

**INDEPENDENT SYSTEM WIDE EVALUATION OF OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES  
FOR DEVELOPMENT**

**META-EVALUATION AND SYNTHESIS OF UNITED  
NATIONS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK  
EVALUATIONS, WITH A PARTICULAR FOCUS ON  
POVERTY ERADICATION**

**(JIU/REP/2016/6)**

SUPPLEMENTARY PAPER TO JIU/REP/2016/6



**United Nations**

**This paper contains complementary annexes to the main evaluation report. It contains analytical frameworks developed and used in the conduct of this meta evaluation and synthesis of UNDAF evaluations.**

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Terms of Reference .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Quality Criteria Used for the Meta-Evaluation and Synthesis .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Evaluation Matrix for Meta-Evaluation and Synthesis.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. Instrument for Report Quality Screening Tool.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5. Process of Conducting the Content Analysis .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>6. Names of Key Informants for Interviews.....</b>	<b>23</b>

# 1. Terms of Reference

## 1. Introduction

In 2013, the United Nations General Assembly approved a new policy framework for partnership in the conduct of independent system-wide evaluations (ISWE) of United Nations operational activities for development (resolution A/68/229). The framework builds on existing UN system-wide entities and mechanisms for evaluation offered by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), interagency evaluation mechanisms on humanitarian affairs (OCHA), and the Secretary General's analytical work in support of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities of the United Nations system - QCPR (UNDESA). An Interim Coordination Mechanism (ICM) comprising these entities and mechanisms had been created in 2012 as part of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities of the United Nations system in 2012 (resolution A/RES/67/226).

This pilot effort is deemed critical to support the development of a coherent body of knowledge and strong evidence about operational activities for development that would guide the work of the UN system as a whole. Thus, the new policy framework defines ISWE as a systematic and impartial assessment of the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the combined contributions of the United Nations entities towards the achievement of development objectives.

In adopting the policy, the General Assembly decided to commission two pilot evaluations, subject to the provision and availability of extra-budgetary resources. One of the topics for pilot is entitled "Meta-evaluation and synthesis of United Nations Development Assistance Framework evaluations, with a particular focus on poverty eradication". This note addresses this topic. A separate note addresses the second pilot topic: "Evaluation of the contribution of the United Nations development system to strengthening national capacities for statistical analysis and data collection".

The importance of conducting during 2015 the two pilot evaluation was re-affirmed by Member States during the 69<sup>th</sup> Session of the General Assembly (resolution 69/327). Countries in a position to do so were invited to provide extra-budgetary resources. The ICM is requested to report on progress during the operational activities segment of ECOSOC in 2015.

## 2. Background

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) is the strategic programme framework that describes the collective response of the United Nations system to national development priorities. The 2007 triennial comprehensive policy review (TCPR) encouraged the UN development system to intensify its collaboration at the country and regional levels towards strengthening national capacities, in support of national development priorities, through the common country assessment, when required, and the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). It recognizes the potential of the UNDAF and its results matrix as the collective, coherent and integrated programming and monitoring framework for country-level contributions.<sup>1</sup>

The current UNDAF Guidelines (2010) established a formal requirement for all UNDAFs to be evaluated. According to the guidelines, UNDAF evaluations should provide an assessment of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness impact and sustainability of the UN system contribution as described in the UNDAF document. The scope of the UNDAF evaluations was to also be based on core programming principles (results-based management, human rights, national ownership, gender equality, capacity building etc.). The results of UNDAF evaluations should be made available in the penultimate year of the cycle so that their findings and recommendations can feed into the preparation

---

<sup>1</sup> Website of the United Nations Development Group (UNDG), January 2015

of the successor UNDAF. UNDAF evaluations are conducted in a decentralized manner and are handled at the country level by the UNCT making use of consultants.

During 2011 and 2012, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) began devoting more attention to UN systemic-level evaluation practise through the creation of the Joint Evaluation (JE) Task Force. In 2011, the UNEG JE Task Force produced an FAQ document on UNDAF evaluation while in 2012, two additional tools were produced. One focussed on providing detailed guidance on preparing ToRs for UNDAF evaluations and a second tool focussed on producing management response plans for UNDAF evaluation results. Both of these tools have sought to provide additional support to UN Country Teams to produce better quality UNDAF evaluations.

During the period under review, the UN system has managed to produce over 40 UNDAF evaluations. It is widely recognized, however, that Country Teams have struggled to implement the evaluation requirement and that there is limited capacity at the country level to make these complex evaluations a useful and impactful exercise.

This pilot ISWE is a timely attempt to take stock of the overall experience with the broader UNDAF evaluation effort between 2009 and 2014. The meta-evaluation will formulate recommendations as to the further conduct of evaluations at country level in the context of the post-2015 agenda.

### **3. Purpose and objectives of the meta-evaluation**

The main purpose of the meta-evaluation will be to serve as an input into the deliberations of Member States concerning the 2016 QCPR resolution. It will therefore have to be completed by the end of 2015. The evaluation will also be used by the United Nations Development Group to revise the UNDAF guidelines at the end of 2015.

According to the Concept Note endorsed by Member States, as a pilot ISWE, the UNDAF meta-evaluation and synthesis is expected to provide an independent evaluation of the role and contribution of the UN system in the achievement of national goals and priorities. This will be based on the synthesis of the existing pool of UNDAF evaluations in over (100) countries, preceded by a validation or meta-evaluation of the quality of the UNDAF evaluations.

The evaluation will be retrospective looking back at the performance of the UNCT as assessed by UNDAF evaluations as well as prospective making forward looking recommendations to support the process of strategic planning, program development and implementation, mechanisms to enhance coherence in UN system including quality, coherence and synergies in the evaluation of the UN system support to countries.

The objectives of the meta-evaluation are:

- i. Conduct an assessment of UNDAF evaluations between 2009-2014 to determine the overall quality, credibility and use of evaluations in order to provide advice on improvements and adjustments to existing UNDAF evaluation guidelines.;
- ii. Identify major key findings, conclusions and recommendations of UNDAF evaluations undertaken between 2009-2013 in order to assess the contribution of the UN system in achieving national development goals to inform QCPR 2016 for planning and adjustments to current strategies

### **4. Deliverables and expected outputs**

#### ***Inception Phase***

The main output of the Inception Phase will be an Inception Report (IR). The IR will provide contextual analysis and present the data collection tools which will be adopted for assessing the quality of each UNDAF evaluation report building on existing tools which are already used for meta-evaluations. The tools developed for this purpose should include

- i. a benchmark for assessing the technical and methodological quality of the report, the quality of the reports' substantive focus;
- ii. a framework for synthesizing evaluation findings based on core policy and programming objectives and themes which have been established for all UNDAFs. The latter should to the extent possible be forward looking and reflect current priorities and policy concerns.

The tools will be reviewed during a validation workshop, during which members of the Evaluation Management Group and the Key Stakeholders Reference Group will participate in the further refinement of the approach.

### ***Implementation Phase***

The main output will be a full Evaluation Report which will incorporate the final results of the four analytical deliverables into a coherent and easy to read report.

The evaluation will include the following core analytical deliverables:

- i. an assessment of the quality of the body of UNDAF evaluation work which was conducted by UN Country Teams between 2010 and 2014;
- ii. a set of forward looking recommendations aimed at improving the quality of UNDAF evaluations and the UNDAF evaluation system in general
- iii. a synthesis of findings in relation to key themes and policy objectives established for UNDAFs by Member States with effective poverty eradication being the central goal but also reflecting current policy and programmatic themes and issues;
- iv. a set of forward-looking recommendations aimed at improving the broader UNDAF programming and implementation processes.

Meetings with the EMG and KSRG presenting and validating the draft evaluation results and conclusions will be held.

## **5. Work Plan and Timetable**

The consultancy will be conducted between February and September 2015 based on a contract issued by the JIU.

<b>Evaluation Activity</b>	<b># of Days</b>
<b>Inception Phase</b>	
Desk research and documentation review	10
Development of tool for assessing evaluation quality	4
Development of UNDAF evaluation synthesis tool	4
Conduct Inception Report Validation Workshop	1
Incorporate feedback from EMG	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Implementation Phase</b>	
Conduct (telephone) interviews with Member States, UN agencies and UNCT staff	20
Apply analytical tools to UNDAF evaluations	40
Prepare first draft of report	10
Revise first draft	4
Conduct Validation Workshop	1

Incorporation of feedback from EMG/KSRG members	2
Finalize Report	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	70
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>90</b>

## **6. Managerial arrangements and support**

The consultancy will be home based with some travel to New York. The consultant will review the programme documents, evaluation reports, policy studies and other relevant documents and will conduct interviews with key stakeholders. The Consultant will need to be self-sufficient and organize his/her own work, interviews and logistics.

An Evaluation Management Group (EMG) chaired by the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) and composed of different representatives of evaluation offices of select United Nations entities will oversee and guide the work of the consultant. A Key Stakeholder Reference Group (KSRG) will provide advice to the meta-evaluation and validate its findings and recommendations. In the absence of EMGs and KSRGs, more informal expert groups may perform these functions. The ISWE Secretariat located in New York will provide managerial support to the EMG and to the EMG Chair

The Consultant will be required to travel to New York i) to present the results of the inception report and ii) to present the draft final report. Based on feedback from EMG members, the consultant will modify the deliverables before finalizing the work.

## 2. Quality Criteria Used for the Meta-Evaluation and Synthesis

Quality Criteria	Sub-criteria	Further Explanation of the contents of the UNDAF evaluation reports
<i>Credibility</i>	<b>1. Evaluation Scope and Purpose</b>	<p>The report must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assess the <b>relevance</b> of the UNDAF outcomes which includes the national ownership; this “requires government leadership and engagement of all relevant stakeholders, in all stages of the process, to maximize the contribution that the UN system can make, through the UNDAF, to the country development process.”<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• assess the <b>effectiveness</b> .</li> <li>• assess the <b>efficiency</b>.<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• assess the <b>sustainability</b> of the UN system’s contribution.</li> <li>• assess the <b>impact</b>. This analysis should specifically focus on the UN development system’s progress made on targets set in the context of national development, including strategies to achieve the MDGs.<sup>4</sup></li> </ul> <p>According to UNDG Guidelines (2010), “Evaluation determines whether the results made a <i>worthwhile contribution to national development priorities, and the coherence of UNCT support</i>.”<sup>5</sup> The evaluations should therefore assess the design and focus of the UNDAF. The interpretation of the findings of the UNDAF evaluations should address strategic direction-setting goals and performance with larger system-wide implications.<sup>6</sup></p>

<sup>2</sup> UNDG. (2010) How to Prepare an UNDAF (Part I), page 4.

<sup>3</sup> This would not be possible without a thorough “cost analysis” described in UNEG Standard 3.8. Such an analysis requires financial information, but may also involve calculating “economic costs” such as human resources, labour-in-kind, and opportunity costs. As the UNDAF evaluations are unlikely to successfully conduct this analysis, the assessment should focus on the costs of operational activities and any obvious inefficient use of resources.

<sup>4</sup> A/RES/68/226 of 31 January 2014. Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008–2017), paragraph 28.

<sup>5</sup> UNDG. (2010) How to Prepare an UNDAF (Part I), page 17.

<sup>6</sup> ISWE. (2013) Policy for Independent System-wide Evaluation of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System, the Guiding Principles section.

Quality Criteria	Sub-criteria	Further Explanation of the contents of the UNDAF evaluation reports
	<p><b>2. United Nations System (UN system) Coherence</b></p>	<p>The report must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide a clear assessment of the “<b>comparative advantage</b>” of the United Nations system as a whole, which includes the <b>involvement of Non Resident Agencies (NRAs)</b>.</li> <li>• discuss the extent to which there was “effective utilization of resources and the unique expertise of all United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies”.<sup>7</sup> This implies United Nations System coordination.</li> <li>• make reference to a process where a joint analysis took place that led to coordinated strategic decision-making, such as the CCA/UNDAF which analyses the national development situation and identifies key development issues with a focus on the MDGs and the other commitments of the UN system.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Credibility</i></p>	<p><b>3. UN system Performance with respect to “establishing or maintaining effective national institutions”<sup>8</sup></b></p>	<p>The report must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• take into account national ownership during <b>both</b> the design and implementation stages of the UNDAF.</li> <li>• discuss the extent to which the UN engaged in activities to <b>build national capacities</b>, along different functions, such as policy/programme design, and monitoring and evaluation.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>4. Accuracy and Technical Rigor</b></p>	<p>The report must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• include a comprehensive understanding of the <b>important contextual elements</b> and challenges within the programme country.</li> <li>• <b>include a results chain.</b></li> <li>• include a methodology section that <b>describes problems, gaps or limitations</b> encountered within the evaluation process in a transparent manner that may have affected the breadth, quality, validity, and availability of the evidence collected, its analysis, and ensuing conclusions and recommendations. Ideally, there should be a reference to confidentiality and the use of ethical safeguards.</li> <li>• draw from multiple methods and information sources.</li> <li>• have triangulated evidence and analysis to substantiate all findings.</li> <li>• include an inclusive approach from which a wide range of stakeholder groups are consulted.</li> <li>• provide clear links from the evaluation design, how the evaluation criteria are addressed, and the answers to the evaluation questions.</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> A/RES/67/226 of 22 January (2013) Quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (QCPR), OP 18.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., OP 57.



Quality Criteria	Sub-criteria	Further Explanation of the contents of the UNDAF evaluation reports
	<b>5. Independence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be void of conflict of interest.</li> <li>• have “an external function that is separated from programme management.”<sup>9</sup></li> <li>• have authorship.</li> </ul>
<i>Utility</i> <sup>10</sup>	<b>6. Utility</b>	<p>The report must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• have an issuing date indicating that the exercise took place in the penultimate year before the next UNDAF cycle.</li> <li>• have communication quality, using clear language and illustrative charts or tables. The report should have a logical and cohesive flow.</li> <li>• indicate the financial resources dedicated to the evaluation.</li> <li>• have a Terms of Reference that describes the “use of evaluation results, including responsibilities for such use” to ensure systematic follow up on recommendations (UNEG Standard 3.2). Information such as a “management response” or any other documentation that shows that evidence-based decision-making is being promoted.<sup>11</sup></li> <li>• have <b>actionable recommendations for stakeholders in order to support future implementation</b>, where each stakeholder understands the respective follow-on responsibilities to complete within a specific time frame.</li> <li>• <b>learn from experiences</b> of the current programming cycle, and identify issues and opportunities emerging from the implementation of the current UNDAF.</li> <li>• <b>disseminate knowledge</b>. The report should provide education for decision makers.<sup>12</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>9</sup> UNDG. (2010) How to Prepare an UNDAF (Part I), page 16.

<sup>10</sup> Refers to evidence from the UNDAF evaluation reports that would indicate the effective use of the report by the UNCT.

<sup>11</sup> UNEG/AGM2012/4c. (2012) UNEG Guidance on Preparing Management Responses to UNDAF Evaluations. The management response is a requirement as per UNDG 2010 which states that “besides feeding into the next cycle and providing lessons learned from past cooperation, the evaluation calls for a written and agreed management response by the UNCT and the government.” UNDG. (2010) How to Prepare an UNDAF: Part (I) Guidelines for UN Country Teams, page 19.

<sup>12</sup> UNEG/AGM2012/4b. (2012) UNEG Guidance on Preparing Terms of Reference for UNDAF Evaluations.

### 3. Evaluation Matrix for Meta-Evaluation and Synthesis

Table 1: Evaluation Matrix for the Meta-Evaluation

Substantive Area(s)	Key Evaluation Questions	Core Dimensions to be explored	Indicators	Source	Analysis
Addressing UNDAF evaluation <b>coverage</b>	How many (the number of) UNDAF countries have produced UNDAF evaluations? How many were not produced which should have been?	<b>Coverage</b> Evidence from one on-line question sent to Resident Coordinators' Offices (RCOs) in programme countries confirming that an evaluation was <u>not</u> undertaken.	# of UNDAF evaluations available.  # of RCOs confirming that they did not conduct an evaluation.  # of cases where an UNDAF evaluation should have been prepared but was not.	UNDG website <sup>13</sup> . UNDP website for evaluation resource centre <sup>14</sup> . Google RCOs	Count of all country or multi country cases of UNDAF evaluations and of no UNDAF evaluations. Frequency analysis Tabulations
	What are main reasons for not undertaking an UNDAF evaluation?	<b>Understanding context for non-compliance</b> Evidence from two questionnaire questions with closed-ended responses inquiring about reasons for not undertaking an evaluation. One (last) open-ended question asks about ways to promote better evaluation coverage.	# of RCOs responding to questionnaire about their reasons for not conducting evaluations.	122-24= programme countries = 98 RCO offices where the link to an on-line questionnaire is sent.	Tabulations and frequency analysis.  Content analysis from one open-ended question.

<sup>13</sup> Examples of UNDAF evaluations: <https://undg.org/home/guidance-policies/common-country-programmingundaf/examples-of-undaf-evaluations/>

<sup>14</sup> Information from: <http://erc.undp.org/index.html;jsessionid=0175E56118FD573714BBFCC1FBFB3E03>

Substantive Area(s)	Key Evaluation Questions	Core Dimensions to be explored	Indicators	Source	Analysis
Improving the UNDAF evaluation quality including utilization of results.	What is the technical quality of UNDAF evaluations? To what extent is the evidence from the UNDAF evaluation credible, useful, and timely?	<b>Report Quality</b> Evidence from UNDAF Report Quality Screening tool.	See the Report Quality Screening Tool	UNDAF Report Quality Screening from 36 UNDAF evaluations.	Tabulations and frequency analysis.
	To what extent are the UNDAF evaluations resourced in terms of funding, human resources, data inputs, and time allocated?	<b>Adequacy of resources</b> Budget evidence from Terms of Reference (ToR) documents. ( <i>Connects to question below about adequacy of resources</i> )	# of reports /ToRs with budget and human resources information	Data from UNDAF evaluations.	Average budget and number of consulting days allocated for UNDAF evaluations  Analysis of stakeholder perceptions Triangulation
Improving the UNDAF evaluation quality including utility of results	To what extent do UNCTs make use of UNDAF evaluation results as a tool for ongoing programme iteration and learning?	<b>Utility of the UNDAF evaluation results</b>  Evidence from the preparation of management response documents.  Evidence from the integration of UNDAF evaluation results into successor UNDAF programme documents.	% of UNDAF evaluations for which a management response has been prepared.  # of successor UNDAF evaluations documents which refer implicitly and explicitly to UNDAF evaluation results from the previous UNDAF cycle.	Management response documents if and when available <sup>15</sup> .  UNDAF Programme documents	Frequency analysis.  Frequency analysis Content analysis  Triangulation

<sup>15</sup> Information from: <http://erc.undp.org/index.html?sessionid=0175E56118FD573714BBFCC1FBFB3E03>

Substantive Area(s)	Key Evaluation Questions	Core Dimensions to be explored	Indicators	Source	Analysis
Adequacy of tools available and improvements needed to strengthen UNDAF evaluation quality	Are current UNDAF evaluation guidelines and tools adequate?	<b>Adequacy of Resources Available (tools only)</b> Evidence from stakeholder perceptions about the adequacy of the UNDAF evaluation guidance.	# of, credible, substantive issues raised (positive or negative) about the adequacy of guidance available.	UNDAF evaluation guidance documents	Content Analysis from stakeholder interviews.
	What improvements can be considered so that UNDAF evaluations may play their intended role?	<b>Adequacy of Resources Available (financial, human, time, and data)</b> Evidence from reports (if any) and stakeholders' perceptions about the extent of resources that <i>ought</i> to be considered to improve evaluation quality and their intended contribution(s).	# of credible, substantive issues raised in evaluation reports or interviews about the needed resources (financial, human, time, data, or whatever) to strengthen the quality of UNDAF evaluations.	Findings from UNDAF evaluations. Interviews with UNEG and UNDG representatives.	Frequency analysis from reports. Content analysis of information from interviews with stakeholders. Triangulation

Table 2: Evaluation Matrix for the Synthesis

Substantive Area(s)	Key Evaluation Questions	Core Dimensions to be explored	Indicators	Source	Analysis
<p>The key themes and policy objectives established for UNDAFs with emphasis on effective poverty eradication.</p> <p>This covers evaluation criteria: Relevance Effectiveness Efficiency</p> <p>The key themes and policy objectives established for UNDAFs with emphasis on effective poverty eradication.</p>	<p><b>Poverty Eradication</b> Based on the report findings and conclusions, to what extent has the UNDAF contributed to and made <b>progress</b> toward the achievement of the national poverty alleviation goals and strategies? What are the challenges or main factors contributing to progress?</p>	<p><b>Progress made</b> Evidence of alignment between UNDAF outcomes and national poverty alleviation goals Link between UNDAF operational activities and progress towards and/or achievement of UNDAF outcomes.</p> <p><b>Challenges or Opportunities</b> Evidence of challenges and context of implementation operational activities</p>	<p># of evaluations which provide a substantive assessment (positive, negative or mixed) on UNDAF's contribution to national poverty alleviation goals. # of evaluations which present positive or negative factors influencing the ability to make progress toward national priorities.</p>	Findings from UNDAF evaluations	<p>Content Analysis from reports. The analysis could summarize: 1-across country status; or 2-poverty themes or by sector; or 3- Based on report findings and conclusions, what is considered highest priority or most important. This is primarily contextual.</p>
<p>This covers evaluation criteria: Relevance Effectiveness Efficiency</p>	<p>From report findings and conclusions, how well have the five programming principles been mainstreamed into the UNDAF?</p>	<p><b>Mainstreaming the principles</b> Evidence of the systematic application of the following principles: National Capacity Building Gender Equality Human-rights-based approach (HRBA) Environmental Sustainability RBM</p> <p><b>Challenges or Opportunities</b> Evidence of challenges and context of mainstreaming the principles.</p>	<p>See Report Content Identification tool # of evaluations which provide a substantive assessment (positive, negative or mixed) on successful mainstreaming of each of the five UNDAF programming principles.</p>	Findings from UNDAF evaluations	<p>Content analysis from reports. Cross report analysis.</p>

*Table 3: Evaluation Matrix for the Synthesis-UN system Performance*

Substantive Area(s)	Key Evaluation Questions	Core Dimensions to be explored	Indicators	Source	Analysis
United Nations System Performance Relevance Coherence <sup>16</sup>	Based on the report findings and conclusions, how well aligned is the UNDAF with national development strategy goals and planning cycles?	Stronger alignment with National Goals and Strategies  Evidence of UNDAF alignment with national development: i) strategy goals to alleviate poverty; ii) cycles.	# of evaluations which provide a substantive coverage on core dimensions.	Findings from UNDAF evaluations.	Content analysis
United Nations System Performance Relevance Effectiveness Sustainability	Does UNDAF facilitate national ownership and leadership during design and implementation stages?	Facilitated national ownership and leadership Evidence of national governments assuming leadership role in key aspects of the UNDAF.  Evidence of successful engagement of NRA capacities in UNDAF context	# of evaluations which provide a substantive assessment or coverage (positive, negative or mixed) on these aspects.  # of evaluations which provide a substantive assessment or coverage (positive, negative or mixed) on these aspects	Findings from UNDAF evaluations.	Tabulations and frequency analysis  Content analysis from reports.

<sup>16</sup> It is recognized that this evaluation criteria is germane to post-conflict settings specifically.

Substantive Area(s)	Key Evaluation Questions	Core Dimensions to be explored	Indicators	Source	Analysis
<p>United Nations System Performance</p> <p>Relevance Effectiveness Efficiency Coherence / Coordination</p> <p>United Nations System Performance</p> <p>Relevance Effectiveness Efficiency Coherence / Coordination</p>	<p>Has the UNDAF led to a more coherent and coordinated United Nations response to the development needs and priorities of the country?</p> <p>Has the UNDAF led to a more coherent and coordinated United Nations response to the development needs and priorities of the country?</p>	<p>Value added of UNDAF-related processes.</p> <p>Evidence of United Nations System better systemic response to country's development needs.</p> <p>Evidence of United Nations System reduced gaps and duplication.</p> <p>Evidence of improved division of labour among UN actors at country level and enhanced coordination (synergies) with the respective national entities concerned at: 1) the strategic level and 2) the operational level.</p> <p>Evidence of implementation of joint UN initiatives (cross sector, advocacy, thematic and/or joint programmes).</p> <p>Evidence of UNDAF as a dynamic process.</p> <p>Evidence of UNDAF as a facilitator of South-South cooperation.</p>	<p># of evaluations which provide a substantive assessment or coverage (positive, negative or mixed) on each of the core dimensions.</p>	<p>Findings from UNDAF evaluations.</p> <p>Findings from UNDAF evaluations.</p>	<p>Tabulations and frequency analysis.</p> <p>Content analysis from reports.</p> <p>Tabulations and frequency analysis.</p> <p>Content analysis from reports.</p>
<p>United Nations System Performance</p> <p>Effectiveness Relevance</p>	<p>Does UNDAF facilitate national access to the full spectrum of United Nations organizations mandates and resources?</p>	<p>Better national access to the United Nations organizations mandates and resources</p> <p>Evidence of UNDAF process, drawing from each agency's comparative advantage (NRA engagement).</p>	<p># of evaluations which present positive, negative or mixed assessments of NRA engagement in UNDAF implementation.</p>	<p>Findings from UNDAF evaluations</p>	<p>Tabulations and frequency analysis</p> <p>Content analysis from reports.</p>

Substantive Area(s)	Key Evaluation Questions	Core Dimensions to be explored	Indicators	Source	Analysis
United Nations System Performance Effectiveness Sustainability Impact	From report findings and conclusions, how has the UNDAF strengthened partnerships between the existing UN system at the country level and other development actors?	Strengthened partnerships beyond the UN  Evidence of the UNDAF proposing the development of <i>new</i> partnerships and synergistic initiatives, including with bilateral, international financial institutions, and private sector actors.  Evidence of the UNDAF enhancing <i>existing</i> systemic-level partnership(s).	# of evaluations which provide a substantive assessment or coverage (positive, negative or mixed) on whether UNDAF has resulted in new development partnerships beyond the UN.  # of evaluations which present positive, negative or mixed assessments on enhanced systemic-level partnership arrangements beyond the UN system.	Findings from UNDAF evaluations	Tabulations and frequency analysis  Content analysis different country UNDAF evaluation reports.



#### 4. Instrument for Report Quality Screening Tool

##### Report Quality Screening Tool

<b>A. Title of report:</b>		<b>B. No. of pages:</b>	<b>C. Year of report issuance:</b>	<b>D. Date of assessment:</b>
<b>E. Management Response Available?</b>		1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes. Date _____	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	3 <input type="checkbox"/> No Information
<b>F. Terms of Reference Describes an Accountability Architecture?</b>		1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes	2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	3 <input type="checkbox"/> No Information
<b>G. Project Budget:</b>		<b>H. Type of Evaluation:</b> [1] Final [2] Mid-Term		
<b>I. 1] Penultimate Year</b>	<b>2] Year of roll out</b>	<b>3] Other</b>		
<b>J. Evaluation Stakeholders Involved in the Evaluation Process (circle one response only):</b>				
<b>1] Non- Resident Agencies: Y /N</b>	<b>3] CSOs: Y /N</b>	<b>5] Private Sector: Y/N</b>	<b>7] Beneficiaries: Y/N</b>	
<b>2] National Government: Y /N</b>	<b>4] Donors: Y /N</b>	<b>6] Academia: Y/N</b>	<b>8] UN Régional Offices: Y/N</b>	<b>9] Foundations: Y/N</b>

##### Part I. Report Quality Screening

Rating scale: 1 = very poor 2 = poor 3 = fair 4 = good 5 = excellent

No.	Quality Standards	Ratings	Comments
	<b>1. Executive summary</b>		<b>Final score for section.</b>
1.	The executive summary contains the key elements of the report, in particular, subject and objectives of the evaluation, methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	<b>2. Introduction Overall [CODE]</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	<b>Final score for section BELOW.</b>
2.	The report states when the evaluation was conducted (period of the evaluation).	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
3.	The report specifies the subject of the evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

No.	Quality Standards	Ratings	Comments
4.	The report specifies the purpose and the objectives of the evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
5.	The report specifies what the evaluation does and does not cover (scope of the evaluation).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
6.	The report states by whom the evaluation was commissioned about the decision to launch the evaluation.	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes      2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
7.	The report states the names of evaluator(s).	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes      2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
<b>3. Methodology</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	<b>Final score for section BELOW.</b>
8.	The methodology describes data sources, data collection and analysis methods.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
9.	The methodology is adequately robust to answering the key evaluation questions.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
10.	The methodology addresses methodological challenges and/or limitations.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
11.	Report discusses confidentiality and ethical safeguards.	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes      2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
12.	Includes a Theory of Change, results frameworks, or some form of logical chain of results (with “if-then” statements).	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes      2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
<b>4. Application of Evaluation Criteria</b>		1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes      2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	If no, skip to question 18.
		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	<b>Final score for section BELOW.</b>
13.	Report assesses <b>relevance</b> of the UNDAF outcomes which includes alignment with national needs and priorities.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
14.	Report assesses <b>effectiveness</b> (progress toward objectives)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
15.	Report assesses <b>efficiency</b> of the UNDAF outcomes (results at lowest possible cost) by which UNDAF outcomes and Country Programme outcomes are being achieved.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
16.	Report assesses <b>sustainability</b> and the UN system’s contribution to national	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

No.	Quality Standards	Ratings	Comments
	priorities and goals.		
17.	Report assesses <b>the impact</b> of the UNDAF outcomes.	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes      2 <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
	<b>5. UN system (UN system) Coherence Analysis, Overall [CODE]</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	<b>Final score for section BELOW.</b>
18.	The report must provide a clear description of the UNDAF design process. The UN system.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
19.	Description includes <b>NRAs involvement in UNDAF design.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	<b>6. National Ownership, Overall [CODE]</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	<b>Final score for section BELOW.</b>
20.	Description includes involvement of the National Government in UNDAF <i>design.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
21.	Description includes the National Government involvement in UNDAF <i>implementation.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
22.	Includes important contextual elements and challenges within the programme country that influence UNDAF implementation.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	<b>7. Report Results Overall [CODE]</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	<b>Final score for section BELOW.</b>
23.	Results are easily identifiable.	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes                      2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
24.	Results clearly relate to the evaluation purpose and objectives, and evaluation questions/criteria.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
25.	Results are formulated linking activities to big-picture priorities.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
26.	Results are supported by sufficient evidence.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
27.	Results are objective (free from evaluators' opinions).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
28.	Results uncover underlying causes for accomplishments/difficulties and opportunities to build on.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
	<b>7a. Results for RBM only Overall [CODE]</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	<b>Final score for section BELOW.</b>
29.	Review of the quality of the UNDAF indicators (i.e., must be specific,	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	

No.	Quality Standards	Ratings	Comments
	realistic, etc.).		
30.	Discussion of the <b>use of the UNDAF evaluation</b> framework by the UNCT.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<b>8. Conclusions</b>		<b>Overall [CODE]</b>	<b>Final score for section BELOW.</b>
		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
31.	Conclusions are arrived at in separate chapter(s)/section(s) of the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes                      2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
32.	Conclusions build on the results (logical link).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
33.	Conclusions reflect the evaluators' professional opinion based on the evidence.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
34.	Conclusions add value to the results (they are forward-looking).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
35.	Conclusions answer the big questions of the evaluation and focus on significant issues.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<b>9. Recommendations</b>		<b>Overall [CODE]</b>	<b>Final score for section BELOW.</b>
		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
36.	Recommendations clearly and directly relate to the results and conclusions.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
37.	Recommendations are limited to a manageable number of key ones (avoid "laundry lists" of too prescriptive recommendations).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
38.	Recommendations are realistic (actionable).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
39.	The report specifies who should implement the recommendations.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<b>10. Format</b>		<b>Overall [CODE]</b>	<b>Final score for section BELOW.</b>
		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
40.	The report is easy to read and understand (avoids complex language and unexplained acronyms).	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
41.	The overall flow of the report is cohesive and logical.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
42.	The report uses relevant tables and charts to illustrate important points and information.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<b>Overall rating of report</b>		<b>Overall [CODE]</b>	
		1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes                      2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	

**Part II. Report Content Identification**

<p><b>A. Overall assessment made in the evaluation report of programme/project in terms of attaining results.</b></p>	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Largely positive results reported                  2. <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed results reported                  3. <input type="checkbox"/> Largely negative results reported</p>			
<p><b>B. Five Programming Principles</b></p>	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> All Five AREAs                  2. <input type="checkbox"/> Human rights-based approach                  3. <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Sustainability</p>	<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Disaster Risk Reduction                  5. <input type="checkbox"/> Gender Equality                  6. <input type="checkbox"/> Results Based Management</p>		
<p><b>C. Poverty Eradication Themes</b></p>	<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Access to health services                  2. <input type="checkbox"/> Education services                  3. <input type="checkbox"/> Food Security                  4. <input type="checkbox"/> Productive employment <b>OR</b> decent work and financial resources</p>	<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Democratic Governance                  6. <input type="checkbox"/> Environment (Nat. Resource Mangt)                  7. <input type="checkbox"/> Human Security</p>	<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> Social Inclusion with participation of disadvantaged groups in the development process                  9. <input type="checkbox"/> Social protection</p>	<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> HIV/AIDS                  11. <input type="checkbox"/> Other:                  _____</p>
<p><b>D. Key positive findings linked to MDGs (thematic areas)</b></p>	<p>Blank summary sheet should include quotes or sections (as appropriate).</p>			
<p><b>E. Key negative findings (results not achieved)</b></p>	<p>Blank summary sheet should include relevant quotes or sections (as appropriate).</p>			
<p><b>F. Key mixed findings (results partially achieved)</b></p>	<p>Blank summary sheet should include relevant quotes or sections (as appropriate).</p>			

## 5. Process of Conducting the Content Analysis

The intent of the Content Analysis is to understand the performance of the United Nations system as articulated in the different evaluation reports through identified contexts, experiences, and activities executed. The overall process of the content analysis includes three steps: (1) coding; (2) separating data for analysis; and (3) data interpretation.

*Coding:* The list of codes used may be found in the methodology section of the report. For example, these codes included “challenges”, “alignment”, “ownership”, “UN Coherence and Coordination”, South-South, “NRA engagement”, “partnerships beyond the UN”, “Capacity Building”, “Gender”, Human Rights”, “Environment”, “M&E system”, “M&E framework”.

*Archiving data for analysis:* 11 different word processor files housed the coded data from evaluation reports. Each file similarly coded information from different reports that were then used for the content analysis. After carefully reading through all the coded data, a few different themes would emerge. Relevant quotes to include in the report were also marked during this process. To identify and build on themes, the evaluator used Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.) referenced in Annex 7. Essentially, the themes were summarized taking into account **both** the range of views expressed in reports about a particular theme as well as the number of reports referring to the same or similar theme.

*Data interpretation:* This process reflected four rounds of review of the thematic summaries to produce the synthesis section.

## 6. Names of Key Informants for Interviews

Organization	Position	Names of Stakeholder
UNEG	UNEG	Mr. Robert Stryker Mr. Colin Kirk and Mr. Krishna Belbase
UNEG	Vice Chair for Partnerships	Mr. Colin Kirk and Mr. Krishna Belbase
UNEG	Vice Chair for the Use of Evaluation	Mr. Robert Stryker
UNDG	Policy Specialist, Programme	Mr. Pervez Hassan

### Names of the Members of the ISWE Evaluation Management Group

Meta Evaluation and Synthesis of UNDAF Evaluations		
Organization	Name and Contact Details	Nomination
JIU	Mr. Gerard Biraud Inspector and Chair EMG Mr. Gopinathan Achamkulangare Inspector and Alternate Chair EMG	
UNICEF*	Mr. Krishna Belbase Senior Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Office UNICEF <a href="mailto:kbelbase@unicef.org">kbelbase@unicef.org</a>	Nominated by Colin Kirk UNEG Head Director Evaluation Office UNICEF <a href="mailto:ckirk@unicef.org">ckirk@unicef.org</a>
UN Women	Mr. Messay Tassew Evaluation Specialist, Independent Evaluation Office UN Women <a href="mailto:messay.tassew@unwomen.org">messay.tassew@unwomen.org</a>	Nominated by Marco Segone UNEG Head Director Independent Evaluation Office UN Women <a href="mailto:marco.segone@unwomen.org">marco.segone@unwomen.org</a>
WFP	Ms. Miranda Sende Evaluation Manager, Office of Evaluation WFP <a href="mailto:miranda.sende@wfp.org">miranda.sende@wfp.org</a>	Nominated by Helen Wedgwood UNEG Head Director Office of Evaluation WFP <a href="mailto:helen.wedgwood@wfp.org">helen.wedgwood@wfp.org</a>
UNDP	Ms. Vijayalakshmi Vadivelu Evaluation Advisor, Independent Evaluation Office UNDP <a href="mailto:vijayalakshmi.vadivelu@undp.org">vijayalakshmi.vadivelu@undp.org</a>	Nominated by Indran Naidoo UNEG Head Director Independent Evaluation Office UNDP <a href="mailto:indran.naidoo@undp.org">indran.naidoo@undp.org</a>
UN-Habitat	Mr. Martin Barugahare Chief Evaluation Unit Office of the Executive Director UN-Habitat <a href="mailto:martin.barugahare@unhabitat.org">martin.barugahare@unhabitat.org</a>	Self-nominated UNEG Head
WHO	Ms. Itziar Larizgoitia Senior Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Office WHO <a href="mailto:larizgoitai@who.int">larizgoitai@who.int</a>	Nominated by Elilarasu Renganathan UNEG Head Director Planning, Resource Coordination & Performance Monitoring WHO <a href="mailto:renganathane@who.int">renganathane@who.int</a>

## Names of the Members of the ISWE KSRG

Ad hoc EMG members		
Name	Function	Contact details
01 Mr. Suppiramaniam Nanthikesan	Evaluation Adviser Regional Bureau for Africa UNDP	E-mail address: Suppiramaniam.nanthikesan@undp.org Phone: 212-906-6534 Address: One United Nations Plaza, DC1-2420, New York, N.Y. 10017
02 Mr. Pervez Hassan	Policy Specialist, Programme Focal Point for Programme Working Group, United Nations Development Group, UN-DOCO	E-mail address: <a href="mailto:pervez.hassan@undg.org">pervez.hassan@undg.org</a> Address: Development Operations Coordination Office, One UN Plaza, DC1-1600 New York, N.Y. 10017
03 Mr. Paul Farran	Head of UN Resident Coordinator Office Zimbabwe	E-mail address: paul.farran@one.un.org Phone: +263 774 460 664 Address: Block 10, Arundel Office Park, Norfolk Road Mt Pleasant, Harare, Zimbabwe
04 Ms. Yamina Djacta	Director Liaison Office UN-HABITAT	E-mail address: <a href="mailto:djacta@un.org">djacta@un.org</a> Phone: 212-963-5464 Address: Two United Nations Plaza, DC2-0943, New York, N.Y. 10017