**Purpose**

This note provides Development Account (DA) implementing entities with guidance on the planning and conduct of the terminal evaluations of 12th tranche projects. It aims to promote the application of the [DA Project Evaluation Guidelines](http://www.un.org/development/desa/da/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/da-project-management-documents/2253_1571321382_UN%20DA%20Evaluation%20Guidelines%20%28Final%29.pdf), presenting clarification and adjustments to certain guidance in the Guidelines, in line with the Administrative Instructions on Evaluation in the United Nations Secretariat (ST/AI/2021/3). The note also provides additional guidance related to evaluation of joint projects with budgets of USD 1 million or more.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The guidance below applies to all the 11 projects under the 12th tranche that are selected for evaluation.[[2]](#footnote-2)

**GUIDANCE ON planning and conduct of a terminal evaluation**

**Evaluation budget**

For the 12th tranche, an evaluation budget, equivalent to approximately 4% of the approved project budget, has been allocated as part of the project budget for each of the 11 projects selected for evaluation.[[3]](#footnote-3) **The evaluation budget should be up to 4% of the final project budget**. In the event that the project budget has been reduced since the beginning of the project, the evaluation budget should also be adjusted to ensure that it does not exceed 4% of the final project budget. The use of project funds in the amount exceeding 4% of the final project budget for evaluation would require a pre-approval from the DA Programme Management Team (DA-PMT). Also, an approval of the evaluation plan or evaluation TOR, including the tentative methodology, by the DA-PMT will be required for an evaluation with a budget of USD 40,000 or more.

**Intended use of evaluation results**

With a view to ensuring that the evaluation generates evidence that is useful in determining the project’s performance and informing future programming, the evaluation TOR should specify the users of the evaluation results and how they are expected to use them, as well as any knowledge gaps the evaluation is intended to help address. It should also elaborate on how the evaluation results will be disseminated to its intended audiences. **The primary users of an evaluation of a DA project are the management and staff of the project’s implementation entity(ies).** **The evaluation report should present recommendations that are derived from the evaluation findings and directed to the management and staff of the implementing entity(ies)**.

Lessons learned and good practices identified through the evaluation that have applicability beyond the implementing entity(ies) should be presented in a section on “Lessons learned and good practices” in the evaluation report (see the DA evaluation report template in Annex 2 and the requirements for DA project evaluation reports under the “Evaluation report and management response” section); the evaluation results, including the lessons learned and good practices, should be widely disseminated among parties within and outside the implementing entity(ies) who may benefit from the knowledge generated (secondary users). The DA-PMT plans to conduct a synthesis of the lessons learned and good practices identified in the 12th tranche project evaluations in late 2024 to help facilitate the dissemination of the knowledge among the implementing entities, and inform future programming at the programme level.

**Arrangements for the management of the evaluation and stakeholder engagement**

Both the ST/AI/2021/3 (para 2.6 (a)) and the Guidelines (para 64) require the management of the evaluation process to be removed from (i.e., not the same person as, and not reporting to) the project manager or project team in order to ensure impartiality and independence. **It is strongly encouraged that the evaluation process be managed or overseen by the evaluation unit of the implementing entity**. In particular, the selection of the evaluation consultant should be overseen or supported by the evaluation unit to ensure that the selection is based on the required skills and qualifications.

The Guidelines encourage the use of an internal evaluation committee and an evaluation reference group in all project evaluations to help enhance the relevance, quality and credibility of the evaluation process, as well as to ensure stakeholder buy-in (para 23-25). It is particularly crucial that the evaluation unit of the implementing entity participate in the internal evaluation committee to support the process, in the event that the responsibility for the management of the evaluation rests with another unit within the entity.

The project manager/team should be fully engaged in the evaluation process, including in finalizing the scope of the evaluation, identifying and facilitating the engagement of the project’s key stakeholders, validating the evaluation findings and developing recommendations that are relevant to the purpose of the evaluation and the work of the implementing entity(ies), supported by evidence and actionable. Timely engagement of the project manager/team in the preparation for the evaluation is also essential to ensuring that required project documentation is made available to the evaluators in a timely manner. With a view to minimizing the burden on the project manager/team during the project closure phase and mitigating risks associated with staff moves in the implementing entity(ies), target countries and/or partner organizations, **it is strongly encouraged that the preliminary list of documentation required for the evaluation be shared with the project manager/team 3-6 months prior to the project completion date**. The typical project documentation that should be made available to the evaluators for a DA project evaluation is presented in Annex 1.

For an evaluation of a project that is jointly implemented by multiple entities, it is strongly encouraged that the evaluation units of all participating entities are involved in the management of the evaluation process in the form of an internal evaluation committee; this will help ensure that the scope and methodology of the evaluation fully take into account the operational environments of each participating entity (including, but not limited to, specific language requirements), and facilitate communications with relevant stakeholders, as needed. The evaluation unit of each participating entity should ensure that the project focal points and other relevant stakeholders within the entity are provided an opportunity to validate the evaluation findings and participate in the development of the recommendations they will be responsible for implementing, and facilitate the development of a management response to the recommendations that are addressed to the entity (see “Evaluation report and management response” section for further detail).

**Evaluation methodology**

Evaluations should apply multiple methods and cross-check information and data from different sources to ensure confidence in the findings (triangulation). A DA project evaluation typically applies a combination of some of the following methods: desk review; interviews (in person and/or by telephone/video); focus group discussions (in person or telephone/video); online surveys; field visits to select project countries; and in-person observation of a workshop or meeting held during the final stage of the project implementation. The methodology should be selected for each evaluation taking into consideration the modalities and activities undertaken, geographic scope and thematic focus of the project, as well as the available budget. In general, travel conducted by the evaluators should be limited to field visits to select project countries to collect beneficiary feedback, which may not be easily collected remotely, and in-person observation of a workshop or meeting; it is recommended that the evaluators’ meetings with the evaluation manager and the project manager/team be conducted remotely unless in-person meetings are possible without additional travel.

The terms of reference for a DA project evaluation, which are used as a basis for the hiring of an evaluator(s), should include a tentative methodology, which is developed based on available project documentation. The tentative methodology is expected to be refined and finalized in the inception phase of the evaluation, reflecting the results of a preliminary desk review and initial consultations with key stakeholders. In developing a methodology that is as rigorous as possible under the circumstances, human rights and gender equality should be integrated into all stages of the evaluation, upholding the principle of ‘no-one left behind’.[[4]](#footnote-4) In addition, disability perspectives should also be integrated into the evaluation process to the extent possible.[[5]](#footnote-5)

**Evaluation report and management response**

As per the memo from the Head of the Capacity Development Programme Management Office (CDPMO) of DESA to the DA Focal Points dated 7 December 2022, and in line with ST/AI/2021/3, **all 12th tranche evaluation reports and management responses will be published on the** [**DA website**](https://www.un.org/development/desa/da/evaluation/).

The evaluation report should be prepared in accordance with the DA project evaluation report template (see the annotated report template in Annex 2).[[6]](#footnote-6) Should any entity have its own standard evaluation report template endorsed by its governing body and/or executive head, and the use of the template is mandated for all evaluations, this may be used instead. However, all the required elements of the DA evaluation report template must be included in each DA project evaluation report, either by incorporating them into the entity-specific template, or by submitting the extra requirements for the DA evaluation report in an attachment.

The implementing entity is also responsible for developing a management response to the evaluation, signed off by the relevant authority in accordance with its evaluation policy and procedures. The signing authority is also responsible for monitoring and ensuring the implementation of the planned actions included in the response by the entity in accordance with their policy and procedures. A management response is a crucial step to ensure the timely and effective use of evaluations and is made mandatory for all evaluations by ST/AI/2021/3. Each entity should develop a management response to each DA project evaluation, using its standard template or the suggested template in Annex 3, and submit it to the DA-PMT, while bearing in mind that it will be published on the DA website.

An evaluation of a project jointly implemented by multiple DA entities may present recommendations that are addressed to all or any of the implementing entities, or a mixture of them. Each participating entity of the project is responsible for developing a management response to the evaluation, responding to all the recommendations that are directed to it, as signed by the relevant authority, and monitoring and ensuring the implementation of the planned actions included in the response, in accordance with its evaluation policy and procedures. It is, therefore, critical that all participating entities of a joint project are engaged in the evaluation process, including being provided an opportunity to review the draft evaluation TOR and agree on the scope of the evaluation, as well as review the draft evaluation report and validate the findings presented prior to the finalization of the report.

**The deadline for the submission of the evaluation report to the DA-PMT is 6 months after the project completion date, except for joint projects with a budget of USD 1 million or more, for which the deadline is 9 months after the project completion date**. **The implementing entities are also expected to submit to the DA-PMT the completed management responses within 3 months of the finalization of the evaluation reports**.

**Annex 1. Sample Documentation TO BE made available to the evaluatorS**

* **Planning documents and revisions**
	+ Concept note
	+ Project document
	+ Documentation related to extensions and revisions, if any
* **Project reports:**
	+ Annual progress reports
	+ Final report – draft (to be shared as soon as completed) and finalized version
* **Information on financial and other resources:**
	+ Project budget and expenditures by object class, as required in the final report template
	+ Information on non-DA resources, financial and in-kind, brought in by the implementing entity(ies)
	+ Information on resources, financial and in-kind, contributed by partners/donors (including information requested under the “supplementary funding” section in the progress reports)
* **Contact list of key project stakeholders** (name, title, affiliation, gender and email address), including:
	+ Project team members (staff of the implementing entity(ies))
	+ Partners (DA and non-DA entities)
	+ Other relevant stakeholders
* **List of completed project activities and details about each activity, including:**
	+ Agenda, participant list (name, title, affiliation, country, gender, email address), minutes/report, handouts, and outcomes document, workshop survey results and any other participant feedback collected, for each in-person or online workshop/meeting
	+ Description of each advisory service, beneficiaries (including contact details of the focal points), any outputs/deliverables produced and any beneficiary feedback received
	+ List of publications, research papers and other knowledge products developed, details on how each product was disseminated and/or used, contact list of recipients/users of the product and contact information and any user feedback collected
	+ List of eLearning courses developed, details of how each course was made available to potential participants, contact list of those who completed the course and any user/participant feedback collected
* **Documentation related to the relevant work of the implementing entity(ies) and partners:**
	+ Relevant sub-programme and/or programme of the implementing entity(ies)
	+ Relevant projects/activities undertaken by the implementing entity(ies) and partners in the target countries and/or regions
* **Requests for assistance/services received:**
	+ Requests received from the target countries
	+ Requests for relevant/similar assistance/services received from the countries that were not targeted by the project

**Annex 2. Annotated Template for DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNT Project Evaluation Report**



*Report completed on: Month YYYY*

*Evaluation conducted by: “Evaluator(s) names”*

*Add implementing entity’s logo here*

**United Nations Development Account**

**Terminal Evaluation of Project ID**

*“Project title”*

*(Start year-End year)*

Evaluator: “Evaluator name(s) and title(s)”

Evaluation Manager: “Evaluation manager name(s), title(s) and division(s)/office(s)”

[Name and contact information of the implementing entity]
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*List contents of the report, including annexes, boxes, graphs, figures, and tables with page references.*

**List of Acronyms and Abbreviations**

*List all acronyms and abbreviations used in the report.*

**Executive summary**

*A stand-alone section of 3-4 pages, including:*

* *A brief overview of the project*
* *Evaluation purpose, objectives, scope, and intended users/audiences*
* *Evaluation methodology*
* *A summary of key findings, conclusions, and recommendations*

**UN Secretariat Quality Assurance Framework (Guidelines on ST/AI/2021/3 – October 2021)**

**Report structure: Is the report well structured, logical, clear and complete?**

22. The executive summary is a stand-alone section with a clear structure along the key elements of the report: subject, purpose and objectives of the evaluation; methodology; main results; conclusions; and recommendations. It is reasonably concise.

**UN Secretariat Quality Assurance Framework (Guidelines on ST/AI/2021/3 – October 2021)**

**Report structure: Is the report well structured, logical, clear and complete?**

23. The report is well-structured:

* Easily readable (i.e. concise, avoids complex language and unexplained acronyms);
* Cohesive and logical;
* Contains relevant graphics for illustrating key points (e.g. tables, charts and pictures);
* Includes annexes where applicable on methodology such as the Terms of Reference, evaluation matrix, bibliography, and a list of people consulted; and
* States when the evaluation was conducted (period of the evaluation and by whom the evaluation (evaluator names not required).

**1. Introduction**

*Provide the following information:*

* *A brief overview of the project, including the start and end dates, the DA implementing entity(ies) and other collaborating UN entities/agencies*
* *Background to the evaluation, including the reason for the evaluation\* and the time frame of the evaluation*
* *Purpose and objectives of the evaluation, and the primary users/audiences\*\**

*\* For the 12thtranche, half (11) of its 22 projects were selected for terminal evaluation prior to the start of implementation. In line with the DA Project Evaluation Guidelines, one project with a budget of over USD 1 million was automatically selected for evaluation, while the other projects were randomly selected to include at least one project for each implementing entity, unless the entity only had one project in the tranche; in the latter case, it was ensured that the entity evaluates at least one project under the 12th or 13th tranche. The implementing entities were provided an opportunity to conduct an optional mid-term review of the list of the selected projects and, if necessary and appropriate, change the selected projects with a view to ensuring their alignment with the entities’ respective learning priorities.*

*\*\* In line with the DA Project Evaluation Guidelines, the primary users/audiences of DA project evaluations are the implementing entities themselves.*

**2. Description of the Project**

**UN Secretariat Quality Assurance Framework (Guidelines on ST/AI/2021/3 – October 2021)**

**Background: Are the evaluation’s subject, context, purpose objectives and scope sufficiently clear to frame and guide the evaluation?**

1. The report clearly specifies the subject of the evaluation, and for programmes or projects: intervention logic or theory of change; budget; human resources; time frame; implementing partners, modalities and status.

2. The report provides sufficient information for understanding the context within which the subject of the evaluation operated (e.g., key social, political, economic, demographic and institutional factors) and describes the key stakeholders involved in the evaluation’s subject.

**2.1 Background**

*Briefly describe the project context, including the issues addressed by the project and the relevant key social, political, economic, demographic and institutional factors.*

**2.2 Project objectives and expected results**

*Briefly describe the project objectives and expected outcomes that were included in its results framework. Provide sufficient details on changes, if any, that were made to the project objectives and/or expected outcomes during implementation, and the reasons for the changes.*

*Note that the project results framework should be included in the annexes.*

**2.3 Project strategies and key activities**

*Briefly describe the actual project strategies and key outputs and activities, including any significant changes that were made during implementation, and the reasons for those changes. The project strategy should include an explanation of how the project was designed to contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as the realization of human rights, with an emphasis on “leaving no one behind”.*

**2.4 Beneficiaries and target countries**

*Describe the project’s beneficiaries and target countries and/or regions.*

**2.5 Key partners and other key stakeholders**

*Describe key partners (DA implementing entities, other collaborating UN entities/agencies and non-UN organizations, and national and/or local governments), and their roles in the project.*

**2.6 Resources**

*The project budget (approved DA funding) and other human, financial and/or in-kind contributions (e.g., XB, RPTC and other resources that were mobilized by the implementing entities to support the project). For in-kind contributions, provide an estimated financial value, if available.*

**2.7 Link to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**

*List the key SDG targets the project intended to address.*

**2.8 Innovative elements (if applicable)**

*DA projects are designed to help test new and innovative development approaches, allowing successful ideas to be scaled up and replicated broadly. If and as applicable, describe the specific new methodology and/or theory that was applied in the project.*

**3. Evaluation objectives, scope and questions**

**3.1 Purpose and objectives**

**UN Secretariat Quality Assurance Framework (Guidelines on ST/AI/2021/3 – October 2021)**

**Background: Are the evaluation’s subject, context, purpose objectives and scope sufficiently clear to frame and guide the evaluation?**

3. The report clearly specifies the purpose and objectives of the evaluation.

*Describe the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, the intended users/audiences, and the expected use of its results by each user/audience. In line with the DA Evaluation Framework, DA evaluations are designed to promote both accountability for results and learning. As currently designed, the primary users of the DA project evaluations are the implementing entities themselves.*

**3.2 Evaluation scope, criteria and questions**

**UN Secretariat Quality Assurance Framework (Guidelines on ST/AI/2021/3 – October 2021)**

**Background: Are the evaluation’s subject, context, purpose objectives and scope sufficiently clear to frame and guide the evaluation?**

4. The report specifies the scope of what the evaluation covers (e.g., time span, geographical coverage).

**Methodology: Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and is the rationale for the methodological choice justified?**

5. The report specifies and explains the chosen evaluation questions, criteria, performance standards or other criteria.

**Gender, human rights and disability: Are gender, human rights and disability perspectives integrated and well addressed in the process of the evaluation as well as in the evaluation report?**

18. Gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEWE related data will be collected.

21. Human rights considerations are integrated in the following, where applicable: evaluation scope of analysis; evaluation criteria and questions design; methods and tools, and data analysis techniques; evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

*Describe the evaluation scope, criteria and questions. If the evaluation involved reducing the scope (e.g., geographical coverage) and/or did not cover all the mandatory criteria for DA evaluation reports (i.e., relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, and efficiency), explain the specific reasons (e.g., the COVID-19 pandemic, which involved the travel restrictions and/or created the need to reduce burdens on stakeholders, adverse security conditions in participating countries).*

*Note that the evaluation TORs and the evaluation matrix should be included in the annexes.*

**4. Methodology**

**UN Secretariat Quality Assurance Framework (Guidelines on ST/AI/2021/3 – October 2021)**

**Methodology: Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and is the rationale for the methodological choice justified?**

5. The report specifies and explains the chosen evaluation questions, criteria, performance standards or other criteria.

6. The report methodology clearly describes the level of stakeholder participation, data sources, and data collection and analysis methods.

7. The chosen methodology is adequately robust/appropriate for answering the key evaluation questions, including adequate measures to ensure data quality/validity.

8. The methodology addresses methodological challenges and/or limitations, and the report mentions ethical standards that were considered during the evaluation (e.g., informed consent of participants, confidentiality, avoidance of harm, evaluator’s ethical obligations).

**Gender, human rights and disability: Are gender, human rights and disability perspectives integrated and well addressed in the process of the evaluation as well as in the evaluation report?**

19. A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.

21. Human rights considerations are integrated in the following, where applicable: evaluation scope of analysis; evaluation criteria and questions design; methods and tools, and data analysis techniques; evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

*Provide the following information:*

* *The methodological approach and rationale, including methods for data gathering and analysis and data sources (including stakeholder groups interviewed and/or surveyed disaggregated by gender, and if applicable, by special country designation, e.g., least developed countries, landlocked developing countries, small island developing states), data availability and reliability*
* *Sampling strategy for qualitative and quantitative data collection methods (e.g., surveys, interviews, field visits), and, if applicable, response rates*
* *If applicable, the criteria used to select countries for field visits or in-depth assessments*
* *Ethical standards applied, and if applicable, ethical concerns and how they were handled*
* *How gender, human rights and disability perspectives were integrated in the data collection methods and tools, and the data analysis techniques*
* *Limitations to the methodology and how they were addressed*

*Note that the data collection instruments used for the evaluation (e.g., interview guides, survey questionnaires), the list of individuals interviewed and the list of documents reviewed should be included in the annexes.*

**5. Findings**

**UN Secretariat Quality Assurance Framework (Guidelines on ST/AI/2021/3 – October 2021)**

**Findings: Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence and sound analysis?**

9. Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).

10. Findings clearly relate to the evaluation criteria and questions defined in the scope in terms of report structure and substance.

11. Findings are objective and are supported by sufficient evidence reflecting systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgements made by the evaluators.

12. Findings uncover underlying causes for accomplishments/difficulties and opportunities to build on.

**Gender, human rights and disability: Are gender, human rights and disability perspectives integrated and well addressed in the process of the evaluation as well as in the evaluation report?**

20. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

21. Human rights considerations are integrated in the following, where applicable: evaluation scope of analysis; evaluation criteria and questions design; methods and tools, and data analysis techniques; evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

*Present the evaluation findings in relation to the evaluation criteria and questions, as defined in the evaluation TORs, with supporting evidence. Only the findings supported by sufficient evidence should be presented, reflecting systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data, and not subjective judgements of the evaluator.*

*Data analyzed should be presented in a gender-disaggregated manner, as much as possible and when there are significant differences between genders. Gender analysis should be reflected in the findings.*

**6. Conclusions**

**UN Secretariat Quality Assurance Framework (Guidelines on ST/AI/2021/3 – October 2021)**

**Conclusions and lessons learned: Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?**

13. Conclusions are clearly presented and logically linked to the findings.

14. Conclusions reflect reasonable judgements of the evaluator(s) in relation to the main evaluation questions and add value to the findings (e.g., include lessons learned; focus on significant issues; answer the evaluation’s big questions).

**Gender, human rights and disability: Are gender, human rights and disability perspectives integrated and well addressed in the process of the evaluation as well as in the evaluation report?**

20. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

21. Human rights considerations are integrated in the following, where applicable: evaluation scope of analysis; evaluation criteria and questions design; methods and tools, and data analysis techniques; evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

*Present the general conclusions that logically follow from the findings and respond to evaluation questions, including insights and lessons learned pertinent to the decision-making of the intended users of the evaluation. The conclusions should reflect the evaluator’s professional opinion in relation to the main evaluation questions and add value to the evaluation results.*

**7. Recommendations**

**UN Secretariat Quality Assurance Framework (Guidelines on ST/AI/2021/3 – October 2021)**

**Recommendations (if any): Are the recommendations well-grounded in the evaluation and clear?**

15. Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.

16. Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject’s potential constraints to follow-up) and manageable (e.g., avoid providing a laundry list or being overly prescriptive).

17. Recommendations are actionable (e.g., specifies who should implement them) and formulated with their use in mind.

**Gender, human rights and disability: Are gender, human rights and disability perspectives integrated and well addressed in the process of the evaluation as well as in the evaluation report?**

20. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

21. Human rights considerations are integrated in the following, where applicable: evaluation scope of analysis; evaluation criteria and questions design; methods and tools, and data analysis techniques; evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

*Provide clear, practical and feasible recommendations, directed to the intended users of the evaluation and supported by the evidence presented in the Findings section around key questions addressed by the evaluation. Recommendations should be logically derived from the findings and conclusions and identify the users/stakeholders to whom they are addressed to. As stated under Section 3.1, the primary users of the DA project evaluations are the implementing entities themselves, and the recommendations should be directed to the management and staff of the implementing entities.*

**8. Lessons learned and good practices**

*Present lessons learned and good practices identified by the evaluation with potential use and applicability to broader audiences beyond the intended primary users of the evaluation.*

**Annexes**

Evaluation TORs

Project results framework

Evaluation matrix

Data collection instruments

List of individuals interviewed

List of documents reviewed

**Annex 3. Suggested Template for Management Response and REcommendation Action Plan for DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNT project evaluation**

**Management Response to the Terminal Evaluation of the Development Account 12th Tranche Project**

***Project title and ID: “the title of the project (project ID number)”***

**Entity name: “the name of the implementing entity”**

**Overall Remarks by Management**

*The overall remarks may include a summary or highlights of the evaluation findings and conclusions that are of the most relevance to the entity, and a statement of the entity’s (or its specific division/unit) commitment to implementing the recommendations. If management rejects any of the recommendations, the reason should be stated.*

**Recommendation Action Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation**  | **Management response[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Planned action** | **Responsible unit(s)** | **Target completion date** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name  | Title  | Signature  | Date |
|  |  |  |  |

1. Draft DA guidelines on evaluation of large-scale joint projects are currently under development as part of broader DA guidelines on large-scale joint projects. Pending the finalization of these guidelines and in light of the absence of guidance related to evaluation of joint projects in the DA Project Evaluation Guidelines, the present guidance note aims to provide additional guidance on planning and conducting the evaluations of 12th tranche joint projects. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. At the time of 12th tranche project document development, all DA projects were required to be evaluated using 2% of the project’s budget. Under the new DA evaluation system that was introduced in October 2019, only half of the projects in each tranche are selected for terminal evaluation, and the projects that are selected for evaluation are provided with an evaluation budget equivalent to approximately 4% of the project budget. In line with this new approach, half (11) of the 12th tranche projects were selected for evaluation in December 2019. One entity replaced a project selected for evaluation with another through the optional mid-term review of the list of 12th tranche projects selected for evaluation, which took place in July 2022; the total number of the tranche projects selected for evaluation remains unchanged at 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Immediately following the selection of half of the 12th tranche projects for evaluation in December 2019, the 2% of the total budget that was earmarked for evaluation was deducted from the 11 projects that were not selected for evaluation. These funds were then redistributed among the 11 selected projects to supplement their existing evaluation funds. As the 11 selected projects included a project with a budget of USD 1.5 million, the additional evaluation funds allocated to each project are slightly less than 4% of the total project budget. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The [UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicators Technical Note (April 2018)](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2148) includes the following three criteria against which all evaluation reports should be assessed: 1) “Gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEWE related data will be collected”; 2) “A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected”; and 3) “The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis”. In addition to these GEWE criteria, the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) also applies the following criterion for the quality assessment of UN Secretariat evaluation reports as part of its biennial Dashboard exercise: “Human rights considerations are integrated in the following, where applicable: evaluation scope of analysis; evaluation criteria and questions design; methods and tools, and data analysis techniques; evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations”. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. ST/AI/2021/3, in para 5.5(b), requires all heads of Secretariat entities to “ensure the integration of respect for gender equality and disability inclusion in evaluation procedures and practices”. While the quality assurance system for evaluation reports established in the Guidelines on the ST/AI (October 2021) did not include a rating criterion specific to the integration of disability perspectives in the evaluation process or evaluation report, the OIOS biennial review on the status of evaluation in the Secretariat for 2021-2022 included an assessment of the integration of disability inclusion and environmental issues in the evaluation report quality assessment exercise, specifically for the purpose of creating a baseline (the ratings on the integration of these two additional cross-cutting issues did not count towards the overall score given to each report). The [UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) “Guidance on Integrating Disability Inclusion in Evaluations and Reporting on the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (UNDIS) Entity Accountability Framework Evaluation Indicator](http://www.uneval.org/document/download/3818)” (January 2022) established six elements to be incorporated into a reporting entity’s evaluation guidelines in order to “approach” (i.e., short of “meet”) the requirements of the Framework in relation to Indicator 10 on Evaluation. These six elements are: a) the ToRs of evaluations pay adequate attention to disability inclusion; b) evaluation teams must have knowledge and/or experience of disability inclusion, where relevant; c) evaluation questions should cover different aspects of disability inclusion; d) stakeholder mapping and data collection methods should involve persons with disabilities and organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs); e) evaluation findings and analysis should provide data and evidence on disability inclusion; and f) the conclusions and/or recommendations must reflect their findings on disability inclusion. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The template, first issued in November 2021 and piloted with 11th tranche project evaluations by several DA implementing entities, has been updated based on feedback received from entities. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Accepted, partially accepted, or rejected. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)