importance in programme design and results management.
- Strengthening internal monitoring and data collection systems focusing on results;
- Strengthening documentation, reporting and dissemination of collaboration interventions along thematic sectors leading to policy briefs, dialogue and position papers, etc.

R.9. GDPP should strengthen the collaboration and management mechanisms of PMB and PTC to promote harmonious and complementary support and ensure IPs' programme ownership. Because of high turnover in IPs, thorough induction of new staff should be systematic.

R.10. Senior management inputs need to go into exploring synergistic partnerships with other UN agencies which may have technical capacity in specific areas of relevance to the GDPP.

R.11. Ensure that when undertaking capacity building interventions, there is a clear baseline of the capacity gaps identified and a defined pathway to change before embarking on the process.

5.1.3 Resource Mobilisation, Monitoring and Reporting

R.12 Use Service User Feedback Surveys, and work closely with CSOs, to elicit people’s views on public service delivery, rule of law, accountability and transparency to identify where efforts to improve performance should best be applied.

R.13 UNDP should work with specialized institutions, including advocacy CSOs and higher research institutions in the country, to publish evidence of trends in policy and strategic information.

R.14 UNDP needs to develop a robust resource mobilisation strategy to strengthen the GDPP. In particular, UNDP needs to explore funding opportunities with other donors apart from the initial 4 (Austria, Denmark, Norway and Sweden) as well as explore options with the private sector.

R.15 UNDP should explore citizen-based funding – as in the experience of Indonesia, for example, where citizens contribute to the anti-corruption commission. In Ethiopia, the context of citizens (dissatisfied by certain government services) is fertile and such funding can be sustainable and independent in order to support areas which the government sees as “thorny” and doesn’t want to touch. This would also increase citizen demands for greater participation in decisions that affect their lives.

R.16 Given the variation in the capacity and experience of IPs, GDPP should create experience sharing opportunities, for example, during joint monitoring visits, regular meetings or capacity strengthening trainings.

5.1.4 Cross-Cutting Issues

R.17 UNDP should seek to learn from the experiences of other countries, and strong gender organisations in Ethiopia, in developing gender-specific programming strategies through virtual workshops or other kinds of information exchanges.

R.18 UNDP needs to cascade the gender tools and frameworks of the UN system to the specific programme and project level in order to better monitor and track results based on gender indicators.

R.19 At the local level, UNDP should seek opportunities to support social networks and movements aimed at advancing women’s rights, gender inclusivity, marginalized groups and persons with disabilities (special needs). (In the context of Ethiopia, this is a meaningful and critical recommendation in the sense that minority voices and rights are not heard; and these groups are increasingly marginalized, even currently, in context where more reforms are the “talk” of the day).

Section 6.

LESSONS LEARNED

- **A high level of flexibility and adaptability** of governance programming to the country context, particularly in transitional settings, is essential. The recent shift in the political landscape of Ethiopia confirmed the importance of ensuring a high level of responsiveness to political and policy shifts without compromising the basic foundations, principles and pillars of the programme.
- **A well-designed and organized programme born out of solid research is crucial.** Lessons learned from previous programmes are salient in informing the growth and development of a programme concept. The design aspect brought on board critical players and institutions relevant to the GDPP.
- **Finding focus: going deep vs. spreading thin.** GDPP learned from experience that the number of implementing partners should be of a manageable scale to ensure good quality programme implementation. Likewise, in reshaping the thematic focus of the programme, it is important to identify essential elements in the wider governance and accountability spectrum. Programme focus is important to leverage resources and to ensure the efficiency of programme outcomes.
- **Striking a balance between ‘supply side’ and ‘demand side’ of governance.** GDPP has emphasized the centrality of good public sector governance and anti-corruption efforts in achieving its overarching programme idea, i.e., “strong, inclusive and responsive democratic institutions are the bedrock to ensure good governance and democracy.” These “supply-side activities” remain essential for improving state capacity and strengthening core country governance systems such as public service delivery. Similarly, the “demand-side” of governance is also very important in addressing governance and accountability issues. Hence, directly partnering with grassroots level CSOs that are closer to the people and reaching citizens is essential.
- **Programme execution modality vs. IPs’ implementation capacity.** Allowing IPs to choose their own priorities and plans was key to effective implementation of programme interventions. The NIM modality has created strong national ‘ownership’ and responsibility. It is important to note that the success of this execution modality requires ‘unwavering’ supportive supervision, mentoring, coaching, and continuous capacity strengthening support to IPs. This needs to be underpinned by the IPs own commitment to the longer term sustainability of the programme interventions by fully integrating the improvements achieved within their own IP systems and structures.
- **Multiple institutional synergies are key to strengthening programme implementation.** Each IP has its own strengths and areas for improvement, but some IPs are more efficient in properly planning and implementing programme activities. Creating more platforms and experience sharing opportunities among IPs are important for cross fertilization of learning and best practices. In addition, this approach is essential to avoid duplication of efforts.
- **A mix of soft and hard interventions improves outcomes.** Soft activities, such as capacity building, policy and legal reforms are enhanced with improvements to the working environment, for example, by infrastructure improvements.
- **The necessity of a well thought out M&E framework.** A well-designed M&E strategy is essential in tracking the progress of programme activities. In the absence of such results, it will be a challenge to determine achievement of the programme outcomes.
- **Necessity of gender and social inclusion.** Adequately considering gender and social inclusion issues at programme design and implementation stages will enhance the promotion of women and other groups rights and enable the programme to reach all the people it seeks to assist.
- **Necessity of clear and measurable indicators.** Abstract and relative sub-output, output and outcome level indicators, baseline and targets constrain the evaluability of programme implementation and the evaluation of results.

ANNEX1.

Programme Achievements against Outputs, Sub-outputs and Targets by Activity.

1. Overall, the initial design of the GDPP was viewed by key stakeholders interviewed as appropriate and coherent for the needs and issues envisaged in promoting democratic governance and participatory democracy in Ethiopia. The programme's design was considered relevant for providing much needed support to key democratic institutions by partnering with them: HoPRs, HoF, EACC, EHRC, EIO, OAG, OFAG, MoP, CCI, NEBE and EBA/EMA. Capacity building support given was immense. The different policies, strategies and laws issued at national level are highly relevant and should have tickle down effect to citizens. An identified weakness of the programme design was the over-emphasis on national level institutions with de-emphasis on CSOs that received negligible direct support and attention despite being a major programme concern. This approach neglected and underrated regional level democratic institutions which are basically the foundations of democratic governance in any nation. Design emphasis on gender was not to the level it was expected. The following sections breakdown the programme's achievements by outputs and sub-outputs.
2. **Output 1: Political processes of federal and regional state legislative bodies are Inclusive and effectively delivering on their constitutional mandates.** This output required the need to strengthen both institutional, and technical capacity to mandated institutions. This helped to provide technical assistance, capacity strengthening training and policy and operational capacities of relevant IPs (HoPR, OAG, EHRC, EIO, FEAC, OFAG, NEBE, HOF and their regional counterparts and branches). A key informant noted the contribution of technical and financial assistance delivered by the GDPP to IPs greatly helped to bridge implementation capacity gaps within their respective institutions. For example, GDPP established the Democratic Institutions Forum and provided support. The HoPR prioritized efforts towards developing and strengthening its systems, frameworks, and tools for enhancing oversight capacity. This was highly relevant because the relationship between the Parliament and the key watchdog institutions⁵⁴ whose function and responsibilities make them directly accountable to the HoPR, had not been defined. Specific relevant supports provided to IPs included capacity strengthening of the legislative staff and elected representatives, improving and/ developing legal systems and operational structures of the House, increasing participation and engagement of women, and reaching people through improved legal and functional framework. However, emerging interests and new developments were not considered while its programme design did not consider CSOs as direct implementing partners.
3. **Output 2: Federal and regional state systems of governance are more accountable, transparent and are delivering services in more inclusive and responsive ways.** Enhancing transparency and accountability is a central feature of any democracy. They are vehicles by which citizens make democratic institutions accountable to people whom they are responsible to serve. However, strengthening accountability, transparency and responsiveness at federal and regional levels requires strong capacity building support. This action starts with assessment of the level of maturation of the institutions and the challenges they are facing in delivering their constitutional mandates. This output considers supporting democratic institutions with the objective of enhancing transparency and accountability through strengthening the information systems. As a key informant said GDPP has promoted key governance issues such as citizens' participation, transparency, accountability, inclusion, improved service delivery and access to justice. This will help improve the ability of citizens to be able to access information. Key partners for this output are FEACC, EIO, OFAG, OAG and their regional counterparts and branches. However, the design and implementation of specific interventions under each of the focus areas (i.e., accountability, transparency and development of anti-corruption policy and strategy) was not supported by strong monitoring and supportive supervision system.
4. **Output 3: Citizens are empowered to voice their concerns and participate in decision-making and political processes at all levels of governance.** This output involves citizens' participation in political decision making which is a key pillar for building and sustaining democratic and inclusive governance systems. On some occasions, Ethiopian people have tried to gain access to political decision-making positions by contesting for elective positions at various levels. Their efforts, however, have not translated into appreciative gains as

⁵⁴ The watchdog institutions that are directly accountable to the House and participating in GDPP include: OAG, EHRC, FEACC, EBA/EMA, NEBE, EIO, OFAG

subsequent elections at least since 1991 revealed. This state of affairs is also evident amongst women, youth and other marginalized groups including PWDs. In recognition of this challenge, GDPP provided support specifically targeting democratic institutions, there by reaching citizens. However, GDPP's support did not adequately reach women, youth and PWDs, recognizing these groups as priorities for stronger democratic inclusion in Ethiopia. The support of GDPP to this area is not only relevant but extremely essential for promoting enduring democratic governance in Ethiopia. The programme identified NEBE, HoPR, EIO and MoP as key institutions in facilitating and promoting this agenda.

5. **Output 4: Systems and mechanisms for promoting social cohesion, managing diversity, preventing, and managing conflicts, fostering dialogues, and building peace are further strengthened at national, regional, and local levels.** Managing diversity should be guided by clear and acceptable principles, systems, and organizational structures. Effective diversity management is an important area for strengthening the federal system. However, the country is lacking essential elements of diversity management. Practice of national consensus building on issues of strategic importance (e.g., advance social cohesion and maintain sustainable peace and stability) is rarely available. GDPP recognized and engaged the HoF, MoP and their regional counterparts in managing diversity which is not only appropriate but a timely effort in consolidating democratic governance in Ethiopia. Project activities and support in this component was thus highly relevant.
6. **Output 5: Access to justice enhanced and human rights promoted and protected across Ethiopia;** Ethiopia is a signatory to a number of international human rights instruments. Among others, Ethiopia is party to core human rights treaties, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The new government has revitalized commitments to human rights protection in the country. However, Ethiopia's human rights records was among the worst in the world. Supplementing government effort, the GDPP focus is placed on establishing/strengthening of: i) Regulatory and procedural systems for effective access to justice and redress mechanisms; ii) Capacity of public and law enforcement bodies to abide by human rights laws and regulation; and iii) Mechanisms for monitoring, compiling, and reporting of human rights protection and violations. As a key informant said GDPP has promoted human rights and democratic governance by establishing systems and structures supportive of human rights institutions. Project activities on this was thus highly relevant.
7. **Improved Oversight Capacity of the Legislatures:** Under this sub-output, value added laws and systems with a gender lens is adopted. The baseline was zero and target was 25 and 36 such laws and system adopted by the HoPR and 4 RSCs (four each) respectively. Out of the 61 laws planned, 54 systems and laws were produced (88.5%). And also, 4 IT systems, 12 gender mainstreaming strategies, 3 manuals and 35 guidelines were produced. There was no distinction by region and federal levels. Analytical reports and legislative proposals by parliamentary staff were planned to be submitted to the HoPR Standing Committees. In 2017, there no such reports. About 53 analytical reports and legislative proposals were planned. In 2021, about 7 analytical reports by HoPR, 1 by EHRC, 4 by HoF and 4 by OAG were produced and submitted. Out of the 53 planned, 16 of the targets was achieved (30.2%). Interaction of the MPs to their constituents were planned to increase with support of the GDPP. The baseline in 2017 was twice annually and the target was planned to be four times a year. Since there is no evidence, it was not possible evaluate the achievements. An HoPR, EIO, EHRC and FEACC staff capacity building in gender analysis and the daily application by federal legislature and 11 RECs were planned. There was capacity building on gender analysis and tracking as a baseline in 2017 and the target was set to train 1585. The IPs trained 1337 staff in 2021. The overall achievement in this target was 84.4%.
8. **Capacity of Key DIs Strengthened to Fulfil their Mission-Critical Functions:** To increase a CSO partnership with government on key agendas/public demands were planned to strengthen capacity of key DIs. The baseline was set to be "inadequate" and the target was to achieve "highly adequate" (60 – 80). A partnership agreement with CSOs was initiated and CSOs engaged in several activities in support of mission-critical functions of DIs. For instance, CSOs involved in the debate on the new anti-corruption law and the structure of the FEACC in the Parliament. The FEACC has had a collaboration agreement with CSOs to work as partners. Also, OFAG involved 35 key stakeholders in the validation of its Audit Report Tracking System. The CCI also involved CSOs (association of persons with disability). The NEBE involved CSOs in voter education and election observations. The EHRC involved CSOs in human rights monitoring. The OAG involved the CSOs in justice sector gap assessment. The MoP involved local CSOs in peace dialogues. However, in terms of evaluating the effectiveness, both the scale and how the numbers in the scale are calculated for the baseline and target is abstract. The IPs planned to adopt, implement and evaluate impact of the HR strategy. In 2016, there was no functional HR strategy and the target was to adopt, implement and assess impact of the HR strategy. The presence of functional and monitored HR strategy in the 11 IPs was the expected achievement. From the interviews with the IPs and reports, all IPs have a HR strategy. Therefore, the target was achieved by 100%.

Table 3 – Achievements of Sub-Outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3

Sub-Outputs of Output 1	Target activities planned	Target activities accomplished	Achievement Rating (%)
1.1. Improved Oversight Capacity of the Legislatives	38	36	94.7%
1.2. Capacity of Key DIs Strengthened to Fulfil their Mission- Critical Functions	18	13	72.2%
1.3. Citizens actively participate in decision making in the country	20	20	100%
Average	76	69	90.8%

Note 1: **Red** (below 75%) **Yellow** (75 - 89%) **Green** = Above 90%

9. The average improvement in public perception about DIs was planned. The baseline in 2021 was set as “low” and this status of perception was expected to improve to 20% from the baseline and the overall public perception to 75% (positively perceive the DIs). Though abstract to rate from the baseline and also the overall public perception, the communication and promotions conducted by NEBE, FEACC, EIO, CCI, HoPR, HoF and the dialogues conducted at grassroots levels by the MoP, enhanced the visibility of the IPs. The digital systems in place such as integrative call-centres at several languages also improved the perception of the public (including clients) on the IPs. Thus, the functions of the IPs got more and more clearer to citizens in terms of what services to expect from the IPs and what rights to exercise as citizens. Adopting policies, guidelines, forums, standards and frameworks were also planned by IPs. The baseline in 2017 was not known and the target was set at 12. About 9 were accomplished. Also, 1,120 regional and federal level participants engaged in forums and familiarization sessions on guidelines, standards, frameworks and policies adopted and implemented. Thus, the target was achieved by 75%. Familiarization programs were planned by EIO, EBA and NEBE. There was no baseline and target identified. The revised result plan was 734 (517 by EBA, 157 by EIO and 60 by NEBE), EIO and NEBE planned to organize 5 and 2 awareness creation sessions respectively. Out of the planned 734, about 390 participants (EBA 184, EIO 151 and NEBE 55) engaged in familiarization forums. NEBE organized 2 sessions. The overall achievement was 53.1% for the familiarization forums. Specifically, the performance of the EIO was 96%. The session planned by the EIO was not conducted but NEBE organized 2 sessions and the performance this target was 40%.
10. **Citizens actively participate in decision making in the country:** Citizen’s active participation in socio-economic/political key decisions in terms of frequency were planned under this sub-output. The indicators were an increase in citizens reporting about their active participation in socio-economic/political decision making in the country and tracking the trend of improvement. A survey was planned to set a baseline but the target was to improve at least by 20% from the baseline. Except the national corruption perception survey conducted by FEACC, the baseline was not set. Since the baseline is abstract and not set as well as tracking mechanism isn’t set, it is difficult to evaluate the achievement. Providing formal opportunities for civil society to participate in/contribute to the work of DIs was planned. The baseline was no such opportunity in 2017 and the target was set to engage at least quarterly. Though the frequency is not tracked in terms of quarterly engagement of CSOs and contributions to DIs, the initiatives by FEACC, NEBE, EHRC, CCI, MoP, HoPR and HoF can be taken as encouraging achievements. In summary, the first output was identified for 10 IPs; namely, the HoPR, EHRC, FEACC, EIO, OAG, EBA/EMA, HoF, OFAG, NEBE and CCI. Under this output (legislative bodies and democratic institutions capacities strengthened for discharging their oversight functions), two sub-outputs and six activities were identified for implementation. The first sub-output considers strengthening legislative bodies and democratic institutions capacities for discharging their oversight functions. The activities (including indicators) identified relate to designing standardized systems/frameworks/tools, establishing platforms/forums, and enhancing the knowledge and skills of staffs on the identified oversight functions.
11. The GDPP achieved better results for sub-output 1.1. Out of the 22 planned activities, 19 were accomplished; and the overall target achievement in terms of activities achieved was 86.4%. For the second indicator, the achievement exceeded the plan, 16 activities were accomplished while the plan was 15; and the overall target achieved by 107%. For the third indicator, out of 1585 staff planned to reach by capacity building training, 1337 staff were trained; and the overall target achieved was 84.4%. In average, sub-output 1.1 achievement is 92.6%. Thus, the accomplishment of the activities effectively contributed to the achievement of the sub-outputs, outputs and outcomes. Sub-output 1.2 aims at enhancing professional independence of DIs in discharging their core functions and the indicators identified to measure this sub output were designing functional standards

and procedures, and professional staff whose knowledge on application of standards, procedures and tools can be confirmed for securing professional independence in the IPs selected. The GDPP achieved results close to target for sub-output 1.2. In the first indicator of this sub-output, out of the 12 activities planned, 9 were accomplished; and the achievement of this specific target is by 75%. In the second indicator for this sub-output, out of the 517 planned training participants, 410 have been trained (79.3%). For the third indicator, out of the 5 awareness sessions planned, two sessions were accomplished; the achievement of this specific indicator is 40%. The achievement of the overall targets for sub-output 1.2 is thus 78.8% and the achievement was just close to the target. In the third indicator, out of the 20 activities planned, all 20 were accomplished and the achievement was 100% and was on the target. In average, the achievement of output 1 was 86.03%, which is close to the target and has relatively contributed to the achievement of the outcome.

12. Promoting and strengthening systems: The objective of this sub-output was to strengthen and promote transparency, accountability, and integrity at all levels of government. The baseline was zero and the target was set as the presence of system that strengthens and promotes good governance. Under this sub-output, improvement in the rank and scores of overall governance index (the Mo Ibrahim Index of African Governance or APRM) was planned. The baseline was that Ethiopia was 36/54 African countries and 47/100 score-points in 2017. The target was set to see Ethiopia being in the top 20 African countries in APRM index and achieving a score-point of 55/100. There is no evidence on such outputs but with the political dynamics and deterioration in the country during the GDPP implementation period, any rank and score would be misleading. Improvement of public rating in accountability, transparency and efficiency of governance of Ethiopia is planned with the baseline to be set and a target of 50% increase from the baseline (which is also subject to adjustment after assessment). The FEACC planned 1 Policy & Strategy Document, 1 National Survey Report and 1 system/web portal to improve the governance was implemented. All FEACC's planned strategy, perception survey report and system/portal facilities were achieved. The EIO planned 1 IT system automation and 1 case-flow system. The CCI planned 1 free call centre & synchronized IT and case management system was implemented. The CCI planned 1 free call centre, 1 case management system and 1 gender mainstreaming manual. The free call centre automation, case flow management systems and gender mainstreaming manual were accomplished. Therefore, the achievement was 100%. A national strategy on transparency, accountability and efficiency was also planned. There was no such strategy in 2017 as a baseline and the presence of a national anti-corruption strategy adopted, implemented and impact assessment conducted and reported was set as a target. The FEACC planned to design and adopt 1 regulation (code of conduct) and 1 review report on UNCAC. Both the code of conduct and UNCAC review were implemented. The achievement was 100%. The CCI also planned 1 study on service provision, 3 study on constitutional issues, 3 discussion forums and 2 publications. The planned 3 research report and 3 discussion forums were accomplished while the assessment report and 2 publications were not. The achievement of the target was thus 66.7%.

Table 4 – Achievements of Sub-Outputs 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3

Sub-Outputs of Output 2	Target activities planned	Target activities accomplished	Achievement Rating (%)
2.1. Promoting and strengthening systems	19	19	100%
2.2. Capacity to prevent, investigate and prosecute corruption and maladministration	3	3	100%
2.3 Promote awareness of service providers and seekers for quality service provision	6	6	100%
Average	28	28	90.8%

Note 1: **Red** (below 75%) **Yellow** (75 - 89%) **Green** = Above 90%

13. A presence of the ethical code of conduct for public officials was planned. The baseline was that no ethical code existed in 2017 and the target was to adopt and implement a code and assess the impact. The FEACC, EIO and CCI planned to assess gaps, adopt a code of conduct and a digital system for implementation (automated case flow and clearance system). The IPs assessed the gap, adopted the automation system and are using the system for case management and feedback until the cases are assessed, decided and cleared with a code of conduct in place. The achievement of the target is 100% for the code of conduct and the automation system but one assessment and 2 publications that were planned by the CCI were not accomplished. Youth and children integrity was planned to be mainstreamed in the education system and the implemented was planned to be tracked and measured. The baseline was that there no such mainstreaming strategy and the target was to adopt,

implement and assess the impact of the strategy. The measurement was set in Likert scale but it does not show for what each scale stands for and how the scale was set. The EIO planned 1 platform, 1 assessment report and one complaint handling strategy and implemented all of them (100%). Also, the EIO established ethics clubs in schools and together with clubs it is working to integrate integrity issues in the education curriculum. The achievement is not rated since the scale is abstract. Sessions were planned to be conducted for raising awareness of information providers and service seekers on service delivery procedures of the IPs. A baseline and target were not set for this indicator. However, the EIO planned 1 forum for raising awareness of information providers and service seekers and organized an awareness raising forum. The achievement is thus 100%. However, since a baseline and target were not set, the effectiveness was not rated.

14. Capacity to investigate and prosecute corruption and maladministration: The objective of the sub-output was to strengthen the capacity at all levels of government to effectively prevent, investigate and prosecute corruption and maladministration but both baseline and target was not set. A public perception on the prevalence of corruption in the country was planned. The measurement was by TI Corruption Perception Index. The baseline set was TI rank 107/180 and an improvement in perception was 35% in 2017. The target was set at 100 top countries in rank and increase in perception average percentage of 45%. An improvement in citizens' corruption perception was planned to be tracked. The baseline was to be decided after the FEACC national perception survey report and the target was set at 20% increase in public perception from the baseline. Since there wasn't baseline and target, and evidence on this was not found in reports and interview narratives, the achievement was not rated for this specific indicator. A plan was set to clear corruption and maladministration (including the outstanding) cases within a year in number of cases (in percentage rate). The baseline was set at 55.5% for FEACC, at 71% for EIO and at 62% for selected regions in 2016. The target was set at 90% for FEACC, at 95% for EIO and at 90% for selection regions. Since evidence was not found for this specific indicator, the achievement was not rated. The second output was planned by 3 IPs; namely, the FEACC, EIO and CCI. The GDPP achieved results on the target for sub-output 2.1. Out of 19 activities planned, all 19 were accomplished. The overall target in this sub-output is achieved by 100% and the achievement was on the target. Sub-output 2.2 aims at installing/strengthening complaints handling and feedback mechanisms for ensuring accountability and customers'/clients' satisfaction, with emphasis on women and youth. Sub-output 2.3 aims at promoting awareness of information providers and service seekers for ensuring quality service provision in the IPs selected. From the evaluation data results, the GDPP achieved results on the target for sub-outputs 2.2 and 2.3 as well. For sub-output 2.2, out of 3 activities, all three (100%) were accomplished. For sub-output 2.3, the activity planned (6) were accomplished (100%) and the target achievement was 100%. In average, the achievement output two was on the target, which is 100% and was effective.

15. Improvement in electoral legal and institutional frameworks: This sub-output aims at ensuring inclusion and participation of citizens in governance affairs in the country. There was no baseline and target set for this sub-output. Increase in women MPs at federal parliaments and regional councils was planned. The baseline was 33/3% in HoF, 38.8% in HoPR and 40.7% (average) in RECs. The target was set at 35% in HoF, 42% in HoPR and 45% in RECs. Also, the HoPR and HOF planned to conduct gender gap assessments, validated and produced handbook (3) and a gender mainstreaming guideline. The guideline planned was not implemented. In line with the target, since women representation in the HoF, HoPR and RECs were not reported, the achievement for this specific measure was not rated. Availing a revised electoral law was planned by NEBE. The baseline was that there no revised electoral law exists and the target set was to have a revised electoral law before 2020 general elections. This was accomplished and the achievement was 100%. Networking and good governance collaborative forums were planned. But both the baseline and target were not set. The EIO planned 3 networking and good governance collaborative forums and accomplished 2 forums by engaging 139 participants. Since the baseline and target was not set, the achievement was not rated, but from the EIO performance, the achievement was 75%. An effective electoral complaint handling and dispute resolution system was planned, adopted and implemented. The baseline was TBD in 2017 and the target was set to be "high" in 2021 though the measure for the scale was not clearly presented. Thus, the achievement in here was not rated. An improved citizen voice and participation in decision-making processes was planned. The baseline and target were not set. From the PWB plan, EHRC planned 80 CSOs (30% working on diversity) to participate in platforms/forums to promote citizens participation. The EHRC engaged 82 CSOs in civic engagement and feedback forums and engaged 124 individual participants from the 82 CSOs. The achievement is 102.5% and additionally participated 124 individuals outside the planned target.

Table 5 – Achievements of Sub-Outputs 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3

Sub-Outputs of Output 3	Target activities planned	Target activities accomplished	Achievement Rating (%)
3.1. Improvement in electoral legal and institutional frameworks	91	79	86.8%
3.2. Enhanced role and participation of women and youth in politics	97	99	102.1%
Average	188	178	94.7%

Note 1: **Red** (below 75%) **Yellow** (75 - 89%) **Green** = Above 90%

16. Increasing voters' turnout was planned by NEBE but both the baseline and target was not set. In this specific activity, the NEBE distributed 10,000 braille and 15,000 video copies, addressed 7.4 million vulnerable groups via the media, sensitized 13 voter education providers, 3 election observation sessions for 3 CSOs, conducted 1 gender mapping study with political parties, advocacy work for 125 participants from diverse groups, 3 awareness creation program and 1 national forum on anti-hate speech. The NEBE transcribed and published the electoral law in sign language. Since a baseline and data was not set, the achievement cannot be evaluated. Increase in women MPs representation at federal parliaments and regional councils were planned. The baseline in 2017 was 32% for HoF, 38.8% for HoPR and 40.7% (Average) for RECs. The target was set 40% for HoF, 42% for HoPR and 42% (average) for RECs. The HoPR targeted 1 digitized parliamentary documentation system and accomplished. An enabling legal and operational space for CSO participation was planned. The baseline was TBD in 2017 and the target was set to have an enabling CSO law in 2021. The FEACC has established a CSO registry and selected 3 CSOs for collaboration support. Also organized four CSO forums. The MoP has conducted two national dialogues/conferences engaging 1500 community representatives and one comprehensive assessment on diversity to identify CSO engagement areas. All the activities planned by the PWB is accomplished 100% but since the baseline and target is not set, the achievement cannot be evaluated.
17. A plan for media sector situational analysis report and action plan was targeted. The baseline was none in 2017 and the analysis report and plan were set as target in 2021. The EIO planned 1 training for 400 participants, five media programs in four media outlets and conducted fifteen radio programs. It organized 1 consultative workshop, established 14 Ombudsman Clubs and conducted awareness raising training to 350 Clubs, 5 promotional Spots via 10 Regional Media. The EMA planned awareness creation for 1000 participants and the EBA 4 promotional spots and established a national medial council. The EMA conducted 1 onsite monitoring visit, provided technical support to 5 Community Radio/Promotion Spots, organized one national platform, sensitization workshop for 890 political parties and training form 10 community radios. From the baseline and target set, the analysis report and action plan were accomplished (100%) and additional forums and awareness creation sessions were conducted. The CCI also planned two awareness session for 200 participants on the constitution and implemented one session for 62 women, youth and other vulnerable groups. From the planned target, one session (50%) and 62 (31%) was accomplished; and thus, the achievement was below the target.
18. **Enhanced role and participation of women and youth in politics:** Both baseline and target not set for this sub-output. Regarding the indicators, training women MPs in leadership, legislative staff trained and institutionalizing the women caucus at federal and region level was planned. Both the baseline in 2017 and target in 2022 were TBD and the achievement was not rated. Also, increasing a women MPs who hold leadership positions in federal parliament and regional councils was planned but both the baseline in 2017 and target in 2022 were TBDs and the achievement is not rated. A training for a parliamentary and legislature staff in gender analysis and tracking daily application in federal and 11 RECs were planned. The baseline was none in 2017 and a target of 150 for HoPR and 110 for 11 RECs was set for 2021. Since evidence was not available, the achievement was not rated. Institutionalization of the women's caucus and its full functionality was planned for the federal HoPR and 9 RECs. The baseline was no fully institutionalized Women's Caucus in 2017 and the target was set for 1 and 11 WCs institutionalized and functional at the HoPR and RECs respectively.
19. This output was identified for 8 IPs; namely, the HoPR, EIO, EHRC, FEACC, MoP, NEBE; EBA/EMA and CCI. Under this output, two sub-outputs were identified. The first sub-output, strengthening policy, system, and institutional frameworks for citizens' active participation, particularly women, youth and other marginalized groups in decision making processes at all levels, and the second sub-output, raising awareness of citizens on the functions of legislative bodies, executive organs and democratic institutions. The GDPP achieved results on the target for sub-output 3.1 and 3.2 as follows. Out of 91 planned targets for sub-output 3.1, 79 were accomplished; and the target is achieved by 86.8%; and the result is close to the target. For sub-output 3.2, 99 activities were

accomplished while 97 activities were initially planned; and this target is achieved by 102%; which is above the target. In average, the achievement of this output is on the target, which is 94.7%.

20. Strengthen institutional frameworks and capacity for conflict transformation: The aim of this sub-output was to strengthen national and local institutional frameworks and capacity for conflict analysis, prevention, management and transformation strengthened but both baseline and target were not set. Peace structures were planned to be effective at federal, regional and local levels but both baseline and target were not set. The MoP planned 1 capacity development, 2 modules on federalism, 1 manual, 2 charters and 1 directive for functional Inter-Governmental Relations (IGR). MoP conducted 1 IGR capacity gap & response plan, assessed and designed 1 IGR institutional framework. MoP also developed 1 manual, 1 charter, 1 directive, 1 training modules on IGR, and organized 2 forums on IGR (1 high-level conference and 1 panel discussion for 180 representatives from institutions and staffs. MoP also conducted 2 training sessions for 92 participants. From what is planned, the performance (achievement) is 100% but since baseline and target was not set, the effectiveness cannot be evaluated. National situation assessment report on and a conflict resolution and peace building strategy was also planned to be adopted and implemented by MoP. The baseline none in 2017 and the target was the strategy designed, implemented and impact assessed. HoF planned conducting conflict and peace situation analysis, produce report, identify gaps and design and implement a national conflict prevention and transformation strategy. It implemented and accomplished the assessment, draft the strategy and submitted for validation. The consultative platform was conducted and the achievement is close to 75%. Fully operational Peace Councils (PCs) at national and at 11 regional states was planned. The baseline was that there was no PCs in 2017 and the target was to institute PCs at federal & 11 regional PCs in 2021. HoF and MoP planned systems on diversity management and social cohesion at all levels consultative forums and IGR structures; and planned to conduct 1 comprehensive assessment and structures (arrangements) in four regional locations. It was implemented and accomplished; the assessment was conducted and the four structures at four regional locations were instituted and operational. Therefore, the achievement was 100%. HoF and MoP also planned systems on diversity management and social cohesion at all levels but both baseline and target were not set. However, the HoF planned 1 consultative platform/forum and MoP planned 4 awareness raising training, 3 panel discussion forums and 1 high level conference with 160 participants. The achievement is 100% but the effectiveness cannot be evaluated because baseline and target were not set.

Table 6 – Achievements of Sub-Outputs 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3

Sub-Outputs of Output 4	Target activities planned	Target activities accomplished	Achievement Rating (%)
4.1. Strengthen institutional frameworks and capacity for conflict transformation	17	14	82.2%
4.2. Promote dialogue, foster tolerance/ social cohesion and institutional capacity	15	15	100%
4.3. Strengthened constitutional interpretation system	36	34	94.4%
Average	68	63	92.7%

Note 1: **Red** (below 75%) **Yellow** (75 - 89%) **Green** = Above 90%

21. Promote dialogue, foster tolerance/ social cohesion and institutional capacity: The objective of this sub-output was to promote dialogue, foster tolerance and social cohesion and strengthen institutional capacity but both baseline and target were not set. A decrease in High Conflict Prone Woredas was planned. The baseline was that 31 HCPWs registered in 2016 and target was set to reduce the HCPWs by 50% in 2021. A national dialogue forum on national consensus and diversity management was planned. The baseline was none in 2017 and 1 national forum to be conducted in 2021. MoP conducted 2 national peace dialogue forums on diversity management and national consensus issues at national and regional levels and the performance was 100% and achieved the target by 100%. Awareness creation on school curriculums to address social cohesion, inclusion and conflict management issues, implanted and measured in Ethiopia. The baseline was not inadequate in 2017 and the target was very highly adequate in 2021. But how the scale was designed and for what it stands for is not presented. MoP planned 2 national dialogues and 1 Peace Day event and broadcast 10 TV and Radio programs. It also planned 1 national event. MoP organized 1 national Peace Day event for 200 community & religious leaders, women & youth representatives and public officials. It broadcast the national Peace Day event in 10 television and radio programs. The performance was 100% and since the baseline and target scale measures were abstract, it is not possible to evaluate the achievement and thus the effectiveness.

- 22. Strengthened constitutional interpretation system:** The aim of this sub-output was to strengthen constitutional interpretation system but both the baseline and target were not set. A familiarization and institutionalization of case management system was planned by CCI. The baseline was none in 2017 and the target was set to put a system in place in 2021. Now case flow and management system are institutionalized and all of the outstanding and current cases were assessed (100%) and the achievement is 100%. MoP also targeted the establishment of 6 national, 10 regional dialogue forums and 2 assessments (1 situation and another 1 public & private media). In line with this, 2 capacity building trainings, reached 1576 peace and religious actors, 3 training to 300 participants and conducted 2 assessment reports. The performance was 100% and the target achievement was also 100%. The MoP planned to establish 6 Peace Council Networks (2 national & 4 regional); and 12 Independent Advisory Groups Networks. It now established 1 national-regional network, 2 peace forums, and organized 5 workshops/forums (1 national workshop, and 4 consultative & discussion forums). The performance is 100% and the achievement is 100%.
- 23.** This output was identified for 2 IPs; namely, HoF and the MoP. Under this output, three sub-outputs were identified. The first sub-output, developing and putting in place systems on diversity management and social cohesions at all levels, the second sub-output, establishing/strengthening policy/strategy and platforms for an effective peace architecture of conflict prevention and peace building at all levels of governance, and the third sub-output, developing/strengthening systems and mechanisms to promote national consensus and nation building at all levels. The GDPP achieved results on the target for sub-output 4.1, 2.2 and 4.3 as follows. Out of the 17 activities planned for 4.1, 14 of them were accomplished; the target achievement is 82.4%. Out of the 15 activities planned for 4.2, all of them accomplished; and the target is achieved by 100%. Out of 36 activities planned for 4.3, 34 accomplished; and the target achievement is 94.4%. In average, the achievement of output is 4 is 92.7%; and in overall the achievement of this output is on the target.
- 24. Enhance access to justice and promote and protect human rights in Ethiopia:** The fifth output is about access to justice and human rights promoted and protected across the Ethiopian society. The indicators for this output are number of beneficiaries/citizens who received legal aid services, disaggregated by gender, age and social status and availability of justice sector assessment report and signed program document for justice sector support (yes/no) by OAG, National Human Rights Action Plan (NHRAP II) effectively implemented and monitored (extent to which NHRAP Coordination Offices have been effective in their coordination, monitoring of and reporting on implementation of the Action Plan (Inadequate, adequate and highly adequate) and Presence of a consolidated NHRAP II implementation report/published report and Percentage of the 2014 UPR recommendations (accepted by GoE) fully implemented by the Government of Ethiopia.
- 25. Strengthening regulatory and procedural systems:** The aim of this sub-output was to strengthen the regulatory and procedural systems for effective access to justice and redress mechanisms. For this sub-output, both baseline and target were not set for this sub-output. Under sub-output 5.1, a national legal aid and implementation strategy was planned. The baseline was none in 2017 and the target was to adopt, implement and assess impact in 2021. A plan to increase beneficiaries/citizens who received legal aid services. The baseline was 82,000 in 2017 and the target was to increase this by 100% from the baseline but there wasn't evidence to evaluate this. A justice sector assessment report and a signed program document was planned to be available. The baseline is none in 2017 and the target was to avail the sector assessment report and a signed program in 2021. Under this, the EHRC planned to conduct 4 investigations on selected human rights violations, establish 2 platforms to promote and enhance information provision and conduct 2 research assignments on systemic human rights issues. It accomplished 8 investigations on Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and the 2 platforms were not implemented. The plan was to accomplish 6 (4 investigations and 2 platforms) and the achievement was 8 investigations and 0 platforms; which is 133.3%. Though the signed program document was not in place, the investigation report was more than 100% achieved.

Table 7 – Achievements of Sub-Outputs 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3

Sub-Outputs of Output 5	Target activities planned	Target activities accomplished	Achievement Rating (%)
5.1. Strengthening regulatory and procedural systems	8	10	125%
5.2. Capacity building of public/law enforcement bodies	6	12	200%
5.3: Mechanisms for monitoring and reporting of human rights violations	47	68	144.7%
Average	61	90	147.5%

Note 1: **Red** (below 75%) **Yellow** (75 - 89%) **Green** = Above 90%

- 26. Capacity building of public and law enforcement bodies:** The objective of this sub-output was to strengthen the capacity of public and law enforcement bodies to abide by human rights laws and regulations in Ethiopia. Both baseline and target were not set for this sub-output. Under this sub-output, a structure for establishing and strengthening mechanisms was planned. Both baseline and target were not set for this sub-output. And NHRAP II recommendations were planned to be implemented and reported effectively. The baseline was not adequate in 2017 and the target was highly adequate in 2021 though the scale and for what it stands for was not clearly set. An effective and functional NHRAP coordination office was planned to be established and functionally effective. The baseline was not adequate in 2017 and the target was highly adequate in 2021 though the scale and for what it stands for was not clearly set. The NHRAP II implementation was planned to be measured and reported. The baseline was no report and measurement of the implementation in 2017 and the target was to measure and report mid and annual performance in 2021. Also, the GoE accepted 2014 Universal Periodic Review (UPR) recommendations were planned to be fully implemented and the baseline was none in 2017 and to enhance the target to 80% of mid and annual reporting in 2021. Since the evidence on this was not available from reports, further evaluation of effectiveness was not possible. An awareness raising sessions was planned to be conducted to advocate or enhance awareness and knowledge of law enforcement organs on human rights promotion. Both baseline and target were not set for this sub-output. The plan by EHRC was to organize 4 human rights education sessions and conducted (organized) organized 9 training to 449 sector officials. The performance was 225%. A familiarization forum was organized for stakeholders. Both baseline and target were not set for this sub-output. The OAG also planned 2 awareness raising trainings (1 training on human rights-based investigation, and another 1 on prevention of violence against women & children). The OAG conducted 3 trainings to 423 justice sector officials and experts; OAG developed 3 training manuals. The performance was 150%.
- 27. Mechanisms for monitoring and reporting of human rights violations:** The aim of this sub-output was to establish/strengthen mechanisms for monitoring, compiling, and reporting of human rights protection and violation in the country. Both baseline and target were not set. The establishment of mechanisms and strengthening for monitoring, compiling, and reporting of human rights protection and violations was planned. Both baseline and target were not set for this sub-output. The EHRC planned the assessment of the effectiveness of 1 mechanism/case-flow management and establishing 1 electronic case management mechanism/system; and 4 monitoring/assessments on human rights situation. The EHRC assessed gaps in existing case management and complaint handling mechanisms, human rights situation IDPs and validated together 8 studies. It also produced 3 monitoring reports on human rights issues of women, children & vulnerable groups, 3 on status of GBV/VAWCs and monitored 2 prisons and detention centres. Though there was not baseline and target, the performance against the plan was 266.7%. A consultation and launching session on National Human Rights Action Plan (NHRAP) was planned. Both baseline and target were not set for this sub-output. The OAG planned 2 consultations and launching sessions on NHRAP. It conducted three consultative sessions for 247 participants. OAG also conducted jointly with MoP on monitoring of human rights situation in 28 police and 11 prison centres. The performance was 150%; though a baseline and target were not set to evaluate the achievement.
- 28. Stakeholders' familiarization forums organized on the mechanisms for reporting of human rights protection and violations was planned.** Both baseline and target were not set for this sub-output. The OAG targeted 2 consultation sessions (CSOs engagement) and 11 training sessions (for awareness raising on the NHRAP); and 25 media programs on human rights issues. It also planned to produce 1 Communication Strategy. The 11 awareness raising training sessions on NHRAP was not conducted. However, the 25 media programs on human rights issues and 1 Communication Strategy were developed. Therefore, the performance was 70.1%. Since there was not baseline and target, the achievement cannot be evaluated. This output was identified for 2 IPs; namely, EHRC and the OAG. Under this output, three sub-outputs were identified. The first sub-output, strengthening regulatory and procedural systems for effective access to justice and redress mechanisms, the second sub-output, promoting the awareness of public and law enforcement bodies on human rights laws and regulations, and the third sub-output, establishing/strengthening mechanisms for monitoring, compiling, and reporting of human rights protection and violation. The three sub-outputs together comprise six indicators with their respective targets; and the results are presented. The GDPP achieved results on the target for sub-output 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 as follows. For sub-output 5.1, out of the 8 targets planned 10 activities were accomplished; which is above the planned target (125%). Under sub-output 5.2, 6 activities were planned but 12 activities were accomplished; which is above the planned target (200%). Under sub-output 5.3, 47 activities were planned but 68 activities were accomplished. The target achievement of this specific output is 144.7% which also above the target. In average, the achievement of output 5 is 147.5%; which is thus above the target.

ANNEX2.

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

KIIs and FGDs Participants

No.	Name	Gender	Organization and Position
1	Eyasu Yimer	Male	UNDP, Programme Officer-HoPR
2	Belay Legesse	Male	HoPR, Directorate Director: Research, Library & Documentation
3	Nechitef Filatie	Female	HoPR, Directorate Director: Women, Child, and Youth Affairs
4	Imad Abdulfetah	Male	EHRC, Regional Director, Human Rights Monitoring and Investigation
5	Rakeb Messele	Female	EHRC, Deputy Chief Commissioner
6	Dr. Emezat Hailu	Female	UNDP, GESI Consultant
7	Afewerk Fekadu	Male	UNDP, Programme Specialist
8	Senait Mulugeta	Female	UNDP, Programme Associate
9	Noah Takale	Male	OAG/MoJ, Director, Justice System Reform & Project Coordination Directorate
10	Mahlet Tiruneh	Female	NEBE, External Relation Expert
11	Bizuwork Ketete	Female	NEBE, Board Member
12	Meron Dessie	Female	NEBE, Grant Budget Inspection and Monitoring Manager
13	Melake Alula	Male	NEBE, Procurement Manager
14	Tamrat Dejene	Male	EBA, UNDP Focal Person and Director
15	Nebiyu Mehari	Male	UNDP, Portfolio Manager
16	Berhanu Alemu	Male	UNDP, M&E Specialist
17	Habtamu Shewalema	Male	MoF, Team Leader, UN Agencies, CRGE Facility & Reg. Econ Coop Directorate
18	Yesuf Bitew	Male	Amhara Region, Branch office: Head of the secretariat
19	Gashanew Dessie	Male	Amhara Region, EIO, Legal and mal-administration investigation director
20	Edmealem Awoke	Male	Amhara Region, EIO, Legal and mal-administration investigation director
21	Seblework Asmamaw	Female	Amhara Region, Regional Council, Regional C. O. Head
22	Gashaw Admasu	Male	Amhara Region, Regional Council, Program Office
23	Maru Chekole	Male	Amhara Region, REACC, Deputy Commissionaire
24	Dr. Samuel Urkato	Male	FEACC Commissioner
25	Mr. Retta Gerra	Male	UNDP, Programme Officer- FEACC
26	Mr. Mesfin Belayneh	Male	FEACC DARS directorate director
27	Mrs. Sara Habte	Female	FEACC Regional & Stakeholders D. director
28	Mrs. Kalkidan Admasu	Female	FEACC Plan, Project, Budget, M&E D. director
29	Mr. Aklilu Mulugeta	Male	FEACC Ethics capacity building coordinator
30	Mr. Haregot Abraha	Male	FEACC Ethics capacity building D. director
31	Mrs. Fasika Ayalew	Female	FEACC Finance and procurement D. director
32	Mr. Mustefa Nasir	Male	HoF Sec., ex-governance and peace D. director
33	Mr. Bizuneh Assefa	Male	UNDP, Programme Officer - HoF
34	Mr. Anteneh Tamirat	Male	HoF Finance directorate director
35	Mr. Nur Abdi	Male	HoF SP & change management directorate director
36	Dr. Waktole Dadi	Male	HoF Research Center Director
37	Dr. Endale N. G.	Male	EIO, Chief Ombudsman
38	Mr. Tadesse Gezu	Mal	UNDP, Programme Officer - EIO
39	Mr. Abera Hirqata	Male	EIO GG and change management D. director
40	Mr. Manaye T.	Male	EIO Freedom for Information D director

No.	Name	Gender	Organization and Position
41	Mr. Fite Terefe	Male	EIO ICT directorate director
42	Mr. Zewdu Wondim	Male	EIO Communications directorate director
43	Mr. Mengisty Kegne	Male	EIO IP GDPP assigned programme officer
44	Mr. Dessalegn W.	Male	CCI Office Head and CCI Council Secretariat
45	Mr. Dawit Ayalew	Male	CCI GDPP focal person, and planning directorate director
46	Mr. Kebede Tadesse	Male	CCI Special assistant to the CCI office head
47	Mr. Getachew Gudina	Male	CCI Research directorate director
48	Mrs. Rahel Berhanu	Female	Case Flow Management directorate director
49	Mr. Tekola W/Y	Male	Finance, procurement and property D. director
50	Mr. Jenberu Nigatu	Male	CCI ethical officer
51	Mrs. Aster Tesema	Female	CCI WYCA Team Leader
52	Mrs. Tifchew Bete	Female	CCI Senior Accountant
53	Mr. Aweke Tenaw	Male	OFAG office head and assistant to acting OG
54	Mr. Dejene Mokoro	Male	OFAG IP assigned GDPP Focal Person
55	Mr. Egram Mengesha	Male	OFAG ISS D. director
56	Mr. Berhanu Asaye	Male	OFAG FPPA Directorate Director
57	Mrs. Meseret Tsegaye	Female	OFAG Senior Finance Officer
58	Mrs. Asma Redi	Female	GDPP IP assigned Focal Person; and PB directorate director general
59	Mr. Taye Dandaea	Male	State Minister, PB and National Consensus
60	Mr. Lema Gezume, HE	Male	SNNPR, CoNN, Speaker
61	Mr. Zeleke Belayneh	Male	SNNPR, Former CoNN PB&CR Director
62	Mr. Alemu Marlos	Male	SNNPR, CoNN PB&CR Director
63	Mr. Firew Bekele	Male	SNNPR NEBE Branch Head
64	Mr. Solomon Tsegaye	Male	SNNPR NEBE Branch Proc. & Property Head
65	Mr. Getahun Lakew	Male	SNNPR NEBE Branch Finance Head
66	Mr. Samuel Kukisa	Male	SNNPR EIO Branch Finance Head
67	Mr. Habtamu Korma	Male	SNNP RC PB & CR Directorate Director
68	Mr. Sofonias Desta	Male	SNNPR Deputy Attorney General
69	Mr. Abaineh Achula	Male	SNNPR Deputy Auditor General
70	Mr. Fasika Getachew	Male	SNNP REACC, Commissioner
71	Mr. Asegid Hamza	Male	HU, Journalist and Information Rights Advocate
72	Afewerk Fekadu	Male	UNDP, Governance Programme Specialist
73	Christophoros Politis	Male	UNDP, Former CTA GDPP
74	Cleophas Torori	Male	UNDP, DRR Programmes
75	Shimels Assefa	Male	UNDP, Governance and Peacebuilding Unit Team Leader
76	Desset Abebe Tefari	Female	UN Women Programme Office,
77	Tsega Gebremeskel	Female	Programme Analyst, Leadership and Governance, UN Women
78	Donna Bugby-Smith	Female	UNDP Senior Governance Advisor
79	Isheba Tafari	Female	Programme Manager, Gender and Governance, Austrian Embassy
80	Doris Gebru-Zeilermayr	Female	Head of Office, Austrian Embassy
81	Karin Borovic	Female	Sweden, Embassy
82	Nebyu Mehary	Male	Portfolio Manager, CO, GDPP Implementation and Monitoring, Gender Focal Point (former CO Policy Specialist)
83	Per Mogstad	Male	Head of Cooperation, Norwegian Embassy
84	Lamrot Gebrechristose	Female	Political Officer, Norwegian Embassy
85	Teweldebirhan Girma	Male	M&E Specialist UNDP
86	Trine Louise Hansen	Female	Team Leader, Danish Embassy

ANNEX3.

EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Indicators/ Judgment Criteria	Data Sources	Method of data collection	Data analysis method
Relevance: The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to GoE/UNDP policies and priorities				
1. To what extent the objectives and operations of the GDPP programme were consistent with the need of beneficiaries of the partner democratic institutions, the need of implementing partners, current country needs, and donors' policies and expectations?	Relevant involvement of stakeholders in planning, designing and consulting at national and district levels to improve capacities to plan, implement and monitor the GDPP.	Prodoc Annual reports MTR	Desk review; key informant interviews (KII)	Multi-source evidence assessment (MEA); ToC analysis
2. To what extent were the interventions aligned with the needs of other key stakeholders, particularly government and other actors in the sectors relevant to governance, democratic participation, and transparency?	Relevant support at national and provincial levels to improve capacities to plan, monitor and implement the GDPP.	UNDP staff, donors, IP agencies	Desk review; KII	MEA
3. Were the approaches and strategies/ arrangements used relevant to achieve intended sub-outputs, outputs, and outcomes of the programme/intervention? To what extent the thematic focus and institutional scope of the Programme were appropriate to achieve intended results?	Key indicators for all outputs; key drivers of change; assessment of the planning/ designing initiatives.	UNDP staff, Prodoc review; annual reports, MTR	Desk review; KII	MEA
4. To what extent did the interventions respond to the needs of vulnerable groups and women?	Prodoc demonstrates gendered analysis of vulnerability; progress reports disaggregate gender; Rigorous use of Gender marker.	Prodoc review, Progress reports, IPs, Project staff,	Desk review, KII	Qualitative analysis
5. To what extent the Programme was aligned to the SDGs, GTP II, Home-grown Economic Reform Programme, Ten Years Development Perspective Plan, UNDAF (now superseded by the UNSDCF but the Evaluation will focus on the UNDAF), the New Horizon of Hope in Africa, and other relevant national policies?	Clear diagnostic of institutional capacity weaknesses. Activities follow a clear pathway to capacity development; evidence of outcome monitoring	UNDP staff, development partners, IPs.	KII, desk review	MEA
6. To what extent were the Programme's interventions coherent with UNDP's policies, strategies, and normative guidance?	Overlaps with Qs. 1 & 5	UNDP staff; progress reports.	KII, desk review	MEA

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Indicators/ Judgment Criteria	Data Sources	Method of data collection	Data analysis method
7. To what extent were the key stakeholders of the Programme, including downstream stakeholders, engaged in the design, implementation and monitoring of the Programme? To what extent is the national ownership and leadership on the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the Programme?	Overlaps with Q. 1	Prodoc Annual reports MTR, IPs	KII, desk review	MEA
8. Did the assumptions and the Theory of Change hold true? If not, why and recommend ToC and results pathways of the 2 nd programme cycle of the GDPP?	Key indicators for all outputs. Key elements of ToC are coherent; evidence of ToC parameters reflected in monitoring and reporting.	UNDP staff, development partners, IPs.	KII, desk review, MTR, Annual reports.	MEA, ToC analysis.
Effectiveness: The extent to which the interventions achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and its results.				
9. To what extent did this programme achieve its planned sub-outputs, outputs, immediate outcomes, and objectives?	Overlaps with Qs 1, 2, 3	UNDP staff, development partners, IPs.	KII, desk review	MEA
10. What were the main expected and unexpected results of the programme?	Key indicators for all outputs; key drivers of change/outcomes	UNDP staff, IPs & progress reports; MTR reports.	KII, Focus Group Discussions (FGD), site visits, desk review.	Contribution analysis ; Qualitative analysis
11. To what extent did the strategic revision for repositioning of the programme led to achievement (or lack of achievement) of the sub-outputs, outputs, and objectives of the programme?	Overlaps with Qs. 3, 6.	UNDP staff, IPs & progress reports; MTR.	KII, Focus Group Discussions (FGD), site visits, desk review.	MEA
12. What were the major factors influenced implementation and operations of the programme for achievement or non-achievement of results? What was the quality of implementation of the programme?	Overlaps with Q. 11 Clear diagnostic of institutional capacity weaknesses. Activities follow a clear pathway to capacity development; evidence of outcome monitoring.	UNDP staff; Frontline staff of IPs; MTR/progress reports	KII; FGDs; site visits; Desk review	MEA
13. What were the unintended results of the changes in political landscape and the reforms underway in the country to the programme implementation and achievement of results?	Positive: stability; strong engaged IPs; Negative: Insecurity, infrequent or weak monitoring.	IP staff, UNDP staff, other development partners, progress reports; ToC	KII, desk review	Contribution and ToC analysis
14. What are lessons learned and good practices to take up for future in designing and implementing a new second phase of the programme?	Key indicators for all outputs; clear diagnostic of institutional capacity; adaptability of UNDP to continue programme; active support for IPs	Prodoc, Progress reports, MTR, IPs, Project staff.	Desk review, KII	Qualitative analysis.

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Indicators/ Judgment Criteria	Data Sources	Method of data collection	Data analysis method
Efficiency: The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.				
15. Did the Project's implementation mechanisms -including institutional arrangements, partnership, support services, etc., permit utilization of resources in efficient way, and also delivery of services and achievement of results in timely manner?	All activities demonstrate Cost, Quality, Timeliness (CQT) factors taken into consideration throughout the implementation cycle.	Finance and operations data on funds disbursement, major cost drivers, contract management and major decision timelines; MTR; progress reports; UNDP staff; IP staff	Desk review, KII	Progress & monitoring reports assessed against ToC and CPD outputs/ outcomes
16. Were the programme resources efficiently used? Was the cost per output/sub-output used in the most cost-effective way or were there areas where savings ought to be made to reduce costs?	Linked to question 15.	Donors' reviews, UNDP staff, MTR	Desk review, KII	MEA
17. To what extent were project management practices and tools adequate to timely and effectively implement the programme?	UNDP's distinctive competence and strategic positioning within the development landscape in the country. Strong knowledge-sharing partnerships developed with donors, IPs, CSOs	MTR; UNDP staff; IP staff	Desk review, KII	MEA
18. Are project resources adequate and available on time to implement the activities as planned?	All activities demonstrate Cost, Quality, Timeliness (CQT) factors taken into consideration throughout the implementation cycle.	Finance and operations data on funds disbursement, major cost drivers, contract management and major decision timelines.	Desk review, KII	MEA
Impact: The long-term effects/outcomes of the programme.				
19. What were the long-term effects/ outcomes of the programme on the target beneficiaries/institutions and citizens? To what extent were the programme objectives met? What are indications of success?	Key indicators for all outputs; key drivers of change/ outcomes; assessment of the planning and designing of initiatives	MTR; UNDP staff; IP staff	Desk review, KII	MEA
20. Did the interventions of the programme bring about any unintended (both negative or positive) effects on the target beneficiaries/institutions, citizens and/or operational environment?	Overlaps with Qs 10, 12	MTR; progress reports; UNDP staff; IP staff	KII; FGDs; site visits; Desk review	MEA
21. What were the gender-specific impacts, especially regarding women's empowerment?	Overlaps with Q. 4 Prodoc demonstrates gendered analysis of vulnerability; progress reports disaggregate gender; Rigorous use of Gender marker	Prodoc review, Progress reports, IPs, Project staff	KII; FGDs; site visits; Desk review	MEA

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Indicators/ Judgment Criteria	Data Sources	Method of data collection	Data analysis method
22. How could the programme be improved in its design, implementation and monitoring to have long-term effect/impact?	Key indicators for all outputs; clear diagnostic of institutional capacity; adaptability of UNDP to continue programming; active support for IPs	MTR; progress reports; UNDP staff; IP staff	KII; FGDs; site visits; Desk review	MEA
Sustainability: The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue, beyond the life of a project/programme.				
23. To what extent are the results and positive changes from the programme implementation up to this point in time likely to continue after end of the current phase of the programme?	Alternative resources (funds, policies, regulatory framework, budgetary support, partnerships) for continuation of relevant outputs and outcomes identified and agreed.	IPs, UNDP staff; multi-year resourcing plans of IPs.	KII, desk review	Analysis and assessment of drivers of sustainability.
24. To what extent did the shift in the governance landscape and political arena of the country would affect continuity and sustainability of results achieved?	Resilience and capacity at national and local level; local institutions at the frontline of delivery of services have planning capacity to continue services.	National and local authorities who are currently involved in implementing UNDP-supported activities.	KII, FGD	Qualitative analysis
25. To what extent were the implementing partners showed ownership of the programme, results, and lessons learned and their ability to continue with the programme with limited or without intervention from UNDP?	Adaptability of IPs to continue programming, e.g. in the COVID scenario and/or in the event of major security challenges. Proactive support for relevant institutions to ensure that vital activities are delivered.	UNDP staff, IPs; COVID and/or security mitigation strategies/briefings.	KII	Descriptive data analysis.
26. To what extent the programme established and maintained effective partnership with development partners, government, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), etc.?	Strong knowledge-sharing partnerships developed with donors, IPs, UN agencies, private sector and civil society.	MTR, donor reporting; UNDP staff	Desk review KII	MEA
27. To what extent were the participation and ownership of the programme by the IPs and other key stakeholders for ensuring sustainability of achieved results & lessons learned after end of the current programme?	Prodoc and progress reports demonstrate planned phase out of UNDP's role and support for relevant techniques and strategies to ensure that vital activities can continue under local ownership.	Prodoc; progress reports, UNDP staff, IPs	KII; Desk review	MEA

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Indicators/ Judgment Criteria	Data Sources	Method of data collection	Data analysis method
Gender: The extent to which the GDPP addressed gender issues.				
28. To what extent have gender considerations mainstreamed and had been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project?	Prodoc demonstrates gendered analysis of poverty and vulnerability; progress reports disaggregate gender; Rigorous use of Gender marker.	Prodoc, Progress reports, Beneficiary data; MTR; IPs, Project staff.	Desk review, KII	Quantitative & qualitative analysis
29. Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?	Linked to Q. 28. All activities which have any direct interface with communities must demonstrate that gender is directly addressed.	Gender assessment reports; Beneficiary selection criteria; Cross-section of beneficiaries/target communities.	Desk research, KII, FGD.	Qualitative analysis.
30. To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in women participation in the forest conservation and development activities? To what extent women benefitted from this project?	Linked to Qs. 28, 29. All activities which have any direct interface with conservation and development activities must demonstrate that gender is directly addressed.	Gender assessment reports; Beneficiary selection criteria; Cross-section of beneficiaries/target communities.	Prodoc, Progress reports, Beneficiary data MTR, IPs, Project staff,	Qualitative analysis
Human Rights: The extent to which the GDPP addressed human rights issues.				
31. To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged & marginalized groups benefited from the work of this programme?	All activities/projects which have any direct interface with communities must demonstrate directly addressing the needs of the most vulnerable.	Prodoc, Progress reports, Beneficiary data; MTR; IPs, Project staff.	Desk review, KII	Quantitative & qualitative analysis.

ANNEX4.**TERMS OF REFERENCE TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION PROGRAMME (GDPP) – JUNE 2017 – DECEMBER 2021. ABRIDGED VERSION⁵⁵**

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT The Government of Ethiopia has over the last two decades shown great commitment to implement policies and programmes aimed at stimulating rapid development transformation largely by prioritizing investments to build and operate social and economic infrastructure, improving capacities within government to broaden access to basic social services such as education, health and water and sanitation, and prioritizing public investments in pro-poor economic sectors such as agriculture and food security. On top of the economic and social transformation, stride has been made in the governance side like ratifying largely progressive constitution, efforts to address inequalities, policies that promote gender equality, establishment of democratic institutions, etc. The policy orientation and commitment has resulted in significant improvements in Ethiopia's human development indicators. In view of the country's context and bold development transformation vision, it has been found important to make deliberate efforts to further broaden space for citizen engagement and participation in the development process to create a sense of shared prosperity, strengthen social cohesion and sustain peace and stability. Despite these positive developments, the country still faced several setbacks. Prior to 2018 the country had been characterized with instability and growing dissatisfaction of large groups of the population, primarily the youth segment with the Government. Widespread and protracted public protests and growing street and youth dissatisfaction forced the way for a series of reforms to be launched under PM Haliemariam Desalegn. Growing dissatisfaction and popular demands for change and reform ultimately resulted in a change in government in February 2018. Therefore 2018 marked a pivotal year in the history of Ethiopia with a wide-ranging introduction of transformational reforms in the political, democracy and socio-economic landscape all launched. With the election of Dr. Abiy Ahmed as the new PM by the ruling Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) coalition, a raft of Proclamations followed including promising announcements to open up the political space, free political dissidents and engage in comprehensive institutional reforms of the public sector, including announcements to privatize public enterprises. In his inaugural speech, the new PM highlighted the need for what he termed as 'an inclusive political process' with the opposition playing a more active role. The PM urged all Ethiopians to put their differences aside as they worked together to forge a solid democratization process. He identified civil rights and freedom of movement and organization, the right to political participation and DocuSign Envelope ID: 12F5BEB0-77B5-4C29-83BF-6134BFD97183 2 representation and the right to freedom of expression as key in this process. He also reaffirmed his government's commitment to ensure the full participation of women in public life and his personal commitment to advancing the equality agenda forward. However, what has emerged recently is that the country has entered into a serious problem of political instability and armed conflicts in various regions of the country. Most notably the conflicts in the Tigray, Amhara and Afar region following the Law Enforcement Operation of the Government in Tigray region in November 2020 has resulted in the displacement of millions of people, and has also created a humanitarian, social and economic crisis. However, despite these conflicts and unrest in various parts of the country, the nation conducted fair and peaceful national election with the highest turnout of voters during 2021. The GoE-UNDP Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP), a five-year multistakeholder's programme (June 2017 to December 2021), has as a main objective of supporting the country sustain efforts towards enhancing institutional capacities and frameworks for strengthening good governance and deepening democratic participation in accordance with the Constitution and International Human Rights Conventions to which Ethiopia is a signatory. Progress in these areas is critical and believed to enable the country to deliver on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II). The programme on governance and democratic participation was designed based on progress made and lessons learned from the former Democratic Participation Programme (DIP) and other interventions to support initiatives aimed at addressing governance bottlenecks, issues of inclusivity, transparency and accountability, and to nurture the development of a more responsive system of governance and peaceful coexistence. The launch in 2017 was against a very different back drop where there were significant risks attached to a governance programme being launched at a time where the enabling environment was fairly restricted. But the changes ushered in 2018 demonstrate that provision of democratic governance support needs to be adaptive to changes in the political landscape in order

⁵⁵ Full version of the ToRs are available upon request.

to capitalize on emerging opportunities. GDPP was designed to deliver on the following five inter-related and complementary outputs: 1) Political processes of federal and regional state legislative bodies are more inclusive and effectively delivering on their constitutional mandates; 2) Federal and regional state systems of governance are more accountable, transparent and are delivering public services in more inclusive and responsive ways; 3) Citizens are more empowered to voice their concern and actively participate in decision-making processes at all levels of the development, governance and political processes and systems; 4) Systems and mechanisms for promoting social cohesion, managing diversity, preventing and managing conflicts, fostering dialogues and building peace are further strengthened at national and sub-national levels; and 5) Access to justice enhanced and human rights promoted and protected across Ethiopia. The implementation of the GDPP commenced in July 2017 based on the initial visioning and workplan of the programme. The programme was implemented through the National Execution (NEX) modality DocuSign Envelope ID: 12F5BEB0-77B5-4C29-83BF-6134BFD97183 3 supporting x11 Implementing Partners towards enhancing the democratization process and good governance in the country. The Mid Term Review in 2020 which formed part of the monitoring of the implementation of the programme revealed that the programme is relevant with the value addition to enhance democratic transformation and political participation. GDPP has reconfirmed as a strong enabling platform for the supporting the realization of the transformational democratization agenda through the various achievements recorded by the participating Democratic Institutions. Moreover, the new governance arrangements and policy priorities have been reinforced and include emphasizing Human Rights, Rule of Law, accountability, peace and stability. GDPP has also enabled the democratic and accountability institutions to strengthen their mandate through direct and clear investments associated with institutional and human capacity development. Building on these positive developments, the dramatic shifts witnessed in the political and governance space and the resulting policy priorities expressed by the political leadership have prompted the Government of Ethiopia and UNDP to 'refocus' the GDPP and 'reposition' it to more effectively address transformational and transitional needs. UNDP in close coordination with the GoE engaged in a 'repositioning' exercise of the programme following the changes in the political landscape and the shift of policy priorities of the Government. The Repositioning Paper, which was launched in December 2018 allowed all Institutions contributing to the programme and UNDP to reconfirm relevance of the programme to the current policy priorities and to ensure identified activities are addressing transformational issues. The results framework of the programme had undergone a review and expansion with new sub-outputs included. The repositioning of the programme in 2018/2019 saw GDPP take actions to target the support towards helping to create an enabling environment for citizens and media engagement in the political and governance reforms. The results yielded with the support of the programme included the development of the civic engagement policy framework, the new media law and also approval of the Inter-Governmental Relations Policy. An independent mid-term review of the programme was undertaken in 2020 to assess if GDPP remained relevant and responsive to the needs of the country as well as to draw lessons that might be needed to inform any necessary adjustments to the Programme in the remaining cycle of the programme. The MTR which was finalized in August 2020 with the validation and dissemination of the findings and recommendations that were presented to the GDPP Programme Management Board (PMB) judged that the programme was broadly on track. Moreover, the Mid-Term Review (MTR) provided valuable evidence and suggestions about how to enhance the impact of the programme which indicated the value of allowing more time for the programmatic interventions to mature and thus be capable of providing solid evidence that GDPP support was yielding positive results. The implication was that to end GDPP as scheduled in December 2021 would be a lost opportunity in the context of institutional development. DocuSign Envelope ID: 12F5BEB0-77B5-4C29-83BF-6134BFD97183 4 Among the ten recommendations of the MTR, the one which boldly came out was the need for 'revisiting the thematic focus and institutional scope of the GDPP'. The recommendations of the MTR together with the Management Responses (MRs) were presented and discussed at the GDPP Programme Management Board (PMB) held in November 2020. The PMB instructed UNDP to prepare an Options Paper that would look the issues associated with the proposed narrowing down of the thematic focus and institutional scope of GDPP as the means to better maximize results. That Options Paper was presented and discussed in the June 2021 PMB meeting. The Board made the decision that the institutional scope and thematic focus of GDPP should be narrowed and that would result in the number of Implementing Partners being reduced from 11 to 6. Similarly, the thematic focus of the programme was agreed to be narrowed by focusing on social cohesion & reconciliation; stronger institutions of representation (legislatures); more effective, efficient, transparent & inclusive public administration; ethics & integrity; and civic & media space. The proposed thematic focus would be further discussed and analyzed during a design phase of a new GDPP II. A six-month cost extension bridging period (January – June 2022) was also approved by PMB during which time working closely with the 6 remaining Implementing Partners HoPR, HoF, EHRC, FEACC, EMA and EIO work should be undertaken to devise a new iteration of democratic governance support which would go-live in July 2022. Therefore, this independent terminal evaluation of the programme will also help to inform the likely design and content of the new iteration of democratic governance support capitalizing on the achievements, lessons and best practices of GDPP.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE This terminal evaluation will be a formative evaluation exercise, with a dual purpose of learning and accountability. This terminal evaluation will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The terminal evaluation promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments. The evaluation is expected to provide concrete evidence on the relevance, effectiveness, adaptability, results/impact, efficiency and sustainability of processes & operationalization of the programme. This evaluation will also assess and analyze the appropriateness, weaknesses and strength of the programme's design, scope, and implementation strategies/arrangements for achieving programme results and also the sustainability of program outcomes. Evidence and lessons from the terminal evaluation will feed into the design of the new iteration of democratic governance support. The findings, judgements and recommendations from this terminal evaluation must be based on concrete, verifiable & credible evidence that will support UNDP for shaping its strategic thinking in a design of a new programme of governance support. The evidence should enable to identify the key priorities of the Programme in supporting Ethiopia in the area of inclusive governance.

3. EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES This terminal evaluation will cover the whole implementation period of the programme (from July 2017 to December 2021). The evaluation will cover all the eleven Implementing Partners with field visits to the selected IPs (at least 50%) by prioritizing IPs that have regional branches or regional DocuSign Envelope ID: 12F5BEB0-77B5-4C29-83BF-6134BFD97183 5 counterparts. For selecting the sample IPs that will be visited during field data collection, the complexity of operations, level of achievements of targets, criticality of the role/mandate of the IP towards the reform process and volume of interventions are considered as criteria for stratification. Assessment on all the five outputs, and corresponding sub-outputs as well as indications/contributions towards achievement of intended outcomes of the programme will be in the scope of the terminal evaluation. The evaluation will emphasize the operational/implementation mechanisms and arrangements practiced at the programme level and in the respective Implementing Partners (IPs) and their relevance, effectiveness & efficiency, perceptions towards the programme/how UNDP operates, the ownership/commitment level by the IPs, etc. The analyses in the evaluation need to be gender focused/sensitive with sex disaggregation of results to clearly reflect on different factors affecting or affected by gender dynamics. In addition, the evidence of efforts to enhance social inclusion by for example engagement with citizens or Civil Society will need to be brought out clearly in the evaluation. This terminal evaluation will have the specific objectives of:

- Review validity of programme assumptions and the theory of change of the programme to map the results pathways and also assess cause - effect relationships for highlighting, based on lessons learned, how should the theory of change and results' pathways of a second programme cycle of GDPP be defined.
- Assess the design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the programme interventions.
- Identify implementation issues and challenges/bottlenecks which constrain programme and financial delivery.
- Provide evidence whether the programme has been able to accomplish the intended results/outputs and identify attributed factors.
- Identify lessons learned, best practices & recommendations, and document knowledge basis from the programme design & implementation, based on evidence and reliable information, so as to improve a design, scope, and implementation strategies/arrangements of a new iteration of democratic governance support which will be formulated in early 2022.
- Identify strengths and weaknesses of the programme in the application of rights-based approaches, gender mainstreaming and social inclusion plus clearly identify recommendations to be applied in any future iteration of democratic governance support.
- Review risk assessment & mitigation measures taken for ensuring progress on implementing the programme's interventions. Also comment on their effectiveness and identify lessons learned about the adaptability/flexibility exhibited by the Programme.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS The evaluation is expected to apply the internationally accepted evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. It will also assess adaptability, responsiveness, coherence and women equality and gender mainstreaming. Aligning to the evaluation criteria, the evaluation may need to include and address the following key evaluation questions, among others:

Relevance:

- To what extent the objectives and operations of the GDPP programme were consistent with the need of beneficiaries of the partner democratic intuitions, need of implementing partners, current country need, and donors' policies and expectations? □ To what extent were the interventions aligned with the needs of other key stakeholders particularly government and other actors in the sectors relevant to governance, democratic participation, and transparency?
- Were the approaches and strategies/arrangements used relevant to achieve intended sub-outputs, outputs and outcomes of the programme/intervention? To what extent the thematic focus and institutional scope of the programme were appropriate to achieve intended results?
- To what extent did the interventions respond to the needs of vulnerable groups and women?
- To what extent the programme was aligned to the SDGs, GTP II, Home-grown Economic Reform Programme, Ten Years Development Perspective Plan, UNDAF (now superseded by the UNSDCF but the evaluation will focus on the UNDAF), the New Horizon of Hope in Africa, and other relevant national policies?

- To what extent were programme's interventions coherent with UNDP's policies, strategies and normative guidance?
- To what extent were the key stakeholders of the programme including downstream stakeholders engaged in the design, implementation and monitoring of the programme? To what extent is the national ownership and leadership on the planning, implementation and monitoring of the programme?
- Did the assumptions and the Theory of Change hold true? If not, why?

Effectiveness:

- To what extent did this programme achieve its planned sub-outputs, outputs, immediate outcomes, and objectives?
- What were the main expected and unexpected results of the programme?
- To what extent did the strategic revision for repositioning of the programme led to achievement (or lack of achievement) of the sub-outputs, outputs, and objectives of the programme?
- What were the major factors influenced implementation and operations of the programme for achievement or non-achievement of results? What was the quality of implementation of the programme?
- What were the unintended results of the changes in political landscape and the reforms underway in the country to the programme implementation and achievement of results?
- What are lessons learned and good practices to take up for future in designing and implementing a new second phase of the programme?

Efficiency:

- Did the Project's implementation mechanisms -including institutional arrangements, partnership, support services, etc., permit utilization of resources in efficient way, and also delivery of services and achievement of results in timely manner?
- Were the programme resources efficiently used? Was the cost per output/sub-output used in the most cost-effective way or were there areas where savings ought to be made to reduce costs?
- To what extent were project management practices and tools adequate to timely and effectively implement the programme?
- Are project resources adequate and available on time to implement the activities as planned?

Impact:

- What were the long-term effects/outcomes of the programme on the target beneficiaries/institutions and citizens? To what extent were the programme objectives met? What are indications of success?
- Did the interventions of the programme bring about any unintended (both negative or positive) effects on the target beneficiaries/institutions, citizens and/or operational environment?
- What were the gender-specific impacts, especially regarding women's empowerment?
- How could the programme be improved in its design, implementation and monitoring to have long-term effect/impact?

Sustainability:

- To what extent are the results and positive changes from the programme implementation up to this point in time likely to continue after end of the current phase of the programme?
- To what extent did the shift in the governance landscape and political arena of the country would affect continuity and sustainability of results achieved?
- To what extent were the implementing partners showed ownership of the programme, results, and lessons learned and their ability to continue with the programme with limited or without intervention from UNDP?
- To what extent the programme established and maintained effective partnership with development partners, government, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), etc.?
- To what extent were the participation and ownership of the programme by the IPs and other key stakeholders for ensuring sustainability of achieved results & lessons learned after end of the current programme?

Gender:

- To what extent have gender considerations mainstreamed and had been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in women participation in the forest conservation and development activities? To what extent women benefitted from this project?

Human rights:

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged & marginalized groups benefited from the work of this programme?

The above listed evaluation questions are not to be considered as exhaustive to address the evaluation purpose and objectives in comprehensive manner. So, the evaluation questions will be further discussed and elaborated in collaboration with the evaluation team, stakeholders (implementing partners) and UNDP during the inception phase to refine and accept.

5. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY The methodology for this terminal evaluation will be designed by the selected evaluation team/consultant in consultation with UNDP during the inception phase. However, the Terminal Evaluation team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts/Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), and other stakeholders. The methodology to be designed by the Evaluation Team will include but not limited to the following:

- Participatory mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) of data gathering and analysis.

The Evaluation Team may also need to triangulate information from different sources and methods so as to ensure reliability and validity of data and findings.

In the inception phase, the selected Evaluation Team will develop an elaborated evaluation matrix that clearly links the evaluation questions with data sources and collection methods. The proposed methods for data collection and analysis should be discussed and agreed by UNDP and other stakeholders before their application throughout the evaluation processes. The mixed methods that will be applying for the evaluation should ensure that women and men from different stakeholders' groups participate and that their different voices are heard and used. Furthermore, the proposed methods should also clearly outline how Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) principles have been integrated and addressed in the design, planning and implementation, as well as what results have been achieved so far. The identified evaluation team also needs to expand clearly and in detail the criteria and approach to be used to select representative sample Implementing Partners and stakeholders that will be consulted for data collection at regional and branch offices levels. Generally, the quantitative and qualitative data to be used for this terminal evaluation will be collected from both secondary and primary sources. The desk level review of available relevant documents at different levels will be main source of secondary data and information for the evaluation.

The Evaluation Team during the desk level review should be able to develop Indicators' Summary Matrix as key deliverable of the desk review. The primary data from representative sample institutions and individuals will be collected through qualitative and quantitative interviews. The data generating through qualitative and quantitative interviews with the help of customized qualitative interview tools and structured quantitative survey questionnaires will be the sources of primary data. The focus group discussions and key informant interviews/individual in-depth interviews that will be conducted with knowledgeable informants from the Implementing Institutions (including regional counterparts or branch offices), UNDP, Development Partners (DPs), and other stakeholders are the prime qualitative methods to be employed for primary qualitative data collection.

The structured quantitative survey that will be carried out with randomly sampled individuals from the Implementing Institutions and/or beneficiaries is the quantitative tool to be used for primary quantitative data gathering. The feasibility of conducting mini-structured quantitative survey will be discussed and agreed during the Inception Phase. It is critical to include respondent end-users in order to ensure effective triangulation of data and receive feedback from citizens/users of the services on their quality, adaptability, responsiveness and on how they are advancing a normative agenda in the country. The evaluation team's own observation with the help of observation checklists will also complement the data that will be collected through focus group discussions and key informant interviews/individual in-depth interviews, and also be used for data triangulation. In fact, the evaluation team is expected to propose, during the inception phase, how many qualitative interviews of each type will be conducted by considering the reliability and validity of findings, and also cost and time requirements.

The evaluators should also follow participatory and consultative approaches throughout the evaluation processes so as to ensure active engagement of the Evaluation Manager/Focal Person, Programme Manager, Democratic Governance & Peacebuilding (DGP) Unit, Implementing Partners, Development Partners, Programme's beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders. The Terminal Evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the UNDP evaluation guidelines, norms and policies/procedures. The evaluation team will be responsible for revising the approach as necessary and present its methodological proposal as part of the inception report. Hybrid approaches which combines both physical and virtual meetings for consultations and interviews could be considered in the era of the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the COVID-19 situation the international consultant is expected to work from home/virtually through phone or virtual

communication platforms and sending out questionnaires, whereas the local consultants will engage in field work and field level data collection in regional and branch offices. The International consultant will serve as Team leader for the Terminal Evaluation.

6. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES) The evaluation team will be accountable for producing and delivering the following products/deliverables. The key deliverables for this terminal evaluation are as described below; with the milestones to be specified in the section for timeframe for the evaluation.

- **Evaluation Inception Report**—Evaluators are responsible for preparing an Inception Report (10 – 15 pages - not counting annexes) with guidance from the Evaluation Focal Person, Programme Manager, and Partnership Development and Results Management (PDRM) Unit. An inception report will be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. An inception report should detail how the team intends to conduct the evaluation with an emphasis on methodological and planning aspects. The clear and detail evaluation matrix which details the evaluation questions is one of the deliverables as part of the inception report. An inception report should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designated team members with the lead responsibility for each task or product. An inception phase, which concludes with an inception report, is believed to give an opportunity to DGP Unit/UNDP and the Evaluators for verification and shared understanding of the evaluation and also clarifying any misunderstanding about the evaluation approach, methodology and processes. An inception report/package is the product to be delivered by the evaluators. The Inception Report will be presented to the UNDP and Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) for review and endorsement. □ Debriefing on preliminary findings or Aide-memoire – once the inception phase is completed with endorsement of the Inception Report/Package, the evaluators will embark on data collection and analysis exercise - this covers data collection and analysis activities, including field work. The evaluation team will conclude the data collection and preliminary analysis phase with a presentation of the early findings of the evaluation to DGPU, PDRM Unit, ERG and other stakeholders during the data collection exit debriefing session. The debriefing session will be conducted immediately upon completion of the data collection; and the preliminary report/raw data is the product that the Evaluation Team should deliver to UNDP.
- **Draft evaluation report**— the evaluation team will analyse the data collected during the desk review and field work, and also conduct additional consultations with stakeholders for filling data gaps and triangulation to eventually draft an evaluation report. The draft evaluation report will present the findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations of the evidence-based evaluation. Findings should be evidence-based and relevant to answer the evaluation questions and meet the evaluation objectives. Data will need to be disaggregated by sex & other relevant characteristics; and also, the evaluation findings and conclusions will require to highlight differences in results by Implementing Partners. There should be a logical flow from findings to conclusions and from conclusions to recommendations & lessons learned. Recommendations will be limited in number, actionable and targeted to the relevant users. The proposed specific recommendations will form the basis of the management responses to the evaluation. The management responses will clearly indicate the responses of the management on the recommendations and also what actions to be taken in defined timer period. The recommendations which will come out from the evaluation should enable UNDP to differently design, implement and monitor a second phase of the current programme.

The draft evaluation report will be reviewed by DGPU/UNDP, Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), Independent Evaluation Quality Assurance Team, and other stakeholders (as deem necessary) to provide comments to address factual errors as well as improve the quality of the evaluation so as to ensure independency, credibility and usability. The evaluation team will incorporate inputs, obtaining from independent review of the draft report as well as a validation session, into a final evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. The draft evaluation report is the product that the evaluation team submits to DGP Unit/UNDP just following the data analysis and interpretation of analytical results.

- **Validation Workshop** – a validation workshop with UNDP, Implementing Partners, Development Partners and other pertinent stakeholders will be conducted for discussing and verifying the findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. In the session, inputs will be solicited to fill data gaps, capture perspectives, as well as refine findings and recommendations. The Evaluation Team Leader will be responsible to lead the session, while UNDP be responsible for all logistical arrangements. The proceedings of the validation workshop will be the product to be delivered.
- **Final evaluation report** – the evaluation team should properly and adequately address the comments provided on the draft evaluation report at different stages to produce the final evaluation report. The final evaluation report that the evaluation team submits to DGPU/UNDP should meet the required quality criteria for ensuring independency, credibility and usability. It should include clear, crisp findings and recommendations that will assist UNDP in the programme formulation for a new iteration of democratic governance support.

ANNEX5. REFERENCES

- “Ethiopia 2030: The Pathway to Prosperity Ten Years Perspective Development Plan (2021 – 2030),” ATA (2020).
- “Bridge, Gender and Election Workshop,” Addis Ababa, December 2020.
- “Civil Society Dialogue Forum, Summary Report,” 21 April, 2017.
- “Conference on Violence Against Women in Election in Ethiopia,” 10 December 2020.
- “Country programme document for Ethiopia (2020-2025), Annual Session 2020,” June 2020.
- “Ethiopian National Volunteer Community Service Programme, Progress Report,” August 2021.
- “FAO Assessment (Borena & Dawa) - Oct/Nov 2021/22: Drought Ethiopia (and the region),” FAO (2021).
- “Drought in the Horn of Africa - Rapid response and mitigation plan to avert a humanitarian catastrophe January–June 2022,” FAO (2022).
- Federal Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (FEACC), “Bi-annual Progress Narrative Report, January, 2021.”
- Federal Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (FEACC), “GDPP Year End Report, July-Dec 31/2021,” (Draft)
- Federal Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission, “Ethiopia National Corruption Perception Survey, Third Report,” July 2021.
- Federal Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (FEACC), “GDPP Mid-Year Progress Report (Jan-Jun 30/2021.”
- “Ethiopian National Anti-Corruption Perception Survey report, July 2020,” FEACC.
- Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, National Planning Commission. “Growth and Transformation Plan II (GTP II) 2015/16-2019/20”, May 2016.
- Federal Negarit Gazette, “Ethiopian Broadcasting Proclamation No. 1238/2021, 27th Year No. 22,” Addis Ababa, 5 April, 2021.
- “Rapid Assessment on Violence Against Women in Elections (VAWE) Campaign Action Plan Development, Procurement,” Reference Number: EHRC/CS/03/2020, Final Report March 2021.
- “Ethiopia Support for gender responsive parliament and promotion of women’s engagement in electoral processes,” Final Report, UN Women 30 April 2021.
- GDDP “CCI Bi-annual Progress Report, August 2021.”
- GDPP, Media Authority, “First Half Fiscal Year (Hamle 2013-Tahsas 2014 E.C.) Report.”
- GDDP “EHRC Mid-Year 2013 EFY (July- December 2020) Project Progress Report,” Jan 2021.
- GDPP “EHRC Bi-Annual Report: July-December 2021.”
- GDDP “Quarter: Mid-year report (January-June 2021),” Ethiopian Media Authority (EMA).
- GDPP “Annual Report July 2019 - June 2020.”
- GDPP “HoPR Bi-Annual Progress Report, Jan–June 2021.”
- GDPP “MoP Bi-Annual Narrative Progress Report, Jan-June 2021.”
- GDPP “EIO Six Months Consolidated Progress Report, (January-June 2021).
- GDPP “PMB Meeting Note, November 2020.”
- GDPP “PMB Meeting Note, November 2019.”
- GDPP “Risk Matrix, May 2020.”
- GDPP, “Repositioning Paper,” November 2018.
- GDPP, “Annual Report,” October 2018-June 2019.
- GDPP, “Mid-Year Report, (July 2020-December 2020).”
- GDPP, First Programme Management Board Meeting Minutes, September 2017.”
- GDPP, Programme Management Board (PMB) Minutes of Meeting, 04 December 2018.”
- GDPP Programme Management Board (PMB) “Meeting Notes (30 June 2021).”
- GDPP Monitoring Visit Report Number 2: FEACC, 12 July 2021.
- GDPP Monitoring Visit Report HoPR, 13 July, 2021.
- GDPP Monitoring Visit Report, OFAG, 19 August, 2021.
- GDPP Monitoring Visit Report, NEBE, 13 July, 2021.
- GDPP Monitoring Visit Report, ENVCSP, July 2021.
- “Gender Analysis of the Draft Electoral and Political Parties’ Law, July 2019.”
- “HoF GDPP Mid-Year Report, December 2020.”
- “HoPR, Bi-Annual Progress Update, July – December 2020.”

- “Major activities to be included in the transition phase of UNDP (2022).”
- National Election Board of Ethiopia (NEBE) “Mid-Year Programme/Project Progress Report, January to June 2021.”
- National Election Board of Ethiopia (NEBE) “Mid-Year Programme/Project Progress Report, July to December 2021.”
- “Mid-year Programme/ Project Progress Report, NEBE, December 2020.”
- “National Anti-Corruption Policy and Strategy (Final Report) August 2021.”
- “Ethiopia - Northern Ethiopia Humanitarian Update, Situation Report Last updated: 20 Jan 2022,” OCHA (2022).
- “Office of the Federal Auditor General (OFAG) UNDP Project Progress Report, July–December 2020.”
- OFAG UNDP: “Mid-year Programme (Project Progress Report) (July-December 2013).”
- OFAG UNDP: Project Progress Report, January June 2021.”
- “Building National Consensus for Sustainable Peace and Development,” National Dialogue Series, Theme 1: Promoting Unity within Diversity, Forum Proceedings, Democratic Systems Building Center, 17th May 2018, Sheraton Hotel, Addis Ababa.
- “Political Leadership and Campaign Training of Trainers Report,” UN Women - Ethiopia, December 3 to 6, 2019 Pyramid Hotels and Resorts, Bishoftu.
- UN Women, “Training on Gender Responsive Parliamentary Oversight Function,” Training Report 02-04, June 2019.
- UN Women, “Informal Update to UNDP: Support for Gender Responsive Parliament and Promotion of Women’s Engagement in Electoral Process Project,” June 2020.
- UN Women, “Support for Gender Responsive Parliament and Promotion of Women’s Engagement in Electoral Process, Quarterly Programme/Project Progress Report,” January-June 2020.
- Report: “Training for Ethiopian Media Women and Men on Gender Sensitive/Responsive Election Reporting,” October 21 to 23, 2019, Addis Ababa.
- “Risk Assessment and Mitigation Measures,” Governance and Democratic Participation Programme, AWP 2020/21.
- Report: Secretariat of Council of Constitutional Inquiry, Governance and Democratic Participation Program, (January 2021-June 2021).
- UNDP Results Oriented Annual Reports, 2018-2021.
- UNDP (2019). United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework, (2020 – 2025).”
- UNDP (2020). Management responses for GDPP MTR’s recommendations, Mid-term Review/Evaluation (June 2017 – July 2020), December 2020.
- UNDP (2021). “GDPP Annual Report, July 2020–June 2021.”
- UNDP (2021). “UNDP Strategic Plan, 2022-2025.”
- UNDP. “Country Programme Document for Ethiopia (2016-2020).”
- UNDP. “Country Programme Document for Ethiopia (2020-2025)”
- UNDP. “Regional Programme Document for Africa, 2014-2017.”
- UNDP. “Strategic Plan,” 2018-2021.
- “United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Ethiopia, 2016-2020.”
- UNDP. “Governance and Democratic Participation Programme (GDPP), Programme Document, June 2017.”
- UNDP GDPP Programme Technical Committee Meeting, 09 November 2017, HoPR Meeting Hall
- UNDP GDPP Programme Technical Committee Meeting, 15 November 2018, UNFPA Hall.
- UNDP GDPP “Programme Technical Committee (PTC), Minutes of Meeting, Oct 2019.
- UNDP. GDPP Programme Management Board, “Future of GDPP – Options Paper, June 2021”
- UNDP/GoE. “Multi-Donor Support for Democratic Institutions Programme,” August 2017.
- UNDP: “Africa’s Promise: The UNDP Renewed Strategic Offer in Africa,” RBA (2020).
- Zachary Donnerfeld, Jakkie Cilliers, Stellah Kwasi and Lily Welborn (2019). “Emerging Giant: Potential Pathways for Ethiopia to 2040,” Institute for Security Studies, East Africa Report 25, September 2019
- Dr. Victoria Stewart-Jolley Ms. Blen Fitsum, Report: “Gender Responsive Electoral Monitoring and Observation Training,” 04-27 March and 19-21 April, 2021, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Abriham Ebabu Engidaw, “Youth and Unemployment in Ethiopia”, Journal of Organizational Culture Communications and Conflict, Volume 25, Issue 1, 2021, p. 1.
- Jules Leichter, “Macroeconomic Update Ethiopia,” IMF Resident Representative, Ethiopia, January 2022.
- Emezat H. Mengesha and Lealem Mersha. Gender Analysis for the Governance and Democratic Participation Program (GDPP) Final Report (Undated)
- Nemata Majeks-Walker and Blen Fitsum, “Manual for Trainers Gender-Responsive Election Observation and Monitoring,” March 2021.
- “Webinar on Women’s and Political Participation During COVID-19 in Ethiopia,” Outcome document, 12 October, 2020.

- Pappa, S., A. Muralidharan, R. Dayal, and M. Das. (August 2015). Promoting Gender Equality in India: Three Approaches to Scale-up. Washington, DC: Futures Group: Health Policy Project
- “Gender and Gender Mainstreaming, Training for Secretariat of the House of People’s Representatives,” Workshop Report: August 26-31, 2019.
- Austrian Development Corporation. “Ethiopia Country Strategy, 2019-2025.”
- DANIDA. “Danish Country Programme for Ethiopia, 2018-2022.”



Engage with us

-  Twitter @UNDPethiopia
-  Facebook UNDPin Ethiopia
- Email communication.et@undp.org
- www.undp.org/ethiopia