Managing for Results: Monitoring and Evaluation in UNDP

A Results-Oriented Framework

16 November 2001

This paper presents the key changes to the UNDP monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system. The changes aim to ensure (a) alignment with results-based management; (b) promotion of evaluative knowledge and learning around outcomes, and (c) simplification. The paper further highlights the rationale for the innovations, as well as their practical application.

To support UNDP's strategic shift toward results, monitoring and evaluation must provide a strong and coherent system of learning and performance measurement. Country offices (COs) and other operating units are expected to monitor progress toward achievement of results systematically; to report on those results annually in the ROAR; and to integrate lessons learned into management decisions and future programming initiatives. The role of the office management becomes more important – in terms of strategic planning and choice of monitoring and evaluation approaches and follow-up. In particular, the senior country office managers will be expected to provide active leadership to the process of change towards better monitoring, learning and evaluation for results.

The demand for increased development effectiveness has been based on, inter alia, a realization that producing good "deliverables" is not enough. In many cases, efficient or well-managed projects or outputs did not actually have any discernable effect on development. The attention must therefore be centered around **outcomes** – realistic and positive changes in specific development conditions. By focussing on outcomes, UNDP tries to aim for results where they are most needed - people's lives. The policy approach toward outcomes places greater emphasis on building strategic and effective **partnerships**; underscoring that no single agency or development actor can produce the desired results on its own, or without ownership.

The skills and capacities needed for monitoring and evaluation are the same as those expected for other key office functions - principally strategic planning, teamwork, analytical abilities, learning and advisory skills and good formulation skills. The new framework, does, however, require a **change in mindset and behaviors** of staff and partners. One consequence is less focus on inputs and implementation tasks and greater focus on results (outcomes and outputs). Offices that find it necessary to continue to monitor inputs and detailed implementation should ensure that this is not done to the detriment of addressing the results.

The M&E system helps key groups (senior office management; programme managers and project management) to assess performance at all **levels of programming** (the UNDAF; CCF/SRF and Project/Programme level), with regard to:
(a) the progress towards outcomes;
(b) the contribution of UNDP to the outcomes through outputs (generated by projects, policy advice, advocacy and other activities); and
(c) the partnership strategy.

The ROAR will remain the centerpiece of performance monitoring and reporting, based on the SRF and generated through the **RBMS**. Work is underway to link the main programming, monitoring, evaluation and reporting tools to the RBMS, in a coherent and results-oriented system of performance monitoring. This aims to eliminate duplication of work, and at the same time create a common information base. The new system, scheduled for release next year, would include modules to (a) plan monitoring and evaluations; (b) monitor the progress of evaluation recommendations; (b) record and analyze lessons learned and findings from evaluations and monitoring; (c) report. Meanwhile, offices may use available templates on the EO website where appropriate. The feedback from practitioners will contribute to improvement for the user requirements for such a system.

The new M&E framework is driven by results and aims to rigorously pursue improvements in UNDP programming while providing for **simplification.** A summary table with key changes is available in **Attachment 1**. Changes include:

a. Abolishing many tools and procedures; namely the tripartite review; the TPR report; the terminal report, the terminal TPR; the country review; the project evaluation information sheet and the mandatory project evaluation for projects over 1 million USD and over 10 years duration.

b. Simplifying other tools and procedures by ensuring alignment with the SRF/ROAR and providing a coherent system of assessment to reduce duplication. These include the annual project report; the field visit; the annual review and evaluation planning. The performance ratings have also been harmonized and aligned behind results-based management. There is flexibility in application, format and timing.

c. Planning further simplification in 2002 when the RBMS database is scheduled to incorporate programming, monitoring and evaluation tools for electronic use.

The monitoring and evaluation policies in this framework paper are **applicable immediately** and replace the procedures in Chapter 7 of the UNDP Programming Manual, with the following conditions[1]:

a. The revised "Monitoring and Evaluating for Results: A Handbook" will complement this paper with detailed guidance for use by all programme units, and, in particular, country offices (see intra.undp.org/eo).

b. All new projects and CCFs should follow the new arrangements. If approval is imminent, the CO may proceed, although it is recommended to analyze where arrangements can be simplified. (Reference is made to the new formats for the CCF/country programme outline and the project document).

c. For on-going projects, the CO may want to examine whether their monitoring and evaluation arrangements can be simplified or improved as per the new framework. Where there is no value added to a change at this point, on-going projects can continue with previous procedures (for example where the project is near at its end, or does not contribute greatly to the outcomes in the SRF).

d. All global, regional and other programmes (TCDC, funds and programmes) under HQ management or responsibility are also subject to the principles in this M&E framework.. (Some specific M&E approaches may have to be adapted to global or regional circumstances).

1.   Key principles for good monitoring and evaluation

In line with simplification, offices will be expected to follow good practices - or key principles - when it comes to: (a) *scope* and (b) *conduct* of monitoring and evaluation. Within these principles, each CO has for the most part the possibility to determine tools, formats, timing, and schedules, ensuring that M&E serve as input to the management team - and the partners - in helping them to manage for results.

Scope. What is essential is the focus on results, i.e. outcomes and outputs. In the 'new' UNDP, M&E assesses the performance and contributions of policy, programme, project and partnership efforts toward the intended outcomes in the SRF/CCF. All monitoring and evaluation efforts should address:

a.   **Progress towards outcomes.** This involves analyzing periodically to what extent intended outcomes have actually been achieved or are being achieved. Evaluations have an important role to play in verifying the achievement of outcomes and in explaining what works/does not work and why. The value of evaluation depends on monitoring tools that contain some assessment of outcome progress and scanning of the national development situation;

b.   **Contribution of UNDP towards outcomes.** This implies monitoring the outputs produced by UNDP through projects, advocacy, policy advice, activities etc.; analyzing whether the output is in

---

[1] Given the room for adaptation within the key principles, crisis and post-conflict counties should be able to adapt, where required, the M&E approaches to their needs. Nevertheless, the EO is developing, with partners, more guidance on specific M&E possibilities in CDC countries as a Companion Series to the M&E Handbook.

the process of being produced as planned, and most importantly whether the outputs contribute to the outcome; and

c. **Partnership strategy.** In most cases, monitoring and evaluation would also look at the partnership strategy for the outcome. Monitoring partnerships involves assessing the design of partnership strategies, the formation and functioning of partnerships. The purpose is to ensure that partners who are concerned with an outcome have a common appreciation of problems and needs, and that they are synchronized in their strategy.

The above three elements represent the minimum scope for monitoring and evaluation. Offices may add additional elements where needed for management or analysis, while ensuring that the scope is realistic in view of available capacities.

Conduct. The credibility of M&E findings and assessments also depends on the manner in which they are conducted. For a UNDP country office and other operating unit, good monitoring and evaluation include:

(a) Focus on progress towards intended results and follow-up with decisions and action;
(b) Regular reporting from Project Management to the country office with partners presenting issues and seeking solutions to problems, as a basis for analysis;
(c) Regular monitoring visits or checks by CO staff to verify and validate progress;
(d) Use of participatory monitoring mechanisms to ensure commitment, ownership, and follow-up and feedback on performance;
(e) Use of indicators and making efforts in improving the performance measurement systems and developing baselines at all programming levels;
(f) Assessing the relevance, performance and success of UNDP development interventions;
(g) Actively learning and improving to adapt strategies and generating lessons and sharing them;
(h) Active planning, conduct and use of evaluations of intended outcomes for validation of results, as well as initiative to undertake additional, voluntary evaluations when useful.

2.   Roles and responsibilities

All partners have a role to play in monitoring and evaluation, though their specific perspective and responsibilities differ. General responsibilities are:

✓ The UNDP country **office management** will be expected to be more closely involved in strategic choice of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. This would include the selection of outcomes to evaluate reflected in an evaluation plan. In close partnership with key national stakeholders, with particular attention to the coordinating ministry, their role is to ensure that the programme developed contributes as best as possible to the attainment of the goals of the SRF/CCF. This supposes an active leadership of the ROAR and annual assessment, advocacy and partnership strategy development, and of encouraging the move towards better monitoring and evaluation for results and a learning environment. In general, the management sets the framework for managing for results, prioritization in workplanning and partnerships. One key deliverable is the follow-up to evaluations through the development of a management response and its implementation. Together with partners, they also ensure periodic assessments whether the approach followed is the best way of producing the intended outcomes to ensure that effective and efficient progress is being made.

✓ The UNDP **programme management** – including Programme Managers and Policy Advisors – will remain responsible for the overall monitoring of the project's production of strategic outputs as well as monitoring progress towards outcome. They take on a greater role in advocacy and partnership building than previously. With the management level of the office, their deliverables include outcome evaluations and the ROAR, for which Programme Managers bring together an analysis of several projects, activities

and data based on an annual performance assessment and help generate lessons learned around outcomes. These staff may also add value to project work and provide soft assistance to exercise a positive influence on the outputs. It is also expected that their role in programme design is strong in order to ensure alignment with strategic priorities. At this phase, they help develop accountability mechanisms and, through them, monitor periodically to ensure that UNDP's resources are being used appropriately and to liberate time for analysis of results.

✓ The **project management,** normally the government, will remain responsible for delivering the outputs of the projects, the actual implementation, input management and sound administrative management. A key task is the monitoring of implementation tasks by other contractors. The project staff will also develop the project workplan and the annual project report to the CO, thus providing critical information and lessons learned regarding the effectiveness of the implementation strategy and the delivery of outputs. The projects can contribute to the implementation of a partnership strategy developed by the CO. They can be asked to organize voluntary project evaluations, or the CO can choose to conduct these itself. The institution managing the project ensures the interface between the desired results and the expectations of the target beneficiaries, thus promoting a sense of ownership.

3.   Planning M&E

Under the new M&E framework, offices cannot mechanically follow detailed and prescriptive procedures, but rather will need to design monitoring and evaluation based on the specific needs of the office, partners, project or outcome. Thus the planning of monitoring and evaluation becomes more important for UNDP and its partners, as integral parts of a country office's overall work. To determine appropriate tools that allow both for assessing progress towards outcomes and the project contributions, offices would need to look at all the projects and programmes intended to contribute to any intended outcome including the nature of those interventions. For example, an outcome to enhance livelihoods at the village level may require more participatory monitoring approaches than may an outcome requiring a high degree of policy advice, for which the monitoring should include a means of following the policy formulation process in the country. An outcome at regional or global level may require more frequent reporting because the countries involved are spread out.

Planning of evaluations begins as early as the formulation stage of the CCF and is subsequently kept up to date continuously, annually or periodically depending on local needs and as plans become more concrete and programmes evolve. Such planning helps to make strategic and selective decisions about what to evaluate, when and why. Planning therefore takes account of expected use of the evaluation for programming and policy improvement.

All operating units and offices will prepare a mandatory **evaluation plan** within the first quarter of each CCF cycle. The preparation of the Evaluation Plan will figure as a key element for performance assessment of offices. Offices will use the plan to ensure that evaluation activities are on track, while HQ will use it as the basis for monitoring evaluation compliance (see below).
a. COs that already have an Evaluation Plan should review it in terms of analyzing whether any of the planned evaluations should still go ahead, what outcomes will be evaluated and whether any of the projects covered by the planned evaluations are included in the outcome evaluations; to be reflected in the new format. COs *without* an existing Evaluation Plan should use the SRF to select the outcomes to evaluate and their associated projects; to be reflected in the new format.
b. Where it would be disruptive to halt a project evaluation already planned, the CO may of course proceed. From 2002 onwards, the evaluation plans should include outcome evaluations as well as other evaluations that are envisaged.

c. It will be possible to revise the evaluation plan over the course of the CCF if there are significant changes in financial resources and/or the national situation. As they do now, the COs will liaise with the EO on changes in the Plan. (A detailed guidance will be issued separately on outcome evaluations to select.)

4. Monitoring

Until now, monitoring and evaluation have been traditionally situated at the individual project level. Success was defined by timely implementation and on meeting project objectives. In a results-based environment, however, projects remain a key vehicle of development assistance, but their success is marked by measurable contributions to outcomes.

The **purpose** of monitoring is to ensure the systematic assessment of performance and progress of UNDP interventions toward achievement of outcomes at country level. In practice, monitoring assesses the performance and progress of projects, programmes, partnerships and soft assistance in relation to SRF outcomes. The scope of monitoring is now therefore wider than just looking at what projects deliver. Information from monitoring provides the basis for making decisions and taking action. As such, it supports immediate decision-making needs more than it contributes to long-term knowledge building. Under RBM, monitoring becomes even more important as a tool for decision-making and learning and is indispensable in providing information and data for evaluations.

Furthermore, the country office now has the possibility to make monitoring more coherent and build ownership since it deals with the same results across all programming instruments. At each programming level, the partners will focus increasingly on higher level results, i.e. project reporting primarily on outputs; the ROAR looking more at outcomes; UNDAF and CCA level aiming at goals and Millennium Development Targets. The monitoring tools applied should match the needs at each level. Monitoring of outcomes may require a different mix of tools than the tools traditionally used at project level, for example through review, analysis or surveys rather than field visits or tripartite/bi-lateral meetings.

Within a framework focused on progress towards outcomes and UNDP's contribution to them, the UNDP Programme Manager has to determine the **right mix of monitoring tools** and approaches for each project, programme or outcome, ensuring that the monitoring contains an appropriate balance following three characteristics:
a. <u>Reporting</u> - obtaining and analyzing documentation from the project that provides information on progress. For example: Annual Project report (APR), progress report, quarterly report, workplan, CDRs, substantive project documentation;
b. <u>Validation</u> - checking or verifying whether the reported progress is accurate or not. For example: Field visits, spot-check visits, external assessment, client survey, evaluation; and
c. <u>Participation</u> - obtaining feedback from partners and beneficiaries on progress and proposed actions. For example: Outcome groups, steering committee/mechanism, stakeholder meeting, focus group meetings, annual review.

The **ROAR** will remain the centerpiece of performance monitoring and reporting, based on the SRF and continuous monitoring of progress. The ROAR should be prepared based on a highly consultative **annual review** exercise that connects reporting, feedback, evaluation and learning to assess performance. The organization of such a review is fully decentralized and must be adapted to local conditions, balancing the ideal comprehensive review with added value and low transaction cost. Taking place in time to feed into the year-end ROAR, the annual review may take the form of *one* meeting where there are relatively few key partners; a series of meetings; wide range of stakeholders or select partners; and be comprehensive or deal with key issues only. What is essential is that the ROAR is prepared from analysis based on consultations

with partners. There are no formats or reports prescribed for such a review. The annual review is mandatory from 2002; for the ROAR preparation end 2001, COs may use suggested approaches in the Handbook to review performance with consultations.

Monitoring tools

The M&E Handbook describes a range of formal and informal monitoring instruments that can be used, together with recommended timing and content and process that reflect good practices. Formats are adaptable to local needs, however a certain minimum content is to be reflected no matter their form (namely progress towards outcome, towards outputs, and towards partnerships). Changes include:

✓ The current **Annual Project Report** (APR, ex-PPER) will be abolished. A new annual project report is available with the key elements of assessing the performance of the project in contributing to intended outcomes through outputs and partnership work. As a self-assessment report by Project Management to the CO, it does not require a cumbersome preparatory process, but can be used to dialogue with partners. The report is annual for larger, key projects that are essential for SRF outcomes and feeding into the annual review (ROAR). However, the CO may decide on a different frequency and/or other types of reporting, particularly for smaller or "non-strategic" projects. In the interest of harmonization, donor report formats may also be used while including information on outcome, output and partnership strategies. (For reports being prepared imminently most COs would want to proceed with the "old" format.)

✓ The annual **Tripartite Review** (TPR) and the **Tripartite Report** are no longer a corporate requirement. Ideally, discussions on project strategy should be held using existing mechanisms, such as established programme steering committees, and/or coordination mechanisms for outcomes (thematic groups, sectoral coordination groups etc.). If steering mechanisms do not exist, the CO may bring key partners together for decision-making through other approaches such as periodic meetings. Participatory stakeholder workshops should be held at critical junctures as part of the project work and linked, for example, to evaluations or annual reviews. Whatever mechanisms are used for consensus-building and decision-making, they should not increase transaction costs by looking at at all project details. (COs that found formal TPRs useful may of course continue to conduct them.)

✓ The corporate requirement for **Terminal Reports** is eliminated. Learning should be part of every monitoring and evaluation effort. In practical terms, the project reports and annual performance assessments are vehicles for lessons learned. For projects reaching their end, it is recommended that COs with the Project Management generate lessons learned for the annual review and for sharing within or outside the organization.

✓ Regular **field visits** remain a key instrument for validation of results as reported by projects, in particular for larger, key projects that are essential for SRF outcomes. Visits may incleasingly be joint and/or concern clusters of projects within an outcome - with a view to rigorously analyze results.

✓ While the focus of monitoring looks toward outcomes, Programme Managers will still need to monitor aspects of implementation at project level for **accountability** purposes. The regular interactions with Project staff and stakeholders should provide sufficient detail on implementation problems, activities, inputs and resource expenditure. Nevertheless, monitoring cannot effectively solve more permanent problems of weak management or accountability. Capacity assessments, good project design and early agreement on standards for management are crucial.

✓ From 1 January 2002, **Country Reviews** (CRs) are no longer required. Where the CO finds a CR useful, it may of course conduct a review with RBx and EO cooperation, but without submission to the EB.

5.   Evaluation

Evaluations at country level have so far been limited to projects and programmes; the scope being to evaluate if objectives in the project document were reached. The focus on accountability was often seen as a judgement, and use for improving performance and policy decisions was uneven. There was little exchange between countries on evaluation findings or corporate learning, in large part due to the project-specific nature of evaluation recommendations. Although the compliance rate of evaluations conducted has been rising, this increase has not been accompanied by a commensurate enhancement of quality and relevance of evaluations. Project evaluations could be useful where they provided answers to help decision-making mid-way, but often did not have a great effect on learning beyond the project evaluated.

Performance cannot be viewed exclusively in terms of the achievement of project objectives; one must also focus on the greater effect of assistance on people's lives within a certain development context. Henceforth, UNDP will focus on evaluating its interventions at the level of outcomes rather than inputs and outputs, because this level reveals more about how effective UNDP's actions are in reaping real change. This level, moreover, promises a shorter timeframe and more credible linkages between UNDP's actions and an eventual effect, than does the level of much longer-term and diffuse impacts.

Selection of outcomes for evaluation

Evaluation is key in ensuring accountability by credibility of results and validation of reporting; by providing and independent, neutral and fact-based perspective; by analyzing problems in-depth to help decisions; by generating a "new" vision that can be used to build consensus and for learning. Country offices will therefore be expected to conduct a **limited number of outcome evaluations** during the CCF cycle, depending on total resources estimated to be available to the country during the CCF cycle; taking account of previous evaluation workload and the need to validate results on a "sample" basis. A separate memo from the EO will provide the number of expected outcome evaluations per country per CCF cycle (ranging from 2 to 6 or more). These evaluations will cover a number of projects associated with the outcome. See **Attachment 2** on their scope and methodology.

From 1 January 2002, **project evaluations are no longer mandatory.** This includes abolishing the criterion of mandatory evaluation for projects above USD 1 million approved in a given year, as it did not prove successful in ensuring that the most critical projects and results were subject to evaluation. Although they will no longer be required to, many offices will no doubt continue to undertake project evaluations because they yield useful information on project implementation arrangements, administrative structures and the achievement of immediate outputs; to promote accountability or demonstrate success. This said, project evaluations undertaken in the future will be expected to be more results oriented; pointing out project contributions towards the progress of the corresponding outcome.

COs are responsible for planning and organizing outcome evaluations. Since fewer evaluations are conducted, **selecting the outcomes** to evaluate becomes more important. Using the SRF, selection will be made by the CO balancing the following criteria:
(a) Resources. CO should select outcomes with significant office resources behind them, rather than outcomes with few resources;
(b) Possible future interventions in the same thematic area. COs should select outcomes for which there are plans to continue assistance (or support in the same thematic area);
(c) Anticipated problems. COs should select outcomes where there were past problems in progress; or with likely complications because it is within a sensitive area with a number of partners; and

(d) <u>Need for lessons learned</u> in other thematic areas/regions. COs should select outcomes for which there is a need to obtain lessons for other thematic areas in the same country (and/or for other countries).

The country office would be expected to determine the **timing** of the proposed evaluations based on the purpose of the evaluation, the anticipated progress to be achieved, the expected workload of the country office in any given year and spreading the evaluations in time during the CCF. Depending on their timing within the CCF cycle, outcome evaluations can generate different types of evaluative knowledge, ranging from early information about the appropriateness of UNDP's partnership strategy or impediments to the outcome, to mid-course adjustments, to lessons learned for the next programming cycle. Thus, such knowledge would become stronger on empirical evidence and lessons learnt as experience builds up.

Depending on needs and local circumstances, the **funding** for outcome evaluations may be obtained: (a) by prorating costs to concerned projects at CO discretion; or (b) from a separate funding window or umbrella project under CO direct management. The simplified CCF should earmark core resources for the purpose of outcome evaluation. Adequate funding for evaluation within country-level resources is a corporate requirement and not negotiable for reprogramming elsewhere.

<u>Use and follow-up of evaluations</u>

The requirement for submission of a Project Evaluation Information Sheet (**PEIS**) for each evaluation is abolished. Instead, offices will upload the all evaluation reports, no matter their subject, into the database for knowledge sharing and trends analysis on lessons learned. (Until the RBMS database is enhanced, offices will upload the reports to the EO for corporate learning). The EO will be responsible for monitoring evaluation, and to report annually on trends and major findings in evaluations to the SMT and the Executive Board.

Furthermore, with the emphasis on evaluation follow-up, the use of evaluative evidence is essential. Evaluation findings provide input that may help to prepare the ROAR, to revise the SRF, to modify relevant projects, and to inform strategies for new programming cycle (CCF), among other things. Offices will track the implementation of evaluation recommendations by recording the management decisions regarding evaluation recommendations and the follow up actions taken for their implementation.

<u>Evaluation compliance</u>

Conducting evaluations is an essential part of good management. To ensure that evaluations are planned and take place, the actual conduct of required outcome evaluations will be monitored through evaluation compliance. UNDP Headquarters will use the evaluation plan developed by the country office as the basis for assessing compliance. Thus, compliance will be based on the outcome evaluations that the office commits to undertaking during a given CCF cycle. Compliance will be calculated by EO from 1 January 2002 onwards.[2] The EO will report to the Executive Board on compliance rates once per CCF cycle. Evaluation compliance is achieved when an office submits the outcome evaluation report as planned.

6. Performance measurement: Rating system

Ultimately, monitoring and evaluation aim to ensure and assess success and learning from sucesses and mistakes. To improve the UNDP performance measurement system, the project success **rating system** (in the APR and evaluations) and the results rating system in the ROAR will be aligned, i.e. the performance of UNDP projects will be rated by the degree of their contributions toward progress and achievement of

---

[2] Under this regime, if an office does not submit an evaluation plan as required, compliance rate will be recorded as zero.

outcomes and outputs. A common rating system would permit performance comparisons across results, whether such comparisons are done by thematic category (e.g., governance, poverty, etc.); level of intervention (e.g., project, output, outcome, etc.); geographic area (e.g., Africa, Asia, etc.); or organizational unit (e.g., country office, regional bureaux, etc.). The results rating system apply to:

a. The ROAR will rate outcome and output progress. A ROAR analyst team at Headquarters makes the rating annually. The ratings are used to report trends and progress to external stakeholders, as well as to identify weak areas for improvement by the organization.

b. Evaluations will rate outcome and output progress, as well as other select performance elements (such as sustainability, relevance etc.). The rating is made by independent assessment teams as part of the evaluation report, periodically when outcome evaluations are taking place. The ratings will be used for trend analysis and lessons learned corporately, as well as for validation purposes of country-level results and reviews of development effectiveness.

c. Select monitoring reports will rate outcome and output progress for projects, on a voluntary basis. The rating is made by the UNDP Programme Manager and/or other office and project staff, annually for projects in the Annual Project Report and periodically for field visits. The ratings may be used by the CO for trend analysis and lessons learned, and may be used corporately for validation, feedback and lessons learned.

7.   Support

The Evaluation Office (EO) will provide a support system to the COs in the introduction of the M&E framework. The main pillar will be the detailed **handbook "Monitoring and evaluating for results",** available on intra.undp.org/eo. This **website** will provide a constant update and development of M&E methodologies; a detailed introduction/training package that can be used both internally in the COs and with partners; references; frequently asked questions (FAQ); examples of reports, and a companion series with detailed guidance on select subjects.

The EO will also conduct thematic, impact and **strategic evaluations** of priority to the organization. These will complement the ROAR and outcome evaluations as validation of reported results. The EO will continue to support periodic global evaluations of the UNDAF, while encouraging use of the CCA as a monitoring tool providing information on national change of interest in UNDP work. Furthermore, the EO will ensure feedback and synthesis of evaluations to enhance UNDP development effectiveness.

Attachment 1: Key Changes to Monitoring and Evaluation Tools

TOOL	BEFORE	NOW
Evaluation	Evaluation mandatory for project of $1 million or more, or when UNDP has supported an institution for 10 years or more. DEX evaluation mandatory.	**Abolished the mandatory requirement of** project evaluation ($1 million, 10 years). A **certain number of outcome evaluations** required during CCF period depending on the size of the total programme. Project evaluations optional.
Evaluation Plan	Country-level evaluation plan prepared by CO after CCF approval. Rolling three-year period, and revised yearly. Send to EO.	Country-level evaluation plan by CO **electronically**, to include **implementation of evaluation recommendations** (tracking system) with future link to RBMS. Analysis and feedback by EO. Serves as basis for evaluation compliance.
Project evaluation information sheet (PEIS)	Project evaluation information sheet (PEIS) – a separate report/questionnaire presenting the project evaluation with evaluators' rating. Prepared by evaluation team leader (or the CO must hire a person to prepare it). Send to EO.	**Abolished**. Instead, submit full evaluation **report electronically** to EO which puts it into a database for lessons learned and analyses corporate trends with future link to RBMS. Rating of performance as integral part of evaluation reports.
Tripartite review (TPR)	The CO organizes in consultation with Government and the designated institution, prepares agenda and TPR meeting report. Held yearly. Terminal TPR towards the end of project.	**Abolished as requirement**. Can be conducted on optional basis for projects requiring it. **Decision-making** ensured by project steering committee, outcome thematic groups or similar arrangement. Periodic **stakeholder** consultations including beneficiaries recommended.
Annual Project Report (APR)	Annual programme/project report (APR). Assessment of a project during a given year by target groups, project management, government, UNDP. The designated institution prepares it. Used for TPR.	Old format **abolished**. Revised to be shorter and to focus on output achievement and their contribution to outcomes. Completed annually by the project CTA or director. Not required for projects unsuited for APR . for projects for which an APR would not provide any useful information on results.
Terminal report (TR)	Terminal report for each project by designated institution. APR for final year serves as the TR with lessons added. The RR sends TR to the RBx/EO. RBx provides feedback and decides on follow-up, EO enters TR in a database.	**Abolished**. Learning to be addressed through APR and annual review. **Lessons learned** to be shared with knowledge network. **Terminal review also abolished** as a requirement.
Field visits	The RR and CO staff must visit all projects yearly. Report immediately after the visit.	Regular **project visits encouraged**. Flexible format but more **results**-oriented. Exception for projects not suited for results validation visit. Visits to designated institution or outcome also included.
Annual Review	Annual meeting to generate annual report by operational units on progress for the SRF. Basis for ROAR.	A strengthened management dialogue at country level **required to assess progress** towards results (outcomes and outputs) with strong stakeholder participation, to serve as a **basis for the ROAR**. Key mechanism for generating lessons learned for new programming as CCF progresses.
Country review (CR)	By all countries once per CCF cycle. Detailed procedures for TOR clearance, CR team selection, CR meeting, CR mission report, EB document, PWG submission with CR matrix.	**Abolished** as a requirement. Where an office still finds a country review useful, it may choose to conduct a review.

Attachment 2: Scope and methodology of evaluations

Scope. The scope of any outcome evaluation would be determined at the CO level, and described in Terms of Reference (TOR) after consultation. They are flexible and should include what are considered crucial issues at that time. The standard objectives of an outcome evaluation are to extract lessons learned, findings and recommendations for, at a minimum:

(a) Assessing progress towards the outcome;
(b) Assessing the factors contributing to the outcome;
(c) Assessing key UNDP contributions (outputs, including those produced through soft assistance) to the outcome; and
(d) Assessing the partnership strategy.

In other words, the four major components (i.e., the outcome, the substantive influences, UNDP's contribution and how UNDP works with the other relevant actors) are examined in depth to varying degrees depending upon the purpose of the exercise. Outcome evaluators can add other objectives to these - e.g., objectives related to implementation issues - while recognizing that the more objectives added, the more time and financial resources will be needed for the exercise.

Based on pilot testing, a suggested outcome evaluation **methodology** is already available in separate "Guidelines for evaluators" that the COs will provide to the evaluation team. The methodology suggested include, for example, suggestions on how to address the planned outcome and to discern other effects that activities may have had, and provides suggestions on how to address cases where on-going project objectives do not fully match the SRF outcome since projects were developed before the SRF. At its core lies the task of illustrating a credible link – or causality chain – between UNDP efforts and change. It does not aim to assess what other partners have contributed.

Outcome evaluation assumes **working with strategic partners** that have been indispensable for the achievement of an outcome. Key partners would be involved in all stages of the evaluation – planning, providing information and for feedback and action. Since outcome evaluation focus on UNDP's contribution to an outcome they are normally organized directly by the UNDP CO while informing and involving partners. (In future, it is expected to see a rise in joint M&E, since outcome evaluations are ideally suited to be launched as joint initiatives. Lessons learned on joint work will be made available as support).

The current **"tripartite" requirement** for evaluation team composition is abolished. COs may determine the composition and size of the team in accordance with the agreed Terms of Reference. Validation of results requires independence of the evaluation. Independence can imply either external or internal evaluators without prior involvement with the UNDP office or the intended outcome.