UN Development Account

Project Evaluation Guidelines

October 2019

Table of Contents

Annexes

List of Tables

List of Boxes

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CDPMO.................. Capacity Development Programmme Management Office (UNDESA)

DA.......................... Development Account

DESA...................... Department of Economic and Social Affairs

ECA .... Economic Commission for Africa

ECE .... Economic Commission for Europe

ECLAC .... Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

ERG........................ Evaluation Reference Group

ESCAP .... Economic and Social Commission on Asia and the Pacific

ESCWA................... Economic Social Commission for Western Asia

GA.......................... General Assembly (UN)

IE(s)........................ Implementing Entity(ies)

IEC .... Internal Evaluation Committee

PMT .... Programme Management Team

RBM....................... Results-Based Management

SDG........................ Sustainable Development Goal

TOR........................ Terms of Reference

UN .... United Nations

UN HABITAT .... United Nations Human Settlements Programme

UNCTAD .... United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

UNEG..................... United Nations Evaluation Group

UNEP .... United Nations Environment Programme

UNODC .... United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

1. Introduction

1. The United Nations (UN) Development Account (DA) was established in 1997 by the UN General Assembly as a capacity development programme of the UN Secretariat. The DA supports the implementation of projects of five global UN Secretariat entities and the five UN Regional Commissions, with the goal of enhancing capacities of developing countries in priority areas of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The DA provides the ten implementing entities (IEs), which are mostly non-resident in beneficiary countries, with the ability to operationalize their vast knowledge and know-how and to deliver capacity development support on the ground to selected stakeholders. In this way, the entities are able to follow-up on their normative and analytical work as well as inter-governmental processes, through concrete projects at multi-country, sub-regional, regional and global levels.

The DA Evaluation Framework

2. The DA Evaluation Framework was developed in 2019 with input from key stakeholders of the Account. The framework aims at enhancing the DA evaluation function, orienting it towards learning, in addition to accountability. The DA Evaluation Framework includes project level evaluations, programme level evaluations, a rolling evaluation workplan and generation and use of learning through evaluation.

DA Project Evaluation Guidelines

3. The present Guidelines provide details on the requirements for the evaluation of DA projects. The Guidelines have been tailored to the specific characteristics of the DA, focusing on the distinctive requirements for the evaluation of DA projects, in addition to a more generic evaluation perspective. The Guidelines aim to support the implementation and enhance the quality of DA project evaluations. They are not meant to be comprehensive and should be regarded as complementing the more general guidelines on project evaluation conducted in the UN context and specific evaluation policies and guidance of DA IEs.

4. The Guidelines are in particular meant for use by the IEs whose projects are being evaluated, managers of DA project evaluations and the IE evaluation sections of which the evaluation managers of DA projects are part, the independent evaluators who conduct DA project evaluations, as well as the substantive section(s) of IEs whose projects are being evaluated. Moreover, the Guidelines will be of use to the DA Programme Management Team (PMT) and other parties with an interest in DA project evaluations.

5. The Guidelines were prepared by a senior consultant. They were commissioned by the DA Programme Manager and the process of developing them was managed by the DA PMT. The development of the Guidelines was informed by a desk review of relevant documentation, analysis of a sample of DA project evaluation reports and consultations with key DA stakeholders. Draft versions of the Guidelines were discussed in virtual meetings with DA Network members, IE evaluation specialists and the DA PMT.

Ways to use the present Guidelines

6. The Guidelines are organized along the five stages of the DA project evaluation process, i.e. preparation, inception, data gathering, analysis and reporting, and follow-up. This provides the reader with the opportunity to be informed about the specific DA requirements during the various stages of DA project evaluations.

7. Though many of the issues regarding project evaluation are relevant in more than one stage of the evaluation process, each of these are discussed in the phase of the evaluation process most relevant to the issues concerned. Thus, issues of purpose and context of the evaluation, as well as evaluation

scope and objectives, evaluation criteria and questions, are in particular dealt with in the preparatory phase, as all these issues need to be included in the TOR of the evaluation. Many of these issues, however, remain relevant throughout the evaluation process. Aspects of the methodology, the organization of the evaluation and the work plan are dealt with in the inception phase, as these issues need to be further developed based on the preliminary setup provided in the TOR, and presented in the inception report. The analysis and reporting phase focuses on findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations, as these are specific to this phase. The follow-up phase of the evaluation concerns the sharing of the results of the evaluation, development of a management response by IEs and partners targeted by the recommendations, use of the lessons and good practices in the design of new projects and programmes and use of evaluation results in reporting of the DA to the UN General Assembly.

8. Throughout these Guidelines use is made of blue boxes to highlight DA specific requirements, while green boxes detail more general good practices and suggestions for DA project evaluations.

DA Requirements

Blue boxes include DA requirements for project evaluations, often related to the specific characteristics of the DA

Good Practice in Project Evaluation

Green boxes focus on good evaluation practices and other suggestions to support the quality of DA project evaluations

2. Characteristics of the DA and DA Projects

2.1 DA Characteristics

9. The DA supports the implementation of projects by ten IEs, consisting of the economic and social entities of the United Nations (UN) Secretariat, including five global UN Secretariat entities, i.e. UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN Habitat), and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the five UN Regional Commissions, i.e. the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) and the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA).

10. The DA projects of the ten IEs are focused in particular on capacity development, policy level engagement, advocacy for and support to the implementation of international norms and standards agreed through inter-governmental processes. The Account aims to support innovative approaches to support sustainable development. After a successful DA project, the initiatives are meant to be picked up by the IEs or by project partners with funding from outside of the Account. All projects implemented through the DA are based on requests from beneficiary countries to the IEs.

11. New DA tranches were until the 11th tranche initiated every two years. From 2020 onwards, starting with the 12th tranche, new DA tranches are launched on an annual basis, with half the number of projects of the previous biennial tranches. Project implementation periods, however, remain at a four year period.

2.2 Characteristics of DA Projects

12. Capacity development is the main focus of DA projects, with capacities being supported at multiple levels, including the individual, institutional and societal level.[1] Many DA projects concern international norms and standards, agreed through inter-governmental processes. This includes the adoption of norms and standards, as well as their integration into legislation, policies and development planning and support to implementation of such legislation, policies and development plans, at the country, (sub-) regional and global levels.

13. The capacity development support of IEs can take a variety of forms, including organization of workshops and trainings, support to the development of knowledge products, facilitation of inter-governmental dialogue and coordination amongst key stakeholders and policy level engagement, at times including the development of tools and guidelines, in order to facilitate policy implementation. DA projects often focus on enhanced capacities of policy makers, increased institutional capacities and strengthened coordination across stakeholders. Ultimate beneficiaries are the women and girls, men and boys who benefit in terms of the effects on their lives and livelihoods, in particular those of vulnerable and marginalized groups.

14. Most DA projects focus on multiple countries, often across multiple regions, involving several of the IEs and including partnerships with national level government, other UN agencies as well as other development partners, civil society organizations and universities. The involvement of multiple partners often results in leveraging of additional resources, including human and in kind resources as well as additional funding.

[1] UNDP, 2009.

2.3 DA Terminology for Results-Based Management

15. The DA uses Results-Based Management (RBM) approaches and has recently aligned its results framework language with terminology commonly used in this connection, as per table 1 below.

Table 1: Previous and new DA Terminology

Previous DA Terminology	New DA Terminology
Main Activity	Output
Expected Accomplishment	Outcome
Objective	Objective

2.4 DA Project Evaluations

16. Project evaluations are a key component of the DA evaluation function. For the 10th and 11th tranches all projects will continue to be evaluated as per past practice. Starting with the 12th tranche a selection of half the projects of each IEs within a tranche are to be evaluated The selection of projects for evaluation within a tranche will be based on a purposive sample[2], with random selection of projects for each of the implementing agencies. Projects with a budget of USD 1 million or more will by default be included among the projects selected for a project evaluation.

17. Project evaluations will include primary data gathering through a possible visit to one or more selected countries and virtual or face-to-face meetings and interviews with stakeholders, including the option for the evaluator to participate in the final workshop of the project and collect data from participants.

18. DA project evaluations are conducted towards the end or shortly after the DA project has been completed, with a focus on the achievements, and learning from the implementation of the project as well as the ways in which these were achieved. DA project evaluations consist of five phases:

- **The preparatory phase**, in which the Terms of Reference (TOR) are developed in coordination with stakeholders, the consultant(s) are identified and hired and secondary resources are compiled
- **The inception phase**, in which a desk review is conducted by the evaluator, the TOR is further operationalized, and a draft and final inception report is produced and discussed with relevant stakeholders
- **The data gathering phase**, in which primary and additional secondary data are gathered by the evaluator and in which an initial analysis is conducted, with preliminary results of the evaluation validated through discussions with key stakeholders
- **The analysis and reporting phase**, in which data gathered are further analysed and draft and final evaluation reports are prepared, informed by comments of relevant stakeholders
- **The follow-up phase,** in which the results of the evaluation are shared with key and other relevant stakeholders, a management response is developed by the entities and partners that have been targeted in the recommendations of the evaluation, and further action is taken with respect to learnings emanating from the evaluation

19. The next chapters (chapters 3-7) will discuss these phases in more detail.

[2] Purposive sampling, also known as selective sampling, is random sampling with the application of certain criteria for selection of the sample. In the case of the DA projects, the IEs are the criterion. This means that projects are organized by IE and from the projects of each IE in a tranche, a random sample is taken of half of the projects concerned. With the approach to selection of projects to be evaluated of each of the IEs being random,there are no specific selection criteria for DA projects to be evaluated.

3. Preparatory Phase of the Evaluation

20. In the preparatory phase the scene is set for the entire DA project evaluation process. This includes putting in place the management arrangements of the evaluation, development of the Terms of Reference (TOR) to guide the entire process, recruitment of the independent evaluator(s) to conduct the evaluation and compilation of the secondary data sources for the desk review. Below, details are presented on the management arrangements to be put in place for the evaluation and the requirements of the TOR and its development. Processes on recruitment of consultants will be specific for each of the IEs. Requirements for the evaluator(s) in terms of background, competencies and skills should be provided as part of the details presented in the TOR.

3.1 Evaluation Management

21. Management of the evaluation includes all phases of the evaluation process. In the preparatory phase it includes the development of the TOR, the recruitment of the evaluation consultant(s) and the compilation of secondary resources for the desk review.

22. DA project evaluations are to be managed independently from the person(s) directly responsible for management of the project. Usually, they are managed by the evaluation section of the IE concerned. This includes the development of the TOR.

23. Evaluation management can be supported by an Internal Evaluation Committee (IEC) as well as by an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG). The IEC is an internal committee, consisting of staff from the evaluation section and other substantive section(s) as relevant. The DA project manager can be included in the IEC as a non-voting member, with a role in terms of facilitation of communication with DA project stakeholders and provision of relevant secondary documentation and other inputs.

24. The ERG combines internal and external stakeholders and includes the management of the IE substantive section(s) (but not the project manager), government counterparts, other UN agencies and other relevant development partners. The ERG provides inputs in particular to the critical points in the evaluation process, including in the development of the TOR, the inception phase and the reporting phase, commenting on draft versions of the inception and evaluation reports.

25. The support of an IEC and ERG can reinforce the management of the evaluation process, enhance its independence and can heighten the credibility of the results of the evaluation. Therefore, the establishment of an Internal IEC and the ERG is encouraged as important means to guide the evaluation process and support evaluation management.

26. DA Project evaluations will be conducted by an independent evaluator or evaluation team, ideally gender balanced and if feasible, consisting of an evaluation as well as a subject matter specialist. The TOR is an important means in the recruitment process of the evaluator[3].

27. In terms of timing of the evaluation, data gathering at country level should not be started before all project activities have been finalized, with the exception of a possible final workshop or meeting, which can provide a useful means for the evaluator to participate in one of the project activities and to interview a variety of key stakeholders and participants at the event. Evaluations need to be finalized within a timeframe of three months after closure of the DA project, but could be extended up to six months following agreement with DA PMT, the period depending on the complexity of the evaluation and to be specified in the TOR.

[3] The term evaluator is in these Guidelines used for both a single evaluator as well as where evaluation would be conducted by an evaluation team of two persons.

28. For all DA projects, project managers prepare a final project report[4]. This report provides an overview of the project and its achievements, possible challenges faced, as well as good practices and lessons learned, primarily from the perspective of the project manager. The final project report forms an important input to the project evaluation. A draft of the report should be available to the evaluator during the evalution process.

3.2 Terms of Reference

29. The TOR provides the basis for the evaluation and gives direction to its implementation. The importance of a high quality TOR cannot be underestimated and it is, therefore, important to pay attention to the requirements of the TOR and its tailoring to the specific characteristics of the DA and the project concerned. The TOR is usually developed by the evaluation manager, in close coordination with stakeholders of the project, the substantive section(s) of the IE that manages the project, including the project manager[5], and the IE evaluation section, with the latter providing the evaluation manager. Moreover, in those situations where an IEC and/or an ERG would be established, the TOR would be reviewed by their members. A high quality TOR will require multiple iterations.

30. As the TOR provides the direction of the evaluation, the contents of the TOR are critical to the entire evaluation process. Though the TOR does need to contain a substantial amount of details, it is important to keep the TOR relatively short (upto 10 pages, excluding annexes), with main issues in the main document and details in annexes to the TOR. Annex 1 of these Guidelines provides a comprehensive overview of the contents required for the TOR of a DA project evaluation. Further details for each of the sections of the TOR are further provided below.

Table 2: Description of Key Components of the TOR

TOR section	Description
Evaluation Purpose	Details why the evaluation is conducted, why now, who the main anticipated users of the evaluation results are, and how the results of the evaluation are expected to be used by each of the users
Context and topic of the DA Project	Focuses on the topic that the project aims to address, and the development approaches used to deal with the issues concerned
Subject of the Evaluation	Is the DA project of which a short description needs to be provided
Evaluation Scope	Determines the boundaries and specifies the reach of the evaluation as well as issues that will be left out of the focus of the evaluation
Evaluation Objectives	Refer to what the evaluation needs to accomplish in order to reach its purpose
Evaluation Criteria	Refer to the guiding principles that will be used to gather and analyse data
Evaluation Questions	Provide further details on each of the evaluation criteria and specify key questions that need to be answered through the evaluation, in this way guiding data collection and analysis

a) Evaluation Purpose

31. The purpose of the evaluation details why the evaluation is conducted, why now, who the main anticipated users of the evaluation results are, and how the results of the evaluation are expected to

[4] See the following link for information on the preparation of the final report: https://www.un.org/development/desa/da/static-guidance-public/

[5] The role of the project manager is limited to providing of relevant information for the development of the TOR, with the evaluation meant to be independent from the management of the project.

be used by each of the users. Detailing the purpose of the evaluation is of critical importance, as it drives the evaluation, informing the evaluation scope, objectives and the evaluation criteria used and questions posed (see also the phases below for further details on the evaluation scope, objectives, criteria and questions).

32. Getting the purpose of the evaluation right is of particular importance for a DA project evaluation, since most of the projects are one-off initiatives, with usually no follow-up phase through the DA. The purpose of the evaluation is thus NOT to inform a second or subsequent phase of the same project, as is often the case in project evaluations of other development partners.

33. It is, therefore, important to identify from the start what the use of the results of the project evaluation is expected to be. In particular use of the results of the project evaluation by the IEs concerned is important, as well as use by project partners. Reference needs to be made to any decision-making processes, at the level of the IEs or otherwise, that the evaluation results could feed into. It will be useful to specify the kind of recommendations that are expected to result from the evaluation process. Moreover, the UN General Assembly needs to be included as an indirect user of the DA project evaluations, with evaluation results used in DA reporting to the UN General Assembly[6], in particular in terms of achievements and possibly lessons learned.

DA Requirements
Detail the purpose of the evaluation in relation to the DA project, specifying expected users and their use of the evaluation results

b) Context and topic of the DA Project

34. Contextual details of TORs of many country level project evaluations focus at the country level, detailing the country specific aspects of the topic that the project aimed to address. For DA projects, which often focus on multiple countries and can cover multiple regions or be global in approach, contextual details are slightly different. In the DA setup, context focuses in particular on the topic that the project aims to address and the development approaches used to deal with the issues concerned. This type of contextual information is important in order for the reader to understand the topic that the project focuses on, including the present state of affairs in tackling the issues concerned. In case the project focuses on a limited number of countries it is useful to elaborate on key details of the topic in the selected countries.[7]

35. Important details that need to be provided in terms of the topic of the DA project include policies, strategies and plans of government(s), government agencies and other stakeholders as well as support to the issues concerned from other UN agencies and development partners. Such data will enable assessing the DA project and its results as part of a wider array of initiatives of parties working on the same topic. Providing details on what others are doing as part of the context can, moreover, inform the understanding of the

DA Requirements
Provide information on the topic of the DA project and key development approaches used to address the issues concerned Include information on relevant government strategies, policies and plans and pay attention to support of development partners and other stakeholders in addressing the topic concerned, in order to understand the contribution of the project vis-a-vis other support

[6] The DA Progress Reports to General Assembly can be found on the DA website at the following link: https://www.un.org/development/desa/da/static-official-public/

[7] Contextual details are typically included in the project document for DA projects and would, thus, be available in the project document.

partnerships that the project has engaged in.

c) Subject of the Evaluation

36. The subject of the evaluation is the DA project, of which a short description needs to be provided. This includes the design of the project, any adaptations from the design during the course of project implementation and the rationale for these adaptations, as well as details on the results framework, outlining the objective of the project and the ways in which the project aims to contribute towards its achievement, through output and outcome level changes. Additional details of the results framework can be included in an annex. With many of the DA projects being part of a wider programmatic approach, there is a need to include the relationship of the project to the larger IE programme of which it is a part and how the DA project contributes to the results of the wider programme.

37. The description of the subject of the evaluation needs to make explicit the human rights related aspects of the DA project. This can include human rights related issues that the DA project relates to, and its contribution to equity and the principle of 'leaving no one behind'. Moreover, the description needs to include how the DA project contributes to gender equality and the empowerment of women and how results of the project could affect women and girls, as well as men and boys. Reference needs to be made to any possible human rights and/or gender analysis conducted in relation to the topic of the DA project, as part of the project or by other stakeholders.

38. The subject of the evaluation also needs to include a stakeholder map, i.e. an overview of stakeholders that have a direct or an indirect stake in the project and its evaluation. This needs to include both the interest and role of stakeholders in the topic of the project and the DA project itself, as well as their expected interest in the evaluation and its results. The early development of the stakeholder map will enable the evaluator to make use of it in the inception phase, further refine it and use the results to inform the evaluation process in terms of who to include in what ways in the data gathering, analysis and dissemination parts of the evaluation. For a format see annex 2.

DA Requirements
Description of the design of the project and any adaptations made to the design, including the rationale for any adaptation
Details of coverage of the DA project in terms of region(s) and countries and the rationale concerned, as well as the project results framework
Explicitly refer to the wider programme that the DA project is part of and the way in which the DA project contributes to the wider programme results framework
Incorporation of a human rights based approach and gender equity perspective in the project and related analysis conducted to inform project design
Include a stakeholder map and the interest of stakeholders in the project and its evaluation

d) Evaluation Scope and Objectives

39. The scope of the evaluation determines its boundaries and needs to be made explicit as part of the TOR. At the centre of the scope of each DA project evaluation stands the specific DA project, its design and its implementation over time, including the adaptations made to the original design during the implementation process. The scope specifies the reach of the evaluation in terms of time frame covered, geographical reach, as well as the stakeholders to be included in the evaluation. It details the thematic attention of the evaluation, the inclusion of cross-cutting issues and its focus on managerial and strategic aspects of the project. It also specifies issues that will be left out of the focus of the evaluation, including the rationale for leaving out such issues.

40. Evaluation objectives refer to what the evaluation needs to accomplish in order to reach its purpose. The objectives of the evaluation need to be distinguished from the purpose of the evaluation (i.e. why the evaluation is conducted, see also paragraphs 28-30 above).

41. Generally, DA evaluations have been focused on two objectives: accountability and learning, with in previous years much focus having been placed on accountability, and with the introduction of the DA Evaluation Framework, more attention being placed on learning. Rather than just making mention of learning and accountability, details on each of these need to be made explicit, as well as the balance between the two. Learning aspects can be further elaborated upon through details on the need for the evaluation to provide lessons and good practices on the topic concerned as well as on the need for recommendations to inform programming on the topic, with the recommendations usually not aimed at informing a second phase of the project.

42. With learning being a main objective of the evaluation, there is a need to conduct the evaluation in a participatory way, in order to ensure that conclusions and learnings are shared with, agreed to and owned by the stakeholders concerned, which enhances the prospects of the use of the results of the evaluation and the implementation of the recommendations.

DA Requirements
Provide details on the boundaries of the evaluation, specifying what is included and what will be excluded from the evaluation. Provide the learning objectives of the evaluation in addition to aspects of accountability and specify the requirements in relation to the topic of the DA project, including the rationale

e) Evaluation Criteria

43. The evaluation criteria refer to the key principles that the evaluation will use in order to gather and analyse data. The selection of evaluation criteria needs to relate to the evaluation objectives and the underlying purpose of the evaluation. A set of evaluation criteria was developed by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in the 1990's, which have been adopted by the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG). These criteria include: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability (see box 1 below for UNEG's definitions). All these criteria, with the exception of impact, need to apply to each DA project evaluation.

Box 1: UNEG Definition of Evaluation Criteria

Relevance: Extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country-needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies

Efficiency: Measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. It is most commonly applied to the input-output link in the causal chain of an intervention

Effectiveness: Extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Effectiveness assesses the outcome level, intended as an uptake or result of an output

Impact: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended

Sustainability: Continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time

Source: United Nations Evaluation Group, Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – Towards UNEG Guidance, March 2011

44. The evaluation criteria developed by the OECD DAC were geared in particular towards country level development interventions, often in single sectors and of a technical cooperation nature. As such their definitions do not necessarily fit with the specific characteristics of DA projects, which are projects at

multi-country, regional, sub-regional or global levels and that focus on capacity development. Therefore, the evaluation criteria need to be tailored to the specific requirements of the DA.

UNEG evaluation criteria tailored to the DA

45. While the criteria of **relevance**, **effectiveness** and **sustainability** do apply to DA projects, the evaluation questions underneath each of these criteria will need to be adapted to the characteristics of the DA (see details in box on page 14). The criterion of **efficiency** is useful in its focus on economic efficiency and timeliness of the process through which activities are transformed into output level results, including the use of human and financial resources and aspects of project management. The criterion of efficiency, however, misses out on other important process issues of DA projects, including partnerships, human rights and gender equality issues, which will be discussed below.

46. The criterion of **impact** proves usually less applicable to DA projects as results, in terms of effects on the lives of people, in particular vulnerable and marginalized groups, would usually only be assessable sometime after phasing out of the project, with a variety of other intervening factors playing a role. Given the limited budget and time frame of DA projects, they cannot necessarily be expected to be able to show impact level changes, i.e. demonstrable improvements in the lives of women and men, girls and boys within the time frame of the project. Impact assessment usually requires a huge investment in human and financial resources in order to be able to establish attribution through project interventions, something beyond the ability of DA projects.

Additional DA required evaluation criteria

47. The UNEG evaluation criteria do not cover all relevant aspects of the DA. Use of the additional DA required evaluation criteria (SDGs, partnerships, human rights, and gender equality and innovation) are, therefore, an essential part of DA project evaluations. These can either be included as separate criteria for the evaluation, or evaluation questions related to these could, alternatively, be included under one or more of the UNEG evaluation criteria.

48. Given the importance of the 2030 Agenda and the **SDGs**, the evaluation of DA projects needs to pay attention to these. This includes attention to the SDGs and related targets and indicators of those SDGs relevant to the project concerned as well as attention to the principle of 'Leaving no one behind'. This can be achieved under selected evaluation criteria, e.g. through analysis of alignment of the project with the 2030 Agenda as part of the assessment of the criterion of relevance, or through analysis of the contribution of the project to SDG targets and indicators as part of the assessment of the evaluation criterion of effectiveness. Alternatively, SDGs can be used as a separate evaluation criterion, with specific evaluation questions formulated and analysed as part of the evaluation.

49. **Partnerships** are an essential element of DA projects, as they can enhance efficiencies and effectiveness of project delivery, by ensuring full utilization of comparative advantages and avoiding duplication of efforts. Partnerships are, therefore, an important and required criteria for the evaluation of DA projects. In the DA context, partnerships typically refer to joint/collaborative implementation of projects amongst DA IEs, other UN agencies as well as sub-regional, regional and global level stakeholders. Direct beneficiaries of DA projects are, however, not refered to as implementing partners.

50. Issues of partnership can be dealt with as part of the criterion of efficiency, looking at aspects of synergy or as part of the evaluation criteria of effectiveness, with a focus on results concerned. Partnerships can also be used as a separate criterion.

51. **Human rights** and **gender equality** are important cross- cutting principles to be incorporated in all UN programming. They are also integrated in the 2030 Agenda and have been incorporated in the evaluation quality assessment framework of UN Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS). It is, therefore, essential to include these issues in the design of a DA project evaluation. This requires explicit attention to the principles of equality, inclusion and non-discrimination as part of the

evaluation. In case the project design has clearly included human rights and gender equality issues, a gender analysis has been conducted and monitoring and reporting have captured related details, disaggregating data, then inclusion in the design of the evaluation can be guided by these aspects. However, if such details are less available or altogether missing, the reasons need to be understood and some of these aspects can be included in the evaluation design. The conduciveness of the context to include human rights and gender related issues in the DA project evaluation will need to be taken into account as it will affect the feasibility and the level of their inclusion in the evaluation process.[8] Human rights and gender aspects can be included in each or a selection of the evaluation criteria, they can be used as a separate criterion or both options can be combined in the evaluation.

52. With the DA focus on **innovation**[9], it is important for DA project evaluation to pay attention to the extent to which, and the ways in which, innovation has been a feature of the project. As with other thematic issues, this can be done as part of the UNEG evaluation criteria or innovation can be used as a separate evaluation criterion, with specific evaluation questions formulated to assess issues concerned.

DA Requirements
Present the UNEG evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and efficiency), tailored to the characteristics of the DA and the project concerned
Use of the additional DA **required** evaluation criteria (SDGs, partnerships, human rights and gender equality and innovation) as additional criteria and as an essential part of DA project evaluations, or include questions related to these under one or more of the UNEG evaluation criteria

f) Evaluation Questions

53. Evaluation questions provide further details on each of the evaluation criteria and specify key questions that need to be answered through the evaluation, in this way guiding data collection and analysis.

54. A large amount of questions tends to divert the evaluation to address a myriad of issues that do not necessarily provide the opportunity for the evaluation to come up with a set of findings that can be the basis for a well informed conclusions on the topic of the project. With the limited resources that DA project evaluations have, it is important to provide useful and evidence based answers to a limited number of questions, rather than superficially addressing a wide range of questions. Project evaluations, therefore,` should ideally be limited to a maximum of six to seven main evaluation questions, which together need to be able to address the purpose of the evaluation.

DA Requirements
Evaluation questions need to be formulated under each of the evaluation criteria selected – doing so is the responsibility of the evaluation manager, supported by the IE evaluation section
In situations where IEC and/or ERG have been established, the questions need to be developed in participation with their members
In order to focus the evaluation, questions should ideally be limited to a maximum of seven

[8] In order to assess the extent to which a project or programme contributes to gender equality, the UN System Wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women includes the Gender Results Effectiveness Scale, which identifies five different levels of results, which can be of use in DA project evaluations: gender negative, gender blind, gender targeted, gender responsive and gender transformative. United Nations Evaluation Group, 2018. For a more comprehensive overview of possible approaches to address challenges in the evaluation of human rights and gender related cross-cutting issues, see United Nations Evaluation Group, 2011 and 2014, with the latter providing a more detailed approach to inclusion of human rights and gender equality in evaluation.

[9] For the purposes of the DA innovation is thought of as IEs either addressing new topics or using new means of delivering projects (or a combination thereof) that differ significantly from the topics and means of delivering projects (or part of them) that the IE has previously addressed or used for delivery.

Examples of Evaluation Questions to adapt to the specifics of the DA

Relevance

- To what extent was the project objective aligned with international conventions and inter-governmental processes?
- To what extent does the project design respond to the needs of Member States?
- What adaptations were made to the design of the project during implementation and were these justified in the context concerned?
- What lessons and good practices from previous DA projects were used to inform project design?

Efficiency

- What human, financial and in-kind resources were leveraged through contributions of partners?
- To what extent did the project achieve efficiency in implementation through the combination of project stakeholders involved, making use of comparative advantages and the creation of synergy?

Effectiveness

- To what extent did the selection of participants for training programmes, workshops and study tours, contribute to results achieved?
- To what extent and in what ways have training, workshops and study tours contributed to learning of participants?
- To what extent have participants been able to make use of learnings through training, workshops and study tours and changed the way in which they conduct their work, in order to enhance results?
- What aspects of policy related change has the project contributed towards?

Sustainability

- Did project design include an approach to scaling up of results and how has this been implemented?
- To what extent and in which ways have national level UN and other national level development organizations been involved in project implementation and what role can they be expected to play in sustaining the results achieved through the project at country level?

Partnerships

- To what extent has partnering with other organizations enabled or enhanced reaching of results?
- Has partnering with other organizations resulted in reduction of overlap and increased efficiency?

The 2030 Agenda/ SDGs

- In what ways and to what extent has the project contributed to supporting the principle of leaving no one behind in the sustainable development process?
- To what extent has the project contributed to reaching targets of selected SDGs?

Human Rights and Gender Equality

- To what extent was a rights-based and gender sensitive approach applied in the design and implementation of the project, informed by relevant and tailored human rights and gender analysis?
- In what ways were results for disadvantaged and left behind groups included and prioritized in the design and implementation of the project and were resources provided to enable this?
- To what extent has the project contributed to human rights and gender equality related objectives and to SDG 5 on Gender Equality and gender objectives in other SDGs and were targets concerned included in the project results framework?

Innovation

- What innovative aspects of the project (addressing new topics or using new means of delivery or a combination thereof) proved successful?
- How can innovative aspects of the project that proved successful be scaled up and replicated with funding from outside the DA?

55. An initial set of evaluation questions is developed as part of the development of the TOR for the DA project evaluation, a process conducted under the responsibility of the evaluation manager. In order for the evaluation questions and the results that they produce to be owned by the various project stakeholders, it is important for the evaluation manager to engage key project stakeholders in the development of the evaluation questions. In case an IEC and ERG are established, it will be important to involve their members. Rather than each stakeholder adding the questions that they are most interested in, a process that usually results in a large amount of evaluation questions, that are not well prioritized, it will be useful to inform the process through virtual meeting(s) with key stakeholders to develop a focused set of questions.

g) Methodology of the Evaluation

56. DA Project evaluations are end of project evaluations and in that respect they are summative in character, aimed at assessment of the results of the intervention for accountability and learning purposes. As such, they differ from formative evaluation, conducted during an intervention and aimed at improvement of the intervention and its management.[10]

57. In their design, DA project evaluations will usually make use of a theory-based approach. A theory-based approach assesses the extent to which an intervention has contributed to observed results through the use of a theory of change or results framework, which outlines the causal relations between activities and their results, while at the same time considering underlying assumptions and risks in reaching results. This approach includes review of results achieved as well as the process through which these have been accomplished. A theory-based approach involves the use of a non-experimental design. This setup suits most of the DA projects, for which experimental and quasi-experimental approaches are less suitable. In addition to a theory-based approach, the methodology can make use of other approaches, including gender and human rights responsive evaluation.

58. DA project evaluations require a mixed methods approach, which enables the assessment of the issues concerned from a variety of methodological perspectives. Moreover, multiple methods can be used in a complementary way, each adding specific data and perspectives, which compensates for bias related to the use of any single method. Application of multiple methods enables the use of triangulation across methods. In addition to methods for data gathering, attention is required to methods for data analysis (for details see annex 3).

59. DA project evaluations make use of a participatory approach, including stakeholders in all stages of the evaluation process. The level of stakeholder participation needs to be made explicit as part of the methodology, in particular which stakeholders to involve in which ways in the evaluation process, for which use can be made of the stakeholder mapping. Stakeholder participation strengthens accountability, enhances ownership of the evaluation process and its findings, heightens credibility of the evaluation results and increases the likeliness of the implementation of the recommendations.

60. The methodology of the evaluation needs to detail ethical considerations that the evaluation and the evaluator need to comply with, making use of the UNEG evaluation ethical guidelines.[11] While this applies to all evaluations, this is of particular concern when members of vulnerable and marginalized groups are participating in the evaluation and the primary data gathering process.

[10] Scriven, 1991.

[11] United Nations Evaluation Group, March 2008.

61. If methodological details are not explicitly specified in the TOR, the evaluator can be required to develop (parts of) the methodology during the inception phase of the evaluation. If the latter is the case, the TOR will need to provide the parameters of the methodology, ensuring that the methodological approach and rigor concerned will end up to be able to result in a credible evaluation report in line with IE and DA needs and UNEG norms and standards.[12] Further details on methodology of the evaluation will be discussed as part of the section on the Inception Phase of the evaluation process, with additional details in annex 3.

DA Requirements
Provide details on methodology in line with the purpose and objectives and the specific characteristics of the DA project to be evaluated
Make use of a theory-based approach, guided by the project results framework
Make use of a mixed methods approach, including qualitative as well as quantitative data gathering and analysis
Use a participatory approach to enhance opportunities for generating learning that is shared across stakeholders of the project

h) Organization of the Evaluation

62. This section of the TOR describes the organization of the evaluation and provides details on the roles, responsibilities and lines of authority for all parties involved in the evaluation process. Implementation arrangements are intended to clarify expectations, prevent ambiguities, and facilitate an efficient and effective evaluation process.

63. Details need to include the roles and responsibilities of the evaluation manager, the evaluator, and if applicable the roles and responsibilities of the team leader and member of the team, as well as the members of the IEC and the ERG and any other relevant stakeholders. In the case of a joint evaluation, with the participation of multiple IEs, responsibilities of each of the partners and management details need to be specified, making explicit which elements of the evaluation are joint and which are agency specific.

64. The organization of the evaluation needs to ensure the independence of the evaluation from the management of the DA project, including that management of the evaluation cannot be the responsibility of the DA project manager.

65. The TOR needs to detail the composition of the Evaluation team, including requirements in terms of background, competencies and skills of team leader (and member if applicable). The type of evidence (resumes, work samples, references) that will be expected to support claims of knowledge, skills and experience of candidates for the position of evaluator, need to be specified. The TOR needs to explicitly require the independence of the evaluator, for her/him not to have been involved in any part of the DA project, including its design and implementation as well as any advisory role to the project that is the subject of the evaluation.

66. Other issues to consider include: lines of authority; processes and responsibilities for approval of deliverables and other aspects of the implementation of the evaluation; and logistical considerations, such as whether and what kind of support will be provided to travel arrangements, office space, supplies, equipment and materials.

67. Details on the organization of the evaluation need to include a detailed Evaluation Workplan (see Annex 2 for a Format for the Evaluation Workplan), with key issues concerning timing of the main phases of the evaluation in the main text, and a detailed work plan in an annex. This needs to include the timing of the various deliverables, including draft and final Inception Report, draft and final

[12] United Nations Evaluation Group, 2016, 2017.

Evaluation Report, with an outline of the contents of each in an annex. A realistic timeframe in the TOR can prevent the need for adaptations during the DA project evaluation process.

68. Any security considerations need to be detailed, specific to the region and countries in which the DA project operates.

69. The details on the total evaluation budget need to be provided, as well as a breakdown of the budget along DA financial categories. Budgetary details are meant for internal use only. Payment arrangement for consultants need to be included.

DA Requirements
Specify the roles of evaluation manager, the evaluator and if applicable the composition and roles of the Internal Evaluation Committee and the Evaluation Reference Group. Provide details on the role of the DA project manager in the evaluation process, in line with the requirements for independence of the evaluation Include specification of the workplan of the evaluation, including details on deliverables and their timing

i) Annexes to the TOR

70. In addition to the annexes that are required, the TOR can include additional details on context, subject and methodology to the specifics provided in the main text of the TOR.

DA Requirements

Annexes to the TOR need to include:

- DA project results framework
- Stakeholder map
- Documents to be consulted
- UNEG Ethical code of conduct
- Detailed evaluation workplan
- Format for Inception Report (see annex 4)
- Format for Evaluation Report (see annex 5)
- Format for Management Response (see annex 2)

Optional:

- Additional details to the context
- Additional details to the subject
- Additional details to the methodology

4. Inception Phase of the Evaluation

71. The inception phase is informed by the desk review of secondary materials and allows for the evaluator to review the details of all aspects of the evaluation process, as presented in the TOR. This process can be reinforced through an inception mission (if feasible in the context of the evaluation concerned), in which the evaluator discusses aspects of the setup of the evaluation with the evaluation manager (and if applicable with members of the IEC and the ERG). Such a mission allows for initial data gathering through interviews and meetings and is particularly helpful in more complex evaluation settings.

72. The evaluation manager provides support to all aspects of the inception phase, including the provision of compiled relevant secondary data, communication with the independent evaluator, sharing of the draft Inception Report with key stakeholders, collating comments and sharing these with the evaluator and sharing the final Inception Report with key stakeholders. It is important for the evaluation manager to support the setup of a meeting schedule, with inputs and support from the project manager, for the data gathering phase of the evaluation.

4.1 Steps in the Inception Phase of the Evaluation

73. Several steps need to be taken in the inception phase, often specifying and working out details provided in the TOR, and further operationalizing the implementation of the evaluation. Each of the steps will be further detailed below, bearing in mind that the order of the steps can vary based on the context and the specifics of the DA project concerned.

DA Requirements
• Start the desk review and inform the inception phase with the initial results of the desk review • Acknowledge the purpose of the evaluation and the expected use and users of the evaluation results as guiding principles to the evaluation process • Analyse the context of the DA project • Review and analyse the details on the DA project to be evaluated, including an assessment of the results framework of the project • Further specify the stakeholder mapping that is included in the TOR, or develop one when this was not included, and conduct stakeholder analysis • Assess the availability and reliability of relevant secondary data • Review the scope and evaluation objectives and assess their relation to the purpose of the evaluation • Review the evaluation criteria and questions and their relation to the evaluation objectives • Review the methodology for the evaluation as presented in the TOR and further develop and/or specify it • Prepare the evaluation matrix • Prepare a detailed work plan for the implementation of the evaluation • Develop and discuss the draft inception report with key stakeholders and prepare the final inception report

a) Desk review

74. The desk review entails a review of relevant secondary resources to inform the inception phase as well as the remainder of the evaluation process. An initial overview of relevant materials is usually provided in the TOR, while the evaluator can further expand on this in the inception phase.

Secondary Information of Use in DA Project Evaluations

Project related data

- DA project concept note, project document, project annual reports, project financial information as well as project monitoring details and project final report
- TORs of consultancy missions, reports of workshops/trainings, mission reports, presentations
- Minutes of meetings related to project implementation
- Knowledge products, including studies, notes, toolkits etc. developed with support of the DA project

Other relevant data

- Documentation on the issues that the project aims to address, including information on international meetings and inter-governmental dialogue
- Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) related data including Voluntary National Reports of countries included in the DA project
- Global level reports on the status of the topic of the DA project
- Relevant regional and country level documentation related to the topic of the project
- Country level national development strategies and plans related to the topic of the project
- Previous evaluations on the topic of the project and any existing baseline studies or other research documentation concerned
- Regional consultation meetings in relation to the topic of the project
- Relevant human rights, gender equality, capacity and other assessments conducted on issues related to the topic of the project in the region and countries concerned
- Relevant statistical data regarding the topic of the DA project

b) Purpose of the Evaluation

75. With the purpose of the evaluation guiding the objectives, which in turn guide the evaluation criteria and questions, it is important for the evaluator, the evaluation manager, and if applicable the IEC and the ERG, to have a shared understanding of the purpose of the evaluation and to acknowledge its significance. Whenever changes in evaluation questions, criteria, scope and objectives would be contemplated during the inception phase, changes concerned need to be in line with the purpose of the evaluation.

DA Requirements

The inception report should provide a clear understanding of the purpose of the evaluation and the expected use of its results in the specific context of the DA project and be informed by the details provided in the TOR

c) Contextual Analysis

76. The context describes information on the backdrop of the DA project, including the political, programmatic and governance environment in which the project is situated and in which the evaluation takes place. Specific to the DA projects, the context includes a focus on the topic that the project aims to address. In the inception report, the evaluator needs to demonstrate a clear understanding of the context of the DA project and its importance in terms of the evaluation. This should build on, but also go beyond, the description provided in the TOR.

DA Requirements
The inception report should inform the operationalization of the evaluation with details concerning the context of the evaluation and present relevant context details

77. It is important to make use of the details of the contextual analysis in other parts of the inception report and to inform the operationalization of the evaluation with specifics of the context in which the DA project has been implemented. This can, for example, be in terms of country or site selection or selection or sampling of participants from trainings conducted, as part of the methodology of the evaluation.

d) Review the Subject of the Evaluation and the DA Project Results Framework

78. Building on the details provided in the TOR and informed by the desk review, the evaluator in the inception phase needs to demonstrate a more thorough understanding of the DA project, the objective it aimed to contribute towards achieving, as well as the ways in which it tried to accomplish this. Such an understanding needs to be reflected in the description of the subject of the evaluation, as part of the inception report, with references provided to secondary information consulted.

79. The review of the DA project as the subject of the evaluation needs to include a preliminary analysis. This includes in particular the results framework of the project, which can be analysed in terms of its internal consistency as well as whether expected accomplishments/outcomes can be expected to be achieved in the timeframe provided for the project and given the resources concerned. Moreover, the extent to which the outputs, outcomes and the objective can be considered to form a causal chain of results, is important to assess.

DA Requirements
The subject of the evaluation needs to be described in sufficient detail in the inception report, including an initial analysis of the results framework of the DA project, to inform the setup of the evaluation

e) Stakeholder Mapping and Analysis

80. The stakeholder map included in the TOR needs to be further developed as part of the inception phase. This in order to inform the evaluation in terms of which of the stakeholders to include in the evaluation as well as the way in which and the extent to which to include each of them. Analysis of stakeholders can be conducted in a variety of ways. One of these is to organize stakeholders in terms of their interest, i.e. the degree to which they are expected to be affected by the project, and in terms of their influence, i.e. the influence that they have over the project and the degree to which they can be expected to be able to support the achievement of its objective. Different kinds of combinations of 'interest' and 'influence' will require different types

DA Requirements
A detailed stakeholder mapping needs to be prepared in the inception phase, analysis of which is indispensable in deciding which stakeholders to include, in what ways and to what extent, in the evaluation process

of engagement with stakeholders concerned. In particular stakeholders with high levels of both 'interest' and 'influence' are those that the evaluation needs to fully engage with.

f) Data Availability and Reliability

81. In order to inform the development of the methodology of the evaluation, there is a need to know which kind of data are available and expand on any information provided in the TOR. This includes the availability of secondary resources and project monitoring data, as well as baseline data on indicators of the project's result framework and other relevant indicators of change and whether available data are disaggregated for gender and other aspects of vulnerability and marginalization. In case baseline data are missing, ways of reconstructing baseline information will need to be included in the setup of the evaluation methodology. Moreover, data availability is dependent on the readiness of key informants and groups of project participants to take part in the primary data gathering process of the evaluation. In addition to the availability of data, it is important at this stage to start providing details on the reliability of the data concerned, which will affect the use of the data in the evaluation process.

> **DA Requirements**
>
> At the inception stage, the evaluator needs to get a clear overview of secondary data available, including baseline and additional data on indicators of the DA project results framework and the level of disaggregation of available data. Moreover, opportunities for primary data gathering need to be identified

g) Evaluation Scope and Objectives

82. The scope and objective of the evaluation are established in the TOR. These need to be consistent with one another and feasible within the time frame and financial and human resources available for the DA project evaluation. If their assessment in the inception phase highlights some critical concerns, these would need to be discussed by the evaluator with the evaluation manager and if applicable with the IEC and ERG. In case there is an inception mission as part of the evaluation, these issues should be discussed at this stage, so that an agreement on any kind of adaptation to the scope and objectives of the evaluation can be included in the draft and final inception reports, together with justification of alterations concerned, compared to the TOR.

> **DA Requirements**
>
> Evaluation scope and objectives need to be reviewed in the inception stage and any modifications agreed with the evaluation manager and included in the Inception Report, with details on the rationale

h) Evaluation Criteria and Questions

83. As part of the inception phase, the evaluation criteria and questions need to be reviewed, in order to ensure that the criteria reflect the evaluation objectives and that the evaluation questions are limited in number and in turn sufficiently reflect the criteria used in the evaluation. This is informed by the desk review and initial (often virtual) discussions with key stakeholders. Evaluation criteria and questions need to be coherent and the answering of the questions needs to be feasible in terms of the level of human and financial resources available for the evaluation. In order to focus the evaluation, the number of evaluation questions should ideally be limited to a total of seven questions.

84. At this stage, the evaluator can propose adaptations to the evaluation questions. This could include, for example, changes in clustering of questions around evaluation criteria or reducing the amount of questions to a more realistic number, in line with the time frame and resources of the evaluation. Changes need to be agreed by the evaluation manager (and if applicable IEC and ERG) with adaptations presented in the draft Inception Report, including adequate justification for adaptations proposed. For details on DA specific suggestions for evaluation questions for the criteria of relevance, efficiency,

effectiveness, and sustainability as well as partnership, the 2030 Agenda/SDGs, human rights and gender equality and innovation (see the box on page 14).

85. One way to review the evaluation criteria and questions is to identify the nature of the DA project support. For eample, a project that focuses on the adoption of norms and standards and related instruments, the evaluation is usually focused on process and governance issues in the adoption of norms and standards as well as the relevance of the norms, standards and instruments in the context of the project. On the other hand, for a project that supports the government in incorporating a particular norm, standard or instrument in national legislation, policies or development planning, the evaluation would usually need to focus on the capacity changes of the agencies concerned and the level of reflection of the norms and standards in legislation, policies and development programmes. For a project that supports the application of laws, policies and plans that have incorporated norms and standards, the evaluation would need to focus on the actual implementation, including capacities and processes concerned and if feasible the results for people, in particular for vulnerable groups.

DA Requirements
Evaluation criteria and questions need to be reviewed and finalized in the inception stage Criteria and questions need to be aligned with the evaluation objectives Evaluation questions should ideally be limited to a maximum of seven

86. The evaluation questions, once agreed among stakeholders in the inception phase, become a means to guide the data gathering and analysis process and the preparation of the draft and final evaluation report. An important tool that assists the evaluator in this respect is the evaluation matrix, which is a way to operationalize each of the evaluation questions, so that data can be gathered and analysed to come to meaningful statements on issues concerned. (See details below and annex 2 for a Format for the Evaluation Matrix.)

i) Evaluation methodology

87. As part of the inception phase, the evaluation methodology needs to be reviewed by the evaluator and if needed adapted and further developed in consultation with the evaluation manager, and if applicable with the IEC and ERG. Discussions need to cover the appropriateness and feasibility of the methodology, its ability to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and to answer the evaluation questions, taking into consideration limitations of budget, time and data sources. The methodology needs to be finalized as part of the inception phase and agreed upon, with a comprehensive overview of the methodological approach of the evaluation included in the final inception report.

88. As outlined in the TOR, DA project evaluations make use of a theory-based approach, making use of the project results framework to assess the output and outcome level changes achieved and the contribution made by the project. A participatory approach is used in order to engage stakeholders in the evaluation process, to enhance ownership of evaluation results and to allow for triangulation across a variety of stakeholders and participants. For data gathering, there is a need to make use of mixed methods, making use of an appropriate combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches, while bearing in mind that use of some of the methods are more extensive and require specific capacities of the evaluator concerned. An overview of methods to be used for data gathering and analysis is presented in annex 3.

89. The inception report needs to provide details on primary data gathering. The approach concerned will depend on the set-up of the DA project and its implementation at country, regional or global level. In particular when a limited number of countries are included, with substantial support at country level, country visits may be useful. Otherwise, visits to regional and global offices of IEs would be a useful approach for primary data gathering, supplemented by virtual interviews with selected stakeholders. Participation of the evaluator at the final project workshop or training activity towards the end of the

project provides a useful opportunity for the evaluator to get first-hand experience of a project activity and to gather data from participants. As part of the methodological details, selection of countries for primary data gathering, sampling for quantitative and qualitative data gathering, and ways to address limitations to the methodology need to be detailed, informed by the information presented in the TOR.

90. Changes to the methodology of the TOR need to be identified and justified and agreed with the evaluation manager and if applicable with the IEC and ERG during discussions on the draft inception report. Tools to be used for data gathering, like lists of items for semi-structured interviews and questionnaires for (mini-)surveys, need to be included in an annex to the inception report.

91. As part of the methodology, there is a need to make explicit how methods included allow for assessment of human-rights and gender equality related issues. This can, among other ways, be achieved through interviewing stakeholders separately, when there are differences in power, interest or influence, including separately interviewing supervisors and staff, women and men, girls and boys, as well as separately interviewing government stakeholders and ultimate project beneficiaries (as relevant). In order to ensure sufficient attention to both policy and technical issues, it might be useful to conduct separate interviews with the policy and technical staff concerned of the same agency.

92. In broader terms, the inclusion of human rights and gender equality can be achieved through the inclusion of aspects of human rights and gender equality in evaluation questions, gathering and analysing sex disaggregated data[13] from in particular vulnerable and marginalized groups, use of appropriate methods in ways that respect the rights of participants in the evaluation and the use of a gender balanced evaluation team, with the inclusion of capacities on human rights and gender in terms of the requirements of the evaluator.

DA Requirements

Make use of a theory-based approach, guided by the project results framework, including assessment of results and the process through which these were achieved

Use a participatory approach to enhance opportunities for generating learning that is shared across stakeholders of the project

Make use of a mixed methods approach, including qualitative as well as quantitative data gathering and analysis

Combine output level assessment with contribution analysis in the review of outcome level changes of a DA project

Changes in methodology from the TOR need to be justified in the Inception Report

Make explicit how human rights and gender equality related data will be gathered and analysed

Inclusion of Gender Equality and Human Rights

- Evaluation objective and scope include human rights and gender equality related issues
- Evaluation criteria and questions specify how to assess human rights and gender equality related issues
- Inclusion of a human rights and gender responsive methodology, data gathering tools and analysis
- The evaluator is qualified with respect to human rights and gender issues
- Evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis

[13] Disaggregated data by sex are important but usually not sufficient to show aspects of gender equality, which also needs to take into account the social positions of the participants concerned and aspects of their representation.

j) Evaluation Matrix

93. Preparation of the evaluation matrix is an important part of the inception phase. The process of preparing the evaluation matrix needs to be guided by the evaluation criteria and questions. The evaluation matrix details for each of the individual evaluation questions a number of assumptions, which need to be assessed in order to get answers to the questions. For each of these assumptions, indicators should be identified that can provide information on the assumption and for which sources of information and methods and tools for data collection and analysis need to be identified. Each of the evaluation questions can thus be broken down in smaller parts on which data can be gathered. In this way the matrix can guide data gathering. A format for the evaluation matrix is provided in annex 2.

94. The evaluation matrix needs to be developed by the evaluator during the inception phase, informed by the desk review. In addition to guiding data gathering, the evaluation matrix is an important means to guide data analysis and reporting. The matrix can be used during the data gathering process to record information collected against each of the assumptions and indicators identified in the matrix. When this is done in a consistent way, the evaluation matrix becomes an important tool for data analysis and in the writing of the evaluation report, as it brings together data on each of the evaluation criteria and questions. The same approach can, moreover, be used as a checkpoint to ensure that data and information gathered covers all aspects of the evaluation, across all of the evaluation questions, assumptions and indicators in the evaluation matrix.

> **DA Requirements**
>
> The development of an evaluation matrix provides a means to operationalize the evaluation questions and is required in the inception phase. The matrix is an important means to guide the process of data gathering, data analysis and preparation of the project evaluation report

95. The indicators in the evaluation matrix should ideally include the indicators of the project results framework, as well as a number of other relevant indicators.

k) Evaluation Workplan

96. In the inception phase, a clear and detailed evaluation work plan needs to be developed, including details of activities to be performed and dates for the various stages of the evaluation process, i.e. the inception phase, on data gathering phase, the analysis and reporting phase and the follow-up phase of the evaluation. With the latter phase in particular aimed at supporting the use of the evaluation results, attention needs to be paid to evaluation use from the start of the evaluation process. The workplan needs to include dates for the draft and final versions of the inception and evaluation reports and any other deliverables that are part of the assignment of the external evaluator. See annex 2 for a format.

> **DA Requirements**
>
> The inception report needs to include a detailed workplan, covering all phases of the evaluation process and specifying dates for the draft and final deliverables of the evaluation

l) Preparing the Draft and Final Inception Report

97. The evaluator is responsible for the preparation of the draft inception report and for providing this to the evaluation manager, who, distributes it to relevant stakeholders and, if applicable, to the members of the IEC and the ERG for comments. Based on discussion of the contents of the draft inception report and the consolidated comments from all key stakeholders, usually prepared by the evaluation

manager, the evaluator prepares the final inception report. It will be useful to provide an overview of comments and the responses of the evaluator to each of these as part of the finalization of the inception report.

98. The presentation of the inception report at the start of the data gathering phase of the evaluation provides an opportunity to get all key stakeholders together at the beginning of the evaluation and to engage them in the process. This also provides an opportunity to discuss the details of the inception report and to address any comments by the evaluator. The final inception report needs to be completed before the start of primary data gathering.

DA Requirements
The draft inception report needs to be discussed with the evaluation manager and key stakeholders and, if applicable, with the member of the IEC and ERG, whose comments, compiled by the evaluation manager, need to be responded to in the preparation of the final inception report

99. Each of the steps taken in the inception phaseprovides inputs to the development of the Inception Report, making use of and building on the details provided in the TOR. The inception report is a means for the evaluator to show a thorough understanding of the purpose of the evaluation, the DA project as the subject of the evaluation, the context and to provide methodological and organizational details on how the purpose of the evaluation will be fulfilled. A detailed overview of DA requirements for the project inception report is presented in annex 4.

5. Data Gathering Phase of the Evaluation

100. The data gathering phase of the evaluation includes gathering of primary and additional secondary data at relevant country, sub-regional, regional and global levels. DA evaluations should include face-to-face interactions with stakeholders. This could, if relevant and timely, be achieved through participation of the evaluator in the final workshop or meeting, which is often part of the activities organized in the final stages of a DA project (typically a regional workshop). Attending the final workshop or meeting can also be an efficient way to establish contact with a number of key stakeholders that can be followed up upon during the course of the evaluation.

101. DA project evaluations can further include primary data gathering through a possible visit to one or more countries that were involved in project implementation, in order to gather first-hand information on results achieved, constraints faced and the ways in which challenges were addressed. Primary data gathering should include the stakeholders identified in the inception phase, through the stakeholder analysis. This will usually also involve visit(s) to the IEs responsible for the project ,including the project manager. Government and non-governmental partners as well as participants in project activities will ussally be included in data gathering, making use of the methods and tools presented in the inception report. Efforts should further be made to gather data from stakeholders who did not participate in the final workshop or meeting as well as those that did not directly participate in the project, but that can bring important perspectives in terms of project achievements, processes and context.

102. Though the data gathering phase is meant to be implemented in line with the final inception report, there is a need to remain flexible throughout the implementation process of the evaluation. Even with a high quality TOR and inception report, unexpected issues may occur and will need to be addressed. When such events occur, it is useful for the evaluator to communicate and discuss with the evaluation manager, who if applicable could get back to the IEC and in certain cases the ERG, in order to get all stakeholders to agree with how to move forward. In practice, adaptations would usually be minor, with most of the issues addressed in the preparatory and inception phases of the evaluation.

DA Requirements
The data gathering phase needs to be conducted in line with the details provided in the inception report Primary data gathering could include possible country visit(s), enabling data gathering on results and how these were achieved from the perspective of stakeholders that participated as well as from those who did not participate directly in DA project events, in addition to possible participation of the evaluator in a final project workshop or meeting Any constraints in the implementation of the evaluation need to be discussed with the evaluation manager and if needed consulted with the IEC and ERG if applicable Preliminary results of the evaluation need to be validated with key stakeholders, with the feedback received to be used for the preparation of the draft evaluation report

103. At the end of the data gathering phase, validation of the preliminary results with key stakeholders is required. This is an important way to get feedback from stakeholders on the initial analysis of the evaluation findings and provides useful inputs to the preparation of the draft evaluation report

6. Analysis and Reporting Phase of the Evaluation

104. With much of the details of the evaluation process discussed as part of the TOR and Inception Report, the consideration of the analysis and reporting phase will focus on those aspects that are new, including findings, conclusions, lessons learned/good practices, recommendations, the executive summary and aspects of the writing of the draft and final evaluation report.[14]

105. Management of the evaluation at this stage is about the review of the draft evaluation report in terms of compliance with DA requirements by the evaluation manager, and application of the quality assurance process of the concerned IE. The draft of the evaluation report then needs to be shared with key stakeholders, with the evaluation manager compiling comments and sending them to the evaluator, to inform the preparation of the final evaluation report.

6.1 Findings

106. Findings are factual statements that respond to the evaluation questions or parts thereof and are informed by evidence and data provided in the evaluation report. The findings respond to the scope and objective of the evaluation. They reflect appropriate analysis of data resulting in statements that start answering parts of the evaluation questions. Findings need to include a focus on results, ways in which these have been achieved and the contributions of the project. Reasons for accomplishments as well as for lack of progress need to be provided as much as possible.

107. Gaps and limitations in data need to be identified and discussed as well as how these were addressed and in what way they affected the findings. In addition to expected changes, as included in the results framework of the project, findings need to pay attention to unexpected changes, which can be positive as well as negative in relation to the project objective. Findings should cover all the evaluation criteria and questions included in the evaluation. Specific attention needs to be paid to human rights and gender equality related issues, in line with their importance in terms of evaluation criteria and questions.

108. Findings need to make note of adaptations made to the design of the project and its results framework and indicators, something which in particular might occur during the first year of DA project implementation. This is especially important for projects where the IE has been requested by DA PMT to provide country specific action plans and indicators as part of the first annual project progress report(s). The evaluation needs to consider these adaptations and base the assessment of project results on the revised results framework, including changes to the indicators.

DA Requirements
Findings need to cover all evaluation criteria and respond to all of the evaluation questions. They have to be informed by evidence provided in the evaluation report
DA project evaluation findings need to include any adaptations made to the DA project design after approval of the project document and during project implementation, especially when country specific action plans and indicators have been requested to be provided as part of the first annual project progress report(s)
Attention needs to be paid to unexpected change(s), in addition to planned results

[14] The OIOS Evaluation Quality Assessment Framework includes details on the requirements of the evlauation report, including details on background, methodology, findings, conclusions and lessons learned, recommendations, gender and human rights and report structure. A comprehensive overview of UNEG requirement for evaluation reports is provided in: United Nations Evaluation Group, 2010.

6.2 Conclusions

109. Conclusions point out the factors of success and failure of the evaluated intervention, with special attention paid to the intended and unintended results, and more generally to any other strength or weakness; they draw on data collection and analysis undertaken, through a transparent chain of arguments.[15] Conclusions need to be grounded in the analysis of the findings and articulate statements at the level of the evaluation questions and the evaluation criteria. They can also refer to issues across evaluation criteria or cross-cutting issues, like human rights and gender equality related issues. Conclusions include strengths and weaknesses of the project that is evaluated, taking into account the viewpoints of a variety of stakeholders. They need to be grounded in the the evidence provided in the report. Conclusions provide insights in the issues that the project aims to address, identifies solutions to important problems faced and pinpoints ways in which what appears to work well in organizations can be reinforced. Conclusions need to provide linkages to the recommendations.

DA Requirements
Conclusions need to build on analysis of findings and provide insights in the topic that the DA project addresses They need to add value rather than being a summary of the findings and provide a connection to recommendations made

6.3 Lessons Learned / Good Practices

110. Lessons learned are generalizations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programmes, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances of the project to broader situations. Frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact.[16] Good practices are 'well documented and assessed programming practices that provide evidence of success/impact and which are valuable for replication, scaling up and further study. They are generally based on similar experiences from different countries and contexts'.[17]

111. DA project evaluations are encouraged to include the identification of lessons learned and good practices, which can be of use beyond the context of the DA project that is being evaluated. Both are important means for learning and crucial in understanding achievements of results, as well as how learnings can be applied beyond the contexts in which they have been developed. In this way, lessons learned and good practices differ from findings, conclusions and recommendations, which are specific to the context of the DA project under evaluation.

112. The identification of both lessons learned and good practices usually results from qualitative inquiry as part of the evaluation process, asking why certain results happened and what can be learned from it, why things worked well and whether these results could also be achieved in other contexts. It is important to involve key stakeholders in the identification of lessons learned and good practices. When such detection is done early on in the evaluation process, the evaluator can review these during the data gathering phase of the evaluation. As learnings often result from trial and error, the evaluator should also probe on what did not work initially, as this can be an important part of the learning process behind lessons learned and good practices.[18]

113. In order for the lessons to be of relevance to users outside the project context, lessons learned and good practices need to be sufficiently detailed and substantiated, including details of how they were

[15] OECD Development Assistance Committee, 2002.
[16] Ibid
[17] UNICEF, not dated.
[18] United Nations Evaluation Group, 2013.

> **DA Requirements**
>
> Lessons learned and good practices need to be identified and included in a separate section of the DA Project Evaluation report
>
> The lessons and practices need to be applicable beyond the context in which they were learned and be sufficiently substantiated to be of use to stakeholders outside the project context
>
> Lessons and practices should ideally be limited to a maximum of five

learned and the evidence that they are based upon. In order to ensure enough attention to the details of each lessons, they should be limited to a maximum of five. Lessons learned and good practices provide ways for IEs to integrate the learnings of project evaluations into their on-going and future programmes. For a format see annex 2.

6.4 Recommendations

114. Recommendations are defined as proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a development intervention; at redesigning the objective; and/or at the reallocation of resources.[19] Recommendations should be linked to the evaluation findings and conclusions and need to be relevant to the purpose and the objective of the evaluation. They need to address main issues identified in the evaluation and be informed by the evidence provided in the evaluation report. They need to be developed with the participation of key stakeholders, with the process of development of the recommendations made explicit in the report. Each recommendation needs to identify the target group concerned and include priorities for action. Each of those needs to show an awareness of the potential constraints in terms of follow-up for the parties concerned. They should address aspects of sustainability of the results supported and achieved by the project. Possible foci for recommendations, taking into consideration the particular characteristics of the DA, are presented in the box below.

115. Recommendations need to be pitched at the right level. With DA projects usually not having a second phase, they should be focused on other ways to make use of the achievements of the DA project and learnings on the topic concerned by the IE and other relevant stakeholders. Recommendations should not be pitched at too high a level, like at management aspects of the IE concerned or of the DA PMT, as the evaluation of a single project would usually provide an insufficient evidence base for such suggestions. They should, moreover, not be over ambitious, but realistic in their approach and time frame.

116. Rather than having a myriad of small and unrelated recommendations, their number should be limited to a maximum of five to seven key recommendations, which need to be further elaborated on in terms of opportunities for their implementation.

> **DA Requirements**
>
> Recommendations should focus on use of the results and learnings from the project by the IE and other relevant stakeholders to further develop the topic that the project addressed, especially as DA projects usually don't have a second phase
>
> Recommendations need to be limited in number to a maximum of 5 to 7, be sufficiently specific and feasible, providing details on implementation, including potential constraints

[19] OECD Development Assistance Committee, 2002.

Examples of Possible Focus for Recommendations of DA Project Evaluations

- Ways in which the IE(s) can make use of the results and learnings of the project in the wider programme of which the project was a part and in supporting the achievement of the SDGs to which the project contributed
- How the results framework and the wider theory of change developed or used in DA project implementation can be fine-tuned based on learnings of the DA project
- Ways in which results and learnings of the DA project can be used to inform other countries / (sub-)regions through south-south learning or otherwise
- Ways in which some of the capacities built through the project at individual and organizational level can be further institutionalized, like the use of training curricula and toolkits developed
- Ways in which capacities developed of IE(s) and partners can be used to further address the issues concerned
- Identification of funding opportunities for continued support to the topic that the DA project addressed
- Ways in which coordination mechanisms supported during the DA project can be continued and enhanced after project termination
- Ways in which aspects of the topic addressed through the DA project can be monitored after project termination in order to generate evidence to inform policy and other decision-making processes
- Ways in which partnerships and networks supported in the implementation of the DA project can continue to function or be further developed
- Ways in which gender related results can further contribute to gender equality
- Options for follow-up on the introduction of innovative practices by project implementing partners, as well as other government partners, UN resident agencies, civil society organizations, private sector actors, universities and other relevant stakeholders

6.5 The Executive Summary of the Evaluation Report

117. The objective of the executive summary is to inform the reader on the key aspects of the evaluation. In particular, it is meant for policy- and decision-makers to be able to learn the main findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations of the evaluation through reading the summary. In order to enable this, the summary needs to be a stand-alone document, which can be understood without reading any other part of the evaluation report. Therefore, the summary needs to provide details on the DA project, the background of the evaluation as well as its purpose, objectives and scope and the intended users. Details on methodology will enhance the credibility of the presentation of key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The length of the summary should be limited to upto three pages.

DA Requirements

The summary needs to be a stand-alone document, aimed in particular at policy and decision makers, in order to enable them to take note of the results of the evaluation

6.6 The writing of the Evaluation Report

118. The writing of the evaluation report is a complex task, as it needs to bring together all of the primary and secondary data and information gathered and analysis conducted over the entire period of the evaluation process in a single concise and coherent document. In particular there is a need for close analytical relations between findings, conclusions and recommendations as well as learning identified. For an overview of these key components of the evaluation report see table 3 below. Usually, there is a need for several drafts of the evaluation report, in order to end up with a report that represents the required quality to all stakeholders. Detailed outline of the required elements of the DA project evaluation report is provided in annex 5.

Table 3: Description of Key Components of the Evaluation Report

Issues	Description
Findings	Factual statements based on evidence provided in the evaluation report that answer part of evaluation questions
Conclusions	Synthesis of evaluation findings that deliver concluding statements that provide answers to evaluation questions and criteria and/or to cross-cutting issues and other issues across evaluation criteria
Lessons learned / Good practices	Learning, in particular on the way in which results were achieved, which are considered applicable beyond the context of the specific DA project in which they were developed
Recommendations	Advisory statements concerning actions to be taken by stakeholders of the project, including timeframes and prioritization

119. The use of the evaluation matrix can be a great help in the preparation of the evaluation report, in particular when details of the data gathered are included in an added column to the matrix, so that all data get organized in line with the evaluation criteria and questions. In order to enhance the accessibility of the DA project evaluation reports, the main text of the report (excluding annexes) should be limited to 40 pages.

120. The draft evaluation report needs to be shared with relevant stakeholders, and if applicable with the members of the IEC and the ERG, in order to obtain their inputs. Comments of the various parties to the evaluation report should focus on factual imprecisions and inconsistencies in the report. Comments provided need to respect the independence of the evaluation and the evaluator in terms of conclusions to be made on the findings identified in the evaluation report. Inclusion of stakeholders in all stages of the evaluation process, including the review of the draft evaluation report, will enhance the ownership of the evaluation results and heighten the likeliness of use of the recommendations.

DA Requirements

The DA project evaluation report needs to provide the details on the results of the evaluation, including findings, conclusions, lessons learned / good practices and recommendations and be a maximum of 40 pages, excluding annexes

In addition to results of the evaluation, the final report of the DA project evaluation needs to include details on the evaluation subject, the context, the purpose of the evaluation and its scope, evaluation objectives, criteria and questions and details on the methodology used in data gathering and analysis

7. Follow-Up Phase of the Evaluation

121. As identified at the start of the evaluation process, the finalization of the evaluation report needs a follow-up phase. The final evaluation report needs to be shared with the DA PMT through the DA focal point in the IE and with project partners. This phase also includes the development of a management response.

7.1 Sharing of evaluation results

122. Follow-up to the evaluation process includes the wider dissemination of the evaluation results, in particular the lessons learned and good practices identified. Entities should publish evaluations as per their disclosure policies and practices. Further information on the sharing and use of evaluation results can be found in the UN Development Account Evaluation Framework.

7.2 Management response

123. The evaluation manager is responsible for the overall coordination of the management response process. The DA project manager is responsible for developing the management response for the recommendations aimed at the IE. The IE does not necessarily need to agree with each and every recommendation, but needs to provide a rationale or indicate otherwise why a response would not be required. Monitoring and follow-up to the implementation of the recommendations needs to be included in the regular follow-up system that IEs have in place as part of their own evaluation function.

124. The evaluation manager further needs to ensure that recommendations aimed at other relevant stakeholders are conveyed to them. These stakeholders will need to provide management response(s), in order to address the issues raised. This can include an overall response to the evaluation as well as a response to each of the recommendations directed at them (see annex 2 for a template). The management response includes whether the party concerned agrees with the recommendations and how they will address the issues concerned and manage the implementation of the response. Follow up to the implementation of recommendations aimed at other stakeholders is at the discretion of the IE concerned.

DA Requirements
IEs are responsible for the communication of evaluation results to project partners, including recommendations, and for dissemination of lessons learned and good practices
Entities should publish evaluations as per their disclosure policies and practices
IEs and project partners need to develop a management response and follow-up on its implementation

Annex 1 - DA Requirements for the Terms of Reference of Project Evaluations

Nº	TOR Section	Contents
1	**Introduction** (1 page)	• Title of the DA project evaluation • Very short description of the DA project to be evaluated • Short reason for the evaluation (will be expanded under 2 below) • Short introduction of the context (will be expanded on under 3 below) • Timing of the evaluation
2	**Evaluation purpose** (0.5 page)	• Clear rationale for the evaluation, in the context of the DA, including expected users and expected use by each of the users of the evaluation results • The kind of recommendations that are expected from the evaluation • Decision-making processes that the evaluation results need to feed into
3	**Context of the evaluation** (1.5 page)	• Introduction to the topic of the project to be evaluated and relevant developments concerned, at relevant global, regional and country levels • Details on policies, plans and programmes of government and other organizations on the topic concerned and relevant support provided by UN, other development partners and stakeholders
4	**Subject of the evaluation** (1.5 page)	• The DA project, its objective, outcomes and outputs and how it tries to realize these • Coverage in terms of countries / regions and time frame concerned • Implementing partners, including government, other IEs, other UN agencies, other development partners at country/(sub-)regional/global levels • Other stakeholders and their interest in the project and the evaluation • Human and financial resources available for project implementation • Past evaluations / assessments / studies including gender analysis and vulnerability assessments
5	**Evaluation scope, objectives, criteria and questions** (2 pages)	• What the evaluation will cover of the subject of the evaluation in terms of project components and outputs, geographical area, time frame and otherwise • What parts of the subject the evaluation will not cover and rationale concerned • Objectives of the evaluation, i.e. what the evaluation will accomplish, what evaluation criteria will be covered and rationale concerned, the need to identify lessons learned • Evaluation questions, organized by evaluation criteria, with the number of questions limited to a maximum of seven
6	**Methodology of the evaluation** (1.5 pages)	• Methodological approach and rationale or inclusion of the requirement for the evaluator to (further) develop the methodology in the inception phase • Required at this stage o Use of a theory-driven approach in terms of results achieved as well as the process concerned, making use of the project results framework o Data availability, including annual and terminal project reports, project monitoring data and other relevant secondary data related to the project and the topic that it addresses o Application of a human rights-based and gender sensitive approach with disaggregation of data by gender and other relevant vulnerability criteria o Ethical considerations and reference to UNEG ethical guidelines • Optional at this stage o Specification of methods for data gathering and methods for data analysis o Identification of primary data gathering and rationale for country selection o Sampling of respondents for quantitative and qualitative data gathering o Limitations to the methodology and ways to mitigate these

Nº	TOR Section	Contents
7	**Organization of the evaluation** (1.5 pages)	• Evaluation process and work plan • Management issues, including roles and responsibilities of IE, evaluation manager, evaluator and if applicable of the members of the IEC and ERG • Evaluation deliverables and their timing, i.e. draft and final Inception Report, draft and final Evaluation Report and other knowledge products as required • Quality assurance process used, including quality assessment of deliverables • Security considerations • Evaluation team composition, requirements and competencies
8	**Evaluation budget** (for internal use only) (0.5 pages)	• Total evaluation budget • Breakdown by DA budget categories
9	**Annexes**	**Required:** • DA project results framework • Stakeholder map • Documents to be consulted • UNEG Ethical code of conduct[20] • Detailed evaluation workplan • Format for Inception Report • Format for Evaluation Report • Format for Management Response **Optional:** • Additional details to the context • Additional details to the subject • Additional details to the methodology

[20] UNEG, 2008.

Annex 2 - Formats for use in DA Project Evaluation

Format for Stakeholder Mapping

Stakeholder	Stake in the project and the topic that the project addresses	Level of influence over topic and project / Ways in which affected by topic and project	Expected use of the evaluation results	Way(s) to involve this stakeholder in the evaluation process

Format for the Evaluation Matrix

Assumption to be assessed	Indicator(s)	Sources of Information	Methods and tools for data collection	Methods and tools for data analysis
Evaluation Question 1:				
Evaluation Question 2:				
Evaluation Question 3:				

Format for the Evaluation Workplan

Specific Activities/Milestones/Deliverables for each Phase of the Evaluation	Dates
1. Preparatory Phase	
2. Inception Phase	
3. Data Gathering Phase	
4. Analysis and Reporting Phase	
5. Follow-Up Phase	

Format for the Presentation of Lessons Learned and Good Practices

Issue	Details
Lesson learned/good practice in short	
More detailed description of lesson learned/good practice	
Context in which learnings were obtained and relevant contextual details concerned	
Details on the lesson/practice and the way in which it was learned, including available evidence	

Format for the Management Response

No.	Recommen-dation	Acceptance (Rationale if rejected)	Priority	Party Responsible	Action Description	Time frame	Status of Progress

Annex 3 - Details on Methods for Data Gathering and Analysis in DA Project Evaluations

Nº	Methodology	Description	Use
Data Gathering			
1	Desk review	Review of secondary information pertaining to the project (including the project document, monitoring data, project reports and financial data) and information on the topic concerned, including lessons from earlier evaluations and reviews of projects on the same topic	Needed to understand the context of the project, stakeholders and roles concerned; yields in particular, information on the evaluation criteria of relevance and efficiency while monitoring reports can include useful data on results, that would need to be triangulated with other sources
2	Key informant interviews	Interviews of selected stakeholders making use of a list of topics to discuss, either face-to-face or through telephone or Skype with topics for discussion informed by the desk review	Effective means of collecting in-depth qualitative information including on what worked, what did not and reasons concerned; face-to-face interviews are usually more effective; setting up interviews takes a lot of time and is usually managed by the evaluation manager, rather than the evaluator
3	Focus group discussions	Discussion type interviews with a group of stakeholders, about 6 to 10 participants, with similar backgrounds and hierarchy for several hours; allows for discussion of a set of issues across the participants of the group; need to ensure for full participation of all group members; topics for discussion informed by the desk review	Effective means of collecting in-depth qualitative information, including on what worked, what did not and reasons concerned; does usually not work with different hierarchical status among group members; ideally two evaluators needed, one to facilitate the discussion and one to take detailed notes
4	Mini-survey	Self-administered short online or e-mailed survey from a substantial number of stakeholder or participants at low cost and with possible wide reach; substantial non-response can affect the ability for quantitative analysis of the data; short surveys with up to 10 questions can reduce non-response rates	Used to provide quantitative data and information, online software can usually provide key statistics; the inclusion of open ended questions can include some qualitative data which could counteract the risk of substantial non-response rate and the related limitations in quantitative analysis of data; development of different questionnaires for different stakeholder groups is usually required, with some overlap to enhance comparability
5	Direct observation	Observing the process of project implementation, often through participation in a workshop, training event, meeting or conference. Preparing aspects for guided observation can enhance data gathering	Can be used to get a better understanding of the workshop, training event, meeting or conference; useful for the assessment of aspects of participation of the various stakeholders in the events concerned; can be combined with key informant interviews and focus group discussions with participants
6	Stakeholder mapping	Identifying stakeholders, their roles and relationships as well as the drivers and those possibly opposed to the change concerned	Useful in particular with the inclusion of many stakeholders in a project; the use of visual mapping can be useful to show inter-relationships between stakeholders; to be included as part of TOR so that it can be specified in the inception phase and beyond
7	Case studies	An in-depth exploration from multiple perspectives of the complexity and uniqueness of a particular policy, institution, programme or system in a real	The case study is useful for in-depth analysis of specific issues, but with its focus on cases is less useful for generalising as it focuses on the concrete and the specific. Need to focus on

Nº	Methodology	Description	Use
		life context. A case study usually combines qualitative and quantitative data and analysis and needs to contain a subject as well as an analytical frame (or object); case studies can be illustrative, exploratory, examine a critical instance, focus on initiative's implementation or effects and be cumulative when bringing together findings from several case studies	information rich cases in order to better understand qualitative issues
8	Knowledge assessment	Assessment of the knowledge and skills gained by individuals who have received training, workshop, coaching or mentoring as part of the project; ideally done before and after the training, workshop, coaching or mentoring; often useful to get information from supervisor or trainer as well	Used in the assessment of learning from training, workshop, coaching and mentoring initiatives, going beyond the initial reaction of participants to establish what they learned through the initiative concerned
9	Benchmarking	Comparing each government's policies, legislation or development plans against a benchmark or ideal example that fits related UN criteria, norms or standards; in addition to comparing policies or plans, individual countries can be assessed against international criteria, norms and standards, which are used as benchmark	UN criteria, norms and standards can be used in the assessment of government legislation, policies and development plans
10	Organizational capacity assessment	Assessment of the capacities of an organization, making use of a range of organizational development criteria with the organization as the primary unit of analysis	Assessment can identify existing capacities as well as capacity gaps and inform an organizational development initiative to enhance organizational performance
11	Country visits	Country site visits give the evaluator an opportunity to conduct face-to-face meetings and interviews and hear the perspectives of the ultimate beneficiaries / rights holders in one or more countries	Country visits can help the evaluator to validate information obtained from other sources and methods, and can help to gain a first-hand understanding of the enabling and constraining factors that governments or institutions face
12	Outcome mapping[21]	Assessment of the intermediate changes that need to be attained in order to reach an organisations' vision; Outcome Mapping focuses on the capacities of partner organizations through assessment of changes in the behaviour, relationships, activities or actions of the parties with whom a programme works directly	The methodology is in particular useful for a project built on longer term partnerships, based on a shared vision and values amongst participating organisations with a focus on output and outcome level changes and with a non-linear view on social change, making use of outcome, strategy and performance journals
13	Most significant change[22]	Assessment of changes that have occurred in a targeted group or area and development of a dialogue on the values attached to these changes by key stakeholders, who select the most important story	A participatory approach in which stories of change are holistic and in which participants provide part of the analysis through their selection of stories. Though the method starts off as qualitative data gathering, it can also be used for quantitative data analysis. The open-ended approach of the method is in particular useful for assessment of unexpected changes

[21] Earl, S., Carden, F., and Smutylo, T., 2001.

[22] Davies, Rick and Jessica Dart, 2005 and; Dart, Jessica and Rick Davies, 2003.

Nº	Methodology	Description	Use
14	Process documentation[23]	The systematic assessment of the outcomes of a set of development activities, in order to understand the processes that led to their results, and consultations with others on these processes, to learn from programme implementation and inform the facilitation and management of supported development processes	This is of particular importance in pilot and other innovative initiatives as well as in more open-ended programme approaches and policy level engagement, in which there is a need for incremental learning and to document such processes for future programme initiatives
15	Appreciative inquiry	A methodology that builds on an organization's strengths and assets rather than its deficits and shortcomings, identifying positive aspects of the organization and how these can be used to enhance organizational development. What does not work well is included by asking participants what they would wish to be changed in the future	This method can be applied in participatory evaluations, the framing of evaluation questions in a positive way is conducive to the involvement of participants; the method is useful in particular for determining practical action to lead to a desired state of organizational development
Data Analysis			
1	Qualitative content analysis	Content analysis is a way to conduct systematic text analysis to reduce large amounts of unstructured textual content into manageable data relevant to the evaluation concerned through a step by step process of devising the material into content analytical units making use of analytical categories, further specified through feedback loops	Categories for data analysis are developed in inductive and deductive ways, providing means for coding of qualitative data. The evaluation matrix provides an important means of organizing qualitative data along the categories of qualitative content analysis
2	Context analysis	Analysis of the context in which a project operates, in particular the political economy context, with a focus on issues of enabling environment, space for change and capacities concerned	In particular of use for initiatives that engage at the policy level in order to understand aspects of the political economy environment in which the project operates
3	Policy analysis	Analysis of policy initiatives and their results, making use of: the policy cycle (to understand to what phases of the policy cycle initiatives aim to contribute and the kind of policy results achieved along the stages of the cycle); type of policy engagement (assessing audience and influence sought); theory of change (to analyse the logic of how policy engagement is meant to deliver results); analysis of the means to reach policy change (including the development of evidence concerned through knowledge products and otherwise); and partnership analysis (to analyse the DA project's partnering with other organizations to reach policy objectives)	Analysis of policy engagement and other policy related initiatives in terms of stage of the policy cycle, type of engagement, means to reach policy change and partnerships concerned
4	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities,	Looking at strengths and weaknesses in terms of internal capabilities of	Strengths and opportunities identified, will be used to assess aspects to be further developed and reinforced, while weaknesses and threats

[23] Da Silva Wells, Carmen et al., 2011; John A Joseph, not dated.

Nº	Methodology	Description	Use
	and Threats analysis	organizations, and opportunities and threats to highlight external factors	will be used to identify those internal as well as external issues that need to be addressed and mitigated against
5	Results chain analysis	Analysis of the project results framework and the logical sequence between activities, their direct outputs, and outcome level changes	This approach provides a framework for assessing whether objectives are likely to be achieved through monitoring of indicators at the levels of the results framework
6	Contribution analysis	An approach designed to reduce uncertainty about the contribution an intervention is making to the observed results, through an increased understanding of why the observed results have occurred (or not!) and the roles played by the intervention and other internal and external factors through several steps, including analysis of the project theory of change, whether it was implemented as intended and the anticipated chain of results occurred, the extent to which the project contributed to outcome level changes through the realization of output level results and the extent to which other factors influenced the program's achievements	Used in the assessment of the effects of project support to intermediate level changes to which it cannot be considered the sole contributor, providing the means to relate output and outcome level changes; particularly useful in those interventions for which a clear theory of change was formulated, the use of the analysis provides evidence on the contribution of the initiative concerned
7	Timeline analysis	Analysis of project implementation from a chronological perspective, linking time related aspects of achievement of results with relevant project management and contextual issues in-country and beyond	This approach can provide insight in the chronological aspects of the achievement of project results and their relation to project implementation and contextual changes occurring at various points in time

Annex 4 - DA Requirements for Inception Reports of Project Evaluations

Nº	Report Section	Contents
1	**Introduction**	• Title of the evaluation • Very short description of the project to be evaluated • Short reason for the evaluation (will be expanded on under 2 below) • Short introduction of the context • Timing of the evaluation
2	**Evaluation purpose**	• Rationale for the evaluation, why it is needed at this time • Expected users and expected use by each of these of the evaluation results
3	**Context of the evaluation**	• Introduction of the topic of the project to be evaluated • Details on the topic in countries/regions covered by the project • Details on policies, plans and programmes of government and other organizations on the topic concerned and support provided by other development partners
4	**Subject of the evaluation**	• The DA project, its objective and how it tries to achieve this • Coverage in terms of countries / regions and time frame concerned • Partners for implementation, including government, other IEs, other UN agencies at country, (sub-)regional and global levels • Other stakeholders that have an interest in the project and the evaluation • Human and financial resources of the DA project • Past evaluations / assessments / studies, including gender and vulnerability assessment
5	**Evaluation scope, objectives and questions**	• What the evaluation will cover of the subject of the evaluation in terms of project components and activities, coverage of geographical area, time frame and otherwise • What parts of the subject, the evaluation will not cover and rationale these to • Objectives of the evaluation, i.e. what the evaluation will accomplish, including what evaluation criteria will be covered and rationale for this • Evaluation questions, organized by evaluation criteria, with the number of questions limited to six or seven • Evaluation scope, objectives, criteria and questions need to be reviewed in the inception phase by the evaluator and if needed adapted in coordination with evaluation manager and if applicable with IEC and ERG
6	**Methodology of the evaluation**	• Methodological approach and rationale • Methods for data gathering and methods for data analysis • Identification of primary data gathering and rationale for country selection • Sampling of respondents for qualitative and quantitative data gathering • Data availability • Application of a human rights and gender equality approach in the evaluation • Ethical concerns and how to address these • Limitations to the methodology and ways to address the challenges identified • Evaluation methodology needs to be reviewed in this phase by the evaluator and if needed adapted/further developed in coordination with evaluation manager and if applicable the IEC and ERG
7	**Organization of the evaluation**	• Evaluation process and work plan • Management issues including roles and responsibilities of IE, evaluation manager, evaluator and if applicable IEC and ERG • Evaluation team composition and responsibilities • Evaluation deliverables, i.e. draft and final evaluation report • Security considerations
9	**Annexes**	**Required** • TOR • Detailed results framework of the project

Nº	Report Section	Contents
		• Stakeholder mapping / analysis • Evaluation Matrix • Detailed evaluation workplan • UNEG Ethical code of conduct • List of acronyms used • References to secondary information sources **Optional** • Additional contextual details • Additional methodological details • Additional details on the subject of the evaluation

Annex 5 - Outline of the required elements for Evaluation Reports

Nº	Report Section	Contents
1	**Title and opening pages**	• Title of the report, including the DA project that was evaluated and the regions / countries and time frame covered • Date of the report • Names and organizations of evaluator • Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation • Acknowledgements
2	**Table of contents**	• Listing of the contents of the report, including annexes, boxes, figures, and tables with page references
3	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**	• Listing of all acronyms and abbreviations used in the DA evaluation report
4	**Executive Summary**	• The summary needs to be a stand-alone section of maximum three pages that is able to inform decision-making • Needs to include short overview of the project, the purpose, scope and objective of the evaluation and the intended users • Provide key aspects of the methodology, its limitations and ways in which these were mitigated • Summarize key findings, conclusions, lessons learned / good practices and recommendations
5	**Introduction**	• Background to the project and the evaluation • Very short description of the project to be evaluated • Short reason for the evaluation • Purpose of the evaluation, including timing of the evaluation and expected users and use of the evaluation results
6	**Context of the evaluation**	• Introduction of the topic of the evaluation and relevant developments concerned • Details on the topic in countries/regions covered by the project • Details on policies, plans and programmes of government and other organizations on the topic concerned and support provided by other development partners
7	**Subject of the evaluation**	• The DA project, its objective and how it tries to achieve this • Coverage in terms of countries / regions and time frame concerned • Partners for implementation, including government, other IEs, other UN agencies at country/regional level • Project resources • Past evaluations / assessments / studies if relevant including gender analysis and vulnerability assessment
8	**Evaluation scope, objectives and questions**	• Scope of the evaluation and rationale concerned • Objectives of the evaluation, including what evaluation criteria will be covered • Evaluation questions, organized by evaluation criteria
9	**Methodology of the evaluation**	• Methodological approach and rationale, including methods for data gathering and analysis, aspects of data availability and reliability of data, designed to meet the evaluation purpose, scope and objectives • Sampling of respondents for qualitative / quantitative data gathering, rationale for country selection of primary data gathering and process of stakeholder engagement • Ethical concerns and how these were handled • Limitations to the methodology and ways these were mitigated

Nº	Report Section	Contents
10	**Findings**	• Statements related to (parts of) the evaluation questions and organized by evaluation criteria that are based on evidence presented in the report and that provide answers to parts of the evaluation questions • There is a need for a clear focus on results obtained, ways in which these have been achieved and contributions of the project
11	**Conclusions**	• Statements at the level of evaluation questions and beyond, that are grounded in the analysis of the findings. This can include statements at the level of the evaluation criteria, across criteria as well as related to cross-cutting issues. Conclusions provide added value to the findings
12	**Lessons learned / good practices**	• Lessons that were learned in the implementation of the DA project and that are useful beyond the context in which they were learned, with sufficient substantiation to be of use to people who do not know the project • A number of good practices that were tried out and produced results and that can be of use beyond the context in which they were identified, with sufficient substantiation for these to be of use to people who do not know the project • Maximum of a total of five learnings (incl. lessons and good practices) • There is a need to pay equal amounts of attention to lessons learned/good practices as to recommendations
13	**Recommendations**	• A list of maximum five to seven actionable recommendations, including responsible agency/agencies, time frame and aspects of implementation, in order of priority
14	**Annexes**	• TOR • Project results framework and additional details on the DA project as needed • Addition details on the context of the project and the evaluation as needed • List of persons interviewed and additional details on methodology as needed • References of documents reviewed

Annex 6 - References

Bamberger, Michael, Jim Rugh and Linda Mabry, RealWorld Evaluation, Working under budget, time, data and political constraints, London, New Delhi, 2006.

Beer, Tanya, Evaluating Public Policy Advocacy, Center for Evaluation Innovation, Health Summit 2012.

Bester, Angela, Results-based Management in the United Nations Development System, A report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs for the 2016 Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review, January 2016.

Coghlan, Anne T., Hallie Preskill and Tessie T. Catsambas, An Overview of Appreciative Inquiry in Evaluation, in: Preskill, Hallie and Anne T. Coghlan, Using Appreciative Inquiry in Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, No 100, Winter 2003.

Cross, Harry, Karen Hardee, Norine Jewell, Reforming Operational Policies: A Pathway to Improving Reproductive Health Programs December 2001.

Dart, Jessica and Rick Davies, A Dialogical, Story-Based Evaluation Tool: The Most Significant Change Technique. In: American Journal of Evaluation, 24 (2), 2003.

Davies, Rick and Jessica Dart, The 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) Technique. A Guide to its Use. April 2005 (available at http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf).

Da Silva Wells, Carmen and Ewen Le Borgne, Nick Dickinson, Dick de Jong, Documenting Change, An Introduction to Process Documentation, IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre, September2011.

Earl, S., Carden, F., and Smutylo, T., 2001, Outcome Mapping: Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs, Ottawa: International Development Research Centre (available at http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-9330-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html).

Development Account Task Team on Evaluation, Preparation of Evaluation Reports for Development Account Projects, September 2017.

Joseph, John A, Process Documentation, not dated.

Keck and Sikkink in Jones, Harry, A guide to monitoring and evaluating policy influence, Background Note, London, 2011.

Kirkpatrick, Donald L., Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels, 2006.

Kirkpatrick, Donald L. and James D., Implementing the Four Levels. A Practical Guide for Effective Evaluation of Training Programs, 2007.

New Zealand Aid, Gender Analysis Guideline, Integrating Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment into an Activity, Programme or Policy, September 2012.

ODA, Successful Communication: Planning Tools, Stakeholder Analysis.

OECD Development Assistance Committee, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, Paris, 2002.

OIOS, Quality assessment framework.

Patton, Michael Quinn, Utilization-Focuses Evaluation, 4th edition, 2008.

Scriven, Michael: The Evaluation of Training, Update 2010.

The Evaluation Exchange, Harvard Family Research Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education. XIII/1, Spring 2007.

UNDP, Capacity development: A UNDP Primer, 2009.

UNICEF, Innovations, lessons learned and good practices, not dated.

United Nations Development Group, Results-based management Handbook, Harmonizing RBM concepts and approaches for improved development results at country level, October 2011.

United Nations Development Group, Programming Principles, UNDAF Companion Guidance, 2018.

United Nations Development Group, Theory of Change, UNDAF Companion Guidance, 2018.

United Nations Evaluation Group, Guidance on Evaluating Institutional Gender Mainstreaming, New York, 2018.

United Nations Evaluation Group, Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – Towards UNEG Guidance, March 2011

United Nations Evaluation Group, Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, August 2014.

United Nations Evaluation Group, UNEG Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work in the UN System, November 2013.

United Nations Evaluation Group, UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation, 2016, 2017.

United Nations Evaluation Group, UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation, March 2008.

United Nations Evaluation Group, UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, 2010.

United Nations Evaluation Group, UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference and Inception Reports, 2010