Contents   **Page**

7.0   MONITORING, REPORTING AND EVALUATION

7.1   Policy framework

7.1.1   General policy statements

1. Monitoring and evaluation are essential management functions that are interactive and mutually supportive. They help UNDP to ensure accountability in the use of resources entrusted to it; provide a clear basis for decision-making; and offer practical lessons from experience to guide future development interventions.

2. Monitoring and evaluation must be integrated into the programming cycle to enhance the implementation and achievement of results from current programmes and projects as well as the design of future programmes and projects.

3. Monitoring and evaluation exercises must be results-oriented and include assessments of the relevance, performance and success of UNDP development interventions.

7.1.2   Coverage

1. The policies and procedures on monitoring and evaluation apply to all programmes and projects supported by UNDP. In line with the objective of the United Nations to harmonize monitoring and evaluation policies, funds in association with UNDP must also follow UNDP policies on monitoring and evaluation.

7.2   Monitoring and evaluation during the programme and project cycle

7.2.1   Definitions

1. Monitoring - is a continuing function that aims primarily to provide the main stakeholders of an ongoing programme or project with early indications of progress or lack thereof in the achievement of programme or project objectives.

2. Reporting - is the systematic and timely provision of essential information used as a basis for decision-making at appropriate management levels. It is an integral part of the monitoring function.

For detailed technical guidance in the development of selected monitoring and evaluation instruments, use also Results-oriented Monitoring and Evaluation: A Handbook for Programme Managers (referred to as M&E Handbook in the rest of this chapter. It may be accessed from the Evaluation office web page on the UNDP intranet or Internet).

See annex 7A for the complete text of the policies approved by the UNDP Executive Committee on 6 June 1997.

The funds should collaborate with the Evaluation Office in adapting the policies to their specific requirements.

For UNDP-GEF projects, refer to the comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Kit http://www.undp.org/gef/m&e While monitoring is done mainly by persons involved in managing a programme or project, evaluation is done by persons who have not been involved in designing or managing it.

3. Evaluation - is a time-bound exercise that attempts to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and success of ongoing and completed programmes and projects.

4. Results – is a broad term used to refer to the effects of a programme or project. The terms outputs, outcomes and impact describe more precisely the different types of results.

7.2.2   **Integrating monitoring and evaluation in the programme and project cycle**

See 4.2 for a full explanation of programme and project design.

1. **Formulation.**   For a programme or project to be effectively monitored and evaluated, the following tasks have to be completed during the formulation stages:

    (a) Construct baseline data on problems to be addressed;

    (b) Search for lessons learned from other programmes and projects;

    (c) Clarify programme or project objectives;

    (d) Establish a set of indicators and benchmarks for monitoring and evaluating the programme or project results;

    (e) Agree on how data will be obtained and used;

    (f) Specify reporting requirements (format, frequency and distribution), including the annual and terminal reports;

    (g) Establish monitoring and evaluation responsibilities;

    (h) Provide an adequate budget for monitoring and evaluation. (Note: the following figures may provide some guidance in this regard: for monitoring one to five per cent of the programme or project budget; for an evaluation of one project - $35,000 - $40,000; and for a cluster evaluation - $50,000 - $100,000)

The LPAC verifies that the tasks have been carried out. See 5.4 on appraisal.

2. **Appraisal and Approval**. It is the responsibility of those appraising and approving programmes and projects to ensure that appropriate lessons and requirements for effective monitoring and evaluation arrangements are incorporated into the programme or project design.

3. **Implementation.** Monitoring and evaluation during implementation must provide information that can serve as a basis for making decisions to institute corrective actions or reinforce early signs of success.   To the extent possible, participatory monitoring and evaluation mechanisms must be used to enable stakeholders to provide their feedback. This is one way of promoting learning among those involved in the programme or project.

> For participatory evaluation, see Who are the Question-makers? A Participatory Evaluation Handbook.

4. **Programme or Project Completion.** Upon programme or project termination, stakeholders must take stock of experience gained – successes and failures, best and worst practices - and future challenges and constraints.   The target groups, the designated institution, the Government and UNDP, as the main stakeholders, should try to achieve the following:

> For information on the terminal tripartite review and the terminal report as mechanisms for drawing and disseminating lessons from experience, see 7.3.4 and 7.3.5.

   (a) Identify lessons from experience that can potentially be applied to a broader range of development interventions;

   (b) Determine which particular groups would benefit most from such lessons;

   (c) Ascertain the best way to disseminate the lessons to those groups.

7.3   Monitoring

7.3.1   **Policy on monitoring coverage**

1. The policy is as follows:

   (a) All UNDP-supported programmes and projects regardless of budget and duration must be monitored;

   (b) Monitoring is the responsibility of the designated institution since it is the entity responsible for the overall management of a programme or project;

   (c) Country offices must also undertake monitoring actions to ensure that programmes and projects supported by UNDP at the country level are implemented effectively and efficiently, and are achieving the desired results;

   (d) Operational units are responsible for undertaking the monitoring actions described in the present chapter for all programmes and projects.

7.3.2   **Field visits**

1. **Definition and purpose.**   A field visit is a direct observation of a programme or project at its site. Its purpose is to enable the person making the field visit to obtain a first-hand account of the progress of a programme or project towards achieving the expected results outlined in the work plan.

2. **Policy.**   The resident representative and country office staff must visit all programmes and projects once a year or more frequently, as necessary.   Joint field visits by UNDP and other development partners involved in the same types of programmes and projects are encouraged in order to promote a participatory approach to the discussion of similar issues with target groups and other stakeholders.

3. **Procedures.**   A person visiting a programme or project must undertake the following tasks:

    (a) Obtain the views of target groups, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders on how the programme or project is affecting them and their recommendations for addressing relevant issues. Also determine whether adequate mechanisms are in place for consulting with, and obtaining feedback from, the stakeholders;

        See the policy on participation in 4.1 para.9.

    (b) Inspect the programme or project site, outputs and services and assess their adequacy in terms of quality and quantity vis-à-vis the expected results;

    (c) Prepare a report immediately after the visit, highlighting stakeholders' views as well as his or her own observations and recommendations on how to address any issues concerning the programme or project;

        See annex 7B - Field visit report form.

    (d) Provide the designated institution with a copy of the field visit report.

4. **Action on the field visit report.** The designated institution reviews the assessment and recommendations of the report and takes appropriate action. When necessary, the designated institution refers the recommendations for decision by concerned entities or by the tripartite review.

7.3.3   **Annual programme/project report**

1. **Definition and purposes**. The APR is an assessment of a particular programme or project during a given year by target groups**,** programme or project management, government and UNDP. It aims to:

   (a) Provide a rating and textual assessment of the progress of a programme or project in achieving expected results;

   (b) Present stakeholders' insights into issues affecting the implementation of a programme or project and their proposals for addressing those issues;

   (c) Serve as an input to any evaluation of the programme or project;

   (d) Be a source of inputs to the preparation of the annual and country reviews of the country cooperation framework.

   See 2.4 for information on the CCF.

2. **Contents and structure.** The APR form is divided into three parts. Part I requests a numerical rating of programme or project relevance and performance as well as an overall rating of the programme or project. Part II asks for a textual assessment of the programme or project, focusing on major achievements, early evidence of success, issues and problems, recommendations and lessons learned. Part III consists of a summary table with two sections: one section reports on resources and expenditures and the other highlights progress toward achieving expected results. Annexes may be included as necessary to provide specific information in support of the rating and assessment indicated.

   See annex 7C - Annual programme/project report form.

   Such additional information could be statistics on indicators or a copy of a training design.

3. **Procedures for preparing the APR.** The designated institution is responsible for preparing the APR. This preparation must be done in consultation with the stakeholders. Representation of stakeholders in terms of level (i.e., organization, individual) and number will be determined by the programme or project itself. The APR must be ready two weeks prior to the tripartite review (TPR). It may be completed and submitted to the country office at any time during the year.

   See 7.3.4 for the procedures for the tripartite review.

4. **Actions on the APR.**   The following actions are taken:

   (a) The designated institution submits the APR to the country office two weeks prior to the TPR. The country office circulates it to the TPR participants one week before the TPR meeting;

(b) The representative of the designated institution presents the APR to the TPR, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the participants. The representative also informs the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the APR preparation process on how to resolve operational issues.

7.3.4   **Tripartite review**

1. **Definition and purposes**.   A tripartite review is a policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in a programme or project. It aims: to assess the progress of a programme or project based on the APR; and to take decisions on recommendations to improve the design and implementation of that programme or project in order to achieve the expected results.

2. **Policy.**   A tripartite review must be held once a year. In exceptional circumstances, there may be more than one TPR during a year. A terminal tripartite review must be held towards the end of programme or project implementation.

3. **Participants.** The following parties participate in the TPR :

   (a) The Government: the national coordinating authority and other concerned departments;

   (b) UNDP;

   (c) The designated institution, whether the Government, a United Nations agency or any other agency;

   (d) Other main stakeholders, including other United Nations agencies and other donors, as deemed appropriate.

Note: Since a tripartite review addresses policy issues affecting the programme or project, it is important that these parties be represented by persons in a position to speak authoritatively.

4. **Overall responsibility.** The resident representative is responsible for organizing a tripartite review, in consultation with the Government and the designated institution, and for ensuring that decisions are taken on important issues.

5. **Procedures.** The procedures for a TPR are:

   (a) **Preparing the agenda.** The resident representative prepares the agenda, in consultation with the Government and the designated institution. The agenda must include the following topics:

   i.   Follow-up to previous tripartite review or evaluation of the programme or project;

ii. APR :   assessment of the relevance, potential and actual achievement of results; issues and problems in design and implementation; conclusions; and recommendations;

iii. Decisions: management actions required, the parties responsible and the time-frame for implementing the actions;

iv. Work plan: progress expected before the next tripartite review, or, in the case of a terminal tripartite review, proposed follow-up to the programme or project, if any;

v. Need for evaluation: a specific recommendation on whether an evaluation is needed and justifications for such a recommendation;

(b) **Circulating documents.**   The   resident   representative circulates the following documents to the participants at least one week before the scheduled tripartite review.

i. Agenda;

ii. APR;

iii. Other relevant documents, e.g., evaluation report, outputs produced by the programme or project such as training material, research reports, etc;

(c) **Proceedings.**   During the proceedings:

i. The senior Government representative presides over the TPR but may also designate the resident representative or the designated institution representative to do so;

ii. The TPR participants review the APR and other agenda items. If they decide not to accept the recommendations of the APR, an explanation of the basis for such decision must be reflected in the TPR report;

(d) **Preparing   the   tripartite   review   report.** The   resident representative prepares the tripartite review report (TRR) and circulates it to the participants within two weeks of the TPR. The TRR must provide a succinct discussion of issues and problems, decisions taken, or in the case of a terminal TRR, any follow-up to the programme or project;

See annex 7E for the TRR form.

(e) **Follow-up to the tripartite review.**   The designated institution ensures that the parties concerned implement decisions taken at the TPR.

7.3.5   **Terminal report**

1. **Definition and purposes**.   The terminal report is an overall assessment of a programme or project by its stakeholders and is prepared towards programme or project completion. The APR for the final year serves as the terminal report. In addition to having the same purposes as the APR, the terminal report also aims to serve as a source of initial lessons from experience and to recommend follow-up activity when necessary.

2. **Contents and structure.**   The terminal report form, like the APR, is divided into three parts - Part I for the numerical rating, Part II for the textual assessment of the programme or project, and Part III, consisting of a summary table with two sections (on resources and expenditures and progress towards expected results, respectively). However, Part II contains additional questions on potential impact, sustainability and contribution to capacity development, and recommendations for follow-up.

    See annex 7D - Terminal report form.

3. **Procedures for preparing the terminal report.**   Procedures for the preparation of the terminal report are the same as those for the APR.

4. **Actions on the terminal report**.   Actions taken on the terminal report are the same as those for the APR, with the addition of the following:

    (a) After the terminal tripartite review, the resident representative forwards the terminal report to the regional bureau concerned and to the Evaluation Office at headquarters;

    (b) The regional bureau concerned reviews the terminal report and provides the country office with feedback on it. When required, it also decides on recommendations for follow-up. The regional bureau also uses the report as a source of lessons to improve future as well as ongoing programmes and projects;

    (c) The Evaluation Office processes the terminal report to draw lessons learned from the experience of the programme or project, especially those that have the potential for broader application. It enters the information extracted from the terminal report in the database (i.e., CEDAB) to expand its repository of information relating to the evaluation of UNDP programmes and projects.   Through CEDAB, the Evaluation Office makes the information available to all UNDP offices.

7.4   Evaluation

7.4.1   **Policies on evaluation coverage.** Evaluation is an important tool for learning and ensuring accountability. It is not practical, however, to evaluate all UNDP-assisted programmes and projects, considering the magnitude of the costs and time that would be required to do so. Thus, for evaluation to be cost-effective, it should be undertaken on a selective basis. Some evaluations are mandatory; others are not.

    1. **Mandatory Evaluation.**   The policy regarding mandatory evaluation is as follows:

       (a) **Purpose.** Evaluation is mandatory in certain cases to ensure:

          i.   An adequate number of programmes and projects from which lessons can be drawn to support organizational learning; and

          ii. Significant financial coverage, i.e., the magnitude of financial resources represented by programmes and projects evaluated to support the accountability of the Administrator;

       (b) **Criteria**. Evaluation is mandatory in the following situations:

          i.   When a programme or project has a budget of $1 million or more at any point during the lifetime of the programme or project;

          ii. Whenever a second or additional phase of assistance is being proposed or when UNDP has been supporting an institution (e.g., ministry, department, agency, etc.) for ten years or more; a mandatory evaluation under this criterion must cover all programmes and projects through which UNDP has channeled its support to the institution concerned;

       (c) **Compliance**.   Compliance with mandatory evaluations is enforced and used as an indicator for assessing management performance;

       (d) **Deferment of mandatory evaluation**.   The country office, in consultation with main stakeholders, may defer the conduct of a mandatory evaluation owing to security risks, complex development situations or a crisis. When the situation improves, the mandatory evaluation must be scheduled as part of the country-level evaluation plan;

> The Evaluation Office monitors and reports on the compliance rate for mandatory evaluations to the Administrator,
>
> who then reports on it, as part of the annual report to the Executive Board.
>
> See section 7.4.3 for discussion of the country-level evaluation plan.

(e) **Justifications for not conducting a mandatory evaluation.** The country office, in consultation with main stakeholders, may decide not to undertake an evaluation that would otherwise be mandatory. Justifiable reasons for such a decision are:

   i.   The programme or project has been canceled;

   ii. The programme or project has been evaluated by a development partner and the substantive concerns of UNDP have been adequately assessed by that evaluation;

(f) **Unacceptable reasons.** Following are examples of explanations that are not acceptable as justifications for non-compliance with the mandatory evaluation policy:

   i.   Resource constraints (Funds for evaluation must be provided at the very outset, during the design and approval stages of the programme or project, or added through a budget revision);

   ii. Programme or project claimed to be successful (Success constitutes an even stronger reason to evaluate the programme or project and identify lessons learned and best practices for replication);

   iii. Technical review of the programme or project already conducted or being planned (A technical review has a narrower focus, i.e., technical aspects of the programme or project while an evaluation seeks to assess relevance, performance and success from a broader perspective);

   iv. Programme or project completed and closed (Unlike a cancelled programme or project, this intervention, although completed, could still be subject to a terminal or an ex-post evaluation).

2. **Non-mandatory evaluation**.   Although it is not necessary to evaluate all UNDP-assisted programmes and projects, the evaluation of innovative and strategic programmes and projects is encouraged in order to broaden the knowledge base for improving the quality of future development interventions.

See chapter 7 of the M&E Handbook for examples of innovative and strategic programmes and projects. Other types of evaluations may also be conducted as country offices and other main stakeholders deem necessary.

7.4.2   **Responsibilities for ensuring compliance with policies on evaluation coverage**

1. The following list of responsibilities has been established to ensure that management at different levels fully complies with policies on evaluation coverage:

    (a) **Country offices.** The country offices ensure that evaluations, particularly those that are mandatory, are undertaken as indicated in their respective country-level evaluation plans. They submit copies of evaluation reports to the Evaluation Office and the regional bureaux;

    (b) **Regional bureaux.** Regional bureaux monitor the implementation of country-level evaluation plans by the country offices in their regions. When necessary, they follow up the submission of evaluation reports by the country offices;

    (c) **Evaluation Office.** Based on the country-level evaluation plans submitted by country offices and the evaluation reports it receives, the Evaluation Office reports to the Administrator on the compliance rate for mandatory evaluations. It also reports on other evaluations conducted;

    (d) **The Administrator.** The Administrator reports on evaluations conducted as part of the annual report to the Executive Board.

7.4.3   **Country-level evaluation plan**

1. **Definition and purpose.** An evaluation plan at the country level identifies the different evaluations that will help to assess the relevance, performance and success of UNDP cooperation with the programme country. The types of evaluations that can be included in the country-level evaluation plan are explained in detail below. The plan is a tool for:

    (a) Ensuring that country offices comply with the policies on evaluation coverage;

    (b) Managing the implementation of the CCF;

    (c) Making sure that appropriate evaluations are undertaken from which lessons can be drawn for future programming.

2. **Policy.**   After the approval of a CCF, each country office must prepare a detailed, country-level evaluation plan covering the evaluation activities for a rolling three-year period. This is to ensure that there will be sufficient information to feed into the annual and country reviews of the CCF.

See 7.5 on the annual and country reviews.

3. **Procedures for preparing and submitting the country-level evaluation plan.** The procedures are:

   (a) The country office must maintain a list of programmes and projects with budgets of $1 million and above, those that provide support to a particular institution with the corresponding duration, and those that are considered to be innovative and strategic;

   (b) In consultation with the government and other main stakeholders, the country office prepares the country-level evaluation plan covering a three-year rolling period. Towards the end of the first year of the plan, the evaluations scheduled for the second and third years must be reviewed and revised where necessary. Plans for the subsequent year must also be prepared;

   (c) Once completed, the country office submits the plan to the Evaluation Office through the regional bureau concerned.

See annex 7F for the form to be used. See also chapter 22 of the M&E Handbook for detailed guidance on how to prepare the plan.

7.4.4   Types of evaluations

1. The country-level evaluation plan may include any of the following types of evaluations:

   (a) **By agent:**

      i.   Internal or self-evaluation: an evaluation conducted by those directly involved in the formulation, implementation and management of the programme or project;

      ii. External or independent evaluation: an evaluation conducted by those not directly involved in the formulation, implementation and management of the programme or project;

Internal evaluations can be valuable because they involve persons who have in-depth knowledge of the operations.

External evaluations have the advantages of greatest objectivity and of benefiting from the experiences of other institutions.

(b) **By timing:**

     i.   Mid-term evaluation: an evaluation conducted at the mid-point of programme or project implementation;

     ii.   Terminal evaluation: an evaluation conducted at programme or project completion;

     iii.   Ex-post evaluation: an evaluation conducted two or more years after programme or project completion;

(c) **By scope:**

     i.   Project evaluation: evaluation of a single project;

     ii.   Programme evaluation: evaluation of a programme (i.e., an intervention under a programme support document using the programme approach), a CCF, or a portfolio of activities under the same management or fund such as the Global Environment Facility, Agenda 21 and the resident coordinator system;

     iii.   Sectoral evaluation: cluster evaluation of projects or programmes in a sector or subsector;

     iv.   Thematic evaluation: cluster evaluation of projects or programmes addressing a particular theme that may cut across sectors or geographical boundaries;

> *See the project evaluation information sheet in the Programming Manual Reference Centre.*

2. Evaluations may focus on specific issues and processes. In such cases, evaluations may be classified as follows:

    (a) **Policy evaluation** - evaluation of programmes and projects dealing with particular policy issues at the sectoral or thematic level;

    (b) **Strategic evaluation** - evaluation of a particular issue where timing is especially important owing to the urgency of the issue which also poses high risks to, and has generated widely conflicting views from, stakeholders;

    (c) **Process evaluation** - evaluation of programmes and projects to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a particular process or modality adopted.

3. In addition, the country-level evaluation plan may also include a country portfolio evaluation. This evaluation aims to assess the portfolio of development interventions supported by UNDP and the funds in association with UNDP in a particular country in any given five-year period. The portfolio represents a broad spectrum of initiatives that include programmes, projects, advocacy and other development-related activities.

7.4.5   Planning and managing an evaluation

1. The UNDP country office is responsible for ensuring that UNDP evaluation policies and procedures are complied with in planning and managing evaluations. In particular, they must ensure that all evaluations are:

   (a) Carried out at the appropriate time;

   (b) Follow a methodology (including team composition) that ensures that critical issues will be objectively examined;

   (c) Produce the expected results, as set out in 7.4.6 below.

2. **Advance preparation**. Once a programme or project has been selected for evaluation, the persons responsible for planning and managing the evaluation prepare for the evaluation exercise by answering the following questions:

   (a) Who initiated or is initiating the evaluation?

   (b) Why is the evaluation being undertaken?

   (c) What products are expected from the evaluation exercise?

   (d) Who are the evaluation stakeholders?

   Answers should be provided before preparing the terms of reference (TOR) for the evaluation.

3. **Formulating the terms of reference.** The next step in planning for an evaluation is formulating the TOR, a written document that defines, among other elements, the issues that the evaluation should address and the products expected from the evaluation. It serves as a useful tool for ensuring that the evaluation is effectively carried out. The following procedures are suggested when preparing the TOR:

   (a) Invest adequate time in formulating and refining the TOR;

   (b) Involve key stakeholders in the process to reflect their views and interests in the TOR;

(c) Include the following elements in the TOR:

    i.   Introduction;

    ii. Objectives of the evaluation;

    iii. Scope of the evaluation;

    iv. Issues to be addressed by the evaluation;

    v.   Products expected from the evaluation;

    vi. Methodology or evaluation approach;

    vii. Composition and responsibilities of the evaluation team;

    viii. Implementation arrangements.

4. **Organizing the evaluation**. Once the TOR is finalized (based on stakeholder's consensus) the following steps should be taken to organize the evaluation exercise:

   (a) Organize the evaluation team. Normally, the government, the designated institution and UNDP are represented on the team. Objectivity and independence as well as competence in the field covered by the programme or project to be evaluated, are the principal criteria used in selecting team members;

   (b) Make necessary logistical arrangements;

   (c) Arrange for stakeholder participation at various stages of the evaluation, as appropriate.

5. **Managing the evaluation**. The UNDP country office assumes a critical role in managing the evaluation exercise being conducted in the field. The responsible country office staff must be thoroughly familiar with the TOR and ensure that the evaluation team is fulfilling the TOR through arrangements such as:

   See chapter 24 of the M & E Handbook for additional guidance on planning an evaluation, using a sub-regional programme as an example.

   (a) Briefings on the progress of the evaluation;

   (b) Preparation of an issues report midway through the evaluation to indicate the preliminary findings of the evaluation;

   (c) Validation of preliminary findings with stakeholders;

   (d) Formal debriefings.

7.4.6   **The evaluation report and the project evaluation information sheet**

1. **The evaluation report.**   The main features of the evaluation report are:

    (a) Definition and purpose. An evaluation report is an objective report that contains the evaluators' assessment in fulfilment of the TOR. It is the product of an independent evaluation team. As such, an evaluation report must not be altered in its substance by the government, the designated institution or UNDP;

    (b) **Contents of the evaluation report**.   An evaluation report contains the following core elements:

        i. Findings - A finding is a factual statement about the programme or project based on empirical evidence. Example: Initial tests of the new technology developed by the Agricultural Science and Technology Institute for preventing soil erosion have been positive. However, the new technology has generated only a lukewarm response from the target group of farmers, who are misinformed about its cost implications;

        ii. Conclusions - A conclusion is a reasoned judgment based on a synthesis of empirical findings or factual statements that correspond to a specific circumstance. Example: The research and development programme of the Agricultural Science and Technology Institute is strong in its technical aspects but weak in its linkage with target groups;

        iii. Recommendations - A recommendation is a proposal for action to be taken in a specific circumstance, including the parties responsible for that action. Example: As a strategy to ensure the acceptability of its research results by target groups, the Agricultural Science and Technology Institute should establish a centre for the sharing of information between the target groups and the Institute. Through a systematic information exchange programme, the Institute should provide target users with information on new technologies being developed and obtain their views on how to improve such technologies;

        iv. Lessons learned - A lesson learned is learning from experience that is applicable to a generic situation rather than to a specific circumstance. Example: A strong information centre is essential to an institution dealing with research and

development (R&D) as a channel for disseminating the
results of its R&D programme to target groups and as a
mechanism for generating their feedback on the usefulness
of such results.

2. **The PEIS.**   The main features of the project evaluation information
   sheet are:

   (a) **Definition and purpose**. The PEIS is a presentation of basic
       information on the project evaluated and the evaluators' rating and
       textual assessment. It aims to capture the evaluators' assessment
       of a project in a form that allows the Evaluation Office to extract the
       information easily and enter it in CEDAB. The information from the
       PEIS constitutes the institutional memory on the relevance,
       performance and success of UNDP-supported programmes and
       projects;

   (b) **Policy.** The evaluation team leader must submit the PEIS together
       with the evaluation report. Final payment of the team leader's fee
       is subject to the submission of a satisfactory evaluation report and
       a completely filled-in PEIS. In the event that no one from the
       evaluation team prepares the PEIS, the country office (or
       headquarters office) that managed the evaluation must hire a
       person to do the task and the cost for this must be charged against
       the budget of that office;

   (c) **Procedures.** It is suggested that evaluators, as a team, discuss
       and prepare the PEIS once they have agreed on the findings,
       conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned to be
       incorporated in their final evaluation report. The team leader
       makes sure that the PEIS is completed and submitted along with
       the evaluation report itself.

3. **Distributing the evaluation report and the PEIS.**   The steps to be
   followed are:

   (a) The evaluation team leader submits five copies of the evaluation
       report and a copy of the PEIS to the country office concerned;

   (b) The resident representative makes sure that each of the following
       parties receives a copy of the evaluation report:

       i.   The government: national coordinating authority;
       ii. The designated institution;
       iii. UNDP country office(s), regional bureau(x) concerned and
            the Evaluation Office;

   (c) The Evaluation Office must receive a copy of both the evaluation
       report and the PEIS.

4. **Actions arising from the evaluation report and the PEIS.**   The following actions may occur:

(a) The designated institution implements recommendations on operational issues, as it deems appropriate;

(b) The designated institution may request a tripartite review to take decisions on recommendations regarding policy issues;

(c) The main stakeholders of the programme or project (i.e., the target groups, the Government, the designated institution and UNDP) assess the implementation status of the evaluation recommendations when they prepare the APR;

(d) The Evaluation Office reviews the substance and quality of the evaluation report as a basis for providing feedback on lessons learned. It also enters information from the PEIS in CEDAB*.

7.4.7   Implementation of evaluation recommendations

1.   UNDP must ensure that decisions on evaluation recommendations are made by parties at appropriate levels (e.g., designated institution, UNDP senior management). It must monitor the implementation status of evaluation recommendations that have been accepted through an effective tracking system.

7.4.8   Evaluation of projects executed directly by UNDP

1. In view of the oversight responsibilities of the regional bureau, the country office plans evaluations of DEX projects in collaboration with the regional bureau. In particular, the regional bureau approves the terms of reference and, in agreement with the country office, nominates the team leader.

7.5   Review and reporting on country and regional cooperation

7.5.1   Annual reviews

1. **Purpose:**
   (a) The annual review is a management tool that enables country offices to:
      i.   Maintain an ongoing dialogue with the government on the country situation and the implementation of the country cooperation framework;
      ii.   Assess progress towards expected results;
      iii. Identify any need for adjustments to programmes and projects as well as to the management of the country office itself;

iv.   Lay the basis for planning programmes and projects as well as country office activities over the next 12 months;

v.   Help to maintain an institutional record of operational issues;

(b) The annual review facilitates results-based management and helps to ensure continuous learning;

(c) The annual review is a key element of holistic oversight and provides the principal building block for the country review;

(d) The annual review is carried out in close collaboration with programme country governments and contributes directly to building national capacity for programme and project management;

(e) The annual review serves as an input into annual assessments of the progress of the UNDAF, carried out by the United Nations country team under the leadership of the resident coordinator and in collaboration with the government and other partners;

(f) UNDP policy requires country offices to consult with a broad range of stakeholders during the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes and projects. In the case of the annual review, principal stakeholders will participate in the annual review meeting. Where this is not possible, the country office will make arrangements for such consultations to be held prior to the annual review meeting;

(g) The annual report emerging from the review process serves as the only instrument by which country offices report to headquarters on overall programme and management issues during the course of the year other than those reports which are generated through corporate systems such as the Financial Management Information (FIM) system and the Automated Field Office Accounting System (AFOAS).

2.   **Scope and timing**

(a) The annual review addresses the following issues:

i.   Changes in the national context and their implications for the continued relevance, results and sustainability of the CCF and associated programmes and projects;

ii.   Progress towards achieving results in the four programme categories and the special development situations category of the SRF;

To minimize work the annual review uses only data and analysis already available from monitoring, evaluation and audit, as well as studies and surveys.

Stakeholders are broadly defined as the direct beneficiaries of UNDP-supported programmes and projects, United Nations agencies, bilateral and other multilateral agencies and representatives from civil society and the private sector.

Elements of the country office annual report have also been designed to enable partly automated report preparation, based on further development of existing software for the formulation and management of programmes.

The four programme categories of the SRF are: enabling environment for SHD, poverty and sustainable livelihoods, gender and environment.

iii. Progress in the contribution of UNDP support to the achievement of UNDAF objectives;

See 1.3.2 for more information on the elements of the results framework.

iv. Support provided to the United Nations system, results achieved and any issues arising;

v. Experience with programme and project as well as country office management, including application of the programme approach and execution modalities, compliance with monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures, resource availability and utilization, and issues related to country office operations as well as support from headquarters and SURFs;

(b) The annual review covers all activities supported by UNDP in a programme country, including net contributor countries;

(c) The reporting period for the annual review will be January-December, the same as the UNDP financial year;

(d) The annual review should take place in time to provide inputs for the country office's planning for the next 12 months. The report emerging from the review must be submitted to headquarters by 15 December.

3. **The review process.** The review process includes the following elements:

(a) **Preparation**

i. The country office reaches agreement with the government coordinating authority on the aims, methods and timing of the annual review;

ii. All institutions designated to manage UNDP-supported programmes and projects are notified of the annual review to ensure that information on programme and project results is current. This will be done through completion or updating of annual programme and project reports or APRs (annex 7C). APRs are prepared for tripartite reviews (TPRs); they are updated only if the TPR took place more than three months before the scheduled date of the annual review meeting;

If there are any specific issues which the Executive Board or headquarters wish to emphasize in the review in a particular year, the regional bureaux bring them to the attention of country offices, after consultation with central units.

iii. The country office collects and circulates the APRs to all participants prior to the annual review meeting;

iv. It is recommended that the country office conduct an internal assessment either prior to or following the annual review meeting. The issues that may be addressed could include the implications for UNDP of any significant changes in country

This assessment may be particularly useful for laying the basis for more productive, proactive and issue-oriented interaction between the country office, government and other development partners.

conditions, constraints and opportunities in programme and project management, effectiveness of partnerships (including advocacy), especially though not exclusively with other organizations of the United Nations system, key issues affecting office management and review of the support received and needed from headquarters and SURFs;

(b) **Annual review meeting**

i. This meeting is co-chaired by a senior member of the Government, normally from the coordinating authority, and the resident representative. The selection of other participants is jointly decided by the government and country office guided by the main issues to be addressed during the annual review meeting.   A special effort must be made to ensure the participation of other organizations of the United Nations system;

ii. Participants aim to continue a dialogue on the evolving country situation, review programme and project performance, including key constraints and opportunities, and reach consensus on follow-up actions, especially any modifications to programmes and projects in the next 12 months;

See UNDP/PROG/99/3 of 29 October 1999 in the Reference Centre which contains additional guidelines on preparing this report.

iii. The country office prepares a brief record of the proceedings, noting issues requiring further discussion. This record is then endorsed by the government.

4. **Preparation of the country office annual report**

(a) The country office prepares the annual report according to the format given in annex 7G. This report is based on the outcome of the annual review meeting as well as any internal assessment and consultations with stakeholders. The resident representative submits the annual report, together with APRs, to the regional director;

(b) The annual report is an internal UNDP document. It may be shared with the government and other stakeholders provided Parts IV (d) and V (on management and support to the country office, respectively) are excluded from the text.

5. **Action by regional bureaux**

See annex 7H for the regional ROAR format [forthcoming].

(a) The regional bureau uses the annual reports, together with a review of its regional cooperation framework (RCF), to: (a) undertake an assessment of regional trends, UNDP performance, key issues arising and best practices; and (b) to prepare a summary of comments, suggestions and requests received from country offices concerning support. The assessment and

summary undertaken by the regional bureau are consolidated into a short regional results-oriented annual report (ROAR). The regional ROAR is shared with all country offices and SURFs in the region, other regional bureaux and central units.

(b) The regional bureau also shares country annual reports and APRs, upon request, with the Evaluation Office, Office of Audit and Performance Review, Office of Human Resources and the Bureau for Finance and Administrative Services.

6. **Review by the Operations Group**

(a) The regional bureau submits its ROAR to OG. OG: (a) reviews UNDP performance in the region; (b) examines any lessons learned and best practices together with their implications for UNDP operations at the country, subregional, regional and global levels; and (c) considers issues relating to country office capacity and support from headquarters and SURFs.

7. **Submission to the Administrator**

(a) The OG Secretariat (OSG) submits the regional ROAR, together with the observations of OG, to the Administrator. Any comments he/she may have are forwarded to the Bureau for follow-up action;

(b) The regional ROAR, together with the reactions of OG and the comments of the Administrator, are consolidated by BOM into the corporate ROAR for submission to the Executive Board.

8. **Outputs of the annual review.**   The principal outputs of the annual review are:

(a) A country office annual report with narrative text of five pages, excluding a one-page executive summary and annexes;

(b) A record of the proceedings at the annual review meeting. This is kept for reference in the country office;

(c) A regional ROAR prepared by the regional bureau based on the country office annual reports and a review of the RCF. It should have a maximum length of 10 pages, excluding the executive summary and any annexes.

9. **Financing.**   Annual reviews are carried out using existing resources of the government, the country office and programmes and projects.

10. **Follow-up.**   The follow-up actions and the institutions responsible for carrying them out are:

    (a) Providing feedback to country offices on their annual reports: done by the regional bureaux within three weeks of receiving the report;

    (b) Revising programme and project objectives, strategies and work plans: done by the government, other national and international partners and UNDP;

    (c) Preparing the country office plan for the next 12 months: done by country offices;

    (d) Providing support requested by country offices: done by regional bureaux, OSG and central units;

    (e) Reporting on and, if required, modifying compacts: done by directors of regional bureaux and resident representatives.

7.5.2   **Country reviews**

See the country review guidance notes in the Programming Manual Reference Centre on the UNDP Intranet.

1. **Purpose**

    (a) The country review:

        i.   Enables the Administrator to account to the Executive Board on the use of UNDP resources at the country level;

        ii. Generates assessments of country-level performance in terms of results (outcomes and impact) and sustainability;

        iii. Suggests clear directions, based on lessons learned, for UNDP support to programme countries;

        iv. Examines the adequacy of country office capacity and future requirements for support.

    The UNDP country review responds to the requirements of the Executive Board (decision 96/7 and comments made at the third regular session of 1997) for monitoring results achieved through country cooperation frameworks (CCFs). It also enables UNDP to assess and report on the country-level strategic results framework.

    (b) The findings of the country review will be one of the major inputs used to:

        i.   Revise an existing or prepare a new CCF as well as associated programmes and projects;

        ii. Revise the country strategic results framework;

       iii. Provide an assessment of the contribution of UNDP support to the achievement of the objectives of the UNDAF;

       iv. Confirm or amend TRAC 1.1.2 assignment for the next programming period;

       v. Confirm or amend authority delegated to the resident representative for programme and project approval;

       vi. Encourage learning on a broad range of operational and substantive issues, including best practices;

       vii. Identify, secure and monitor provision of any assistance required by country offices and programme country governments to act on agreed recommendations;

       viii. Promote experience sharing with the United Nations country team;

       ix. Inform donors about the use of resources by UNDP to advance its mission in programme countries.

2. **Scope.**   The country review will address the following issues:

(a) **National context.**   Major changes in development conditions, national policies and programmes as well as cooperation with other organizations of the United Nations system and the international community. Implications for the continued relevance and expected results of UNDP support;

(b) **Programme performance.** In the four programme categories of the SRF, and in the special development situations category, assess the:

> The four programme categories of the SRF are: enabling environment for SHD, poverty and sustainable livelihoods, gender and environment. See Programming Manual Reference Centre for the Executive Board decision 98/1 and the full text of the guiding principles.

       i. Extent of focus in the CCF and application of the guiding principles endorsed in Executive Board decision 98/1;

       ii. Planning for and achievement of results as anticipated in the CCF, specified in associated programme support documents and project documents and reflected in the SRF;

       iii. Scope and effectiveness of advocacy;

       iv. Level of support for the follow-up to global conferences;

> See 9.1.4 for a full list of global conferences.

       v. Progress in the achievement of UNDAF objectives made possible through UNDP support;

vi. Range and quality of partnerships with the government, civil society and the private sector;

vii. Extent of collaboration and coordination with other United Nations system organizations, including the Bretton Woods institutions, and with other development partners such as the regional development banks and international non-governmental organizations.

(c) **UNDP support to the United Nations:**

i. Analysis of the status and prospects of collaboration with other organizations of the United Nations system (including the Bretton Woods institutions) through the CCA and UNDAF;

ii. Review of the effectiveness of UNDP representation of country office support services for organizations of the United Nations system not represented in the country;

iii. Assessment of the scope, quality and results of advocacy by UNDP on issues concerning the United Nations system;

In the context of advocacy, reference should be made to the use of SPPD, STS and DSS resources. Include support from consultative groups and round-tables under aid coordination.

iv. Assessment of the country office role in coordination of development cooperation.

(d) **Management:**

i. Progress towards and effectiveness in the use of the programme approach and national execution;

ii. Mobilization and use of resources benefiting both UNDP-supported and other national programmes;

iii. Capacity and management of the country office to achieve expected results;

iv. The type, quality and effectiveness of support provided by headquarters units to the country office.

(e) **Timing and Duration:**

i. The country office must undertake country reviews of UNDP operations either at mid-term or towards the end of the CCF period;

ii. The country review covers all activities supported by UNDP in a programme country, including net contributor countries. It

should take place in time to provide inputs for the preparation of the next CCF and will typically cover a three-year period. The duration of the complete review process should not normally exceed four to six months.

3. **The Review Process.**   The review process includes the following elements:

(a) **Review schedules.** The regional bureaux maintain a schedule of country reviews for all programme countries, in consultation with the country offices, the Operations Support Group (OSG), the Evaluation Office (EO) and other central units. They ensure that country offices adhere to this schedule.   OSG maintains a consolidated global list of planned country reviews and monitors progress;

(b) **Preparing the terms of reference.** The country office prepares a draft terms of reference (TOR) in consultation with the regional bureau and government coordinating authority. As part of this process, the regional bureau solicits the views of central units and ensures that they are shared with the country office. The Bureau also liaises with OSG to determine the level of funding from headquarters for the country review. Headquarters consultation on the TOR must be completed within three weeks of receiving the draft TOR from the country office. The draft TOR is finalized by the resident representative and communicated to the regional director prior to implementation;

> The views of the following central services are required: BOM, BOM, OAPR, BDP, Evaluation Office, OSG. Other headquarters units such as United Nations Volunteers, UNIFEM and UNCDF should be contacted where warranted by the substance of the CCF.
>
> See annex 7J for the format of the TOR.

(c) **Leadership, composition and responsibilities of the review team.** The procedures to be followed are:

i.   The review team should comprise three or more independent persons, depending on the scope and complexity of the exercise;

ii. The government coordinating authority nominates one member of the team while the others are chosen by UNDP. Of the members chosen by UNDP, the regional bureau selects one person to serve as team leader, in agreement with OSG; the remaining members are chosen by the country office;

iii. The members chosen by UNDP should include at least one staffmember from outside the subregion, from a country office, subregional resource facility (SURF) or the Evaluation Network. Staffmembers from organizations of the United Nations system within the country as well as consultants (locally or internationally recruited) may also be selected for the team. In all cases, the utmost effort must be made during the selection process to ensure gender balance in the composition of the review team;

> "Independent persons" are defined as those who have not been directly involved in the formulation and management of the CCF and associated programmes and projects.
>
> Ideally, this would be a deputy resident representative or other senior officer.
>
> See annex 7I for the format of the country review report.

iv. The review team will be responsible for generating findings and

recommendations on the issues identified in the TOR for the country review. The draft country review report will be prepared by the team leader, assisted by other team members. Issues relating to internal management will be addressed by one or more team members nominated by UNDP;

v. The review team will consult with all relevant stakeholders during the preparation of the report;

The senior government official responsible is normally from the coordinating authority.

(d) **Country review meeting.**   The procedures to be followed are:

i. The government and country office convene a meeting to discuss the findings and recommendations of the review, except those dealing with internal management issues and support to the country office. The meeting is co-chaired by a senior member of the government and the resident representative. The government and the country office jointly decide on the selection of other participants. The regional bureau normally participates in the country review meeting; other headquarters units may attend after consultation with the bureau. All or at least some of the members of the review team, especially the team leader, should be present at the meeting.   The country office will prepare a record of the proceedings of the country review meeting. The record is then endorsed by the government;

"Stakeholders" are broadly defined as the direct beneficiaries of UNDP-supported programmes and projects, United Nations agencies, bilateral and other multilateral agencies and representatives from civil society as well as the private sector**.**

ii. UNDP policy requires country offices to consult with a broad range of stakeholders on the draft country review report. If this cannot be accomplished at the country review meeting, then alternative arrangements have to be made by the country office to ensure that such consultations take place;

See 4.1 para.9 for more information on participation during programme design.

(e) **Finalization and distribution of the country review report.**   The procedures to be followed are:

i. The final country review report is prepared by the review team taking into account the outcome of discussions at the country review meeting and noting any unresolved issues, if applicable;

ii. Once completed, the report is forwarded by the resident representative to the regional director. The report (excluding Parts V (f) (g) and VI, on management and support to the country office, respectively) is also submitted to the government coordinating authority; in addition, this version can be shared with other stakeholders;

(f) **Review at headquarters.** The procedures to be followed are:

    i.   The regional bureau submits to the PWG: (a) the summary of the final country review report; and (b) the bureau's suggestions for follow-up action in the matrix of recommendations;

> For further guidance, see the PWG website http://intra.undp.org/osg/draft/pwg

    ii. PWG: (a) reviews the country office performance; (b) examines any lessons learned and implications for UNDP operations in the country, subregion, region or globally; (c) adopts or modifies recommendations concerning changes in the CCF and in TRAC 1.1.2 assignment; and (d) endorses or revises suggestions relating to country office management, including measures to support the office to meet revised performance objectives.

    iii. Following the Administrator's review, the regional bureau arranges for a summary of the country review report together with any observations by the Administrator to be submitted to the Executive Board (10 per year).

> This applies only to those countries whose reviews are to be discussed by the Executive Board.

4. **Adaptations of the Review Process.** The procedures to be followed are:

(a) The country review process can be adapted by regional bureaux, in consultation with country offices, to minimize managerial requirements and financial costs. This alternative will apply only to programme countries with a resource mobilization target in the CCF of $10 million or less per annum;

(b) Clustered country reviews (grouping two or more countries) may be carried out in those cases where there are substantial similarities in the developmental conditions of and UNDP support to the relevant countries;

> This may apply for example, to a group of small island states. See annex 7K for further guidance.

(c) In the particular case of countries in special development situations, any necessary modifications can be made to the country review process by the regional director, in consultation with the concerned country offices and the Associate Administrator;

> The Associate Administrator is supported in this review by ERD and OSG.

(d) Modifications to the country review process will also be considered to accommodate joint reviews of country programmes prepared within the parameters of the UNDAF where such an approach is requested by the United Nations country team through the resident coordinator. These modifications will be made in consultation between the country office, regional bureau and OSG.

5. **Outputs of the country review.**   The principal outputs of the country review are:

   (a) A country review report with a maximum length of 15 pages, excluding annexes (the summary of conclusions and recommendations should not normally exceed three pages);

   See annex 7I for the format of the country review report.

   (b) A record of the proceedings at the country review meeting and, where necessary, additional meetings with stakeholders, with a maximum length of five pages.

6. **Financing.**   Country reviews are financed from two major sources: primarily, from programme resources at the country level; and, secondarily, from line 1.4, managed at headquarters.   The TOR serves as the basis for obtaining the requisite resources.   It will, therefore, indicate the budgeted costs for the country review, those elements to be financed from country programme resources, and residual amounts requiring support from line 1.4.

   Regional bureaux liaise with OSG to determine the level of resources available from line 1.4.

7. **Follow-up.**   Within UNDP, the regional bureaux and country offices are responsible for ensuring action on recommendations arising from the country review.   To this end:

   (a) Key results expected from follow-up actions will be reflected in compacts between regional bureaux directors and resident representatives, on the one hand, and the heads of central units and the Administrator, on the other hand;

   (b) Country offices will use the agreed recommendations of the country review as a checklist for assessing country level progress within the context of annual reviews and associated country office annual reports;

   (c) The checklist of recommendations will also be used during missions by bureau staff to country offices;

   (d) The findings and recommendations of the country review should serve as key points of reference during programme or project evaluations and audits of country offices;

   (e) Finally, the findings and recommendations of the country review will contribute to a review by the United Nations country team, led by the resident coordinator, of system-wide progress towards the objectives of the UNDAF. (This will occur in those cases when the country review is not replaced by a joint United Nations system review of the UNDAF and associated country programmes and projects.).

   See the UNDAF Guidelines for further details.

ANNEX 7A

MONITORING AND EVALUATION POLICIES OF UNDP
(Approved by the Executive Committee on 6 June 1997)

1**. General policy statements.** Monitoring and evaluation are essential management functions that are interactive and mutually supportive. Monitoring and evaluation must be continuously strengthened to enable UNDP to respond to demands for: (a) greater accountability in the use of resources; (b) a clearer basis for decision-making; and (c) more practical lessons from experience to guide future development interventions. Monitoring and evaluation must be results-oriented and provide assessments of the relevance, performance and success of UNDP development interventions.

2. **Monitoring coverage.** Monitoring and systematic reporting must be undertaken for all programmes and projects regardless of duration and budget.

3. **Evaluation coverage.** Evaluation of programmes and projects will be undertaken selectively based on the following set of criteria:

For mandatory evaluation

- Scale of resources - large-scale programmes and projects, i.e., those with budgets of $1 million or more

- Duration of technical cooperation – technical cooperation (channeled through various programmes and projects) that has been provided to a particular institution for ten years or more

For non-mandatory evaluation

- Nature of development intervention - innovative programmes and projects

4. **Compliance with mandatory evaluations.** Compliance with mandatory evaluations will be enforced and used as an indicator for assessing management performance. However, flexibility may be exercised as a management prerogative following guidance provided in *Results-oriented Monitoring and Evaluation: A Handbook for Programme Managers* (see para. 8). The Evaluation Office will monitor and report on the compliance rate for mandatory evaluations to the Administrator who then reports it, as part of the annual report, to the Executive Board.

5. **Tracking system for evaluation.** Management information systems must be able to track: (a) programmes and projects to be covered by evaluations, and (b) the implementation status of recommendations emanating from evaluations.

6. **Institutional memory on lessons learned.** In support of organizational learning, UNDP will continue to maintain and ensure access of staff to its central evaluation database (CEDAB) as the institutional memory on lessons learned from programmes and projects that have been evaluated. Evaluators must submit, along with their evaluation reports, a project evaluation information sheet (PEIS) containing information to be entered into the database. In the event that no one from the evaluation team prepares the PEIS, the country offices or headquarters units that managed the evaluation must hire a person to do the task and the costs for this must be charged against their own budgets.

7.   **Funds in association with UNDP**.   In line with the objective of harmonizing monitoring and evaluation policies within the United Nations system, funds in association with UNDP must follow UNDP policies and guiding principles on monitoring and evaluation. They should work in collaboration with the Evaluation Office in determining the extent of the flexibility that they would exercise to adapt the policies and guiding principles to their specific contexts and requirements.

8. **Implementation of monitoring and evaluation policies**. Guidance on the implementation of these monitoring and evaluation policies will be provided in *Results-oriented Monitoring and Evaluation: A Handbook for Programme Managers*.   Operational procedures will be provided in the new *UNDP Programming Manual*.

ANNEX 7B

FIELD VISIT REPORT FORM

General Instructions

Use this form to prepare your field visit report. Be concise in presenting your assessment of the programme or project. In writing your findings, conclusions and recommendations, reflect the views of stakeholders, especially the target groups, whom you have interviewed. Be sure to list in an annex the names of persons whom you met and the organizations they represent. Provide your office and the designated institution with copies of this report.

I.   Basic programme or project information

Programme or Project number and
title:

Designated institution:

Implementing agency(ies):

Project starting date:
      Originally planned _____   Actual _____

Project completion date:
      Originally planned _____   New _____

II.   Purpose of the field visit

The general purpose of a field visit is to obtain a first-hand account of the progress in achieving programme or project results.   In addition to this, however, list any special objectives that you might have, e.g., to look into reported refusal of farmers to use new agricultural practices being introduced by the programme.

III.   Findings

State facts on the status of the programme or project in terms of producing expected results, using established indicators and benchmarks. Present significant issues that need to be addressed, and, similarly, any observed opportunities for improving the programme or project.

IV. Conclusions

Based on your findings, state whether or not the programme or project is making progress as planned. If you had any special objective in making the field visit, also include your conclusions relating to it.

V. Recommendations

State your recommendations clearly. Describe the actions proposed. Identify who are responsible for implementing them. Provide an indication of the timeframe and any significant resources required.

Name	**Signature**
Title	**Date of visit**

Organization represented

VI. Field visit report annex

List of persons met and the organizations they represent

ANNEX 7C

ANNUAL PROGRAMME/PROJECT REPORT (APR)

Page 1

Basic programme/project information (To be provided by programme or project management)

Programme or project number and title: _____

Designated institution: _____

Project starting date: _____
        Originally planned: _____
        Actual: _____

Project completion date: _____
        Originally planned: _____
        New: _____

Total budget ($): _____
        Original: _____
        Latest signed revision: _____

Period covered by the report: _____

PART I: NUMERICAL RATING

Rate the relevance and performance of the programme or project using the following scale:

    1 - Highly satisfactory   4 - Unsatisfactory
    2 - Satisfactory   X - Not applicable
    3 - Unsatisfactory, with some positive elements

Place your answers in the column that corresponds to your role in the programme or project.

SUBSTANTIVE FOCUS	Target group(s)	Programme or project manager	Government	UNDP
A. RELEVANCE				
1. How relevant is the programme or project to the development priorities of the country?				
2. How relevant is the programme or project to the promotion of sustainable human development? Indicate your rating on the focus area which the programme or project was designed to address. (a) Poverty eradication and sustainable livelihoods (b) Protection and regeneration of the environment (c) Gender in development (d) Promoting an enabling environment for SHD, including governance				
3. To what extent are appropriate beneficiary groups being targeted by the programme or project, based on the following considerations? (a) Gender (b) Socio-economic factors (c) Geographic location				
4. Given the objectives of the programme or project, are the appropriate institutions being assisted?				

B. PERFORMANCE				
1. Using the following indicators rate the contribution of the outputs to the achievement of the immediate objectives:[a/] (Indicator 1) (Indicator 2) (Indicator 3)				
2. Rate the production of target outputs.				
3. Are the management arrangements of the programme or project appropriate?				
4. Are programme or project resources (financial, physical and manpower) adequate in terms of: (a) quantity? (b) quality?				
5. Are programme or project resources being used efficiently to produce planned results?				
6. Is the programme or project cost-effective compared to similar interventions?				

[a/] The programme or project manager must list the indicators as reflected in the programme support document or project document or as agreed on by the stakeholders.

7. Based on its work plan, how would you rate the timeliness of the programme or project in terms of: (a) Production of outputs and initial results? (b) Inputs delivery?				

	Target group(s)	Programme or project manager	Government	UNDP
OVERALL RATING OF THE PROGRAMME OR PROJECT				

Explain the basis of your rating, which need not be limited to, or which may be different from, the relevance and performance criteria rated above. For the last year of the programme or project, the overall rating should include an assessment of the potential success of the programme or project as well as its relevance and performance.

PART II: TEXTUAL ASSESSMENT

1. What are the major achievements of the programme or project vis-à-vis the expected results during the year under review? To the extent possible, include an assessment of the potential impact, sustainability and contribution to capacity development.

2. What major issues and problems are affecting the achievement of programme or project results?

3. How should these issues or problems be resolved? Please explain in detail the action(s) recommended. Specify who should be responsible for such actions. Also indicate a tentative time-frame and the resources required.

4. What new developments (if any) are likely to affect the achievement of programme or project results? What do you recommend to respond to these developments?

5. What are the views of the target groups with regard to the programme or project? Please note any significant gender-based differences in those views.

6. To date, what lessons (both positive and negative) can be drawn from the experience of the programme or project?

7. If the programme or project has been evaluated, what is the implementation status of the recommendations made by the evaluators?

8. Do you propose any substantive revision to the programme or project document? If yes, what are they? State justification.

9. Provide any other information that may further support or clarify your assessment of the programme or project. You may include annexes as you deem necessary.

For target groups: Name: Title: Signature: Date:
For the programme or project management: Name: Title: Signature: Date:
For the government: Name: Title: Signature: Date:
For UNDP: Name: Title: Signature: Date:

PART III: Programme or project summary table

Programme/project title and number:		Management arrangement:	
Designated institution:		**Period covered:**	

OVERALL ASSESSMENT			
Brief analysis of progress achieved in the contribution of the programme or project to the expected results.			

FINANCIAL SUMMARY			
Source of funds	**Annual budget ($ '000)**	**Estimated annual expenditure ($ '000)**	**Delivery rate (%)**
TRAC (1 and 2) TRAC 3 Other Cost-sharing: Government Financial institution Thirdparty Trust funds AOS (where applicable)			

SUMMARY OF RESULTS		
Programme support objectives (PSOS) or immediate objectives	**Indicators**	**Achievements**
Obj. 1		
Obj. 2		
Obj. 3		
....		
Annual output targets	**Achievement of outputs**	**Proposed output targets for the next year**
Obj. 1 Output 01 Output 02 Output 03 …		
Obj. 2 Output 01 Output 02 Output 03 …		

TERMINAL REPORT FORM

Basic programme/project information (To be provided by programme or project management)

Programme/Project number and title: _____

Designated institution: _____

Project starting date: _____
             Originally planned: _____
                      Actual: _____

Project completion date: _____
             Originally planned: _____
                      New: _____

Total budget ($): _____
                    Original: _____
       Latest signed revision: _____

Period covered by the report: _____

PART I: NUMERICAL RATING

Rate the relevance and performance of the programme or project using the following scale:

      1 - Highly satisfactory   4 - Unsatisfactory
      2 - Satisfactory   X - Not applicable
      3 - Unsatisfactory, with some positive elements

Place your answers in the column that corresponds to your role in the programme or project.

SUBSTANTIVE FOCUS	Target group(s)	Programme or project manager	Government	UNDP
A. RELEVANCE				
1. How relevant is the programme or project to the development priorities of the country?				
2. How relevant is the programme or project to the promotion of sustainable human development? Indicate your rating on the thematic focus which the programme or project was designed to address. (a) Poverty eradication and sustainable livelihoods (b) Protection and regeneration of the environment (c) Gender in development (d) Promoting an enabling environment for SHD, including governance				
3. To what extent are appropriate beneficiary groups being targeted by the programme or project, based on the following considerations? (a) Gender (b) Socio-economic factors (c) Geographic location				
4. Given the objectives of the programme or project, are the appropriate institutions being assisted?				

B. PERFORMANCE				
1. Using the following indicators, rate the contribution of the outputs to the achievement of the immediate objectives: [a] (Indicator 1) (Indicator 2) (Indicator 3)				
2. Rate the production of target outputs.				
3. Are the management arrangements of the programme or project appropriate?				
4. Are programme or project resources (financial, physical and manpower) adequate in terms of: (a) quantity? (b) quality?				
5. Are programme or project resources being used efficiently to produce planned results?				
6. Is the programme or project cost-effective compared to similar interventions?				

---

[a] The programme or project manager must list the indicators as reflected in the programme support document or project document or agreed on by the stakeholders.

7. Based on its work plan, how would you rate the timeliness of the programme or project in terms of: (a) Production of outputs and initial results? (b) Inputs delivery?				

Please indicate your overall rating of the programme or project using the following numbers:

 1 - Highly satisfactory
 2 - Satisfactory
 3 - Unsatisfactory, with some positive elements
 4 - Unsatisfactory
 5 - Not applicable

	Target group(s)	Programme or project manager	Government	UNDP
OVERALL RATING OF THE PROGRAMME OR PROJECT				

Explain the basis of your rating, which need not be limited to, or which may be different from, the relevance and performance criteria rated above. For the last year of the programme or project, the overall rating should include an assessment of the potential success of the programme or project as well as its relevance and performance.

PART II: TEXTUAL ASSESSMENT

1. What are the major achievements of the programme or project vis-à-vis the expected results? Please explain them in detail in terms of potential impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development.

2. What factors affected the achievement of programme or project results?

3. What lessons (both positive and negative) can be drawn from the experience of the programme or project?

4. What are the views of the target groups with regard to the programme or project? Please note any significant gender-based differences in their views.

5. If the programme or project has been evaluated, what is the implementation status of the recommendations made by the evaluators?

6. What activities or steps do you recommend as follow-up to the project?

7. Provide any other information that may further support or clarify your assessment of the programme or project. You may include annexes as you deem necessary.

For target groups: Name: Title: Signature: Date:
For the programme or project management: Name: Title: Signature: Date:
For the government: Name: Title: Signature: Date:
For UNDP: Name: Title: Signature: Date:

PART III: Programme/project summary table

Programme or project title and number:		Management arrangement:	
Designated institution:		Period covered:	
OVERALL ASSESSMENT			
Brief analysis of progress achieved in the contribution of the programme or project to the expected results.			
FINANCIAL SUMMARY			
Source of funds	**Budget ($ '000)**	**Estimated expenditure ($ '000)**	**Delivery rate (%)**

TRAC (1+2)
TRAC 3
Other
 	
Cost-sharing:
     Government
     Financial institution
     Thirdparty
 	
Trust funds
AOS (where applicable)			

SUMMARY OF RESULTS		
Programme support objectives (PSOs) or Immediate Objectives	**Indicators**	**Achievements**
Obj. 1		
Obj. 2		
Obj. 3		
….		
Output targets	**Achievement of outputs**	
Obj. 1		
Output 01 Output 02 Output 03 …		
Obj. 2….		
Output 01 Output 02 Output 03 …		

ANNEX 7E

TRIPARTITE REVIEW REPORT FORM

I.   Basic programme/project information

Programme or project number and title:

Designated institution:

Implementing agency
(if different from the designated institution):

Project starting date:
                Originally planned:
                Actual:

Project completion date:
                Originally planned:
                New:

Total budget ($):
                Original:
         Latest signed revision:

Delivery rate (%):

Date of the tripartite review

II.   Follow-up to the previous tripartite review and evaluation

Briefly discuss the status of any follow-up action to the previous TPR or evaluation, if one was conducted.

III.   Conclusions of the review

Based on the assessment of the annual programme/project report (APR), briefly discuss the conclusions of the TPR on the following:

1. Programme or project relevance, potential and actual results;
2. Issues and problems in programme or project design and implementation.
3. Significant actions to be taken regarding the short-term programme or project strategic plan.

IV.   **Decisions taken**

List decisions taken with a brief discussion of the basis for each.   Indicate the parties responsible and the time-frame for implementing each decision.
(N.B. For the terminal TPR only: briefly discuss any recommended follow-up activity*.)*

V.   **Need for an evaluation**

If it is decided in the tripartite review to have the programme or project evaluated, indicate why and when the evaluation will be conducted and the issues that the evaluation will address.

_____
Resident representative

_____
Signature

_____
Date report prepared

VI.   **Tripartite review report annex**

Names of TPR participants and organizations represented

ANNEX 7F

COUNTRY-LEVEL EVALUATION PLAN FORM

EVALUATION PLAN

UNDP Country Office _____ **time-frame**_____
                          (name of country)

Highlights of the country cooperation framework (CCF):

Indicators for monitoring and evaluation and the collection of data:

Funding sources for the evaluations:

EVALUATION PLAN

UNDP country office,_____   _____

                       (name of country),   **(year)**

Programme/project number and title	Budget ($000)	Year approved	Schedule				Type of evaluation (By agent, timing and scope)
			1st Qtr.	2nd Qtr.	3rd Qtr.	4th Qtr.	
Mandatory evaluations							
Non-mandatory evaluations							

ANNEX 7G
STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THE COUNTRY OFFICE ANNUAL REPORT

Executive Summary

Part I: National context

Major changes in development conditions, national policies and programmes, as well as cooperation with other organizations of the United Nations system and the international community. Implications for the continued relevance and expected results of the CCF and associated programmes and projects.

Part II: Programme performance

For the programme categories of the SRF (enabling environment for SHD, poverty eradication and sustainable livelihoods, environment and gender), as well as for countries in the special development situations category, provide:

(a) an analysis of major constraints and/or opportunities affecting the achievement of expected results;

(b) an assessment of the contribution of UNDP support to the achievement of the objectives of the UNDAF and any issues arising; and

(c) a review of key factors influencing the range, scope and effectiveness of partnerships with other organizations of the United Nations system (including the Bretton Woods institutions), regional development banks, bilateral donors, international NGOs, civil society and the private sector.

Part III: UNDP support to the United Nations

Update on the overall status and prospects of collaboration with organizations of the United Nations system (including the Bretton Woods institutions) through the CCA and UNDAF, taking into account UNDP organizational policies in this area. Emphasis can be placed on issues such as progress with the harmonization of programming cycles, thematic groups, common advocacy efforts, joint and/or parallel programmes, fund-raising, utilization of line 3.1, SPPD and STS. Review of developments with regard to the United Nations House, administrative harmonization and common services.

Issues arising from UNDP representation of, or country office support services for, organizations of the United Nations system not represented in the country.

Update on the scope, quality and results of advocacy by UNDP on issues concerning the role of the United Nations system in development cooperation.

Developments during the preceding year concerning the role of the country office in the coordination of development cooperation, including the Consultative Group or round-table mechanism.

Part IV: Management

Assessment and analysis on four key issues, as follows:

(a) Progress towards and effectiveness in the use of the programme approach and national execution;

(b) Mobilization and utilization of resources;

(c) Application of organizational policies and procedures on monitoring and evaluation; and

(d) Capacity and management of the country office to achieve expected results.[a]

Part V: Support to the country office

Assessment of the range, quality and effectiveness of support received from headquarters units and SURFs to facilitate improved programme[b] and management[c] performance. Initial identification of support required over the next 12 months.

---

[a] Brief description of country- and country office-specific issues relevant to an assessment of management performance. Changes in country office capacity: number, skills and gender of staff (all categories); the size, allocation and availability of funds from the administrative budget; and standards, availability and connectivity of computer systems. Brief summary of any issues concerning work planning and review as well as process management (financial disbursement, procurement, recruitment, training and performance appraisal). Update on audit follow-up. Activities concerning staff development. Management of staff relations.

[b] This may include advice/guidance/feedback, back-stopping and technical support for: research and analysis, programme planning and management, access to international knowledge networks and experts, advocacy, resource mobilization, allocation and utilization, coordination and collaboration with other UN system organizations, and monitoring and evaluation (including timely reactions to the country office annual report).

[c] This may include advice/guidance/feedback, backstopping and technical support on: financial and human resources management as well as procurement and inventory control; information technology management, including information management systems; follow-up to audits and performance reviews; common services and harmonization of administrative and financial procedures within the United Nations system; and reactions to management concerns raised in the country office annual report.

Part VI: Financial summary

Country: CCF period: Reporting year:			
REGULAR RESOURCES	**Amount assigned for the CCF ($ '000)**	**Amount planned for the year ($ '000)**	**Estimated expenditure for the year ($ '000)**
Estimated IPF carry-over			
TRAC 1.1.1 and TRAC 1.1.2 (% of TRAC 1.1.1)			
TRAC 1.1.3			
Other resources			
SPPD/STS			
Subtotal			
OTHER RESOURCES	**Amount targeted for the CCF ($ '000)**	**Amount mobilized for the year ($ '000)**	**Estimated expenditure for the year ($ '000)**
Government cost-sharing			
Third-party cost-sharing			
Sustainable development funds GEF Capacity 21 Montreal Protocol			
Funds, trust funds and other UNIFEM UNCDF UNSO			
Subtotal			
GRAND TOTAL			

Part VII: UPDATED SRF FOR THE COUNTRY OFFICE ANNUAL REPORT

Sub-goal X:						
Situational indicators:			**Update on situational indicators:**			
Strategic areas of support	**Intended outcomes**	**Performance indicators (update)**	**Intended outputs**	**Achievement**	**Partnerships**	**Update on partnerships**

ANNEX 7H

STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THE REGIONAL RESULTS ORIENTED ANNUAL REPORT (ROAR)

[forthcoming]

ANNEX 7I

STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THE COUNTRY REVIEW REPORT

Summary of conclusions and recommendations

Part I: The national context

Analysis of any major changes in the country situation since the CCF was formulated and their implications for the continued relevance and impact of UNDP support. The range, quality and effectiveness of relations between UNDP and the programme country government. Brief overview of the role and activities of the United Nations system within the broader framework of development cooperation in the country.

Part II: The country cooperation framework

Any substantial changes in the CCF and associated programmes and projects and their justification. Extent of focus in the CCF on the most critical development problems in the country, consistent with national and UNDP global, priorities and factoring in the activities of other development partners, especially, though not exclusively, partner organizations within the United Nations system. Consideration given to assisting national level follow-up to global conferences through UNDP-supported programmes and projects.   Any linkages established with regional and global programmes.

Part III: Programme performance

For the four programme categories of the SRF (enabling environment for SHD, poverty eradication and sustainable livelihoods, environment and gender) as well as in the special development situations category, assess the:

(a) Achievement and sustainability of results as anticipated in the CCF, specified in PSDs and project documents and reflected in the SRF. Reference may be made to significant constraints and opportunities influencing performance;

(b) Status and prospects of partnerships with organizations of the United Nations system (including the Bretton Woods institutions). Scope, purpose and outcomes of links with the regional development banks, bilateral donors and international NGOs. The scope and characteristics of, and any opportunities and/or constraints affecting partnerships with, civil society[a/] and the private sector;

(c) Scope and effectiveness of advocacy. Subjects could include issues selected for advocacy (consistent with key organizational directives such as the Direct Lines from the Administrator), choice of target groups, the range of advocacy tools deployed to reach these target groups, resources allocated and used for advocacy, measures, if any, adopted to assess outcomes and indications about the effectiveness of efforts.

[a/]   This could include, for example, the media, domestic NGOs, human rights groups, parliamentarians, political parties, academic institutions, think-tanks, research institutions, professional associations, trade unions, employers' federations and farmers' organizations.

Part IV: UNDP support to the United Nations

(a) Analysis of the overall status and prospects of collaboration with organizations of the United Nations system (including the Bretton Woods institutions) through the CCA and UNDAF, taking into account UNDP organizational policies in this area. Emphasis can be placed on issues such as progress with the harmonization of programme cycles, thematic groups, common advocacy efforts, joint and/or parallel programmes, fund-raising, utilization of line 3.1, SPPD and STS. Review of developments with regard to the United Nations House, administrative harmonization and common services;

(b) Review of the effectiveness of UNDP representation of, or country office support services for, the organizations of the United Nations system not represented in the country;

(c) Assessment of the scope, quality and results of advocacy by UNDP on issues concerning the United Nations system's role in development cooperation;

(d) Assessment of the country office's role in coordination of development cooperation, including the consultative group and / or round table mechanisms.

Part V: Management

(a) Application of and experience with the programme approach. Particular issues of interest include the existence, scope and quality of national programmes (NPs), actions taken by UNDP to advocate for and support the development of NPs where they do not exist already, participation of donors in NP design, UNDP strategic role within NPs, resource mobilization at the level of the NP and PSD and the status of multisectoral coordination and progress towards decentralized management;

(b) Application of and experience with execution modalities (NEX, Agency, NGO and DEX). In the case of NEX, particular attention should be directed towards issues such as country office support, exit strategies and capacity-building measures to strengthen management within the programme country government;

(c) Information on the magnitude of resources mobilized by UNDP for the CCF from regular and other sources. Additional resources mobilized for other national programmes. Analysis of the potential for resource mobilization, from domestic and external sources. Description of any innovative approaches to resource mobilization employed by the country office and/or government. Assessment of resource allocation among the four programme categories of the SRF (and the special development situations category), as well as across programmes and projects; progress in delivery; and productivity of resource utilization. Implications for resource allocation and utilization in the remaining years of the current CCF as well as the next CCF;

(d) Adequacy of monitoring and evaluation within UNDP-supported programmes and projects. Key issues include formulation and implementation of monitoring and evaluation plans, to enable on-going assessment of progress towards expected results; evaluation compliance; and status of follow-up on evaluation recommendations. Particular attention should be paid to application of and experience with the SRF and periodic reviews and reports;

(e) Significant innovations or best practices in programme or project design, management, monitoring and evaluation, including application of participatory approaches in each of these areas;

(f) Assessment of how the organizational structure and human, financial and physical resources of the country office are aligned with UNDP activities in the country and required competencies:

    i.   Does the country office have sufficient resources – both qualitatively and quantitatively - to carry out its principal tasks in the country? This question relates, in particular, to the number, skills and gender of staff (all categories), the size, allocation and availability of funds from the administrative budget, and the standards, availability and connectivity of computer systems;

    ii. Does the structure of the country office represent a rational allocation of human resources – in skills, gender, numbers and organizational deployment – in view of principal UNDP activities in the country?

(g) Assessment of how the management of country office resources supports the implementation of UNDP activities in the country:

    i.   Are staff knowledgeable about UNDP programming policies and procedures?
    ii. Are systems in place to ensure that UNDP programming policies and procedures are followed?
    iii. Is there a functioning and effective system of work planning in the country office?
    iv. Are procedures in place for oversight and quality control of essential tasks such as financial disbursement, procurement, recruitment, training and performance appraisal?
    v.   Is adequate attention being paid to staff development/learning on both substantive and operational issues?
    vi. Is there a functioning staff association? Are there any effective consultative mechanisms between the staff association and management?
    vii. Is staff morale a factor in the country office?
    viii. Are information systems operating in support of increased learning and productivity?

Part VI: Support to the country office

Type, quality and effectiveness of assistance requested and received from headquarters units and SURFs to facilitate improved programme performance. This may include advice/guidance/feedback, back-stopping and technical support for: research and analysis; programme planning and management; access to international knowledge networks and experts; advocacy; resource mobilization, allocation and utilization; coordination and collaboration with other organizations of the United Nations system; and monitoring and evaluation, including timely reactions to country office annual reports.

Type, quality and effectiveness of assistance requested and received from headquarters units to facilitate improved management performance. This may include advice/guidance/feedback, back-stopping and technical support on the: application and effectiveness of the compact, with emphasis on the range of issues covered, the specificity of agreed targets or deliverables, monitoring of performance, feedback and adjustment; financial and human resources management as well as procurement and inventory control; information technology management, including information management systems; follow-up to audits and performance reviews; common services and harmonization of administrative and financial procedures within the United Nations system; and reactions to management concerns raised in the country office annual report.

Part VII: Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions and recommendations in each of the areas covered in Parts I-VI with clear indication of responsibilities for follow-up by UNDP (both headquarters and country office), the programme country government and other partners.

Part VIII: Financial Summary

Country: **CCF period (including any extensions):** **Period covered by the country review (rounded up to full calendar year):**			
REGULAR RESOURCES	**Amount assigned for the full period of CCF ($ '000)**	**Amount actually made available for the period under review ($ '000)**	**Estimated expenditure for the period under review ($ '000)**
	1	2	3
Estimated carry-over			
TRAC 1.1.1 and TRAC 1.1.2 (*indicate % of TRAC 1.1.1*)			
TRAC 1.1.3			
SPPD/STS			
Subtotal			
OTHER RESOURCES	**Amount targeted for the full period of CCF ($ '000)**	**Amount actually mobilized for the period under review ($ '000)**	**Estimated expenditure for the period under review ($ '000)**
Government cost-sharing			
Third-party cost-sharing			
Funds, trust funds and other UNIFEM UNV UNCDF UNSO *GEF* Capacity 21 Montreal Protocol			
Subtotal			
GRAND TOTAL			

CONTENTS OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR COUNTRY REVIEWS

I. BACKGROUND

Brief description of the country context and history relating to the formulation as well as implementation of the CCF and other UNDP activities. Reference to any significant concerns noted by PWG and the Executive Board when the CCF was reviewed.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE COUNTRY REVIEW

Statement on the country-specific objectives of the review, consistent with corporate policy on country reviews, comprising both programme and management concerns. These objectives must incorporate any issues raised by the regional bureau. For this purpose, the bureau must consult with central services (such as the Bureau for Development Policy, the Bureau for Financial Administrative Services, the Bureau of Planning and Resource Management, the Evaluation Office, the Office of Audit and Performance Review and the Operations Support Group) to ensure that it has identified a comprehensive list of concerns relevant to the country office .

III. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Description of the proposed approach towards the collection, analysis and interpretation of data necessary to meet the objectives of the country review. The aim should be to undertake a thorough assessment - using a combination of secondary data[a/], interviews as well as focus group discussions with stakeholders, and field observation - to validate and expand upon information available from programme and management indicators. In this connection, the record of the annual review process and the contents of country office annual reports may be particularly helpful since both have been designed to lay the groundwork for the country review.

The specific issues identified for review may be organized thematically, along the lines of the categories in the SRF, or other forms of categorization[b/] which are appropriate and lend themselves to ease of analysis, understanding and follow-up.

IV. PROCESS AND MANAGEMENT

Outline of the various stages in the review process, with associated deadlines, from the preparation of the TOR to the finalization of the report. Identification of organizations/individuals/teams who will participate in all or part of the review process and their responsibilities for specific functions and/or tasks.

[a/]   Programme or project reports, country office annual reports, annual reports of the resident coordinator, audits, evaluations, National Human Development Reports (NHDRs), Common Country Assessments (CCAs) and UNDAFs, among other possibilities.

[b/]   Possible categories could be identified from the expected contents of the country review report, for example, advocacy for SHD, utilization of the programme approach in UNDP-supported interventions, application of national execution, resource mobilization for UNDP-supported and other national programmes, inter-agency collaboration, and linkages with civil society and the private sector.

V. EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The key products of the exercise, based on the list described in these procedures.

VI. COSTS AND FINANCING

A budget for the country review according to major activities, denominated in United States dollars, indicating sources of financing and specifying funding required from line 1.4.

APPROACH TO CLUSTERED COUNTRY REVIEWS

A. **Selection of countries and preparation of TOR**

1. The regional bureau identifies the group of countries and secures the agreement of resident representatives and programme country governments. It consults with central services as well as country offices and either prepares a draft TOR or delegates the responsibility to a country office within the cluster. The draft TOR (based on annex 7J) is then sent to all country offices in the cluster.

2. Country offices consult with programme country governments and provide feedback on the draft TOR to the regional bureau as well as the country office with delegated responsibility for preparing the TOR (when this is the case). A final version is prepared by the bureau or delegated country office and approved by the regional director.

B. **Selection of the review team**

1. A review team, selected in the manner described in the country review procedures (see 7.5.2), prepares the draft country review report. All countries in the cluster are visited by the team.

C. **Subregional or cluster review meeting**

1. A subregional or cluster review meeting discusses the draft country review report except those issues dealing with internal management and support to the country office. It is organized and chaired by the regional bureau and attended by representatives from all country offices and programme country governments in the cluster. Additional participants may include a selected group of other country-level stakeholders. The presence of all or some members of the review team, especially the team leader, will be necessary.

2. The meeting will normally be held in a country within the cluster.

D. **Finalization and distribution of the report**

1. The final country review report (see annex 7I) as well as a record of proceedings are prepared by the regional bureau with the assistance of country offices.

2. Once completed, the final country review report is forwarded by the regional director to resident representatives. Resident representatives submit the country review report (excluding Parts V (f) (g) and VI, on management and support to the country office, respectively) to programme country governments (government coordinating authority); they may also share the document with the United Nations country team and other stakeholders within the country.

E. **Review at headquarters**

1. The regional bureau submits the summary of the final country review report, together with its suggestions for follow-up action, to a meeting of PMOC. The full text of the report as well as records of proceedings at the subregional or cluster review meeting will be available at the meeting of PMOC for reference. PMOC accepts or revises the bureau's recommendations. If requested by the regional bureau, one or more resident representatives may attend this meeting.

2. The summary of the final country review report together with the recommendations of PMOC are then submitted by the PMOC Secretariat (OSG/DOPP) to the Administrator for review and approval.

3. The Administrator submits the summary of the country review report (including a financial summary for each country in the cluster) as well as PMOC's recommendations to the Executive Board together with his/her observations. The concerned regional bureau prepares the Administrator's observations. Any comments made by the Board are forwarded to the bureau for follow-up action.