



Resources and Annexes

Acronyms	93
Glossary	97
Related Documents and Websites	109
A. Programming and Reporting in UNDP	110
B. Results-Based Management	110
C. Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines by UN Agencies/Donors	111
D. Monitoring and Evaluation Methods and Tools	114
E. Indicators and Measurement	118
F. Partnerships	118
G. Learning and Knowledge Management	120
H. Evaluation Capacity Development	121
I. Conflict and Crisis Intervention	122
J. Poverty	123
K. Gender	123
L. Democracy and Governance	124
M. Other References	125
Monitoring and Evaluation Tools	127
Annex A: Evaluation and Tracking Plan	128
Annex B: Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR)	131
Annex C: Annual Project Report (APR)	134
Annex D: Field Visit Report	136
Annex E: Menu of Monitoring Tools	138

Acronyms

Many of the following acronyms appear in this *Handbook*. Others are listed here because they are frequently used in documentation related to monitoring and evaluation.

AIDS	Acquired immune deficiency syndrome
AOS	Administrative and operational services
APR	Annual programme/project report
AR	Annual review
BDP	Bureau for Development Policy
BOM	Bureau of Management
CCA	Common country assessment
CCF	Country cooperation framework
CDR	Combined delivery report
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CO	Country office
COMP	Country office management plan
CP	Country programme
CPO	Country Programme Outline
CR	Country review
CSO	Civil society organization
CTA	Chief technical advisor
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DEX	Direct execution
DRR	Deputy Resident Representative
DSA	Daily subsistence allowance
EB	Executive Board
ECD	Evaluation capacity development

EFT	Evaluation focal team
EO	Evaluation Office
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FAQ	Frequently asked question
G	Goal
GA	General Assembly
HDI	Human Development Index
HDR	Human Development Report
HIV	Human immunodeficiency virus
HPI	Human poverty index
HQ	Headquarters
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
ICT	Information and communication technology
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
NEX	National execution
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NHDR	National human development report
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OSG	Operations Support Group
PDR	Project/programme delivery report
PEIS	Project/programme evaluation information sheet
PLSP	Programme logistical support project
PRSP	Poverty reduction strategy paper
PSC	Project steering committee
PSD	Programme support document
PWG	Programme working group
RBM	Results-based management
RBMS	Results-based management system
RBx	Regional Bureaux
RC	Resident Coordinator
RCA	Results competency assessment
ROAR	Results-oriented annual report
RR	Resident Representative
RRA	Rapid rural appraisal
RST	Resource strategy table
SAS	Strategic area of support
SHD	Sustainable human development

SG	Sub-goal
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SOF	Source of funds
SRF	Strategic results framework
SURF	Sub-regional resource facility
TOR	Terms of reference
TPR	Tripartite review
TR	Terminal report
TRAC	Target for resource assignment from the core
UN	United Nations
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WFP	World Food Programme

Glossary

Most of the terms appearing in this *Handbook* are of general use in the development community and by evaluation practitioners. In this publication, all terms are defined in the context of monitoring and evaluation, although they may have additional meanings in other contexts. Terms of Reference, for example, always refers specifically to a Terms of Reference for an evaluation.

Definitions in the Glossary were developed with the intention of harmonizing the use of terminology throughout the development community. The definitions were developed by the UNDP Evaluation Office and/or extracted and adapted from the following sources:

- UNDP, the UNDP Programming Manual, <http://intra.undp.org/bdp/pm>
- UNDP, RBM Technical Note, <http://intra.undp.org/osg/results>
- UNDP/EO, Participatory Evaluation Handbook, <http://www.undp.org/eo/methodology/methodology.html>
- UNDP/EO, Development Effectiveness Report, <http://www.undp.org/eo/publications/publications.html>
- OECD-DAC, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/htm/glossary.htm>
- UNFPA, The Programme Manager's Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit, http://bbs.unfpa.org/ooe/me_methodologies.htm
- CCA Guidelines, <http://www.dgo.org>
- UNDAF guidelines, <http://www.dgo.org>

Some terms are defined in much greater detail in the Glossary than they are in the text. This not only enhances understanding but also covers terms that appear in the reference documentation related to this *Handbook*.

A

Accountability: Responsibility for the justification of expenditures, decisions or results of the discharge of authority and official duties, including duties delegated to a subordinate unit or individual. In regard to Programme and Project Managers, the responsibility to provide evidence to stakeholders that a programme or project is effective and conforms with planned results, legal and fiscal requirements. In organizations that promote learning, accountability may also be measured by the extent to which managers use monitoring and evaluation findings. Accountability is also an obligation to provide a true and fair view of performance and the results of operations. It relates to the obligations of development partners to act accordingly to clearly defined responsibilities, roles and performance expectations and to ensure credible monitoring, evaluation and reporting.

Activities: Actions in the context of programming which are both necessary and sufficient, and through which inputs (financial, human, technical and material resources) are mobilized to produce specific outputs or contribute to the outcome. Activities may also be referred to as “development interventions”.

Advocacy: Pleading for, speaking on behalf of or recommending something or someone. UNDP’s advocacy role is one of promoting the human development agenda at the global, regional and national level through issues as diverse as debt relief, gender equality, poverty eradication, climate change and good governance. Part of “**soft**” assistance.

Attribution: The causal link between observed (or expected) changes and a specific intervention in view of the effects of other interventions or confounding factors. With regard to attribution for the achievement of outcomes, evaluations aim to demonstrate a credible linkage between UNDP’s outputs and efforts in partnership with others and development change (outcome).

Audit: An examination or review that assesses and reports on the extent to which a condition, process or performance conforms to predetermined standards or criteria, policy and procedures. It must be an independent, objective assurance and consulting activity that is designed to add value and improve an organization’s operations. It helps an organization accomplish its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to assess and improve the effectiveness of risk management, control and governance processes.

B

Baseline data: Data that describe the situation to be addressed by a programme or project and that serve as the starting point for measuring the performance of that programme or project. A baseline study would be the analysis describing the situation prior to receiving assistance. This is used to determine the results and accomplishments of an activity and serves as an important reference for evaluation.

Benchmark: Reference point or standard against which progress or achievements may be compared, e.g., what has been achieved in the past, what other comparable

organizations such as development partners are achieving, what was targeted or budgeted for, what could reasonably have been achieved under the circumstances. It also refers to an intermediate target to measure progress in a given period.

Beneficiaries: Individuals and/or institutions whose situation is supposed to improve (the target group), and others whose situation may improve. Also refers to a limited group among the stakeholders who will directly or indirectly benefit from the project.

Best practices: Planning and/or operational practices that have proven successful in particular circumstances. Best practices are used to demonstrate what works and what does not and to accumulate and apply knowledge about how and why they work in different situations and contexts. See also “lesson learned”.

Bias: Refers to statistical bias. Bias is an inaccurate representation that produces systematic error in a research finding. Bias may result in overestimating or underestimating characteristics or trends. It may result from incomplete information or invalid data collection methods and may be intentional or unintentional.

Brokerage: Acting as an impartial intermediary between stakeholders, beneficiaries and development and other actors, sometimes in sensitive areas. Brokerage takes many forms, e.g., political, information and partnership. Part of “**soft**” assistance.

C

Capacity development: The process by which individuals, groups, organizations and countries develop, enhance and organize their systems, resources and knowledge—all reflected in their abilities (individually and collectively) to perform functions, solve problems and set and achieve objectives. Capacity development is also referred to as capacity building or strengthening.

Cluster evaluation: An evaluation of a set of related projects and/or programmes. A cluster evaluation centered on a development outcome is also called an “**outcome evaluation**”.

Common Country Assessment: A country-based process for reviewing and analyzing the national development situation, and identifying key issues as a basis for advocacy, policy dialogue and preparation of the UNDAF. The findings from this exercise are described in a CCA document.

Conclusion: A reasoned judgment based on a synthesis of empirical findings or factual statements corresponding 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. (See “**finding**” for the difference between a conclusion and a finding.)

Cost-effectiveness: The relation between the costs (inputs) and results produced by a project. A project is more cost-effective when it achieves its results at the lowest possible cost compared with alternative projects with the same intended results.

Country-level impact assessment: An assessment of the entire contribution of UNDP within a country, including soft interventions; UNDP contributions that have produced recent end-results irrespective of a given programme cycle in the last five years; and UNDP interactions with development partners to achieve national goals. By definition, an ex post evaluation. See also “**impact evaluation**”.

D

Data: Specific quantitative and qualitative information or facts that are collected.

Development effectiveness: The extent to which an institution or intervention has brought about targeted change in a country or the life of an individual beneficiary. Development effectiveness is influenced by various factors, beginning with the quality of the project design and ending with the relevance and sustainability of desired results.

E

Effectiveness: The extent to which a development outcome is achieved through interventions. The extent to which a programme or project achieves its planned results (goals, purposes and outputs) and contributes to outcomes.

Efficiency: The optimal transformation of inputs into outputs.

Evaluation: A time-bound exercise that attempts to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and success of ongoing and completed programmes and projects. Evaluation can also address outcomes or other development issues. Evaluation is undertaken selectively to answer specific questions to guide decision-makers and/or programme managers, and to provide information on whether underlying theories and assumptions used in programme development were valid, what worked and what did not work and why. Evaluation commonly aims to determine relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Evaluation is a vehicle for extracting cross-cutting lessons from operating unit experiences and determining the need for modifications to the strategic results framework. Evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process. See also “**project evaluation**” and “**outcome evaluation**”.

Evaluation scope: The focus of an evaluation in terms of questions to address, limitations, what to analyze and what not to analyze.

Evaluation team: Group of specialists responsible for the detailed planning and conduct of an evaluation. An evaluation team writes the evaluation report.

Evaluator: An individual involved in all stages of the evaluation process, from defining the terms of reference and collecting and analyzing data to making recommendations and taking corrective action or making improvements.

Ex-post evaluation: A type of summative evaluation of an intervention usually conducted two years or more after it has been completed. Its purpose is to study how

well the intervention (programme or project) served its aims and to draw conclusions for similar interventions in the future.

F

Feedback: As a process, feedback consists of the organization and packaging in an appropriate form of relevant information from monitoring and evaluation activities, the dissemination of that information to target users and, most importantly, the use of the information as a basis for decision-making and the promotion of learning in an organization. Feedback as a product refers to information that is generated through monitoring and evaluation and transmitted to parties for whom it is relevant and useful. It may include findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons from experience.

Finding: Factual statement about the programme or project based on empirical evidence gathered through monitoring and evaluation activities. Example: Although its initial tests of the new technology for preventing soil erosion have been positive, the Agricultural Science and Technology Institute effort has generated only a lukewarm response from the target group of farmers, who are misinformed about the cost implications of that technology. (See “**conclusion**” for the difference between a finding and a conclusion.)

I

Impact: The overall and long-term effect of an intervention. Impact is the longer-term or ultimate result attributable to a development intervention—in contrast to output and outcome, which reflect more immediate results from the intervention. The concept of impact is close to “**development effectiveness**”. Examples: higher standard of living, increased food security, increased earnings from exports, increased savings owing to a decrease in imports. See “**results**”.

Impact evaluation: A type of evaluation that focuses on the broad, longer-term impact or results, whether intended or unintended, of a programme or outcome. For example, an impact evaluation could show that a decrease in a community’s overall infant mortality rate was the direct result of a programme designed to provide high quality pre- and post-natal care and deliveries assisted by trained health care professionals. See also “**country-level impact assessment**”.

Independent evaluation: An evaluation carried out by persons separate from those responsible for managing, making decisions on, or implementing the project. It could include groups within the donor organization. The credibility of an evaluation depends in part on how independently it has been carried out, i.e., on the extent of autonomy and the ability to access information, carry out investigations and report findings free of political influence or organizational pressure.

Indicator: Signal that reveals progress (or lack thereof) towards objectives; means of measuring what actually happens against what has been planned in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. An indicator is a quantitative or qualitative variable that provides a simple and reliable basis for assessing achievement, change or performance.

Input: A means mobilized for the conduct of programme or project activities, i.e., financial, human and physical resources.

J

Joint evaluation: An evaluation to which different donor agencies and/or partners contribute. There are various degrees of “jointness” depending on the extent to which individual partners cooperate in the evaluation process, merge their evaluation resources and combine their evaluation reporting. Joint evaluation can help overcome attribution problems in assessing the effectiveness of programs and strategies, the degree to which efforts supported by different partners are complementary, the quality of aid coordination, and so on.

L

Lesson learned: Learning from experience that is applicable to a generic situation rather than to a specific circumstance. Example: A strong information center is essential to an institution dealing with research and development (R&D) as a channel for disseminating the results of its research programme to target groups and generating feedback from target groups on the usefulness of its R&D results.

Logical framework (logframe) approach: A methodology that logically relates the main elements in programme and project design and helps ensure that the intervention is likely to achieve measurable results. The “logframe matrix” can be used to summarize and ensure consistency among outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs, and to identify important risks or assumptions. It is also referred to as a results-oriented programme planning and management methodology. The approach helps to identify strategic elements (inputs, outputs, purposes, goal) of a programme, their causal relationships, and the external factors that may influence success or failure of the programme. The approach includes the establishment of performance indicators to be used for monitoring and evaluating achievement of programme aims.

M

Mid-term evaluation: A type of evaluation carried out during project or programme implementation. Its principal goal is to assess progress made, to draw initial conclusions for managing the programme or project and to make recommendations for the remaining period. It addresses operational issues of relevance and performance and extracts initial lessons learned. Sometimes referred to as an “ongoing” evaluation.

Monitoring: A continuing function that aims primarily to provide managers and main stakeholders with regular feedback and early indications of progress or lack thereof in the achievement of intended results. Monitoring tracks the actual performance or situation against what was planned or expected according to pre-determined standards. Monitoring generally involves collecting and analyzing data on implementation processes, strategies and results, and recommending corrective measures.

O

Outcome: Actual or intended change in development conditions that UNDP interventions are seeking to support. It describes a change in development conditions between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact. Examples: increased rice yield, increased income for the farmers. See “**results**”.

Outcome evaluation: Evaluation that covers a set of related projects, programmes and strategies intended to bring about a certain outcome. An outcome evaluation assesses “how” and “why” outcomes are or are not being achieved in a given country context, and the contribution of UNDP outputs to the outcome. It can also help to clarify the underlying factors that explain the achievement or lack thereof of outcomes; highlight unintended consequences (both positive and negative) of interventions; and recommend actions to improve performance in future programming cycles and generate lessons learned.

Outcome monitoring: A process of collecting and analyzing data to measure the performance of a programme, project, partnership, policy reform process and/or “soft” assistance towards achievement of development outcomes at country level. A defined set of indicators is constructed to track regularly the key aspects of performance. Performance reflects effectiveness in converting inputs to outputs, outcomes and impacts.

Outputs: Tangible products (including services) of a programme or project that are necessary to achieve the objectives of a programme or project. Outputs relate to the completion (rather than the conduct) of activities and are the type of results over which managers have a high degree of influence. Example: agricultural extension services provided to rice farmers. See “**results**”.

P

Participatory evaluation: The collective examination and assessment of a programme or project by the stakeholders and beneficiaries. Participatory evaluations are reflective, action-oriented and seek to build capacity. Participatory evaluations are primarily oriented to the information needs of the stakeholders rather than the donor who acts as a facilitator.

Partnership: Collaboration among institutions to achieve mutually shared and agreed upon objectives and goals that draws on individual strengths and maximizes synergies. Effective partnerships, where there is a clear understanding of the contribution of each partner to agreed outcomes, are central to achieving results.

Performance assessment: External assessment or self-assessment by programme units, comprising outcome, programme, project or individual monitoring, reviews, end-of-year reporting, end-of-project reporting, institutional assessments and/or special studies.

Performance indicator: A particular characteristic or dimension used to measure intended changes defined by an organizational unit’s results framework. Performance

indicators are used to observe progress and to measure actual results compared to expected results. They serve to answer “how” or “whether” a unit is progressing towards its objectives, rather than “why” or “why not” such progress is being made. Performance indicators are usually expressed in quantifiable terms, and should be objective and measurable (e.g., numeric values, percentages, scores, and indices).

Performance management: The generation of management demand for performance information and its use and application for continuous improvement. It includes “**performance measurement**”.

Performance measurement: The collection, interpretation of, and reporting on data for performance indicators which measure how well programmes or projects deliver outputs and contribute to achievement of higher level aims (purposes and goals). Performance measures are most useful when used for comparisons over time or among units performing similar work. A system for assessing performance of development initiatives against stated goals. Also described as the process of objectively measuring how well an agency is meeting its stated goals or objectives.

Project evaluation: An evaluation of a project or a specific development intervention to attain designated objectives, in a determined time span, and following an established plan of action. The basis of evaluation should be built in to the project document. In the context of UNDP, it also includes evaluations of programmes described in Programme Support Documents.

Proxy measure or indicator: A variable used to stand in for one that is difficult to measure directly.

R

Rating system: An instrument for forming and validating a judgment on the relevance, performance or success of a programme or project through the use of a scale with numeric, alphabetic and/or descriptive codes.

Recommendation: 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 users, the Agricultural Science and Technology Institute should establish a center for sharing of information between the target users 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.

Relevance: The degree to which the objectives of a programme or project remain valid and pertinent as originally planned or as subsequently modified owing to changing circumstances within the immediate context and external environment of that programme or project. For an outcome, the extent to which the outcome reflects key national priorities and receives support from key partners.

Reliability: Consistency and dependability of data collected through repeated use of a scientific instrument or data collection procedure under the same conditions.

Absolute reliability of evaluation data is hard to obtain. However, checklists and training of evaluators can improve both data reliability and validity. Sound reliability implies exhaustive data collection and the appropriateness of the evaluative questions asked.

Results: A broad term used to refer to the effects of a programme or project and/or activities. The terms “**outputs**”, “**outcomes**” and “**impact**” describe more precisely the different types of results at different levels of the logframe hierarchy.

Results-Based Management (RBM): A management strategy or approach by which an organization ensures that its processes, products and services contribute to the achievement of clearly stated results. Results-based management provides a coherent framework for strategic planning and management by improving learning and accountability. It is also a broad management strategy aimed at achieving important changes in the way agencies operate, with improving performance and achieving results as the central orientation, by defining realistic expected results, monitoring progress towards the achievement of expected results, integrating lessons learned into management decisions and reporting on performance.

Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR): The principal instrument for reporting on performance and progress of results achieved on the entire range of UNDP interventions by operational units. In aggregate, the ROAR provides UNDP with a comprehensive assessment of key results achieved and a review of the resources at the organizational level. It is intended to provide a basis for feedback and continuous adjustment.

S

Secondary sources: Sources such as periodic progress reports, annual reports, memos, sectoral studies and baseline data. They serve as background and foundation material and resources for an evaluation.

Self-evaluation: An evaluation by those who are administering a programme or project in the field.

Soft assistance: Advocacy, policy advice/dialogue, and facilitation/brokerage of information, partnerships or political compromise. UNDP policy advisors, programme staff and senior country office staff are the main conveyers of “soft” assistance either through projects and programmes, or independent of them in an ad hoc, on demand manner. “Soft” assistance tends to be delivered at the “**upstream**” level where national policies that affect human development outcomes are debated, formulated and implemented, although it can also be delivered “**downstream**” by project staff.

Stakeholders: People, groups or entities that have a role and interest in the objectives and implementation of a programme or project. They include the community whose situation the programme seeks to change; project field staff who implement activities; project and programme managers who oversee implementation; donors and other decision-makers who decide the course of action related to the programme; and supporters, critics and other persons who influence the programme environment. In participatory evaluation, stakeholders assume an increased role in the evaluation process as question-makers, evaluation planners, data gatherers and problem solvers.

Strategic evaluation: An evaluation of a particular issue, often crosscutting, with significant implications for the major development priorities of the Government and UNDP and with high risks to stakeholders. Its timing is especially important owing to the urgency of the issue which poses high risks to, and has generated widely conflicting views from, stakeholders. It aims to advance a deeper understanding of the issue, reduce the range of uncertainties associated with the different options for addressing it, and help to reach an acceptable working agreement among the parties concerned and enables various stakeholders to reach a common understanding of certain policy issues as a significant step towards policy formulation.

Strategic results framework: As a generic term, the strategic results framework (SRF) represents the development hypothesis including those results necessary to achieve a strategic objective and their causal relationships and underlying assumptions. The framework establishes an organizing basis for measuring, analyzing and reporting results of the operating unit. It is also useful as a management tool and therefore focuses on the key results that must be monitored to indicate progress. It also may be the overall aims and objectives of a country's approach to development based on analysis of problems, and including a statement of priorities. For UNDP, the SRF is the document that describes the UNDP results for an operating unit in terms of outcomes, outputs, partnerships and indicators with specified Goals, Sub-goals and Strategic Areas of Support.

Survey: Systematic collection of information from a defined population, usually by means of interviews or questionnaires administered to a sample of units in the population (e.g., person, beneficiaries, adults).

Sustainability: Durability of positive programme or project results after the termination of the technical cooperation channeled through that programme or project; static sustainability—the continuous flow of the same benefits, set in motion by the completed programme or project, to the same target groups; dynamic sustainability—the use or adaptation of programme or project results to a different context or changing environment by the original target groups and/or other groups. For an outcome, it reflects whether the positive change in development situation will endure.

T

Target groups: The main beneficiaries of a programme or project that are expected to gain from the results of that programme or project; sectors of the population that a programme or project aims to reach in order to address their needs based on gender considerations and their socio-economic characteristics.

Terminal evaluation: Evaluation conducted after the intervention has been in place for some time or towards the end of a project or programme to measure outcomes, demonstrate the effectiveness and relevance of interventions and strategies, indicate early signs of impact, and recommend what interventions to promote or abandon.

Terms of reference: Definition of the work and the schedule that must be carried out by the evaluation team. The terms of reference (TOR) recalls the background

and specifies the scope of the evaluation, states the main motives for an evaluation and the questions asked. It sums up available knowledge and outlines an evaluation method and describes the distribution of work, schedule and the responsibilities among the people participating in an evaluation process. It specifies the qualifications required from candidate teams or individuals as well as the criteria to be used to select an evaluation team.

Thematic evaluation: Evaluation of selected aspects or cross-cutting issues in different types of interventions. May involve a cluster evaluation of projects or programmes addressing a particular theme that cut across sectors or geographical boundaries. Similar to a “**strategic evaluation**”. Example: Evaluation of national execution, evaluation of collaboration with civil society.

U

United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF): A planning and resources framework for the country programmes and projects of agencies in the United Nations system. It is developed on the basis of the analysis of the common country assessment.

V

Validity: The extent to which a measurement or test accurately measures what it is supposed to. Valid evaluations take into account all relevant factors, given the whole context of the evaluation, and weigh them appropriately in the process of formulating conclusions and recommendations.

W

Work plan: Annual or multi-year summary of tasks, timeframes and responsibilities. It is used as a monitoring tool to ensure the production of outputs and progress towards outcomes.

Related Documents and Websites

The following documents, websites and other resources were of value in developing the UNDP monitoring and evaluation framework. They provide more in-depth information on specific subjects introduced in this *Handbook*. To assist users in selecting relevant information, most references are accompanied by a brief description of content.

To obtain these resources:

1. Visit the website, if listed; or
2. Visit the UNDP Evaluation Office website (<http://www.undp.org/eo>) and follow links to documents, if available; or
3. Order a printed copy from the publisher.

The list of documents is organized by the following themes:

- A. Programming and Reporting in UNDP
- B. Results-Based Management
- C. Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines by UN Agencies/Donors
- D. Monitoring and Evaluation Methods and Tools
- E. Indicators and Measurement
- F. Partnerships
- G. Learning and Knowledge Management
- H. Evaluation Capacity Development
- I. Conflict and Crisis Intervention
- J. Poverty
- K. Gender
- L. Democracy and Governance
- M. Other References

A. Programming and Reporting in UNDP

UNDP, “**UNDP Programming Manual**”, April 1999, <http://intra.undp.org/bdp/pm>

UNDP, **The Multi-Year Funding Framework Report by the Administrator**, 1998.

UNDP, **Guidelines on the Annual Review and ROARs**, <http://intra.undp.org/osg/>

UNDP, **Change Management**,

<http://intra.undp.org/bom/maintopics/services/bp/bpmain.html>

The site contains key documents related to UNDP change management, including the UNDP “Country Office of the Future” Options Paper and the Administrator’s Business Plans 2000-2003.

UNDP, **Balanced Scorecard**, <http://intra.undp.org/bom/scorecard/index.html>

The site aims to provide answers to queries on the concept of the Balanced Scorecard, and to provide information about the progress made in building and implementing UNDP’s Balanced Scorecard, including the development of the Management Result Framework (MRF).

CCA Guidelines, April 1999, <http://www.dgo.org>

UNDAF Guidelines, April 1999, <http://www.dgo.org>

Guidelines for the 2000 Annual Report of the United Nations Resident Coordinator, <http://www.dgo.org>

UNDP, The Oversight group, **Discussion Paper on Oversight**, 22 November 2000.

B. Results-Based Management

UNDP, **Results Based Management Center Gateway**,

<http://stone.undp.org/undpweb/rbmsgat/main.cfm>

The Results-Based Management System (RBMS) is an online database that provides country, regional and global level information on the strategic results framework (SRF) and the results-oriented annual report (ROAR).

UNDP, **Technical Note on UNDP Results Framework**,

<http://intra.undp.org/osg/results/rg/training.html>

This site contains technical notes and training materials on the SRF, ROAR, and other tools.

Office of the Auditor General of Canada (OAGC), **Implementing Results-Based Management**, http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/domino/other.nsf/html/00rbm_e.html

This is a concise synthesis of lessons learned from implementing results-based management in a variety of Canadian and international jurisdictions.

Binnendijk, Annette, “**RBM in the development cooperation agencies: A review of experience, Evaluation Capacity Development in Asia**”, UNDP/NCSTE/WB, 2000, http://intra.undp.org/eo/documents/evaluation_cap_dev_china.pdf

Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN, **Results-Based Budgeting in FAO**, Rome, February 2001.

Inayatullah, C., UNDP Pakistan, **A Review of the 1999 Annual progress reports from the standpoint of RBM, CCF for Pakistan**, work-in-progress.

Marc Holzer, National Center for Public Productivity, USA, “**Public Performance Evaluation and Improvement: A review of experience**”, *Evaluation Capacity Development in Asia*, UNDP/NCSTE/WB, 2000, http://intra.undp.org/eo/documents/evaluation_cap_dev_china.pdf

Tofflon-Weiss, Melissa, Bertrand, Jane T., Terrell, Stanley S., “**The Results Framework—An Innovative Tool for Program Planning and Evaluation.**” *Evaluation Review*, Vol. 23, No. 3, June 1999.

This article presents a case study of the development and implementation of the “results framework” for a USAID-funded regional initiative for HIV/AIDS prevention in Central America. The results framework is found to have many advantages over traditional evaluation approaches that rely on outside consultants. Instead, the results framework spanning the life of the project provides an opportunity for program staff, donors, partners and evaluators to work as a team to collect and use data for project planning, implementation and evaluation purposes.

UNDP, **Measuring & Managing Results: Lessons for Development Cooperation**, 1997.

The report examines the state of performance measurement: what it is, the types of activities that it involves, which development agencies are using it and for which purposes, and the lessons that can be drawn from their experiences and best practices. Selected experiences of public sector and development agencies are reviewed to examine the variations in emphasis in performance measurement. Lessons learned, best practices and recommendations are shared from each development agency reviewed. (Available from EO)

C. Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines by UN Agencies/Donors

DANIDA, “**Evaluation Guideline**”, 1999.

OECD/Working Party on Aid Evaluation, **Glossary of Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management**, 2001, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/html/glossary.htm>
Reference guide that provides an overview of the terms included in OECD members’ glossaries and database of terms and definitions in 15 agencies.

OECD/Development Assistance Committee, **Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance**, 1991, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/Evaluation/pdf/evalprin.pdf>

The DAC has drawn up a series of policy principles addressing key areas of aid programming and management, including project appraisal, programme assistance and technical cooperation. The set of principles described in the paper state the views of DAC members on the most important requirements of the evaluation process based on current policies and practices as well as donor agency experiences with evaluation and feedback of results.

OECD/Development Assistance Committee, **Review of the DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance**, 1998, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/Evaluation/pdf/eval.pdf>

This review examines the implementation and use of the Principles in order to assess their impact, usefulness and relevance. The Principles include: purpose of evaluation, impartiality and independence, credibility, usefulness, participation of donors and recipients, donor cooperation, evaluation programming, design and implementation of evaluations, reporting, dissemination and feedback, and decentralized evaluation systems.

OECD/DAC, **Evaluation Criteria**, <http://www.oecd.org//dac/Evaluation/htm/evalcrit.htm>

The site presents general criteria for evaluation and monitoring that are endorsed by the OECD-DAC members. It also lists key questions under each criteria (i.e., relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability).

OECD/Public Management Service, **Improving Evaluation Practices: Best Practice Guidelines for Evaluation and Background Paper**, 1999, <http://www.oecd.org/puma>

The guidelines identify key issues and practices to improve the use of evaluation. The guidelines focus on the management of evaluation activities in government and management of individual evaluations rather than on methodological questions. Best practices include defining clear objectives for the evaluation process; using evaluations to improve decision-making, resource allocation, and accountability; managing the evaluation process to ensure it remains focused; involving stakeholders in the evaluation process; and communicating evaluation findings internally and externally.

OECD/Development Assistance Committee, **Effective Practices in Conducting a Joint Multi-Donor Evaluation**, 1998, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/>

This report outlines key steps in how to plan and conduct a joint evaluation of development programmes when more than one donor agency is involved. With the enhanced role of partnership in the funding and implementation of development assistance, there will be a growing demand for joint evaluation and for lessons learned from various modalities of jointly implemented development cooperation. The guide serves as a useful tool for those who seek to promote joint evaluation and collaboration among donor agencies. It was prepared for donor agency managers involved in planning and implementing joint evaluations of development assistance programs with other donor partners.

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, **External Evaluation: Are we doing the right things? Are we doing things right?** June 2000.

The guidelines are divided into two sections. Part I explains the terminology

and principles of evaluation. Part II discusses each of the five stages of an external evaluation. These guidelines are primarily addressed to organizations that sponsor or participate in evaluations and are responsible for implementing their results.

UNCDF, **Monitoring Guidelines**, 2000.

UNFPA, **Monitoring and Evaluation Methodologies: The Programme Manager's M&E Toolkit**, 2000, http://bbs.unfpa.org/ooe/me_methodologies.htm

The Toolkit provides guidance and options for UNFPA country offices to improve monitoring and evaluation activities in the context of results-based management. Of specific interest to UNDP country offices are tools discussing stakeholder participation in evaluation, planning evaluations, the data collection process, managing the evaluation process, and communicating and using evaluation results.

UNICEF, **A UNICEF Guide for Monitoring and Evaluation: Making a Difference?** February 1991.

This manual covers UNICEF monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures. Section I discusses the importance of monitoring and evaluation. Section II addresses the organization of monitoring and evaluation by delineating roles and responsibilities in UNICEF (HQ and country office) and the role of national governments. Section III presents the scope of monitoring and how it can be used at the level of projects/programmes and higher development outcomes (e.g., the situation of women and children). Section IV presents the scope of evaluations; guidelines for how to plan, manage and conduct evaluations; and the use of evaluation findings.

USAID, **A Sourcebook on Results-Oriented Grants and Cooperative Agreements**, <http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/sourcebook/usgov/>

This sourcebook is an electronic resource to assist in the design, award and administration of USAID results-oriented grants and cooperative agreement to implement development assistance activities. It is primarily intended for USAID staff and development partners but contains useful guidance and suggestions in the following areas:

- Defining results-oriented assistance interventions;
- Managing for results through partnerships with government, non-governmental organizations and other civil society actors and the private sector;
- Gathering, analyzing and reporting on overall performance against intended outcomes; and
- Using outcome monitoring and evaluation information to inform decision-making, making flexible adjustments when necessary and highlighting achievement of results.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation, **Evaluation Handbook**, 1998, <http://www.WKKF.org/>

This Handbook is designed for evaluations at project level. It provides a framework for thinking about evaluation as a relevant and useful program tool and outlines a blueprint for designing and conducting evaluations. It also provides basic information to allow project staff to conduct an evaluation without the assistance of an external evaluator.

World Bank, “Monitoring and Evaluation Chapter (draft),” **Monitoring and Evaluation for Poverty Reduction Strategies**, 2000, <http://www.worldbank.org/html/oed/evaluation/>

The Poverty Reduction Strategy Sourcebook is an evolving document aimed at assisting countries in the development and strengthening of poverty reduction strategies. The purpose of the Monitoring and Evaluation chapter is to provide guidance on developing outcome monitoring systems and impact evaluation strategies. In addition, it addresses how to use monitoring and evaluation results to create a feedback process, how to promote participation in monitoring and evaluation activities, and how to build institutional capacity for outcome monitoring and impact evaluation.

World Bank, **Evaluation, Monitoring and Quality Enhancement Community Website**, <http://worldbank.org/html/oed>

This website contains World Bank evaluation studies—including a range of documented evaluations conducted at country, sector, thematic and impact levels—and reports on best practices and lessons learned. Web links are provided to World Bank monitoring and evaluation handbooks and toolkits on indicators and poverty measurement, and to other evaluation groups in the World Bank.

D. Monitoring and Evaluation Methods and Tools

UNDP, OESP, **Who Are the Question-makers? A Participatory Evaluation Handbook**, 1997, <http://intra.undp.org/eo/methodology/methodology.html>

The handbook complements the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. It is intended for those wanting more guidance on participatory evaluation methods. It contains a brief description of the evolution of the participatory approach, a comparison of participatory evaluation with more conventional evaluation approaches, a discussion of the role of participation in UNDP, a description of the framework of a participatory evaluation and a discussion of some of the practical issues involved in doing such an evaluation.

Inter American Development Bank (IADB), **A Management Tool for Improving Project Performance**, <http://www.iadb.org/cont/evo/EngBook/engbook.htm>

This Evaluation Handbook for headquarters and field office staff of the IADB presents various tools for evaluation at the levels of project design, implementation or monitoring, and project completion/impact.

United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), **A Guide for Monitoring and Evaluation**, <http://www.unicef.org/reseval/mande4r.htm>

United States Agency for International Development (USAID), **Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Tips**, http://www.dec.org/usaid_eval/004

The Gateway to Development Information (eldis), **Methods, Tools and Manuals**, <http://nt1.ids.ac.uk/eldis/hot/pm3.htm>

This site contains range of guidelines and manuals to help development practitioners in carrying out participatory monitoring and evaluation.

The M and E News, <http://www.mande.co.uk/>

The M and E News is a news service focusing on developments in monitoring and evaluation methods relevant to development projects with social development objectives.

Research Methods Knowledge Base, <http://trochim.human.cornell.edu/kb/index.htm>

This is a comprehensive web-based textbook that addresses all of the topics in a typical introductory course in social research methods. It covers the entire research process, including formulating research questions, sampling, measurement (surveys, qualitative), research design, data analysis and writing up the study. It also addresses the major theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of research, including the idea of validity in research, reliability of measures and ethics.

USAID, Automated Directives System (ADS), Chapter 200–Introduction: Managing for Results, Functional series 200–Programming Policy, <http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/ads/>

This site comprises USAID’s official, written guidance to its employees on policies, operating procedures and delegations of authority for conducting Agency business. It includes guidance on achieving results (Chapter 200), planning (Chapter 201), assessing and learning (Chapter 203).

USAID, Center for Development Information and Evaluation,

http://www.dec.org/usaid_eval/

USAID’s Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) publishes a wide range of impact evaluations, program and operational assessments, managing for results reports, performance monitoring tips and the *USAID Evaluation News*. These publications summarize and communicate the effectiveness of USAID sustainable development initiatives, “lessons learned” from the Agency’s portfolio of development activities and “best practices” of re-engineered USAID development processes. This site includes access to more than 60 publications produced by CDIE since 1996. Reports are added as they become available.

USAID Evaluation Publications, Published 1997 - 2000, http://www.dec.org/usaid_eval/

This site presents a number of evaluation publications, including the following:

----- . *Conducting a Participatory Evaluation*, TIPS No. 1, 1996.

This note defines participatory evaluation, its characteristics and purposes. It discusses the differences between participatory evaluation and traditional evaluation. Finally, it outlines the key steps in conducting a participatory evaluation, including when participatory evaluation is appropriate, determining on the degree of participation and building consensus on results.

----- . *Conducting Key Informant Interviews*, TIPS, No. 2, 1996.

This note presents key informant interviews as a low-cost rapid appraisal technique. It discusses the method’s advantages and limitations, how to maximize its usefulness and step-by-step instructions of how to apply the method.

-----*. Preparing an Evaluation Scope of Work*, TIPS, No. 3, 1996.

This note offers suggestions for preparing a good evaluation scope of work. It outlines the components of the scope of work and highlights the kind of information needed under each.

-----*. Using Direct Observation Techniques*, TIPS No. 4, 1996.

This note introduces direct observation as one example of a rapid, low-cost method for collecting information on the performance of development interventions. It discusses the method's advantages and limitations, how to maximize its usefulness and provides step-by-step instructions of how to apply the method.

-----*. Using Rapid Appraisal Methods*, TIPS, No. 5, 1996.

This note introduces a range of low-cost methods known as rapid appraisal methods, which are used to collect information on the performance of development interventions. It discusses their strengths and weaknesses and when they are appropriate.

-----*. Preparing a Performance Monitoring Plan*, TIPS, No. 7, 1996.

This note introduces the elements of a performance monitoring plan and provides advice on preparing one for the systematic and timely collection of performance data.

-----*. Establishing Performance Targets*, TIPS, No. 8, 1996.

This note defines what performance targets are, why they are important, and what information sources and approaches may be used for setting targets.

-----*. Conducting Focus Group Interviews*, TIPS, No. 10, 1996.

This note defines focus group interviews, discusses the method's advantages and limitations, when it is best utilized and for what, and provides a step-by-step guide on how to organize and conduct focus group interviews for high quality results.

-----*. The Role of Evaluation in USAID*, TIPS, No. 11, 1997.

This note addresses questions about the new role of evaluation in USAID. It discusses the changed emphases of evaluation in a results-based context and why this is important. It also outlines the key steps in planning and conducting an evaluation.

-----*. Guidelines for Indicator and Data Quality*, TIPS, No. 12, 1998.

This note describes USAID criteria and procedures for ensuring the quality of indicators and data in performance monitoring systems for managing for results.

-----*. Monitoring the Policy Reform Process*, TIPS, No.14, 2000.

This note discusses the issues and challenges of designing and implementing systems to monitor the policy reform process. Based on best practices of USAID missions in policy reform, the paper outlines the characteristics of

good monitoring system, provides examples of milestone events during policy formation/adoption and policy implementation that constitute the first step towards monitoring and tracking change, and elaborates three methodological approaches for monitoring the policy reform process: quantitative, qualitative and the composite approach, and identifies their strengths and weaknesses.

-----, *Measuring Institutional Capacity*, TIPS, No. 15, 2000.

This paper provides information on measuring institutional capacity, including some tools that measure the capacity of an entire organization as well as others that look at individual components or functions of an organization. The discussion focuses on the internal capacities of individual organizations. It addresses the following issues: different measurement approaches for particular types of capacity building, strengths and limitations of each approach, data collection and how participatory the measurement process should be.

World Bank Institute, **Training Evaluation Toolkit** (Version 1.3)

This toolkit, developed by the World Bank Institute Evaluation Unit, is a set of templates and guidelines that enables anyone—with or without prior evaluation knowledge—to conduct a Level 1 training evaluation. The Toolkit can be used to develop questionnaires that elicit participant feedback to training activities, collect the data and tabulate the ratings, <http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/>.

Worthen, Blaine R., James R. Sanders, and Jody Fitzpatrick, **Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines**, 2nd Edition, White Plains, NY: Longman Inc., 1997.

This book serves as a reference guide for practicing evaluators and those professionals who want a comprehensive overview of program evaluation and references to additional information. It covers the following topics:

- Evaluation approaches and models;
- Collection, analysis and use of qualitative and quantitative data;
- Practical guidelines for planning, conducting and using evaluations, including checklists and procedural guides;
- Glossary of evaluation terminology.

Sida, **Ownership in Focus? Discussion paper for a planned evaluation**, *Sida Studies in Evaluation*, 00/5, 2000, <http://www.sida.org/Sida/jsp/Crosslink.jsp?d=520>

This paper examines the concept of ownership and reviews prevailing views about the causes and effects of weak partner country ownership. It concludes with a presentation of a set of issues that should be considered in an evaluation concerned with ownership.

World Bank, **Impact Evaluation**, April 2001, <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/impact/index.htm>

This site is designed to disseminate information and provide resources for people and organizations working to assess and improve the effectiveness of projects and programmes aimed at reducing poverty.

E. Indicators and Measurement

UNDP, **Selecting Key Results Indicators**, http://stone.undp.org/undpweb/co/evalnet/docstore1/index_final/methodology/documents/indicators.PDF

OECD, DAC, **Development indicators**, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/Indicators/>
This site explains the core set of indicators developed by OECD/DAC to monitor development performance and strategies. It provides maps, charts and links to data sources for all indicators in the core set. It offers an integrated worldview of human well-being in its economic, social and environmental aspects.

ELDIS Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Guide: Indicators, <http://nt1.ids.ac.uk/eldis/hot/pm4.htm>

This site offers links and information about a number of works on the participatory development of indicators. Examples of indicators may be found in several of the documents cited.

World Bank, Operations Evaluation Department (OED), **Performance Monitoring Indicators: A handbook for task managers**, 1996, <http://www.worldbank.org/html/oed/evaluation/>

This handbook provides background on the logical framework and typology of indicators; describes how indicators are developed and applied in project design, supervision, and evaluation; and discusses important issues related to the meaningful use of indicators. It also provides examples of performance indicators developed for Bank-financed projects and shows how indicators are developed on the basis of each project's development objectives.

Funnell, Sue C., **“Developing and Using a Program Theory Matrix for Program Evaluation and Performance Monitoring,”** *New Directions for Evaluation*, no. 87, Fall 2000.

This article discusses the essential features of the program theory approach and how its usefulness for monitoring and evaluation can be enhanced: by incorporating information about the context in which the program operates, by defining success criteria and comparisons for judging and interpreting performance information, and by identifying sources of performance information.

Holzer, Mark., National Center for Public Productivity, USA. **“Public Performance Evaluation and Improvement: A review of experience”**, *Evaluation Capacity Development in Asia*, UNDP, 2000, http://intra.undp.org/co/documents/evaluation_cap_dev_china.pdf

F. Partnerships

Institute for Development Research, <http://www.jsi.com/idr>

The Institute for Development Research (IDR) is dedicated to promoting the participation of underrepresented and impoverished groups in social,

political and economic development. In the area of inter-sectoral partnering, IDR helps to identify strategies and increase the capacities of civil society representatives to work with leaders from the business and government sectors to develop effective policies.

Knowledge Resource Group, <http://www.civicus.org/krg/html>

The KRG objective is to collect, analyze, link and disseminate the lessons learned about partnerships involving business, government and civil society. The KRG draws from the existing base of knowledge on partnership building as well as experience in developing tools and programmes that can hasten the learning process and can increase the sustainability of the partnerships because lessons are being learned and applied.

Partnerships for Poverty Reduction, http://www.worldbank.org/ppr/english/ppr_eng.html

This site is sponsored by the Inter-American Foundation, UNDP and the World Bank. The site presents the accumulated knowledge of a group of researchers and practitioners on the effect of partnerships on poverty reduction in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Strengthen Partnerships and Improve Aid Effectiveness, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/hm/devpart.htm>

This site provides monitoring and periodic progress reports to reflect strong strategic collaboration with other multilateral institutions. The site has links to information on strengthening partnerships and improving aid effectiveness.

USAID, **Partnering for Results: Assessing the Impact of Inter-Sectoral Partnering**, 1999, <http://www.info.usaid.gov/pubs/isp/>

This guide covers the selection of indicators, tracking of progress and documentation of results of inter-sectoral partnering among government, business and civil society actors. It also discusses some of the challenges specific to assessing inter-sectoral partnerships. Finally, it proposes a framework to use when selecting indicators to measure the impact of inter-sectoral partnerships and discusses existing indicators that fit within this framework. The guide is intended to be flexible, allowing users to choose from a menu of indicators to ensure that indicators selected meet the unique needs of a specific partnership.

USAID, **New Partnerships Initiative (NPI): Resource Guide**, <http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/npi/npiresrc.htm>

NPI is an integrated approach to sustainable development that uses strategic partnering and the active engagement of civil society, the business community and institutions of democratic local governance to bolster the ability of local communities to play a lead role in their own development. The NPI Resource Guide brings together the results of pilot tests in 15 USAID missions and provides a number of programming tools to assist with the incorporation of NPI into USAID mission portfolios.

USAID, **Participatory Development**, http://www.usaid.gov/about/part_devel/docs.html

This website contains all of the documents produced through USAID's Participation Initiative. The site also provides information about the Global

Participation Network (GP-NET), a listserv that provides an opportunity for development practitioners around the world to exchange information, share ideas and discuss issues related to participatory development. The page also provides links to other sites dealing with participatory development.

World Bank Partnerships, <http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/prt-global.htm>

This page has synopses and contact information for four World Bank partnerships, including Business Partners for Development (BPD). BPD is an informal global network of businesses, civil society organizations and relevant government ministries. BPD aims to produce solid evidence of the positive impact of tri-sector partnerships by taking the example of a number of focus projects involving business, government, and civil society organizations and providing inputs to them. The BPD Network objective is to demonstrate that these partnerships provide win-win benefits to all three parties, can be much more widely used throughout the world, and can be scaled up to national and regional levels.

G. Learning and Knowledge Management

UNDP Central Evaluation Database (CEDAB), <http://www.undp.org/eo/database/cedab/cedab.html>

CEDAB is a corporate institutional memory database containing information about more than 1,500 UNDP project and programme evaluations.

UNDP Evaluation Plan Database (EVP), <http://www.undp.org/eo/database/evp/evp.html>

This database enables UNDP country offices and other corporate units to prepare their respective evaluation plans on-line and make them accessible to each other.

Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Database, <http://minweb.idrc.ca/cida/dacloge.htm>

This website contains a list of evaluation abstracts that various international development organizations have made available to the general public.

Department for International Development (DFID), **Project Evaluation**, http://www.dfid.gov.uk/public/what/project_frame.html

This site provides access to on-line versions of all DFID evaluation summaries and ordering information for full evaluation reports.

International Labour Organization (ILO), **PROGEVAL**, <http://ilis.ilo.org/ilis/progeval/ilintrpr.html>

PROGEVAL contains bibliographical references and summaries of evaluation reports on technical cooperation programmes and projects executed by the ILO and other international organizations. It also provides references to evaluation guidelines and other methodological publications on evaluation.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), **Lessons through Evaluation**, http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/public_html/eksyst/doc/lle/index.htm

This site lists the lessons learned through the evaluations conducted by IFAD. The lessons learned are listed by themes and by regions.

United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), **Evaluation Index**, <http://www.uncdf.org/projects/eval/es-index.html>

This site lists CDF project evaluations, providing lessons for future project design.

Bellanet International Secretariat, **Knowledge Management—Implications and Applications for Development Organizations**, <http://www.bellanet.org/>

Based on a workshop, this report clarifies, explores and positions knowledge management within the cultures and practices of the international development community. It discusses five themes: understanding knowledge, defining the knowledge business and strategic purpose, managing the knowledge structure and process, building a knowledge culture and momentum, and fostering knowledge management networks.

Institute of Development Studies, **Efela: evaluation feedback for effective learning and accountability: synthesis report**, July 2000. <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/>

This report summarizes the results of a survey capturing OECD member policies, practices, thinking and approaches to evaluation feedback. It discusses the issues and dilemmas that agencies face when seeking to improve their evaluation feedback practices, and highlights areas where new thinking is emerging and new possibilities are opening up for improving evaluation feedback practices and linking EFELA with other objectives and initiatives in the development policy arena. The report draws out some of the main areas of thinking and learning and points to where good practice is beginning to emerge.

Morten T. Hansen, Nitin Nohria, and Thomas Tierney, **“What’s Your Strategy for Managing Knowledge?”** *Harvard Business Review*, March-April 1999.

This article examines the knowledge management practices of companies in several industries, with a particular focus on management consulting firms. It delineates two strategies: the codification strategy and personalization strategy and how to go about choosing the right strategy for one’s industry. The authors argue that emphasizing the wrong approach, depending on the nature of an organization’s business—or trying to pursue both at the same time—can undermine one’s business.

H. Evaluation Capacity Development

UNDP, **Evaluation Capacity Development in Asia**, 2000., http://intra.undp.org/co/documents/evaluation_cap_dev_china.pdf

This report contains the proceedings and discussions of the Beijing Conference on Evaluation and Capacity Development held 27-28 October 1999. The Conference had four objectives: (a) to stimulate reflection on the role of evaluation in good governance and public sector reform; (b) to explore the interface between results-based management (RBM) and monitoring and evaluation, in connection with good governance; (c) to identify strategies and resources for building monitoring and evaluation supply and demand in Asian countries; and (d) to encourage and support the creation of country and regional networks to facilitate follow-up actions.

World Bank/OED, **Sub-Saharan Africa: Lessons from Experience in Supporting Sound Governance**, ECD Working Paper Series, no.7, 2000, <http://www.worldbank.org/evaluation/me>
The paper provides a basis for identifying common issues and operational synergies between monitoring and evaluation capacity development (M&ECD) and governance in Sub-Saharan Africa, and establishing linkages between governance support and M&ECD.

World Bank/OED, **Evaluation Capacity Development: A Diagnostic Guide and Action Framework**, ECD Working Paper Series, no.6, 1999, <http://www.worldbank.org/evaluation/me>
The guide is intended to assist those governments and development agencies that are developing a national or sectoral evaluation system. It is organized into nine separate but related steps to assist in the identification of ECD options and the development of an ECD action plan. It provides a detailed checklist of issues to be considered in developing a country's evaluation capacity.

I. Conflict and Crisis Intervention

OECD/DAC, **Guidance for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies**, 1999.
This publication provides guidance for those involved in the commissioning, design and management of evaluations of humanitarian assistance programmes. It defines and describes the characteristics of complex emergencies and explains the difference between evaluation of humanitarian assistance programmes and evaluation of conventional aid programmes. It provides guidance for evaluation managers on how to plan, conduct and manage the evaluation.

Overseas Development Institute, **Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance Programmes in Complex Emergencies**, 1998.
The study seeks to improve the consistency and quality of evaluation methodologies, enhance the accountability function of evaluation, contribute to institutionalizing the lessons learned, and identify better methods for monitoring the performance of humanitarian aid operations. It discusses key considerations of evaluations in a humanitarian context, measures to enhance the effectiveness of the evaluation process and how to establish basic parameters for the evaluation. It contains guidelines for planning, conducting and managing evaluations in conflict situations, including preparing a terms of reference, team composition, sources of information and information gathering techniques and methods of working.

UNHCR, **Enhancement of the Evaluation Function in UNHCR**, 1998, <http://www.unhcr.ch/evaluate/reports>
The review assesses the role of the evaluation function in UNHCR Section I presents a situational analysis. Section II discusses key steps in enhancing evaluation by establishing an enabling structure and suggesting improvements to the evaluation cycle.

UNHCR, **Planning and Organising Useful Evaluations**, 1998, <http://www.unhcr.ch/evaluate/reports>

These guidelines are intended to assist UNHCR field and headquarters staff in evaluating and analyzing the broad range of operational activities undertaken by UNHCR. The guidelines provide an elementary understanding of the function; a description of the different approaches; and how to plan, implement and follow up on evaluations.

J. Poverty

World Bank, **Evaluating the Impact of Projects on Poverty: A Handbook**, 2000, <http://www.worldbank.org/evaluation/toolkits/>

This handbook provides project managers and policy analysts with the tools needed for evaluating impact at the project level. It is aimed at readers with a general knowledge of statistics. The Handbook comprises four chapters and a series of case studies designed to cover a broad mix of country settings, project types and evaluation methodologies.

World Bank, **Monitoring and Evaluation for Poverty Reduction Strategies**, 2000, <http://www.worldbank.org/evaluation/toolkits/>

The Poverty Reduction Strategy Sourcebook is an evolving document aimed at assisting countries in the development and strengthening of poverty reduction strategies. The purpose of the Monitoring and Evaluation chapter is to provide guidance on developing outcome monitoring systems and impact evaluation strategies. In addition, it discusses how to use monitoring and evaluation results to create a feedback process; how to promote participation in monitoring and evaluation activities; and how to build institutional capacity for outcome monitoring and impact evaluation.

K. Gender

World Bank, **“Evaluating Gender and Development at the World Bank,”** OED Precis No. 200, 2000, <http://www.worldbank.org/evaluation/lessons/>

This note summarizes and highlights the views of participants attending a World Bank workshop on gender and evaluation. It discusses issues relevant to the proposed evaluation of the gender dimensions of Bank assistance and the complexity of gender issues and the variety of views on effective approaches to addressing them.

UNDP/Gender in Development, **Guidance Note on Gender Mainstreaming**, <http://www/UNDP.org/gender/policies/guidance.html#appendix1>

This note calls for the mainstreaming of gender equality objectives throughout the programming cycle. It highlights the key issues and delineates the role of staff from senior management to resident representatives to gender focal points. It provides guidance on how to integrate gender concerns into the programming cycle and how gender mainstreaming can be an effective tool for expanded public relations.

UNDP/BDP, **Tracking Gender Mainstreaming in MDGD Activities**, 1998, <http://magnet.UNDP.org/Docs/Gender/Testgnded.htm>

This note reviews the status of gender mainstreaming in MDGD's programmes and activities, briefly examines the relationship of gender and good governance, and identifies ways and proposes tools to strengthen gender mainstreaming throughout the programme cycle.

L. Democracy and Governance

Department for International Development (DFID), **Strategies for Achieving the International Development Targets: Making Government Work for Poor People**, June 2000, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk>

An internal document to the United Kingdom's Department for International Development, this paper presents a strategy for making government work for poor people. The paper looks at the capabilities needed for pro-poor government and at the concerns of poor people regarding their treatment by the institutions of government. It identifies and promotes seven key government capabilities that governments need to develop, in partnership with the private sector and civil society, in order to meet the International Development Targets.

OECD, **Public Management and Governance**, <http://www.oecd.org/puma>

This site is divided into six key areas related to governance in OECD countries: budgeting in the public sector, engaging citizens, ethics and corruption, human resource management, regulatory reform, strategic policymaking. For each area, key issues are outlined and documents and additional links are provided. It contains public sector statistics and information on public management initiatives for each member country.

Sida, **The Evaluability of Democracy and Human Rights Projects**, 1997, <http://www.sida.org/Sida/jsp/Crosslink.jsp?d=520>

This evaluability assessment examines Sida's support for democracy and human rights based on 28 projects in four countries: El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua and South Africa. This study focuses on the evolution of Sida's approach, general issues concerned with evaluation of these projects, the context of democracy and human rights in the countries under study, and the methodology and activities associated with the evaluation. The study contains lessons on useful methods for democracy and human rights impact evaluation and good practices for the planning and implementation of such projects.

UNDP, **Evaluation of the Governance Programme for Latin America and the Caribbean**, 1998, <http://intra.UNDP.org/eo/publications/publixations.html>

This thematic evaluation was carried out in 1997-1998 and covered the activities of UNDP in the area of governance in the region during this time. The ultimate purpose of the evaluation was to draw out main lessons learned and provide recommendations to improve the activities of cooperation in the field of governance and to encourage their application in other sets of circumstances.

Kaufmann, Kraay and Zoido-Lobaton, “**Governance Matters: From Measurement to Action,**” *Finance & Development* (IMF) June 2000, Volume 37, Number 2.

M. Other References

UNDP, Simplification Task Force, **Simplification Report to the Executive Team,** <http://intra.undp.org/eo>

UNDP, Evaluation Office, **Impact Assessment of UNDP Country Interventions, Methodology for CLIA Phase I** (version 2.1), <http://intra.undp.org/eo/methodology/methodology.html>

UNDP, Alex Rusita, Evalnet, **End of mission report,** 2001.

UNDP, Netnarumon Sirimonthon, Evalnet, **Tripartite meetings,** <http://intra.undp.org/eo>

UNDP, Siv Tokle, **PowerPoint Presentation to the Associate Administrator,** 2000.

UNDP, Siv Tokle, **IAWG Presentation on RBM and M&E,** Geneva, 2001.

UNDP, Uzbekistan, **New Approach to Monitoring in Uzbekistan,** RBEC best practice newsletter no.4, Nov-Dec 2000, <http://intra.undp.org/rbec>

UNFPA, Linda Sherry-Cloonan, **IAWG Presentation on RBM and M&E,** Geneva, 2001.

World Food Programme, **Strategy for 2002-2005,** WFP/EB.A/2001/5-B/1.

World Food Programme, **Notes on the development of RBM in WFP,** 18 July 2001.

World Bank, **Aid and Reform in Africa,** A World Bank Study, December 1999.

Monitoring and Evaluation Tools

The major tools for results-oriented monitoring and evaluation are presented in the following annexes. These tools complement Chapters 4 and 5 on the monitoring and evaluation processes. Four specific tools are featured here: examples of an evaluation and tracking plan, a sample TOR for an evaluation, a format for annual project reports (APR) and a format for a field visit report. The Handbook concludes with a comprehensive table depicting how Project Managers, Programme Managers and senior management might use the flexible menu of monitoring tools in a medium to large country office.

- Annex A. Evaluation and Tracking Plan**
- Annex B. Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR)**
- Annex C. Annual Project Report (APR)**
- Annex D. Field Visit Report**
- Annex E. Menu of Monitoring Tools**

The forms are annotated to indicate where and how they can be adapted to fit different purposes. The annexes should help users to flexibly apply tools and formats that focus on results and progress towards outcomes.

These annexes are available electronically on the UNDP Evaluation Office website: <http://www.undp.org/eo>. In future, some or all of these tools also may be available through an integrated computer system.

Annex A: Evaluation and Tracking Plan

PURPOSE

The objectives of the evaluation and tracking plan are to:

UNDP Headquarters will also use these plans to assess compliance with evaluations, based on evaluations that a CO commits to undertake in a Country Programme cycle.

- Provide COs and other units with a planning tool for conducting evaluations;
- Record and analyze lessons learned and findings from evaluations;
- Help monitor the progress of evaluation recommendations.

PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION

Country offices prepare their evaluation plan at the beginning of each programming cycle, and submit it electronically (or in hard copy) to the UNDP Evaluation Office.²⁰ This involves strategic and selective decisions by the management with programme staff on what to evaluate when. Subsequently, the CO uses the plan to ensure that evaluation planning activities are on track.

Once evaluations are conducted, the CO enters, sends or uploads the full report to the EO (and into the system once ready). The EO is responsible for monitoring evaluation compliance and systematically analyzing information generated to promote learning. The CO also enters excerpts including recommendations into the table. This serves as the basis for follow-up and research on evaluation findings, lessons and recommendations. The CO tracks the implementation of evaluation recommendations by recording the decisions regarding evaluation recommendations and the follow-up actions taken for their implementation.

TIMING

The country office submits the evaluation plan to the EO within the first quarter of each Country Programme (CP) cycle. Subsequently, it can be kept up-to-date continuously, annually or periodically depending on local needs. For example, if the first evaluation is planned around an outcome three years into the CP, the CO may not need to revisit planning until the year prior to the evaluation.

FLEXIBILITY

Country offices without mandatory evaluations are not required to develop an evaluation plan. Project evaluations are voluntary and recorded in the plan when agreed to at country level. Country offices may add elements that describe planning for all of their monitoring and evaluation activities, should they wish.

²⁰ Previously, the Evaluation Plan was prepared electronically and made available on EO's intranet website. In future, the plan will interface with the corporate RBMS. In the meantime, COs develop the plan on Word. Future electronic facilities are indicated in the template below.

EVALUATION AND TRACKING PLAN

[Programme Period (eg, 2002–2006)] [country name]

Sample – filled out

EVALUATION	ASSOCIATED PROJECTS OR OUTCOME	GOAL SUB-GOAL	EVALUATION TIMING	PROGRAMME BUDGET	EVALUATION STATUS AND COMMENTS
OUTCOME EVALUATIONS					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased Representativeness of Parliament Effective regulatory, legal and policy framework for decentralization 	<p>CTY/00/004 – Electoral support</p> <p>CTY/01/892 – National Governance Programme</p> <p>CTY/95021 – Local governance</p> <p>CTY/95/008 – Participatory district development</p> <p>CTY/97/005- Mainstreaming gender</p>	<p>G1-SG2</p> <p>G1-SG3</p>	<p>2004 1st quarter</p> <p>[In future, drop down menu.]</p>	<p>For outcome: \$ 4.5 M</p> <p>[If attributed]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>For respective projects:</p> <p>7.9 M</p> <p>12 M</p> <p>2.1 M</p>	<p>[Comments, if any, COs may enter postponements or clarifications on evaluation schedules here.]</p> <p>Options:</p> <p>Done [i.e., sent to EO]</p> <p>Pending</p> <p>Re-scheduled</p> <p>[In future, the status will change automatically when the evaluation report is submitted in the database.]</p>
PROJECT EVALUATIONS					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CTY/02/932 – Drinking water in Rural Areas CTY/00/001 – Civil aviation 	<p>Outcome: The national policy framework reformed to achieve universal access to basic services.</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>G2-SG2</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>2005</p> <p>[If quarterly timing not yet decided, indicate year only.]</p>	<p>\$ 2.1 M</p> <p>[In future, project title and budget will pop up when number is entered.]</p>	<p>Re-scheduled to 2nd quarter of 2006 due to coordination with evaluation of UN partners in same area.</p>
OTHER EVALUATIONS					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National execution CP portfolio evaluation Joint evaluation <p>[Any other evaluation that cut across projects/ outcome e.g., CP evaluation, evaluation of civil society involvement.]</p>	<p>All NEX projects</p> <p>All projects and outcomes</p>	<p>All</p> <p>All</p>	<p>2002 2nd quarter</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>[No budget associated with thematic evaluations.]</p>	<p>Pending as recommended in last Annual Review.</p>

TRACKING EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS 2001-2003

GOAL: Creation of an enabling environment for SHD (G1) [In future, drop down menu.]		SUB-GOAL: Increased social cohesion based on participatory local governance and stronger local communities and institutions (SG3)		KEY PARTNERS:	
RECOMMENDATIONS	MANAGEMENT DECISIONS	PLANNED ACTION	DEADLINE/RESPONSIBLE	STATUS/COMMENTS	
EVALUATION OF OUTCOME: Effective regulatory, legal and policy framework for decentralization [If project evaluation, put number and title, e.g., CTY/02/932 - Drinking water in Rural Areas. If other, put subject/title of evaluation.]					
1. To achieve outcome, include the development of a macro-economic framework, which recognizes the role of the community in decision-making and links development with sustainability and growth with equity (date).	Agree (date) Options: Agree Disagree Partially Agree [In future, drop down menu.]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ External assistance focus support on greater integration of planning committees and the budget processes. ■ Assess inter-departmental committees in terms of their capacities and relevance to decentralized planning, including integration of dynamic development issues such as mining and land-owners who provide substantial resources to provinces, etc. 	By Dec 2003/ Government with RC Jan 2002/Dept of Budget with CTA	Partially achieved, because.... (date) Achieved (date)	
2. To restrict support activities to 20 districts, but include as an output the preparation of a project to support participatory planning and information capability in all 75 districts (date).	Partially agree (date) [Management decisions are made by CO Management in consultation with partners.]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ One Planning Advisor to serve each two districts supported by field-based senior staff. ■ Develop criteria for roll-out in new districts based on successful experience pilot districts. 	March 2002/ Ministry Dept. Immediate/CTA	Postponed to August Achieved (date) Not realistic within time-frame to achieve rollout in 75 districts (date).	
3. Decision on the need for CTA has to be taken by the BSNL Committee Secretariat (date).	Disagree - the selection process will not be transparent (date). [Add text where useful; can include response of government or other counterparts if different]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ UNDP to appoint CTA. [Also possible to put No Action, but normally an alternative action is proposed if management disagrees with recommendation.]	New project approvals 2001-2003/ continuous UNDP	Achieved (date)	
4. Completion of the decentralized planning manual taking account of the work already undertaken at the provincial level	Agree (date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Establish working group with select planners from provinces where progress is made. ■ Working group to identify key elements of the project cycle, the planning system and the budget cycle. 	March 2002 October 2001	Achieved (date) Delayed (date)	
5. Continued ...					

Annex B: Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR)

The sample terms of reference below is designed for adaptation and use in BOTH project and outcome evaluations. Special content for outcome evaluations is noted.

1. INTRODUCTION

A brief description of the context of the programme country, including its development needs and priorities. It also places the outcome, programme, project, group of projects and other elements to be evaluated within this context, and identifies the key stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries.

For an **outcome evaluation**, the following information should be included:

- Brief description of the outcome (baseline of the outcome and current situation of the outcome);
- Rationale for UNDP's involvement in the outcome and why it is now being evaluated;
- Brief description of UNDP's main outputs and initiatives expected to have contributed to the outcome;
- Key partners involved in the outcome;
- Highlights of progress towards or achievement of outcome.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

Brief description of how the need for the evaluation was identified, as well as the main stakeholders of the evaluation and a description of why the evaluation is being undertaken and why it is being undertaken now.

3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Describes what to focus on (and implicitly what **not** to address).

For a **project evaluation**, the scope would be expected to include:

- Geographic coverage of the project;
- Timeframe of the project to be covered by the evaluation;
- Issues pertaining to the relevance, performance and success of the project(s) covered by the evaluation.

For an **outcome evaluation**, the same areas should be included, tailored to outcomes. The scope would also be expected to include at least lessons learned, findings and recommendations in the following areas:

- Whether the **outcome** has been achieved and, if it has not, whether there has been progress made towards its achievement;
- An analysis of the underlying **factors** beyond UNDP's control that influence the outcome (including the opportunities and threats affecting the achievement of the outcome);
- Whether UNDP's outputs and other interventions can be credibly linked to achievement of the outcome, including the key **outputs**, programmes, projects and assistance soft and hard that contributed to the outcome;
- Whether UNDP's **partnership strategy** has been appropriate and effective.

4. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

A description of the products that the evaluation manager wants to obtain, e.g., an evaluation report with findings, recommendations, lessons learned, rating on performance. This also includes an “action item” list or a description of best practices in a certain area or in the appropriate niche for UNDP interventions in a specific programme country.

For an **outcome evaluation**, the product might be a report that includes:

- Strategies for continuing or concluding UNDP assistance towards the outcome;
- Recommendations for formulating future assistance in the outcome if warranted;
- Lessons learned concerning best and worst practices in producing outputs, linking them to outcomes and using partnerships strategically;
- A rating on progress towards outcomes and progress towards outputs;
- A rating on the relevance of the outcome.

5. METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

Suggesting key elements of the methodology to be used by the evaluation team.

For **project or outcome evaluations**, this section may include information about:

- Documentation review (desk study);
- Interviews;
- Field visits;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the gathering and analysis of data;
- Participation of stakeholders and/or partners.

For an **outcome evaluation**, it is recommended that an additional brief description be included on outcome evaluation methodology, particularly its focus on development change and the role of partners.

6. EVALUATION TEAM

Details the number of evaluators and their areas of expertise, as well as their respective responsibilities. The Team Leader is always responsible for finalizing the report. Evaluators can be internal or external, national or international, individuals or firms. There can be significant advantages to using firms rather than individuals for evaluations. The table below details some of the advantages (and disadvantages) of each approach. (See following table.)

7. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

Details on the following implementation arrangements:

- Management arrangements, specifically the role of the UNDP country office and partners.
- A timeframe for the evaluation process, including the time breakdown for the following activities:

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF HIRING EVALUATION FIRMS VERSUS INDIVIDUAL EVALUATORS

	FIRMS	INDIVIDUALS
Advantages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fees are agreed upon as a package that is unlikely to vary, unless there is a change in the TOR. 2. Members of the team are used to working together. 3. The firm assures the quality of the products. 4. A multidisciplinary approach is guaranteed. 5. Hiring procedures, although longer than for an individual, are usually easier. 6. A firm develops the methodology/ proposal for the evaluation. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Individuals may be highly qualified, with very specialized expertise and many years of experience. 2. The diverse backgrounds of the team members contribute to debate and discussion that could enrich the exercise. 3. May be less expensive.
Disadvantages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could be costly. 2. If the firm has been overexposed to the topic or the organization, it could compromise the credibility of the exercise. 3. Team members tend to have similar approaches/perspectives, thereby losing some of the richness of different positions. 4. Bidding procedures can be lengthy and cumbersome. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of individual consultants is time consuming. 2. Forming a team of professionals that have not worked together could hamper cohesiveness and coherence in the work and increase the risk of conflicts that affect progress. 3. Any change in the schedule turns into an additional cost in fees, per diem and travel arrangements. 4. Logistics have to be provided by the country office.

- Desk review;
- Briefings of evaluators;
- Visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires;
- Debriefings;
- Preparation of report;
- Stakeholder meeting;
- Finalization of report;
- Consultations and follow-up.

- The resources required and logistical support needed. How many consultants and experts are needed and for how long? What kind of travel will be required? What kind of materials will be needed? While funding arrangements for the evaluation are considered at the planning stage, they are not to be reflected in the TOR itself.

For an **outcome evaluation**, the purpose (and timing) of the evaluation will dictate the time required by the various parties working on it. See Table 5 in Chapter 5 for a sample comparison of time and resource requirements for outcome evaluations. The CO staff tasked with managing the outcome evaluation, i.e., the outcome group or Evaluation Focal Team, should use these time estimates as a rule of thumb in budgeting for an outcome evaluation.

Annex C: Annual Project Report (APR)

The format of the APR is FULLY FLEXIBLE. It must, however, cover the essential elements on results, namely progress towards outcome, outputs produced and relevant efforts on partnerships and soft assistance. Each office may add any other element, depending on the project and results.

For project: _____
 [Insert number and short title: CTY/99/002/D/99 – Poverty alleviation]

Period covered: _____
 [Put the period since last APR. Normally the fiscal year, Jan 2001-Dec 2002]

PROJECT PERFORMANCE—CONTRIBUTION TO THE SRF GOALS

[The table below briefly analyzes the contribution of the project during the period of review towards the attainment of an outcome. The Project Manager will concentrate on the “Update on outputs” column, but as the technical expert may also have input or views for the column “Update on outcome”. Any given project contributes to one outcome. If the project or programme is large with several components, it may contribute to more than one outcome. If so, also include these outcomes, or cross-refer outputs to the outcome.]

SRF GOAL: [imported from SRF]	SRF SUB GOAL: [imported from SRF]	STRATEGIC AREA OF SUPPORT: [from SRF]
---	---	--

Outcomes	Update on outcome	Annual Outputs	Update on Outputs	Reasons if progress below target	Update on partnership strategies	Recommendations and proposed action
Outcome [from SRF]	A brief analysis of the status of the situation and any observed change, any project contribution	For SRF outputs, use SRF targets. For other outputs, use project document or workplan.	Achievements of the project in outputs (marking if strategic). Use data from workplan if no SRF targets set.	If applicable. Explores underlying factors and reasons for gaps in output and target.	Brief update on any achievement and/or problem (exception reporting).	Actions on any matter related to outcome, progress of outputs, and/or partnerships. Corrective measures. Responsibilities.



PROJECT PERFORMANCE—IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

[There may be problems that are generic and not related to any specific output, or that apply to all of them. If so, the Project Manager fills out the “top three” such challenges. More can be added if considered indispensable, although when the top problems are solved other issues will normally improve, too. If the issues have been covered through the table above, this section may be left empty.]

List the three main challenges (at most, if any) experienced during implementation and propose a way forward. Note any steps already taken to solve the problems.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

RATING ON PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS

[If the CO has decided to use “rating of progress” as a tool, the Project Manager indicates his/her rating of progress for outputs. Subsequently the Programme Manager indicates agreement (or rates differently) and rates progress towards the outcome. These ratings may be used by the country office and/or Headquarters for the ROAR analysis, as well as for input to evaluations and other purposes for results validation.]

FOR OUTCOMES:

- Positive change (determined by evidence of movement from the baseline towards the end-SRF target measured by an outcome indicator)**
- Negative change (reversal to a level below the baseline measured by an outcome indicator)**
- Unchanged**

FOR OUTPUTS: Applied to each output target

[This is for the strategic outputs only. If the parties want rating of all outputs, the ones not in the SRF would be based on the project document, work plans or any other agreement on expected results.]

- No (not achieved)**
- Partial (only if two-thirds or more of a quantitative target is achieved)**
- Yes (achieved)**

SOFT ASSISTANCE NOT PROVIDED THROUGH PROJECTS OR PROGRAMMES

[Soft assistance contributes to the outcome and/or outputs. This section asks the Project Manager to provide information about any activities conducted that were not envisaged in the work plan or have yet to produce concrete results. It aims to identify additional or specific activities that are required to ensure progress towards the outcome. This section of the APR could contribute to the reporting section in the ROAR regarding narrative on “advocacy and policy dialogue”. It allows the country office and the project to work in the same direction in advocacy and dialogue. If soft assistance is not an issue for the project or too sensitive to address, this section may be left empty.]

What are the key activities (if any) of soft assistance undertaken by the project?

What are the main constraints in progress towards outcome that require additional soft assistance?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Please propose elements for soft assistance strategy for the next year: _____

LESSONS LEARNED

[The lessons learned from the APR should serve as input to the performance analysis of the ROAR as well as the annual review, which allows the partners to compile and exchange lessons learned from all projects and APRs.]

Describe briefly key lessons learned during the year:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Prepared by: _____ **(Project management, name and title)**

[Note: Since reporting should as much as possible be electronic for efficiency, signature is not required. The Project Director can transmit it in an Email, through a website or through a computer programme.]

Annex D: Field Visit Report

The content of the field visit report varies depending on the purpose of the visit. At a minimum, any field visit report must contain an analysis of the progress towards results, the production of outputs, partnerships, key challenges and proposed actions. Additional information may be provided if necessary and requested by the country office management or the project steering committee (PSC). THE FORMAT FOR THE REPORT BELOW MAY BE CHANGED AT THE COUNTRY OFFICE LEVEL TO SUIT LOCAL NEEDS.

Date of visit: _____

Subject and venue of visit: _____
 [Project number(s) and title(s), venue visited]

Purpose of the field visit: [Check those that apply, or write your own.]

- Review of progress towards results
- Support decision-making
- Problem-solving
- Beneficiary satisfaction and feedback
- Learning
- Accountability
- Other (specify) _____

[Same table as for the APR for consistency.]

SRF GOAL: [imported from SRF]		SRF SUB GOAL: [imported from SRF]		STRATEGIC AREA OF SUPPORT: [from SRF]		
Outcomes	Update on outcome	Annual Outputs	Update on Outputs	Reasons if progress below target	Update on partnership strategies	Recommendations and proposed action
Outcome #1 [from SRF]	A brief analysis of the status of the situation and any observed change, any project contribution	For SRF outputs, use SRF targets. For other outputs, use project document or workplan.	Achievements of the project in outputs (marking if strategic). Use data from work-plan if no SRF targets set.	If applicable.	Brief update on any achievement and/or problem (exception reporting).	Actions on any matter related to outcome, progress of outputs, and/or partnerships. Corrective measures. Responsibilities/time.
Outcome #2	If the project contributes to more than one outcome.					

PROJECT PERFORMANCE—IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

[If the person conducting the field visit observes problems that are generic and not related to any specific output, or that apply to all of them, he/she should address the “top three” such challenges.]

List the three main challenges (at most, if any) experienced during implementation and propose a way forward.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

RATING ON PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS

[If the country office has decided to use ratings in the APR, it is useful to include a similar section here for validation. The UNDP Programme Manager, or other person conducting the visit, indicates his/her rating of progress. This can be used by the country office and/or Headquarters for the ROAR analysis, by the Steering committee for analysis and action as well as for input to evaluations.]

FOR OUTCOMES:

- Positive change (determined by evidence of movement from the baseline towards the end-SRF target measured by an outcome indicator)**
- Negative change (reversal to a level below the baseline measured by an outcome indicator)**
- Unchanged**

FOR OUTPUTS: Applied to each output target

[This is for the strategic outputs only. If the parties want rating of all outputs, the ones not in the SRF would be based on the project document, work plans or any other agreement on expected results.]

- No (not achieved)**
- Partial (only if two-thirds or more of a quantitative target is achieved)**
- Yes (achieved)**

LESSONS LEARNED

[If, during the visit, lessons learned emerge in the discussions with project management and/or beneficiaries, or the Programme Manager observes lessons directly, this section may be filled out.]

Describe briefly key lessons learned during the project:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Participants in the field visit: [Only fill this out if the visit was joint and/or accompanied by someone.]

Prepared by: _____ **(Name, title and organization)**

[Note: Signature is not required since reporting should as much as possible be electronic for efficiency. The Programme Manager may transmit it in an Email, through a website or through a computer programme.]

ANNEXES

- **List of persons met** [Optional]
- **Other annexes**

Annex E: Menu of Monitoring Tools

The table below depicts how the three main groups concerned with UNDP’s assistance—Project Managers, Programme Managers and senior management—might use the flexible menu of monitoring tools in a medium to large country office. Shading indicates that a tool is particularly important for that level. Individual country office structures and duties or course may not fall into these hard and fast distinctions.

MAIN RESPONSIBILITIES AND USES OF DIFFERENT MONITORING TOOLS				
	MONITORING TOOL/ MECHANISM	PROJECT MANAGER	UNDP PROGRAMME MANAGER	UNDP CO SENIOR MANAGERS
↑ Increasing higher levels of results ↓	Consolidated Delivery Report (CDR), Project Delivery Report (PDR)	Prepare and use the PDRs for budgeting and estimated expenditures.	Analyze in terms of spending against Budget Line and work plan. Process budget revisions if needed.	Not used, except when key problems of under delivery or overspending.
	Project Work Plans	Prepare and use work plan for activities for results. Share it with project staff, CO and steering mechanism (if any). Use it to implement and review strategy for project, and to plan for resource use.	Participate in setting benchmarks in work plan. Review it to agree on key results and ensure that results contribute to SRF. May also use it to discuss activities and corresponding inputs, budget. Use critical milestones to monitor early warning for progress off target.	Not used. May be informed by PM of major events that need management knowledge or support.
	Progress and/or Quarterly reports	Prepare as agreed in project documents or with UNDP. Share it with project staff, CO and steering mechanism (if any). Use it to present progress and problems.	Analyze the reports in terms of results achieved and progress. Take action. Share with outcome partners if relevant. May use it to assess work plan progress and new requests for funds.	Not used (unless major problems emerge on which the PM alerts the management).
	Focus group meetings	May organize with project beneficiaries periodically. Ideally planned in project document. Use it to adapt strategy. Share results.	Use results to analyze and review strategy. Identify lessons learned. May also use with key partners to get feedback on outcome, normally by contract M&E experts to conduct the meeting.	Not used. Only alerted by PM if policy issues or dissatisfaction emerge.
	Bilateral/ Tripartite meetings	May initiate. Use to solve problems and discuss strategy.	May initiate. Use to provide feedback, solve problems and discuss strategy.	Will normally take part only when policy issues or decision-making involved, and/or when the Government counterpart takes part.
	Substantive project documentation	Prepare as part of work plan. Use to share achievements and/or new thinking. May also be used for policy dialogue.	Analyze in terms of content, quality, action needed. Review conformity with work plan if major result. Identify policy issues. Use to monitor outcome where relevant.	Not used. Would normally receive major reports only within key subjects, and/or be alerted to issues by PM.

Increasing higher levels of results

MONITORING TOOL/ MECHANISM	PROJECT MANAGER	UNDP PROGRAMME MANAGER	UNDP CO SENIOR MANAGERS
Annual Project report (APR)	Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) or Director prepares it. Shares it with project staff, CO and steering mechanism (if any). Rates output progress.	Provide instructions to project on what additional issues to include. Analyze in terms of content, quality, action needed. Rate output/ outcome progress and review self-assessment by project of outputs. Share it with knowledge networks.	Make decisions on policy issues or follow-up if PM reports key problems. May look at APRs for major programmes. Look at trends.
Project evaluation	May request (normally planned in project document). May be asked to help organize the evaluation. Provide support and information. Take action.	May initiate. May organize the evaluation on behalf of government. Share lessons learned. Track action.	May take decision that project evaluation is needed. Take policy decisions with partners on recommendations, and develop management response.
Field visits	Provide support and information to visiting mission. Will visit implementation operations on the ground.	Normally visiting each outcome or programme/project contributing to SRF at least once a year. Can be undertaken by PM, policy advisor, a team from CO with/without partners. Verify results, recommend actions.	The resident representative and CO management are also encouraged to undertake select field visits. Make decisions on policy issues or follow-up if PM reports key problems.
Spot-check visits	Normally not used, though may conduct spot-checks for contractors. Ensure systems in place for CO spot-checks.	Most useful for monitoring administrative and management accountability. By Programme Support Unit (PSU), Programme manager or Administrative staff. Verify accountability, make recommendations, identify bottlenecks, rate progress.	Take decisions only if key problems are reported, and follow-up on trends if general accountability problems emerge.
Client surveys	May organize for feedback from beneficiaries on project performance and/or needs.	May commission client surveys to obtain feedback on outcome progress. Use for validation of results/indicators, corrective action.	Take action according to findings of surveys, i.e., advocacy and/or corrective action to outcome strategy.
External assessments/ monitoring	Not used.	May commission external expertise for independent technical validation of project results, outcome situation analysis or research.	Decide on strategic use of external expertise. Use the findings reported for feedback to partners on outcomes.
Outcome evaluation	Provide information and support to evaluation. Follow up if progress towards outcome is weak.	Main organizer with CO team and partners. Provide input on what outcome to select. Contract evaluation team. Lead development of TOR. Ensure participation/ consultation.	Make strategic decisions on what outcomes to evaluate with partners. Share evaluation report with key partners. Lead management response. Follow-up/action. Monitor implementation of recommendations.

	MONITORING TOOL/ MECHANISM	PROJECT MANAGER	UNDP PROGRAMME MANAGER	UNDP CO SENIOR MANAGERS
Increasing higher levels of results ↓	Steering committees/ mechanisms	Share APR/other documents. Normally organizes meetings. Take action on decisions and adapts strategy.	Work with the project to ensure planning, results focus and follow-up. Share RBM approaches. Monitor follow-up. [For steering committees for outcome, see outcome group].	May lead the meetings. May be informed by PM only on key policy issues or problems emerge.
	Stakeholder meeting/ workshop	Normally responsible for organizing it, according to work plan. Use to adapt strategy based on feedback from beneficiaries.	Encourage stakeholder meetings around outcome and/or project when useful. Ensure follow-up to plan of action from workshop. Use to assess outcome achievements by views from beneficiaries. Help to reorient direction for outcome progress.	Follow-up on policy issues. Advocacy for change if emerges from workshop. Use to build consensus around priorities. Use as input to annual review and evaluations.
	Outcome group	Participate. Provide information on results/activities for project related to outputs and outcome. Change approach based on feedback from group.	Organize and participate, may lead the group. Assess status of strategic outputs/ outcomes, ensure implementation on outcome monitoring. Develop/share lessons. Define strategic approach towards outcome. Input to outcome evaluation.	May lead the group particularly when external partners take part. Use inputs from outcome groups for input to annual review. Take action on policy issues emerging.
	Annual Review	Provide the APRs as a tool for discussion. May take part depending on subject detail being discussed. Adapt strategy based on review.	Provide highlights of reporting, evaluation and learning based on APR trends/key issues. Record conclusions and ensures follow-up for each outcome. Take part in review meetings. Help prepare the ROAR.	Ensure leadership and consultation. Use for building a consensus and a mutual understanding with partners around outcomes and performance. Use as input to UNCT assessment of progress on UNDAF/goals. Lead CO workplanning for next year. Monitor implementation of key decisions.
	Donor coordination groups	Rarely used.	May take part. Ensure feedback to projects.	Lead/participate in Agency head-level groups. Ensure results focus. Feed into ROAR.
	CCA/UNDAF review	Rarely used. May provide information on thematic or technical issues.	May take part. Apply lessons learned to programming. Ensure feedback to projects.	Lead/participate in Agency head-level groups. Ensure results focus.
	Thematic evaluations/ impact evaluations	Rarely used.	May be consulted for information. Apply lessons learned to programming.	Decide on conduct and use of such evaluations. Lead follow-up and learning. Feed into ROAR.
	ROAR	Will provide information through the APR. May receive it for feedback.	Prepares it in a team, based on APRs and annual review. Provides feedback to projects.	Use as management tool. Liaise with Headquarters. Share with key partners.



UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

© Evaluation Office, 2002

**Evaluation Office
United Nations Development Programme
One United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017, USA
Tel. (212) 906 5095, Fax (212) 906 6008
Internet: <http://intra.undp.org/eo>
or <http://www.undp.org/eo>**