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Introduction

Description
This section of the Policies and Procedures describes the minimum requirements and processes used by UNDP as a member of the UN Country Team (UNCT) to deliver development results. UNDP’s results are outlined in Country Programmes, Regional Programmes and the Global Programme. These documents operationalise UNDP’s vision, directions and strategies as established in the UNDP Strategic Plan. Programmes are operationally implemented through projects with annual workplans. The latter must fall within the approved frameworks of corresponding programme unless under emergency situations.

Please post questions, comments and suggestions in the "UNDP Programming Policy Discussion" on the Results Management Service Space on Teamworks. Also, please see the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) on Programme and Project Management for further information.

UNDP’s Strategic Focus
The 2008-2013 Strategic Plan outlines the major goals and objectives for UNDP, as approved by the Executive Board. It sets the overall direction for UNDP operations in its support to programme countries.

The Strategic Plan:

- Focuses our work on four development focus areas: Poverty eradication and achievement of internationally agreed development goals, including the MDGs; democratic governance; crisis prevention and recovery; and environment and sustainable development. Please see the BDP workspace for further policy guidance such as practice notes.
- Supports programme countries, within the framework of national ownership, to achieve national development objectives related to human development. UNDP programmes must therefore be
firmly anchored in the needs and priorities of programme countries and UNDP’s programming processes fully aligned to national processes. Development solutions must always reflect local circumstances and aspirations and draw upon national actors and capabilities. Fostering national ownership requires the full participation of different parts of government and civil society organisations.

- Approaches development in a **holistic, cross-sector approach to human development** with its focus on the expansion and use of institutional and human capabilities which provides the basis for UNDP’s focus on capacity development. See The Human Development website for more information.
- Focuses on **inclusive and sustainable growth** to place particular attention on those that are being left farthest behind.
- Focuses UNDP’s programmatic role on the **provision of knowledge, policy advice, advocacy, and technical support**.
- Pursues **development of national capacities** as UNDP’s core contribution in all UNDP’s work across the four development focus areas. Please see the UNDP Approach to Supporting Capacity Development, UNDP Practice Note on Capacity Development and UNDP Practice Note on Capacity Assessment.
- Promotes the **integration of gender equality and women’s empowerment** throughout our programmes guided by the Gender Equality Strategy 2008-2011 (GES).
- Steps-up efforts to **mainstream South-South approaches in all development focus areas** - see the South-South Cooperation website.
- **Upholds the principles of aid effectiveness** throughout our programmes as well as support developing countries’ capacities to manage external development assistance through strengthened national ownership of aid coordination and management. See www.aideffectiveness.org for more information.
- Ensures **accountability** of UNDP. As outcomes are nationally owned, the first line of accountability rests with national authorities. UNDP is accountable for achieving its planned outputs, and for ensuring that these contribute to the national outcomes.
- Is based on **results based management** principles. This means that the processes of analyzing, planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating the organisation’s work are structured around achieving real and meaningful results. For UNDP, this is reflected in a clearly formulated chain of results (results framework) that starts with MDGs and national development priorities, addressed through UNDAF/ Country Programme/CPAP. Outcomes and outputs must be realistic, and be logically formulated and include performance indicators. For further guidance please see UNDP Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results and the Results Management and Accountability section.
Uses a corporate **Enterprise Risk Management** (ERM). UNDP programmes and projects should systematically and proactively identify, monitor and manage all significant impacts of risks through effective planning and decision making. See the ERM section of the Policies and Procedures for more information.

Mainstreams security as per the UNDP Security Policy. The purpose of Security Risk Management (SRM) is to enable operational capabilities and mission accomplishment, with minimal or no loss of life, assets and mission scope. SRM must be factored into the definition, budgeting, initiating, running, through to monitoring and evaluating of all programmes/projects. For further details, please see: UNDP Security Risk Management Linkage with Programming.

In addition, environmental sustainability, including climate change resiliency, is fundamental to the achievement of development outcomes including the MDGs and must be systematically mainstreamed into UNDP's Programme and Project Management cycles. Opportunities to strengthen the environmental sustainability and climate resiliency of programming need to be identified and realized. Potential adverse impacts and risks need to be avoided or minimized, where possible, and mitigated if not. The Strategic Plan states that UNDP will not normally engage in: (a) specialized sectoral activities; (b) small-scale projects without country-wide impact; (c) infra-structure with no capacity-building; or (d) stand-alone procurement of goods and services.

**UNDP Programme and Project Management Process**

The UNDP Programme and Project Cycles are the underpinning processes that provide UNDP with the ability to deliver results. Within these processes, a series of actions are carried out including the definition of a clear hierarchy of results (outputs contributing to outcomes) and continuous monitoring of progress towards these specified results.

Figure 1 illustrates the major steps in lifecycle of UNDP programme.
In general, a UNDP programme is a plan for effectively delivering development results through a set of projects. The projects are normally developed after the approval of the programme.

The programme management section details the key policies and considerations including the detailed procedures for UNDP’s programme management process. It flows from: UNDP’s participation in the preparation of the road map for the CCA/UNDAF process and associated stakeholder engagement; followed by the country analysis, to the preparation of the UNDAF and UNDP country programme document; followed by the development of a Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) or UNDAF Action Plan (as applicable), before implementing the programme including its monitoring and evaluation. The programme then finally transition to the subsequent programming cycle taking into account lessons learnt.

Projects are integral components of a UNDP programme. At the country level they are imbedded in the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) or United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Action Plan (as applicable). The project management section covers the entire project life cycle from idea generation to formulating a project, implementing the activities in the project, monitoring and evaluating the project, and realizing project outputs and their intended contribution to programme
outcomes. At each process, the Project Management section of the UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP) will provide information to ensure appropriate UNDP policies are followed, key stakeholders are kept informed, appropriate project management structure exists, outputs and activity deliverables are monitored, and the project is well managed.

Both programmes and projects should be designed to be rigorous in delivering quality results against a plan, but sufficiently flexible for continued renewal of focus and adaptation to change.

**Legal Framework**

**1.0 Description**

1. **Definitions of Execution and Implementation**

General Assembly, ECOSOC and Executive Board resolutions and decisions determine UNDP’s mandate, operations and organisation. The Executive Board approves the multi-year funding framework Strategic Plan, which is the key instrument for the strategic management, monitoring, and accountability of UNDP internally, as well as for external stakeholders.

The Executive Board on 28 January 2005 approved the new Financial Regulations and Rules and along with them the new definitions of ‘execution’ and ‘implementation’ enabling UNDP to fully implement the Common Country Programming Procedures resulting from the UNDG simplification and harmonization initiative. The revised UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules have significant operational implications for Country Offices’ role in implementing the Country Programme as it introduces harmonized programming processes.

For UNDP programme activities carried out under the harmonized operational modalities (i.e. Common Country Programming Processes), the term ‘execution’ is redefined as the overall ownership and responsibility for UNDP programme results at the country level. The government, through the Government Coordinating Agency, exercises its ownership and responsibility for UNDP programme activities by approving and signing the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) with UNDP. All activities falling within the CPAP are, therefore, nationally executed.

Under the harmonized operational modalities, the term ‘implementation’ is redefined as the management and delivery of programme activities to achieve specified results, specifically the mobilization of UNDP programme inputs and their use in producing outputs that will contribute to development outcomes, as set forth in the Annual Work Plans (AWPs). AWP is incorporated by reference to the CPAP and signed by UNDP and the implementing partner. The CPAP and AWP together constitute the minimum requirements for a project document.

Since under the harmonized operational modalities, execution means ownership of the country programme documented in the CPAP, projects are therefore no longer ‘executed.’ Rather, they are
implemented by implementing partners who are responsible for producing outputs, and for the efficient and effective use of resources. Implementing partners may contract Responsible Parties to carry out specific activities. In countries where the harmonized operational modalities have not been introduced, Implementing Partner is equivalent ‘Executing Entity’ and Responsible Party to ‘implementing agent’ respectively. The above terminology shift can be illustrated in the following figure:

### Terminology Shifts

**Non-Harmonized**

- **Country Programme Level**
  - Execution
  - Implementing Entity

- **Project Level**
  - Execution
  - Executing Entity
  - Implementation
  - Implementing Entity

**Harmonized**

- **Execution (redefined)**
  - Government Coordinating Agency

- **Implementation (redefined)**
  - Implementing Partner
  - “Contractual”
  - Responsible Party

---

2. Operational Legal Framework

The Executive Board’s approval of a Country Programme provides UNDP with a mandate to fulfill the approved programme in a country. The subsequent approval and signature by the Government Coordinating Agency of the CPAP constitutes an agreement between UNDP and the programme country Government on an action plan to execute that programme. The Government Coordinating Agency is the government entity designated to coordinate UNDP activities. Details of specific UNDP interventions are outlined in a Project Document (CPAP/AWP together) which articulates an agreement to implement a
project in accordance with the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA) between the government and UNDP. Implementing Partners are accountable to UNDP for the use of UNDP resources and the production of identified outputs.

The following documents are used to operationalise such legal arrangements:

- **Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA):** The legal agreement between the programme country Government and UNDP outlining general conditions for UNDP cooperation under which all UNDP programme activities are carried out. Where there is no SBAA (i.e. the Special Fund or Technical Assistance Agreements are still in use), a standard annex (Supplemental Provisions) to the project document must be used.

- **Country Programme Document:** A document approved by the UNDP Executive Board to mandate UNDP to work for agreed development results in a country.

- **Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP):** A legal agreement between the programme country Government and UNDP to execute the Country Programme. For the UNDP Country Programming Cycle, the Country Programme document and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) are the key tools for programme-level management.

- **Project Document:** From a legal perspective as defined in the SBAA, the term “Project Document” is articulated as follows:
  
  o For countries under the harmonized operational modalities (i.e. CPAP countries), the term “Project Document” refers to the combination of the AWP and CPAP. The AWP is a legal agreement between UNDP and the Implementing Partner to implement activities under a specific AWP within a calendar year, as identified in the CPAP signed between the Government and UNDP. The AWP of the current year needs to be signed for each calendar year. As most UNDP projects have a duration covering multiple calendar years, AWPs for subsequent years could be added if these are required for resource mobilization purpose. The level of details in the AWPs for subsequent years, provided at the beginning of the project, need not be complete and may contain only the agreed activities and contractual commitments. However as they progressively become current, the respective AWP for a given year should be completed in detail prior to its signature. Project budgets in Atlas are entered and revised accordingly.
  
  o For countries under the non-harmonized operational modalities (i.e. non – CPAP countries) or for regional and global projects, the term “Project Document” refers to the former project document format which is a legal agreement between UNDP, the government, and the Executing Entity to implement a specific project. The Project Document describes the project linkage to the CP, specifies the project results and resources framework and management arrangements. The Results and Resources Framework identifies the intended outcomes to which the project contributes, the intended outputs and the activities and inputs needed to deliver the outputs.

Besides the above minimal requirements for a project document, a country office, in consultation with the government, may decide to include additional documentary support for the implementation of projects. For example, a government may still wish to require their signature on each AWP under the harmonized operational modalities.
2.0 Relevant Policies

Accountability & Delegation of Authority

This section covers the following:

- Accountability, including: the UN rules and regulations on accountability as well as important prescriptive contents related to accountability within UNDP
- Delegated authority to country offices, including: Project approval authority and approval of projects with large equipment components
  - Project Approval Authority
  - Approval of projects with large equipment components

1. Accountability

UNDP staff, including contractors working for UNDP, are expected to comply with standards of conduct appropriate for their relationship with UNDP. Staff members are expected to uphold the highest standards of conduct for international civil servants. Similar expectations are made for experts, contractors, and other non UN officials. The fundamental base for this legislation begins with the Staff Regulations that embody broad principles of personnel policy for the staffing and administration of the UN staff, including UNDP. Fundamental conditions of service and the basic rights, duties, and obligations of UN staff are also covered in the Staff Rules.

In order to implement this legislation known as the regulations, a detailed set of rules has been developed. These are known as Staff Rules and they are approved by the Secretary - General, who provides specific guidance on how to implement the broad principles as defined in the Staff Regulations. Further guidance is available to staff from the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), which has issued a guide that explains in detail how the code of conduct should be enacted in the working environment of staff. This guide is known as the Standards of Conduct for the International Civil Service Commission.

For contractors, there are similar expectations of behaviour that can be found in the Regulations Governing the Status, Basic Rights and Duties of non UN Secretariat Officials, and Experts on Mission (ST/SGB/2002/9/ 18 June 2002). In addition to the above UN rules and regulations, there are two important prescriptive documents related to accountability within UNDP:

- Accountability, Disciplinary Measures and Procedures, which define misconduct and explains the process by which staff members will be held accountable for their actions if they breach regulations and rules.
• The Internal Control Framework which describes staff member accountabilities with reference to their “role” in the office, including project roles.

2. Delegated Authority to Country Offices

The UNDP Administrator is accountable to the UNDP Executive Board for UNDP programming results including those of Associated Funds and Programmes in line with the decisions of applicable governing bodies. In exercising his accountability to the Executive Board, the Administrator delegates authority to enter into an execution agreement with the programme country Government through the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) once the Executive Board has approved the Country Programme. This authority is delegated to the UNDP Resident Representative (RR – also referred to as Programme Manager), through the Director of the Regional Bureau. The RR together with the programme country Government also has authority to adjust the CPAP to changing circumstances within the country providing this is within the overall framework of the Country Programme as approved by the Executive Board. The Director of the Regional Bureau may, however, withhold, withdraw, or limit this authority also if an Executive Board decision or other circumstances so require.

Each UNDP project is implemented by a single Implementing Partner which is accountable to UNDP for the use of UNDP resources and achievement of identified project outputs.

2.1 Project Approval authority

The authority to approve projects at the country level will be specifically delegated to the resident representative by the director of the regional bureau when a country programme document has been approved by the Executive Board.

In exercising this authority, the resident representative will be guided by the recommendation of the local Project Appraisal Committee (PAC). The resident representative is accountable to the Administrator through the director of the regional bureau for the quality and sustainability of UNDP interventions and for ensuring that UNDP policies and procedures have been fully complied with. Any divergence between the recommendations of the PAC and the decision of the resident representative should be recorded on file.

Exceptions. The resident representative does not have authority to approve a project document in the following cases, unless he/she has received specific authorization from the regional bureau director:

• When a project document includes personnel who would be supervised by the resident representative or another member of the UNDP office staff;
• When support to an infrastructure project (This refers to construction or other major infrastructure development or large equipment components) is proposed;
• When the amount to be spent on micro-capital grants, out of TRAC funds, would increase the overall amount spent on micro-capital grants beyond 10 per cent of the country’s TRAC allocation for the CPD period;
• When direct implementation by UNDP is proposed.
The authority to approve project documents applies to TRAC 1 & TRAC 2; approvals may not exceed the funds released by headquarters for those funds for the given year/s. The authority also applies to cost-sharing funds when a standard cost-sharing agreement is used. For government cost-sharing, the standard project document with a payment schedule constitutes the legal basis for cost-sharing. The authority to approve projects financed from TRAC-3, trust funds and other sources of funds may be delegated on a case-by-case basis.

No UNDP official may sign a project document that singles out by name a private company or NGO to carry out activities and receive funds from UNDP, unless a waiver of competitive bidding has first been obtained.

For projects funded with GEF resources, final accountability for project management rests with the GEF. In this regard, project work plans, key management decisions, budget revisions, progress reports, annual reports and project evaluations require oversight of the GEF regional coordinator in addition to the role played by the designated institution and UNDP country office.

2.2 Approval of projects with large equipment components

In cases where the equipment component exceeds 50 per cent (including cost-sharing) of the budget or costs more than $1 million, the country office must make a critical assessment of the component. The procedures below also apply where equipment is procured under the contract component.

The country office shall prepare a report that outlines:

- Conformity with UNDP policies, and the comparative advantages of UNDP;
- The capacity of national authorities to use the equipment, maintain the equipment, and replenish equipment and sustain activities, for which the equipment was purchased, after the termination of UNDP intervention;

If capacity gaps are identified, an explanation should be provided as to i) the role UNDP will play during the lifetime of the project to cover the gaps, and ii) how and when these responsibilities will be handed over to the national authorities. The resident representative is responsible for monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the capacity-building measures and the transferring of responsibilities to national authorities. The resident representative is also responsible for ensuring that the annual reviews address these matters.

The PAC shall review the report. The resident representative should communicate the results of the review and send the project document or substantive revisions, together with the report, to the regional bureau.

The Director of the regional bureau must report to the Associate Administrator quarterly on all the large equipment approvals. The report should be brief (two pages maximum) and provide both statistical and analytical information on:

- The number of project documents with large equipment components that have been approved during the quarter;
• Assessment of the capacity of the national authorities to use, maintain and replenish the equipment, as well as to sustain the activities for which the equipment was purchased, once UNDP intervention has ended.

Advance authorization

• Advance authorizations permit designated institutions to enter into commitments and incur expenditures without delay in accordance with a project document or revision document that has been finalized but has not yet been signed by all the parties. This may be due to bureaucratic delays in securing such signatures.
• An advance authorization is valid for 60 days only. It must be replaced with a fully signed project document or revision within 60 days.
• The resident representative signs the advance authorization after ascertaining that the government and the designated institution agree to it.

Programme & Project Management Arrangements

Management arrangements and oversight of UNDP programming activities need to be established appropriately both at programme and project levels to ensure UNDP’s accountability for programming activities, results and the use of resources, while at the same time fostering national ownership and alignment to national processes. Minimum requirements for such management and oversight arrangements include the elements or functions describe below and illustrated in Figure 1. To the extent possible, existing national, UN Country Team (UNCT) and other structures should be used to fulfil these functions.
Programme Management Arrangements:

- **Government Coordinating Agency**: This Agency is responsible for defining, assessing, and monitoring programme outputs towards country-level outcomes. This Agency will work closely with UNDP to ensure that the plan of the programme includes necessary aspects, including identification of projects required to achieve the expected outcomes. The Government Coordinating Agency is often the government planning/finance/foreign affairs ministry.

- **UNDP Country Office**: The UNDP Country Office is responsible for developing and managing the UNDP Country Programme to ensure that the programme outputs are delivered as planned, contributing to the achievement of programme outcomes as per UNDAF and CPD (as agreed with national counterparts). They are also responsible for ensuring that there is efficient and effective use of programme resources. The Country Office is also responsible for assessing Implementing Partner capacity, appraisal/approval of projects and oversight of project implementation.

- **Country Programme Board**: At the overall programme management level, a Country Programme Board shall be set up as a mechanism for consultation and on the consensus basis making management decisions on programme issues. The Country Programme Board is responsible for oversight of the UNDP Country Programme implementation, as well as its contribution to the overall UN Country Team efforts (within UNDAF).
Board is as a minimum composed of the Heads (or their designated representatives) of the Government Coordinating Agency and UNDP Office respectively.

- **UNDP Programme Manager:** The UNDP Programme Manager is responsible for the successful programme management and contribution to the achievement of programme outcomes. The Programme Manager is also responsible for developing an evaluation plan and commissioning and using evaluations in accordance with the UNDP evaluation policy. Through management of the programme, the Programme Manager ensures that projects continue to contribute to programme outcomes through delivery of planned outputs, via efficient and effective management of resources. Monitoring of interdependencies between projects and managing changes within and among projects will be a key focus area of this role. The UNDP Resident Representative holds the role of the Programme Manager, and can designate this role to another UNDP staff.

- **Programme Assurance:** Programme Assurance is the responsibility of the each Programme Board member. The Programme Assurance role supports respective Programme Board member in carrying out programme oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate programme management milestones are managed and completed. Programme Assurance should be independent of the Programme Manager. A Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist (or a Focal Point as some UNDP Country Offices have appointed) typically holds the Programme Assurance role.

**Outcome Group/Relevant Coordinating Mechanism:** In consultation with the government Coordinating Agency, the UNDP Programme Manager (or designate) should ensure that there are sector wide or inter-agency groups around each major outcome or thematic area in which UNDP is working. Whenever there are existing national structures such as sector-wide coordination mechanisms, UNDP should engage them and participate in these rather than setting up parallel systems. In other words, sectoral/outcome-level coordinating mechanisms should ideally not be a UNDP management arrangement, but an existing national structure which is already charged with the coordination of the sector from a development perspective within the national context. UNDP should engage with the Outcome Group for the following:

- To acknowledge the national ownership of all development results
- To partner and dialogue within a coordinated mechanism comprising all relevant initiatives, projects and programmes that are relevant to the corresponding outcome
- To align and position UNDP contribution with planning, monitoring and evaluation processes at national level
- When relevant, to use the Outcome Group to serve as a forum to appraise UNDP funded projects
- To effectively use and disseminate monitoring and evaluation information for decision making and in future planning/programming

**Project Management Arrangements**

Establishing an effective project management structure is crucial for its success. Every project has a need for direction, management, control and communication, using a structure that differs from line management. As a project is normally cross functional and involves partnership, its structure needs to be more flexible, and is likely to require a broad base of skills for a specific period of time. The UNDP Project Management structure consists of roles and responsibilities that bring together the various interests and skills involved in, and required by, the project.

- **Government Cooperating Agency:** The Government Cooperating Agency is the governmental unit directly responsible for the government’s participation in each UNDP-assisted project. In
consultation with the Implementing Partner, the Government Cooperating Agency will designate its representative for each project, who would typically perform the role and functions of either the Executive or Senior Beneficiary in the Project Board as appropriate for each particular project. The Government Cooperating Agency is typically the government ministry responsible for the functions or areas being addressed by the project. For example, in a biodiversity project, the Government Cooperating Agency would typically be the Ministry of the Environment.

- **Implementing Partner**: The Implementing Partner is the entity responsible and accountable for managing a project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outputs, and for the effective use of UNDP resources. A single Implementing Partner is designated to manage each UNDP-supported project. The Implementing Partner may enter into agreements with other organisations or entities to assist in successfully delivering project outputs. Possible Implementing Partners include government institutions, other eligible UN agencies and inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), UNDP, and eligible civil society organisations (CSOs). Eligible CSOs are those that are legally registered in the country where they will be operating. Proposed Implementing Partners must be identified based on an assessment of their legal, technical, financial, managerial and administrative capacities that will be needed for the project. In addition, their ability to manage cash must be assessed in accordance with the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT). The Implementing Partner may enter into agreements with other organisations or entities, namely Responsible Parties, to assist in successfully delivering project outputs.

- **A Responsible Party** is defined as an entity that has been selected to act on behalf of the Implementing Partner on the basis of a written agreement or contract to purchase goods or provide services using the project budget. In addition, the Responsible Party may manage the use of these goods and services to carry out project activities and produce outputs. All Responsible Parties are directly accountable to the Implementing Partner in accordance with the terms of their agreement or contract with the Implementing Partner. Implementing Partners use Responsible Parties in order to take advantage of their specialized skills, to mitigate risk and to relieve administrative burdens. The following types of organizations may act as Responsible Parties: UNDP, other UN agencies, Government agencies, IGOs, CSOs and private firms. Firms and CSOs (except micro-capital grant recipients) shall be selected as Responsible Parties only on the basis of a competitive procurement process undertaken by the Implementing Partner. UNDP, UN agencies, IGOs, Government agencies, or CSOs as micro-capital grant recipients are exempted from competitive procurement process and shall be selected under programming modalities. To the extent that Responsible Parties exempted from competitive procurement process can be identified or anticipated during project formulation, they should be listed in the annual work plan and draft terms of reference for their services attached to the project document.

- **Project Board (also called Project Steering Committee)**: The Project Board is the group responsible for making by consensus, management decisions for a project when guidance is required by the Project Manager, including recommendation for UNDP/Implementing Partner approval of project plans and revisions. In order to ensure UNDP’s ultimate accountability, Project Board decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In case a consensus cannot be reached within the Board, final decision shall rest with the UNDP Programme Manager. In addition, the Project Board plays a critical role in UNDP commissioned project evaluations by quality assuring the evaluation process and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. Project reviews by this group are made at designated decision points during the running of the project, or as necessary when raised by the Project Manager. This group is consulted by the
Project Manager for decisions when Project Manager’s tolerances (normally in terms of time and budget) have been exceeded (flexibility). Based on the approved annual work plan (AWP), the Project Board may review and approve project quarterly plans when required and authorizes any major deviation from these agreed quarterly plans. It is the authority that signs off the completion of each quarterly plan as well as authorizes the start of the next quarterly plan. It ensures that required resources are committed and arbitrates on any conflicts within the project or negotiates a solution to any problems between the projects and external bodies. In addition, it approves the appointment and responsibilities of the Project Manager and any delegation of its Project Assurance responsibilities. Potential members of the Project Board are reviewed and recommended for approval during the PAC meeting. Representative of other stakeholders can be included in the Board as appropriate. The objective is to create a mechanism for effective project management. This group contains four roles:

- **Project Director** (*also called Executive*): individual representing the project ownership to chair the group. There should be only one project executive, who should normally be a national counterpart. Typically held by Government Cooperating Agency or UNDP.

- **Development Partners** (*also called Supplier*): individuals or groups representing the interests of the parties concerned which provide funding and/or technical expertise to the project. Typically includes Implementing Partners, UNDP, donors.

- **Beneficiary Representative**: individuals or groups of individuals representing the interests of those who will ultimately benefit from the project. The primary function within the Board is to ensure the realization of project results from the perspective of project beneficiaries. Often CSO representative(s) can fulfil this role.

- **Project Assurance**: Project Assurance is the responsibility of each Project Board member; however the role can be delegated. The project assurance role supports the Project Board by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed. Project Assurance has to be independent of the Project Manager; therefore, the Project Board cannot delegate any of its assurance responsibilities to the Project Manager. A UNDP Programme Officer, or M&E Officer, typically holds the Project Assurance role on behalf of UNDP.

  - **Project Manager**: The Project Manager has the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Implementing Partner within the constraints laid down by the Board. The Project Manager is responsible for day-to-day management and decision-making for the project. The Project Manager’s prime responsibility is to ensure that the project produces the results (outputs) specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost. The Implementing Partner appoints the Project Manager, who should be different from the Implementing Partner’s representative in the Outcome Board. Prior to the approval of the project, the Project Developer role is the UNDP staff member responsible for project management functions during formulation until the Project Manager from the Implementing Partner is in place.

  - **Project Support**: The Project Support role provides project administration, management and technical support to the Project Manager as required by the needs of the individual project or Project Manager. It is necessary to keep Project Support and Project Assurance roles separate in order to maintain the independence of Project Assurance.
Please see the detailed generic terms of reference (TORs) of the above roles.

Programme Management

- Analysis for a Programme
- Programme Strategic Planning
- Initiating a Programme
- Implementing a Programme
- Evaluating a Programme
- Programme Completion and Transition

1.0 Description

UNDP Programme Management Process

UNDP programming process at the country level is founded on the UN system’s programming process normally called the ‘CCA/UNDAF’ process. Following points characterize the CCA/UNDAF process:

- National ownership that is inclusive of all stakeholders in all stages of the process;
- Alignment with national development priorities, strategies, systems and programming cycles;
- Inclusiveness of the UN system with full involvement of specialized and non-resident agencies;
- Integration of the five UNDG programming principles tailored to the country context:
  - the human rights-based approach,
  - gender equality,
  - environmental sustainability,
  - results-based management, and
  - capacity development;
- Mutual accountability for development results.

There are four main steps in the UN systems programming process:
(1) Road Map,
(2) Country Analysis,
(3) Strategic Planning, and
(4) Monitoring and Evaluation.

While these steps are mandatory, UNCTs may undertake each step in a flexible manner in response to the national context and with a view to meeting the minimum requirements. The Programme Management section of UNDP POPP follows the CCA/UNDAF process and details it as required by UNDP’s internal programme management policies and procedures in the later sections.

The UNDP Programme and Project Cycles are underpinning processes that provide UNDP with the ability to deliver results. Within these processes, a series of actions are carried out including the definition of a clear hierarchy of results (outputs contributing to outcomes) and continuous monitoring of progress towards these specified results.

UNDP Programmes are strategic programmatic responses to contribute towards achieving selected outcomes at country, regional and global levels, formulated through an inclusive process. Figure 1 illustrates the major steps in lifecycle of UNDP programme.
1. It begins with UNDP's participation in the preparation of Road Map for CCA/UNDAF process as given in the UNDG guidelines How to Prepare an UNDAF.

2. The first programmatic step in programming is analysis for the corresponding Country, Regional and Global programme. At country level this is carried out as part of UN common analysis process. Further details are given in the Roadmap and Analysis for a Programme section.

3. The next step is the preparation of the respective Country, Regional and Global programme preparation is an inclusive process with the participation of all relevant stakeholders. At country level this is carried out as part of the UNDAF process, in which UNDP participates actively and fully. In addition to UNDP programmes, their initial monitoring and evaluation frameworks are prepared during this phase. Programmes are also appraised and approved at the end of this phase. Further details are given in the Programme Strategic Planning (formerly Defining a Programme) section.

4. The Initiating a Programme phase is the stage in which operational details and management arrangements are developed, and the initial monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks are elaborated in readiness to implement. It also includes setting up of results elements for monitoring in Atlas and UNDP RBM Platform. At the country level this also relates to the preparation of Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) or UNDAF Action Plan. Further details are given in the Initiating a Programme section.

5. During the Implementing a Programme phase the planned programmatic actions including monitoring and outcome evaluations are carried out. This phase also involves keeping the programmes continuously relevant through implementing revisions as necessary and agreed at reviews of stakeholders following monitoring and evaluation activities and reviews. Further details are given in the Implementing a Programme section.

6. The Programme Completion and Transition phase ensures learning from the current cycle and transition to the subsequent programming cycle.

Figure 1 represents the process flow of a programme. For each process, the Programme Management section of the POPP provides guidance to ensure that: appropriate UNDP policies are followed, key stakeholders are kept informed, appropriate management structure exists, results are monitored, and the programme results are well managed.
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Figure 1. Overall flow diagramme of UNDP Programme and Project Cycles

UNDP Country, Regional and Global Programmes, unlike their constituent projects, do not often start from a substantive zero point or end with the complete achievement of all the envisaged outcomes. While the UNDP programmes have fixed time durations, substantively, they normally flow from one programme and transit into the next. The processes and planning documents mentioned in the above diagramme express how UNDP contribute to achieving a country’s national development priorities consistent with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The results expected from the support of the UN Country Team, including UNDP and its Associated Funds and Programmes, are identified as outcomes and outputs agreed by the government in the UNDAF results matrix. The UNDP Country Programme states more directly the programmatic contributions specifically agreed by UNDP in order to achieve selected national outcomes. The UNDP Project Cycle is concerned with delivering the agreed outputs through UNDP interventions.

In the context of this Guide, the term ‘UNDP programme’ refers to the UNDP Country, Regional and Global Programme. At the discretion of each office (respectively Country Office, Regional Bureau and the
Bureau for Development Policy), this Programme may be divided into a set of portfolios or sub-programmes, typically organised into appropriate practice or sector-based groupings.

In general, a UNDP programme is a plan for effectively delivering development results through a set of subordinate projects. Normally, the projects are developed after the approval of the programme. A programme is neither a large project; nor a collection of projects. It differs from a project in several ways:

- A programme focuses on delivery of higher level results (the intended effects of a set of interventions) by optimizing synergy among project’s outputs and assuring their on-going relevance for contributing to expected outcomes, while a project focuses on delivery of outputs (required to contribute to achieving an outcome)
- A programme considers interdependencies, priorities and interactions among a set of projects, while a project considers interdependencies, priorities and interactions among a set of activities in relation to specific outputs.

Both programmes and projects should be designed to be rigorous in delivering quality results against a plan, but sufficiently flexible for continued renewal of focus and adaptation to change.

2.0 Relevant Policies
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**Summary of changes** (one entry per revision)

Discerning UN/UNDP’s comparative advantage in a given programme context

1.0 Description

As noted in the previous section, UNDP programming process at the country level is founded on the UN system’s programming process normally called the ‘CCA/UNDAF’ process.

There are four main steps in the UN systems programming process:

1. Road Map,
2. Country Analysis,
3. Strategic Planning, and
In this subsection a short description is given on the Road Map for CCA/UNDAF process which is the initial step of the engagement for country programming process. The country analysis which begins immediately after the Road Map is also covered in this section. The rest of the programme management processes are addressed subsequently in subsections of: strategic planning; setting up and initiation of a programme; implementation of programme; and completion and transition from UNDP one country programme to the next.

A. Road Map:

UNCTs are required to develop a Road Map outlining the preparation process of the UNDAF described in How to Prepare an UNDAF. The UNCT and the government coordinating body prepare and agree on the Road Map. Its specific purposes are:

- Outline the UNDAF preparation process.
- Ensure full alignment to national planning cycle.
- Ensure a full consultative process throughout to ensure national ownership.
- Identify support needed from regional offices and HQs.

Once finalized, the Resident Coordinator sends the road map to all national partners and also to the Regional Directors Team/ Peer Support Group (RDTs/PSGs), headquarters of all UN agencies and the UN Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO).

As part of the road map, the UNCT and national stakeholders agree on a consultative process, of their choice, for conducting the country analysis and for validation and review of the draft UNDAF. For increased ownership by all relevant stakeholders, the consultative process needs to be inclusive. UNCTs may identify appropriate coordination mechanism(s) for implementing the road map.

B. Country Analysis

The purpose of the country analysis is to provide an analysis leading to discerning UNDP’s comparative advantage in a given country programme context, and using that analysis to assist the selection of priorities for programming in United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and Country Programme Documents (CPD). Sound analysis is both key to and a pre-requisite for effective development planning. At the country level there are two minimum UNDP requirements with regard to the country analysis: (a) UNDP must actively participate in, and make an effective contribution to the country level common analysis by the UN system; and (b) within that process, prepare the specific analysis needed for UNDP country programme.

Valid and comprehensive analyses are also required for UNDP Regional Programmes and the Global Programme. Analyses for UNDP Regional and Global Programmes should aim to discern and develop analytical capacities of relevant regional and global institutions as relevant and as appropriate. Such efforts should be founded on participatory and inclusive processes as much as possible.

2.0 Relevant Policies

2.1 Road Map as basis for planning UN System’s country analysis and programming process.
1. UNCTs are required to develop a Road Map outlining the preparation process of the country analysis and UNDAF as the first milestone of the CCA/UNDAF process. UNDP must actively participate in the development of the roadmap, which is required as a deliverable.

**2.2 UN system’s country analysis for programming**

1. In line with the 2007 triennial comprehensive policy review (TCPR) UNDP should intensify its collaboration at the country and regional levels towards strengthening national capacities through country analysis.

2. In contributing to UN system’s country analysis UNDP collaborates with UN Country Team (UNCT) and follows the harmonized policies, procedures and processes pertaining to the preparation of the country analysis detailed in How to Prepare an UNDAF and in its Technical Guidance for UNCTs. Normally his process should start towards the middle of the penultimate year of the programme cycle.

3. The analysis should be guided by inter alia: (a) national priorities; and (b) five UNDAF programming principles agreed by UN Development Group (UNDG): human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, and capacity development.

4. Country analysis process should ensure participation of key stakeholders, including government, civil society, other UN agencies and development partners. Detail supplementary guidance on stakeholder identification and engagement is available in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results.

5. UNDP as a member of UN Country Team (UNCT) will jointly select one of the three approaches as given in How to Prepare an UNDAF to prepare the country analysis for a given country. (See Procedure table below, ref point 2)

6. If there is the likelihood of Direct Budget Support (DBS) or Sector Budget Support (SBS), then scope for possible engagement in such arrangements should be analyzed in accordance with the UNDP engagement in sector budget support and pooled funding.

**2.3 UNDP specific additional analytical considerations and requirements**

*Substantively UN/UNDP’s engagement should enrich the national analysis with respect to UNDP priorities such as MD/MDGs and other internationally agreed priorities. More specifically, UNDP’s own contribution to country analysis and analyses for regional and global programme should be guided by, and lead to analyzing issues connected with the advancement of goals and expected development outcomes in the Strategic Plan as approved by the Executive Board. All programme managers are expected to refer to the Strategic Plan prior to commencing their analytical and programming work.

There are also key cross-cutting priorities in the Strategic Plan that provide the context for UNDP’s work: capacity development (the overarching contribution of UNDP); gender equality and the empowerment of women (the integrating dimension across UNDP’s work); and south-South cooperation. It is mandatory for these major cross-cutting priorities to be reflected in all of UNDP’s development work. As such, these cross cutting priorities should be taken fully into account during programme analysis.*
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Detail guidance on analytical techniques, for example, based on problem tree analysis that can be used, is available in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results.

2.4 Quality assurance of UN/UNDP analyses

United Nations Development Group’s Quality Support and Assurance System (QSA) is set up to help UNCTs contribute effectively to country analysis. Regional Directors’ Teams, Regional Offices and regional Peer Support Groups play an important role, and must be involved as early as possible in the process. Within UNDP the Regional Bureau is the focal point for the QSA/PSG system, and is responsible for UNDP’s active participation in it to ensuring a high quality country analysis. The UNDP Regional Bureaux are also responsible to ensure that the analytical work carried out in respective of each Regional Programme is of necessary depth and quality. Similarly UNDP Bureau of Development policy is responsible to ensure that the analytical work carried out in respective of the Global Programme is of necessary depth and quality.

2.5 Applicability

It is mandatory for UNDP/UNCT to make an analytical contribution prior to developing a country programme. Similarly it is mandatory for managers of Regional and Global Programmes to ensure preparing an analysis that would lead to systematically identifying priorities for Regional and Global programmes. The UN analytical contribution in those countries that are in, or emerging from, a crisis situation should support the preparation of post-conflict needs assessment (PCNA). Guidance for PCNA is available in UN Transitional Strategy Guidance Note.

3.0 Flowchart

Not applicable.

4.0 Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Mandatory Step</th>
<th>Tasks and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 01  | Prepare Road Map for an inclusive CCA/UNDAF process | • **The UNCT and the government coordinating body prepare and agree on a Road Map** clearly aligning to the national development planning process, and laying out the steps and milestones for the UNCT’s contribution to country analysis and UNDAF preparation. The UNCT also agrees on how to share costs.  
• UNCT and UN agencies (including UNDP) should carefully consider their collective and individual capacity to deliver on potential results. For this purpose an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and treats (SWOT) is recommended in CCA/UNDAF guidelines ([How to Prepare an UNDAF](#)). Such an exercise would help UNCT/UNDP narrow any gaps in expectations and capacity.  
• **UNDP Programme Manger** is responsible for:  
  ✓ Highlighting issues/aspects and areas where UNCT support can bring added value, depth, quality and develop capacities.  
  ✓ **Identifying key stakeholders relevant to UNDP and ensuring their effective engagement** in the CCA/UNDAF process. National stakeholders, as well as staff from non-resident and specialized agencies are included in the development of the road map. |
✓ (Use, as required, guidance for systematically identifying, analyzing and selection of stakeholders given in Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results)

- In transition settings, the UNCT needs to consult with the Integrated Mission Task Force or Integrated Task Force on the road map to ensure coordination with other UN actors.

- **UNDP Programme manager** should also forward the road map to UNDP Headquarters to enable latter to position itself to support as appropriate.

- **Although it is not mandatory to prepare a road map, managers of Regional and Global programmes** are responsible to make sure that all stakeholders relevant to UNDP are identified systematically and that they have the opportunity to contribute to the analysis and programming process of regional and global programmes in a planned way. Further information in this regard is available in guidance for [Global and Regional Programming](#).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>02 Draft UNDP analytical contribution for Country Programme.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Carryout a desk review</strong> of country analytical sources and capacities in order to identify country analytical sources and capacity; and needs for further analysis. <strong>UNDP Programme Manger and others who participate in UNCT led country programming processes on behalf of UNDP</strong> must:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Assess and review relevant documents, especially recent analysis on national or sectoral development, reports of relevant evaluations and Annual Reviews of UNDAF. Recommendations of the evaluations of the global, regional and country (<a href="#">Assessments of Development Results</a>) programmes in line with their respective management response and action plan, as well as outcome, thematic and project evaluations that may have been carried out in the recent past must be used in the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Ensure that the process is informed by human development reports (HDRs), national human development reports (NHDRs), MDG Reports, as well as lessons learnt from the previous programmes made evident through relevant evaluations. Further guidance is available in <a href="#">How to Prepare an UNDAF</a> and in its <a href="#">Technical Guidance for UNCTs</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ <strong>Decide on which of the three options</strong> for country analysis to be adopted as given in <a href="#">How to Prepare an UNDAF</a>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Participation in government-led and harmonized donor analytical work and use of government analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Complementary UN-supported analytical work, with a focus on gaps in the existing analysis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ A full UN Common Country Assessment (CCA) process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Draft the UNDP analytical contribution</strong> for CP and analyses for RP and GP. All programme managers should:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Refer to the <a href="#">Strategic Plan</a> prior to commencing their analytical and programming work In order to be familiar with the priorities, cross-cutting issues in the Strategic Plan as applicable to the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Ensure that the analysis would be: (a) based on rigorous identification of development problems for example using problem analysis given in the <a href="#">Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results</a>; (b) integrated in the UNCT's overall analysis forwarded to the regional Peer Support Group (PSG) mechanism; and (c) forwarded to regional and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relevant Policy Advisers for substantive review and advice. **Ensure high quality country analysis** (assessed by):

- the inclusiveness and quality of participation of all relevant stakeholder groups, coverage of relevant issues and depth of the issues considered;
- the subsequent use of the analysis to guide the selection of development priorities with high ownership among all relevant stakeholders;
- Agreement among partners about the root causes of priority development problems;
- Identification of critical capacity assets and needs at different levels of society through systematic application of country-led capacity assessments, to address above-mentioned problems; and systematic application of, and follow up to, country-led capacity assessments;
- Inclusion of the risks of crises and natural disasters, as well as capacities for crisis prevention and **disaster preparedness**;
- Including measures to enhance national capacity for data collection and analysis, ensuring that data is sufficiently disaggregated to reveal patterns of discrimination

- Participate in the **Regional Directors Teams (RDTs) and their regional peer support groups (PSGs)**. PSG members need to be involved as early as possible in the process, and particularly during the discussion on the UNCT’s analytical contribution. Analyses for UNDP country, regional and global programmes must be reviewed and commented on by the relevant practice groups and subject specialists.

- **The regional bureau provides substantive feedback to the resident representative** on the country analysis. The bureau should at that time also indicate how it intends to participate in the UNDAF and draft CPD formulation in order to ensure timely contributions from headquarters, which are indispensable to minimize the need for detailed review or significant changes at a late stage in the process;

- At the country level Macro Assessment of Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) should be carried out and completed in accordance with UNDG HACT guidelines. **Framework for Cash Transfers to Implementing Partners**

- Programme managers of regional programmes and global programme must ensure that:
  - analyses for RP and GP are prepared;
  - they meet the quality standards; and
  - they lead to discerning and/or confirming the comparative advantage of UNDP in the given regional and global programming context.

---

**5.0 Inputs**
- Relevant National Evaluations and reviews and Sector Analysis.
- 2010 UNDG guidance: How to Prepare an UNDAF and in its Technical Guidance for UNCTs.
- Evidence generated from evaluations and reviews of UNDP and partner agencies should be drawn upon in developing a project concept. All related outcomes and project evaluations should be reviewed, focusing in particular on the management response, follow-up actions and commitments. Evaluations or reviews of similar work conducted by other partners in the same area or utilizing a similar programming approach shall also be used, especially when they could serve as justification for the relevance of further interventions in this area.
- Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results
- UNDP Strategic Plan
- MDG and National Human Development Reports:
- Existing knowledge products, such as policy notes and briefs, how-to-guides, lessons learned, consolidated replies and analytical studies, should inform the justification of a project.
- UNDAF Checklist 2010: Assessing the quality and strategic positioning of the UNDAF

6.0 Deliverables

- UNDP Contribution UNCT Road Map
- A sound analytical contribution to UN system’s common analysis in a country, regional or global context that highlights UNDP’s comparative advantages in the given programming context. This should include a set of indicative preliminary priorities to focus UNDP’s subsequent programming interventions, capturing capacities of national institutions that should be developed for high quality monitoring data.
- Macro Assessment of Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (See HACT Guidelines)

7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

Programme Manager

The Programme Manager takes primary responsibility during this process to ensure:
- UNDP’s participation with the relevant stakeholders at country level, in UNCT and also at regional and global level to inform programming.
- UNDP analytical contribution covers the corporate as well as national, regional and global priorities relevant to the respective programming context.
- The analytical work of UNDP leads to UNDP discerning its comparative advantage in the corresponding programming context.
For specific roles of UNCT, Resident Coordinator and the Regional Directors Team see: How to Prepare an UNDAF.

8.0 Templates and Forms

There is flexibility to structure the analysis and a specific format is not prescribed. UNDAF Technical Guidance for UNCTs provides guidance on a suitable structure, content of the analysis and steps for preparation of a full Common Country Analysis (CCA), which should be adapted as appropriate for local circumstances. At a minimum it should state:

- Brief description of the relevant issues, their root causes, capacity assets and gaps
- Comparative advantage of UNDP in the relevant context
- Priorities that should be considered for subsequent programming
9.0 Additional Info. and Tools

Please see the following information resources:
- Programme and Project Management Resource Center.
- The Results Management Service Space on Teamworks
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1.0 Description

The purpose of this process is to plan and prepare a strategic level programmatic contribution as a Country, Regional or Global programme. At the country level this specifically involves:

- UNDP participating in, and contributing to the UNCT preparation of the UNDAF; and
- Developing and appraising a UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD).

United Nations System’s country programming process should be country-led and country-driven, and based on national priorities and needs. It reaffirms that the national Government has the primary responsibility for the formulation of the country programmes in consultation with relevant United Nations agencies, including specialized agencies, and other relevant partners, as appropriate.

2.0 Relevant Policies

2.1 Alignment with National Development Plan and processes:

In line with the 2007 triennial comprehensive policy review (TCPR) UNDP must intensify its collaboration at the country and regional levels towards strengthening national capacities in support of national development priorities, through the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).

2.2 UNDP programming process at the country level must remain within the overall UN system’s programming process normally called the ‘CCA/UNDAF’ process. Following are the common policy points that guide the CCA/UNDAF:
- National ownership that is inclusive of all stakeholders in all stages of the process;
- Alignment with national development priorities, strategies, systems and programming cycles;
- Inclusiveness of the UN system with full involvement of specialized and non-resident agencies;
- Integration of the five programming principles tailored to the country context:
  o the human rights-based approach,
  o gender equality,
  o environmental sustainability,
  o results-based management, and
  o capacity development);
- Mutual accountability for development results.

Further guidance is available in How to Prepare an UNDAF and in its Technical Guidance for UNCTs.

2.3 Consistency with UNDP Strategic Plan.

The 2008-2013 Strategic Plan outlines the major goals and objectives for UNDP, as approved by the Executive Board. The plan outlines the areas of focus for UNDP based on its mandate and comparative advantages, and signals the ways in which the organization works to enhance development effectiveness, including its focus on national ownership, national capacity development, gender equality and women’s empowerment as well as south-south cooperation.

All programme managers must refer to the Strategic Plan prior to commencing programme development work. UNDP’s own contribution to UNDAF, as well as country, regional and global programmes should be focused on, and lead to contributing to achieve the goals and expected development outcomes in the Strategic Plan.

2.4 Programming within a set of common coherent programming instruments:

United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) is the primary UN system-wide instrument for programming at the country level. It is produced during the strategic planning stage. It states UN’s collective response in terms of agreed common development results and partnerships necessary to achieving those. UNDP must participate fully in the preparation of UNDAF and contribute to achieving the strategic results selected through the UNDAF processes through its country programme.

Country Programme Document (CPD) for UNDP assistance flows directly from the UNDAF. It states more clearly those results in the UNDAF for which UNDP has a direct responsibility. CPD’s primary function is to articulate and convey to the UNDP Executive Board for its approval UNDP’s contribution to the national results through the UNDAF, and the resources needed for achieving results. CPD should be prepared during the strategic planning stage together with the UNDAF. The format of CPD is described in detail in the Country Programme Document (CPD) Template available on the online tool (see next paragraph). A CPD must be prepared by all countries for UNDP assistance.

A country programme document tool with its companion step-by-step guide—intended to provide easy processing of CPD— is available in UNDP RBM platform. It offers easy-to-follow guidance on how to use the tool which facilitates communication between the country office and the regional bureau during preparation of CPDs. The tool is designed to enable country offices to obtain all the necessary inputs in advance of appraisals at the local and regional bureau levels.
In addition to the UNDAF and CPD, country offices should consider other possibilities and options for increasing UN system’s coherence in programming from the beginning of the CCA/UNDAF process. Several UNCTs in consultation with respective Governments and Regional Directors Teams have initiated common delivering as one approaches to increase coherence and effectiveness of UN System’s programmes and operations going beyond the UNDAF. These efforts bring all members of the country team together under one nationally-owned strategy that draws on the full range of UN expertise. With full participation of relevant national and international partners, the UN Resident Coordinator leads the UN Country Team through a programming process to create a set of strategic results based on national priorities, the internationally agreed development goals, and the UN’s capacity and comparative advantages. UNDP actively participates in such initiatives. Further guidance to initiate such programmes is available at the UNDG websites on the System-wide Coherence and Delivering as One.

Joint programmes and UNDAF Action Plans (UNDAF-AP) are two other approaches being used increasingly by UN agencies with a view to increase coherence of implementation of UN system’s response. During the Country Programme preparation process opportunities for potential joint programmes and the use of UNDAF Action Plans should be explored. Joint Programming Guidance Note (JPGN) explains in detail the process of UN organizations and national partners working together to prepare, implement, monitor and evaluate joint programmes. Further guidance on UNDAF-AP is available in UNDAF Action Plan Guidance Note and UNDAF Action Plan Guidance Note (Annex II).

2.5 Planned Monitoring and Evaluation

A clear framework, agreed among the key stakeholders at the end of the planning stage, is essential in order to carry out monitoring and evaluation systematically. Preparation of the monitoring and evaluation framework should be an integral part of the programme strategic planning process. This framework serves as a plan for monitoring and evaluation, and should clarify:

- What is to be monitored and evaluated,
- The activities needed to be carried out to monitor and evaluate,
- Who is responsible for M&E activities,
- When M&E activities are planned (timing),
- How monitoring and evaluation are carried out (methods),
- What resources are required and where they are committed.

In addition, relevant risks and assumptions in carrying out planned M&E activities should be seriously considered, anticipated and included in the M&E framework.

Regional and Global Programmes should also prepare similar initial M&E Framework for Regional and Global programmes. Further details on monitoring are available in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results.

It is mandatory for UNDP to present an Evaluation Plan to its Executive Board with each Country, Regional and Global programme document considered for approval. The Evaluation Plan is a
component of the M&E framework, and should include those evaluations which can be foreseen at the end of the programme planning stage. The plan should be strategic, including a selection of evaluations that will generate the most critical and useful information for UNDP and its partners in decision-making. The Evaluation Plan should meet the minimum quality criteria established by the EO and include all mandatory evaluations. In UNDP, outcome evaluations and evaluations required by partnership protocols such as the Global Environment Fund (GEF) are mandatory. The Evaluation Plan is not a static document; it should be reviewed as part of the M&E framework and refined as needed during programme implementation. For example, as new projects are designed and the need for evaluations is identified, new evaluations should be added to the Evaluation Plan as necessary.

After a country, regional or global programme is approved, the respective programme unit enters the evaluation plan in the Evaluation Resource Center (ERC) for tracking [1]. As the units exercising oversight responsibility, the Regional Bureaus use the evaluation plan submitted by the programme units as the basis for assessing compliance. The Evaluation Office reports on evaluation compliance directly to the UNDP Executive Board in its Annual Report on Evaluation.

UNDP programme units are required to select and commission evaluations that provide substantive information for decision-making. In deciding what to evaluate, the programme units should first of all determine the purpose of evaluation and other factors that may influence the relevance and use of proposed evaluations. In general, for accountability purposes, at least 20 to 30% of the entire programme portfolio should be subject to evaluation.

2.5.1 Evaluation Planning

Developing an evaluation plan

It is mandatory for UNDP to prepare and present a costed evaluation plan to its Executive Board as an annex to global, regional, country, south-south and other programme documents that are submitted for approval. At the level of country programmes, the Evaluation Plan is a component of the UNDAF M&E framework, and should include those evaluations, which are foreseen for the life of the programme cycle. The plan is developed together with key programme partners (e.g. programme governments for country programmes) and should be strategic, including a selection of evaluations that will generate the most critical and useful information for UNDP and its partners in decision-making. The evaluation plan should include all planned evaluations, including those required by a cost-sharing agreement or partnership protocol (e.g., GEF).

The revised evaluation policy (2011) introduced the full implementation of the evaluation plan as the basis for decentralized evaluation compliance. (In the previous policy (2006), the basis for compliance was the implementation of planned outcome evaluations only.)

The revised policy emphasizes flexibility and quality over quantity in evaluation planning and conduct. It encourages programme units to make strategic choices. A comprehensive and strategic evaluation plan should include an appropriate mix of outcome-level evaluations, preferably conducted jointly with other partners, of programmes or programme components, projects and themes, as well as other types of outcome-level evaluations, as appropriate (see section on Evaluation).
Whenever opportunities arise, joint evaluations are the preferred modality for evaluating UNDP’s contribution. However, these evaluations need to analyse UNDP-specific contributions to results so that they fulfil the organization’s accountability and learning needs.

While the evaluation plan has to address all outcomes in the programme document, it does not mean “one outcome = one outcome evaluation”. An outcome area could be evaluated through an outcome-level programme, project or thematic evaluation, or a mix of the same or different types of evaluations. Regardless of the types of evaluations, evaluations in UNDP, including project evaluations, should address UNDP’s contribution at the outcome level. For example, a project level evaluation should provide information on how the project contributes to changes at the outcome level. By that logic, a good outcome-oriented project level evaluation or thematic evaluation may provide sufficient evaluation coverage of programmatic activities in an outcome area, and there is no need for an outcome evaluation.

At country level, all evaluation plans submitted with CPDs to the Executive Board for approval must be fully costed. It is important that costing be realistic, so it forms part of the agreement with Government in order to facilitate future budgeting and resource allocation. After the Executive Board approves the country programme, the country office enters the evaluation plan in the **ERC**. As the units exercising oversight responsibility for country office evaluations, the regional bureaux use the evaluation plan submitted by the programme units as the basis for assessing compliance. The Evaluation Office reports on evaluation compliance directly to the UNDP Executive Board in its Annual Report on Evaluation, and UNDP management reports on the status of implementation of management responses in the Annual Report of the Administrator.

The evaluation plans for country offices must be budgeted (e.g. sources of financing identified) at the time of CPAP design. There is no prescriptive way to finance decentralized evaluations so offices may use the best means available in their context. The Executive Board requested UNDP, in its decision on the Annual Report on Evaluation 2009/11, to “improve compliance through the establishment and appropriate resourcing of achievable country programme evaluation plans, including the resourcing of decentralized outcome evaluations from programme resources”.

**ADR and decentralized evaluations**

Since the ADRs are part of the approved programme of work and budget of the Evaluation Office, the Evaluation Office is responsible for the conduct and content. The country office is expected to provide in-kind contributions, as outlined in the Terms of Reference of the ADR. Because the selection of countries for ADRs is made by the Evaluation Office, ADRs are not included in the country programme evaluation plans that are submitted for approval to the Executive Board. However, when planning decentralized evaluations, country offices should take steps to ensure that whether or not an ADR is conducted, there will be adequate evaluation coverage over the life of the programme cycle to provide useful and actionable lessons that can feed into the development of the next UNDAF/CPD. If an ADR is scheduled, it will be conducted during the penultimate year of the programme cycle. Ideally, all major decentralized evaluations should be conducted prior to the ADR since they may provide useful inputs to the ADR, and will help avoid duplication of evaluation efforts and undue burden.
The conduct of the ADR does not replace evaluation requirements for programme units or substitute for planned decentralized evaluations. Both independent and decentralized evaluations have distinctive purposes: ADRs are independent evaluations mandated by the Executive Board that aim to strengthen the accountability and learning of the organization. The decentralized evaluations are linked to compliance requirements of programme units and aim primarily to support learning and managing for development results. Both types of evaluations are required.

In the ERC under the evaluation plan, there is a narrative section where the evaluation context (donor evaluations, government-led evaluations and ADR, etc…) can be described to give a more comprehensive picture.

Revision of the evaluation plan

Evaluation plans of programme units are reviewed as part of the annual programme review process to ensure relevance of the planned evaluations. With the advance clearance by the regional bureau and the agreement of the government, the evaluation plans for country offices can be revised for compelling reasons such as major changes in policy, programme or evaluation context. The regional bureau clears the revised evaluation plan for country offices in the context of its oversight responsibilities. The Administrator clears any changes in the regional, global, thematic and South-South programme evaluation plans.

The evaluation plan, which has gone through the appropriate review and clearance process, serves as the basis for compliance in terms of decentralized evaluation coverage. The most up-to-date evaluation plans should be made available in the ERC.

2.6 UNDP’s role in the appraisal and approval of the draft UNDAF

A self-assessment of the draft UNDAF must be undertaken by the UNCT. This is to ensure ownership, high quality of UNDAF and to ensure the optimum strategic positioning of the UN system at country level. UNDP contributes to this self-assessment and is accountable for its designing high quality contributions towards the achievement of UNDAF outcomes. (For details on criteria for a quality UNDAF, refer to How to Prepare an UNDAF and Technical Guidance for UNCTs.)

The UNCT and government also seek feedback on the initial draft from other development partners. The UNCT is required to share a draft UNDAF with the regionally based Quality Support and Assurance (QSA) Convening Agency for final review by the Peer Support Group (PSG). The Convening Agency provides consolidated comments from the PSG within 15 working days. The UNCT then reviews and updates the UNDAF based on the comments and concerns received. The UNDAF is signed thereafter and the RC sends the signed UNDAF to all partners and to the Chair of the UN Development Group for submission to the UN Secretary-General.

2.7 Country Programme Document (CPD) Appraisal & Approval processes

2.7.1 Appraisal

All UNDP funded programmes (country, regional and global programmes) must be appraised before approval, through a formal appraisal meeting. The appraisal consists of the review of the draft Country Programme Document which includes the results and resources framework. Persons who were not directly involved in formulation must participate in the appraisal. During appraisal of a UNDP programme, UNDP and stakeholders ensure that the programme has been designed in a sound and results-oriented way and that the results are clear, coherent and lend well to monitoring (see 2.5 above).
Prior to submission to headquarters, the Resident Representative must ensure that the Country Programme Document is reviewed locally by all relevant stakeholders (including government, civil society, UN agencies and other multi-lateral and bilateral partners) for ownership, relevance and other quality considerations. The content of the Country Programme must be consistent with the Strategic Plan and with the UNDAF.

2.7.2 Approval

The Director of the Regional Bureau is accountable for the submission of a high-quality draft CPD to the Associate Administrator for onward transmission to the Executive Board for review and approval. The country office and the regional bureau are jointly responsible for following a thorough formulation and appraisal process.

The Director of the Regional Bureau is accountable also for the submission of a high-quality draft Regional Programme for Executive Board review and approval. In this regard, the Bureau should be guided by the Considerations for Quality Programming and Checklist for Use by the BPAC in their Review of Draft CPDs. Similarly the Director of the Bureau for Development Policy (BDP) is accountable for the submission of a high-quality draft Global Programme for Executive Board review and approval. The detailed processes applicable for appraisal and approval are stated in the Global and Regional Programming section.

2.8 Applicability

All programme countries including the net contributor countries (NCCs) are required to prepare a Country Programme document for approval by the UNDP Executive Board. When circumstances prevent the preparation or approval of a Country Programme, the Executive Board may authorize the Administrator to approve projects on a case-by-case basis.

3.0 Flowchart

Not applicable.

4.0 Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Mandatory Step</th>
<th>Tasks and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 03  | Prepare Draft UNDP Country Programme and M&E Plan as constituents of the UNDAF and UNDAF M&E Framework. | ✓ Formulate UNDP programmatic contribution to the UNDAF and UNDAF M&E Framework following the inclusive stakeholder participation processes envisaged in the Road Map, and based on the country analysis. [responsibility: **UNDP Programme Manager**] This takes place within the UNDAF preparation process that includes:  
✓ Holding a strategic prioritization exercise among UN system and stakeholders, led by the government to link the comparative advantages of the UN system to specific national development priorities in a particular country.  
✓ Agreeing on a set of outcomes to support national development priorities.  
✓ Preparing a SMART results matrix for every UNDAF. The country analysis and prioritization exercise is the basis for drafting the results matrix. See further guidance in **Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development** Results. The results matrix should be a strategic contribution— |
focused on achievement of substantive national priority outcomes—in line with UNDP’s comparative advantage and the goals and the expected outcomes in the Strategic Plan development results framework. Further guidance on the preparation of UNDAF is available in How to Prepare an UNDAF and in its Technical Guidance for UNCTs.

- **Locally appraise, approve and sign the UNDAF: UNDP Programme Manager** must ensure appropriate UNDP participation in the review, appraisal, clearance and signature of the UNDAF as per the arrangements agreed in the Road Map. UNDAF Appraisal should ensure: (a) the substantive strength of the draft UNDAF and outcome orientation; (b) identification of opportunities for joint programmes. (see Guidance on Joint Programmes); and (c) adoption of simplification and harmonization measures such as the use of an UNDAF Action Plan in the implementation in accordance with the UNDAF Action Plan guidance Note, and when there is:
  - Strong government leadership of the development process and an indication that the Government is supportive of greater UN coherence;
  - Strong alignment among the donor community and indications that donors support greater UN coherence;
  - Strong UNCT with a high level of commitment among its members to UN coherence.

- **Develop and draft UNDP Country Programme Document**, flowing from the UNDP’s contribution to the UNDAF. Capacity development strategies, including gender equality and South-South cooperation must be integrated in the Country Programme document. (See interim guidance on CPD and Evaluation Plan for further details)

- All UNDP country programmes should prepare an initial M&E framework at the end of the planning stage consistent with CCA/UNDAF M&E guidelines and also taking into account the guidance in Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. The Evaluation Plan for CPD should be prepared as part of M&E Framework to present to the Executive Board along with the CPD. (See interim guidance on CPD and Evaluation Plan for further details)

- The Director of the Regional Bureau is accountable for the preparation of a high-quality draft Regional Programme through an inclusive process and based on the relevant analysis and concept paper (see below); Similarly the Director of the Bureau for Development Policy (BDP) is accountable for the preparation of a high-quality draft Global Programme as per guidance for Global and Regional Programming. Key formulation steps for RP and GP are:

  - The regional bureau (via Regional Service Centres as appropriate) prepares a concept paper as a basis for preparing the draft RPD, using a standard format. The paper validates and advocates the needs and priorities and proposes a framework for UNDP programming in the region. The draft paper is circulated for comments among a broad range of stakeholders and specifically among regional and sub-regional organizations. It is also circulated to the other regional bureaux, the central units in UNDP headquarters and country offices within that region.

  - Based on the analysis of global mandates and priorities, BDP prepares a short concept paper for the GPD covering the main elements of the proposed framework. BDP uses the concept paper as the basis for consultations with a broad range of partners, including the United Nations Development Group,
United Nations specialized agencies, UNDP bureaux and units, programme country governments, donor governments, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental and civil society organizations, and other stakeholders. The draft Global Programme is prepared through this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>04</th>
<th>Appraise the UNDP Country Programme at country level and forward for HQ appraisal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>The Programme Manager is responsible to</strong> organize a local programme appraisal meeting of the draft Country Programme with government, UNCT and other partners to review and validate the UNDP’s CP against the UNDAF Results Matrix. This could be a joint meeting to review and validate CPs of several agencies that come under the UNDAF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The local appraisal of CPD should also ensure that Agencies (including Specialised Agencies and Non-Resident Agencies) review and commit to the common UNDAF results. It should also promote establishing or realigning thematic groups to outcomes, and identify opportunities for joint programming including joint monitoring, studies and evaluation. Donor representatives and key multi-lateral agencies, including IFIs, are also invited to participate in the CPD appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ The appraisal should ensure the relevance for national results, compliance with UNDP strategic plan, high substantive standard/potential effectiveness of the draft CPD and its orientation to achieve outcomes. In addition it should identify opportunities for joint programmes as well as inclusion of simplification and harmonization measures, for example, engagement in Direct Budget Support (DBS) or Sector Budget Support (SBS) in accordance with the <strong>UNDP engagement in sector budget support and pooled funding</strong>. (See interim guidance on CPD and Evaluation Plan for further details)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>The Programme Manager</strong> is responsible for organizing the local appraisal, factoring in the comments and recommendations and forwarding to UNDP HQ (a revised) draft country programme document for latter’s appraisal and clearance. Along with draft CPD the country office also submits the draft Resource Mobilization Target (RMT) table. Please see the <strong>Resource Mobilization Target Table Template</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At the time of submission of draft CPDs to the regional bureau, Country Office should attach records of appraisal process and the completed checklist ensuring that all important programming and quality aspects relevant to CPD process and content are satisfactorily addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>05</th>
<th>Appraise the Country programme in UNDP HQ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ <strong>Appraisal of the Country programme in UNDP Headquarters:</strong> The Regional Bureau convenes the <strong>Programme Advisory Committee (PAC)</strong> to review the draft Country Programme document and check that it is: results/outcome oriented; consistent with the UNDAF, the <strong>Strategic Plan</strong> and other UNDP policies and procedures. See <strong>interim guidance on the preparation of CPD and evaluation plan</strong> for further details and the <strong>Checklist for Use by the BPAC in their Review of Draft CPDs</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The regional bureau reviews the Resource Mobilization Target (RMT) table, ensures that it is realistic and submits it to Office of Planning and Budgeting (OPB). OPB confirms the accuracy of the financial resources included in the RMT of the CPD. OPB confirms the estimated TRAC 1/2 carryover and TRAC 1 amounts. The RMT is not part of the draft CPD that is submitted to the Executive Board. It is used for internal management purposes and confirmation of availability of envisaged UNDP resources by OPB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clearance of Country, programme for Executive Board approval

- For each draft CPD, its accompanying draft evaluation plan is reviewed for evaluability and compliance with the evaluation policy by the respective bureaux with support from the Evaluation Office.
- Taking into account PAC comments, the Bureau revises the document and the evaluation plan in collaboration with the CO. The Regional Bureau and CO must ensure the national ownership as well as the consistency of the revised draft Country Programme document and the evaluation plan with the UNDAF results matrix and national priorities.
- Regional Bureau submits the Country Programme document to the Operations Support Group (OSG) together with its appraisal record and the Bureau Director’s signature on the clearance form. OSG clears the programme on behalf of the (Associate) Administrator.
- In the event that UNDP and the government are unable to reach full agreement on the draft CPD content, the areas of disagreement will be brought to the attention of the Executive Board in a note by the Administrator. The regional bureau prepares this note.
- The CPD is submitted to the EB through the EB Secretariat. The evaluation plan is made available on the Executive Board webpage as an annex to the Country Programme document. The UNDAF Results Matrix is made available to Executive Board members.
- The approval of the draft Country, Regional and Global Programme by the Executive Board constitutes the authority of the Administrator to assign UNDP funds.

Appraisal and clearance of Regional and Global programmes for Executive Board approval

- Regional/Global Programme appraisal is organized by the respective Bureau. The detailed processes applicable for appraisal and approval are stated in the Global and Regional Programming section. Key steps:
  ✓ Review of draft regional/global programme document, along with the draft evaluation plan by Operations Group to validate/certify programme direction.
  ✓ The Bureau Director submits the draft RPD/GPD, along with the evaluation plan, to OPB/BOM for clearance on resource allocation and then to AA through OSG for endorsement;
  ✓ The draft RPD/GPD is then submitted to the Executive Board for approval. The draft evaluation plan is made available to the Executive Board as an annex for review. The Executive Board may propose changes to the document;
- The approval of the draft Regional and Global Programme by the Executive Board constitutes the authority of the Administrator to assign UNDP funds.

5.0 Inputs

- National Development Plans
- Strategic Plan
- Country Analysis
- Evaluations of the Global and Regional Programmes, their associated management responses and follow-up action plans Millennium Development Goals Report (MDG)
- National Human Development Report (NHDR)
6.0 Deliverables

For a complete set of interim guidance, templates and forms on CPD, go to home.undp.org/cpd. (Guidance for CPDs and costed evaluation plans is interim, since approval of UNDP’s revised Evaluation Policy must occur before publishing of the costed evaluation plan guidance and templates in the POPP).

- Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) (as applicable)
- Reviews of past co-operation, evaluations and lessons from other programmes
- UNDP engagement in sector budget support and pooled funding
- UNDAF Checklist 2010: Assessing the quality and strategic positioning of the UNDAF

- UNDP contribution integrated in the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and its Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
- EB approved Country Programme document (or Regional/Global Programme Document)
- Initial M&E Framework of UNDP Country programme (Regional Programme/Global Programme)
- Draft evaluation plan of UNDP Country Programme (Regional Programme/Global Programme)
- Resource Mobilization Target Table

7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

The government has the full ownership of results to be supported by UNDP as articulated in UNDAF and in the UNDP country programme, therefore should provide leadership for the preparation of UNDAF and CPD.

**Government Coordinating Agency:** Represents the government and ensures national priorities both in terms of development results and capacity development are addressed through UNDAF and UNDP Country Programme. The Government Coordinating Agency should also facilitate UNDP’s engagement with existing national and sector development planning and coordination mechanisms.

UNCT has the primary responsibility for the formulation of the UNDAF in close consultation with the government and other national partners.

**Programme Manager:** The UNDP country office should assist the government and UNCT as required in ensuring a results-based orientation in the UNDAF and programme as well as their M&E Frameworks. UNDP Programme Manager carries the primary responsibility from UNDP office to formulate a programme working closely with the Government Coordinating Agency or relevant counterparts and UNCT. Ensures that the basis for monitoring and evaluation (clear outcomes, outputs, indicators, data collection instruments and budgets) are established and summarized in the Country Programme document. Ensures that CPD is appraised and all necessary quality checks are carried out. Responsible for preparing an evaluation plan that meets the quality criteria, securing sufficient financial and human resources to carry out planned evaluations and making sure that the evaluation plan is entered and updated in the ERC.

**Country Programme Board:** Tasks include assisting with organization of appraisal of UNDAF and UNDP country programme as part of the former and coordination with different parties throughout this process to ensure inclusiveness of stakeholders.

**Regional Bureau:** Performs an oversight function over country programmes. Reviews the programme and the evaluation plan, based on the quality criteria, to provide in-house quality assurance of the programme. The Director of the Bureau endorses the quality of the evaluation plan prior to the submission to the
Executive Board. In brief, the Bureaux ensures that: the process of developing the country programme and the evaluation plan is participatory in order to enhance their ownership at the country level; the selection of evaluations is strategic and aligned with national, as well as corporate Strategic Plan priorities; mandatory evaluations are included; and the timing, financing and resource requirements are clearly stipulated; outcome evaluations identified in the plan provide adequate programme coverage to enable an end of the cycle evaluations such as ADR and UNDAF evaluations; and country offices enter the finalised plans into the ERC and update the status of evaluations. They also ensure that the evaluations commissioned by country offices provide the balanced coverage of Strategic Plan objectives/priorities.

**OSG/Associate Administrator**: clears and submits to the Executive Board.

**Executive Board**: Approves the Country Programme as defined in the Country Programme document

**Evaluation Offices**: Provides guidelines, quality standards and template for evaluation planning, and maintains the ERC.

### 8.0 Templates and Forms

- UNDAF and UNDAF M&E Template (see [2010 CCA/UNDAF Guidelines](#))
- **Country Programme Document (CPD) Template**
- [Global programme document template](#)
- [Regional programme document template](#)
- [Evaluation Plan template](#)
- Considerations for Quality Programming
- [Checklist for Use by the BPAC in their Review of Draft CPDs](#)
- [Resource Mobilization Target Table Template](#)
- [Form for Approving the CPD](#)
- [CPD Clearance Checklist](#)
- [CPD Clearance Timeline](#)
- [CPD Extension Form](#)
- [CPD M&E Framework Template](#)
- [link to UNDP Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook](#)
- [EB Documentation Deadlines](#)

### 9.0 Additional Info. and Tools

Check the [Programme and Project Management Resource Center](#)

### Initiating a Programme

Programme and Project > Programme Management > Initiating a Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Capacity Development Group – Bureau for Development Policy</th>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Asoka Kasturiarachchi</th>
<th>Issuance/POPP Publishing Date</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>15/12/2010</th>
<th>24/11/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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1.0 Description

The purpose of this process is to:

1. Develop the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) or contribute to the preparation of UNDAF Action Plan based on the Country Programme/UNDAF while awaiting formal approval of the country programme by the Executive Board (EB); and

2. Elaborate the Monitoring and Evaluation framework in readiness to monitor the CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan (UNDAF-AP). (The elaborated M&E Framework serves as the CPAP/UNDAF-AP M&E Framework/Plan) and costed evaluation plans that are annexed to the CPDs.

The Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) and the UNDAF Action Plan (UNDAF-AP) are integral parts of the UN system’s ongoing UN Reforms to simplify and harmonize country level programming efforts. Preparation of CPAP/UNDAF-AP and Annual Work Plans (AWP) should be considered key elements of a single programming continuum at the country level that starts with the preparation of the Country Analysis, continues with the formulation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), and in the past concluded with the drafting of the Country Programme Document (CPD) and project document. In the past, linkages especially of the results between the CPD and specific project documents were not clearly articulated as a whole for the programme. The CPAP/UNDAF-AP and the AWP address this gap in results management by explicitly linking outcomes and outputs in the CPD/UNDAF to activities which are articulated in the CPAP/UNDAF-AP and AWP.

There is currently no CPAP equivalent for global and regional programming. However, the Global programme and each of the Regional Programmes are required to prepare an accompanying elaborated M&E Framework.

2.0 Relevant Policies

2.1 Increased UN Programming focus, coherence & coordination.

Under the UN country programming process each UN agency with a Country Programme prepares its own CPAP (see CPAP Template), or prepares an UNDAF-AP collectively (see UNDAF-AP Technical Guidance Annex I and Annex II). CPAP/UNDAF-AP is signed by the government with all UN agencies participating in it. It constitutes the legal agreement between UNDP and the government to execute the Country Programme. Whenever possible UNDP and other UN Agencies should sign the CPAP/UNDAF-AP with the Government at a joint signing event to signify increased focus, coherence and coordinated UN response.

The CPAP/UNDAF-AP and Annual Work Plans (AWP) together constitute the project document as referred to in the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA). Annual Work Plan (AWP), which is an integral part of, and is incorporated by reference into the CPAP/UNDAF-AP, are the legal agreements between UNDP and Implementing Partners to implement a specific project within a calendar year as
identified in the CPAP/UNDAF-AP. The basic format of **AWP** is given at [http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=252](http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=252). To the extent possible UNDP and partners will use the minimum documents necessary, namely the signed CPAP or UNDAF-AP and Annual Work Plans (AWP) to implement programmatic initiatives.

However it should be noted that many countries have found that this basic AWP format is often inadequate to capture the multi-year nature as well as accountability and risk management requirements of UNDP projects. UNDP has therefore adapted the basic AWP format to serve its needs, which is given at Annual Work Plan (AWP)/Project Document.

The CPAP/UNDAF-AP should be explicitly linked to the CPD and UNDAF, and through them to the strategic results which the UN is supporting to achieve in the country. The CPAP/UNDAF-AP provides additional details (of the programme that is strategically articulated in CPD/UNDAF) in order to provide further clarity in results and envisaged operational arrangements. In short, the CPAP/UNDAF-AP is the programme level operational plan that guides the development and delivery of UNDP funded outputs, linking programme management to project management.

### 2.2 Key elements of the content of CPAP/UNDAF-AP

The narrative sections of CPAP/UNDAF-AP should make references to following points:

- Outlining the inclusive dialogue/consultative process that was followed in preparing CPAP/UNDAF-AP to ensure national ownership and how stakeholders would continue to be engaged during implementation of CPAP/UNDAF-AP.
- The Country Programme outcomes and strategies, and how they would contribute to the strategic outcomes of the UNDAF and national development results.
- The Description of each **Programme Component**, the expected results and the strategies to be used to achieve these results. In describing the proposed strategies, reference should be made to:
  - the application of the lessons learned;
  - a brief description of UNDP’s distinctive role, vis-à-vis other development partners, in addressing the identified country development challenges; and
  - how outputs would contribute to the achievement of abovementioned overall outcome(s) of Country Programme and the UNDAF;
- The programme should include a strategy to enable UNDP to utilize Fast Tracking policies and procedures in any future circumstances that may warrant application of such policies and procedures.
- In the description of each programme component and expected results, clear reference to capacity development should be made, and should include, inter alia, the following:
Use of systematic assessment of capacities.
- Documentation and use of past experiences in capacity development
- Promotion of local knowledge acquisition, connecting individual capacity development to institutional and societal change.
- Promotion of use of national systems
  - Consideration and application of gender equality and women’s empowerment in line with the UNDP Gender Equality Strategy (http://content.undp.org/go/topics/gender/).

CPAP and UNDAF-AP are legal instruments. Therefore particular attention must be paid to adhering to the standard mandatory clauses in the templates, guidance notes and annexes: (see CPAP Template, UNDAF-AP Technical Guidance Annex I and Annex II). Prior clearance from the Legal Support Office must be obtained for any deviations from standard clauses.

2.3 Joint Programmes

The CPAP/UNDAF-AP should also indicate the results that are to be implemented by joint programmes. Where possible specific reference should be made to the foreseen joint programmes themselves in the CPAP under the programme management section. For further information on joint programmes refer Guidance Note on Joint Programming. There are three joint programme fund management options: (i) Parallel; (ii) Pooled; and (iii) Pass-through. These options can also be combined to suit country context, although combining of options would be complex.

If UNDP is selected as the Administrative Agent under a Pass-through fund management option of a joint programme, delegation of authority to carry out this function must be obtained from the Multi Donor Trust Fund Office. Guidance for the delegation of authority can be found on “UNDP’s Accountability when acting as Administrative Agent in MDTFs and/or UN Joint Programmes using the pass-through fund management modality.” When UNDP participates in a joint programme as a Participating UN Organization (PUNO) in a parallel or pass-through fund management option or as the Managing Agent in pooled fund management option, the component for which UNDP is responsible should be treated as equivalent of a UNDP project for its justification, appraisal, implementation and closing.

UNDP should hold an internal pre-Project Appraisal Committee (pre-PAC) to clear the component of a joint programme for which it is responsible in accordance with UNDP procedures for appraising projects. The deliberations and decisions of this pre-PAC should inform the appraisal of the overall joint programme, which by nature should be joint. Approval and monitoring of the overall joint programme should be done jointly.

When a component of a joint programme that UNDP supports as a PUNO is covered by the signed CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan, the execution modality would be NEX. However any one of the five implementation modalities (i.e. national implementation, UN agency implementation, CSO implementation, IGO implementation and Direct (UNDP) implementation) can be selected for implementation (see below also).

2.4 Identification and Selection Implementation Modalities and Implementation Partners.
Note that with the signing of the CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan, that national execution or NEX becomes the default execution modality for all projects covered by them.

UNDP may select an implementing partner for a project from one of five different types of partner organizations:

1. Government entities. The use of a government entity is referred to as national implementation (NIM). Eligible government entities include:
   
   (a) A ministry of the government;  
   (b) A department within a ministry; or  
   (c) A governmental institution of a semi-autonomous nature, such as, the central bank, a university, a regional or local authority or a municipality.

2. United Nations agencies

3. Civil society organizations (CSOs/NGOs)

4. UNDP itself. The use of UNDP as the implementing partner is also referred to as direct implementation (DIM)

5. Inter-governmental organizations that are not part of the UN system

More details on selection of implementation modalities are available at Defining a Project. The implementation modalities (and, to the extent possible, the potential implementing partners) for specific projects will be identified during CPAP/UNDAF-AP preparation. The following would apply:

- National institutions should be given the first consideration to implement constituent parts/projects of CPAP/UNDAF-AP. This is in order to enhance national ownership, sustainability and capacity development. Nevertheless, when required as a last resort UNDP may implement AWP/WS/PPs.

- Some Implementing Partners (IPs) may already be managing ongoing projects, i.e., projects that began in the previous programme cycle. In such cases, the CPAP formulators can either reconfirm the current IP, or if there are potential alternative IPs, then they should be considered.

- When the CPAP only states the intended results, i.e., in situations where a project document or annual work plan is not fully developed, then the CPAP formulators should propose candidates or categories of partners (such as CSO/NGOs) who could serve as implementing partner. The selection of the implementing partners can be undertaken/finalized after the CPAP is agreed and as the projects are developed. In such cases, the identity of IP in the CPAP/UNDAF-AP is indicative.

- Where a project document and/or annual work plan for a project in CPAP/UNDAF-AP has already been prepared, and if the implementing partner has been selected in accordance with the procedures in Project Management section of Defining a Project, then the selected IP can be included in the CPAP as the designated IP for that project/AWP.

During the life of the CPAP, any new project ideas or proposal that may emerge which are not in the agreed CPAP must be approved by the Government Coordinating Authority and UNDP prior to being
included in CPAP. The implementing modalities and partners for such projects would be selected in accordance with the procedures given under Defining a Project.

An implementing partner may enter into agreements with other organizations or entities, known as responsible parties who may provide goods and services to the project, carry out project activities and produce project outputs. Responsible parties are accountable directly to the implementing partner.

### 2.5 Additional Policy for UNDP direct implementation under CPAP/UNDAF-AP

For projects that are included in CPAP/UNDAF-AP, which had previously used the Direct Execution (DEX) modality, or new projects in which UNDP has been designated as the Implementing Partner, please see Policy on Oversight of Implementation of Country Programmes by UNDP Country Offices under Common Country Programming Process.

The Regional Bureau should review designation of UNDP in CPAP/UNDAF-AP for (direct) implementation (DIM). The following should be considered, inter alia: (1) assessment of CO capacity for implementation; (2) the extent of the CPAP and/or the number of AWPs that is to be delegated to CO for DIM; (3) requirements of annual reporting by CO on UNDP implemented AWPs. (Further considerations are given in the procedure section below.)

Based on the review of CO capacity as above, the Regional Bureau can:
- delegate to CO authority to approve all UNDP implemented AWPs
- delegate authority to CO to approve UNDP implemented AWPs subject to conditions specified by the Bureau
- require CO to submit all UNDP implemented AWPs for approval by the Bureau

For projects outside the CPAP, normal procedures for DEX approval will continue to apply.

### 2.6 Setting up Programme and Outcome Monitoring

#### 2.6.1 Detailed M&E frameworks with up-to-date relevant information.

A detailed programme level M&E plan should be elaborated at the initiation stage for each UNDP country, regional and global programme. The initial M&E Framework prepared at the end of the planning (or defining) stage of programme (UNDAF/CPD) forms the basis for this purpose.

All outcomes and outputs contained in CPAP/UNDAF-AP should have indicators. Indicators are signals that reveal progress (or lack thereof) towards pre-defined outputs or outcomes measured in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. In identifying suitable indicators, the key is to have a clear understanding of what is (the change) agreed to be important and how it can be observed in practice. Baseline data and targets are required for each outcome and output indicator. Establishing a baseline requires an assessment of the current status of the indicator. Target setting is based on consideration of degree of change that is realistically achievable in a given time period. It depends on assumptions about resources,
effectiveness, time frame of policy deliberations, risks and the like, and should be established and agreed jointly by all relevant stakeholders.

Detail information on the outcomes, outputs and related indicators, baselines, risks, assumptions becomes clearer during the stages of the development of the CPAP and specific constituent projects. Data that emerges during the detailed project development stages should be used to improve the initial descriptions of outputs, indicators, baselines, risks, assumptions, etc. and thereby enhancing the effectiveness and quality of monitoring. Modifications to make the initial M&E Framework a more realistic and effective tool for monitoring should ideally be factored in at the time of finalizing CPAP.

Updating of the M&E Framework should not, however, be a onetime event. Each time a significant relevant change to the Results Framework is effected, for example when existing projects are completed and/or new projects are added to the CPAP/UNDAF-AP, both the CPAP/UNDAF-AP and the M&E Framework should be revised and approved as applicable. Annual reviews and work planning events that take place at the end or beginning of the year are pertinent points for this continuous updating of CPAP/UNDAF-APs and their M&E Frameworks.

2.6.2 Coordination and consultation fora for monitoring outcomes.

Monitoring of a given outcome requires a clear understanding of all contributory outputs to it from all partners, other actions such as advocacy, and harnessing their inter-connections synergistically. UNDP as one partner is directly accountable for making its own agreed contribution toward the achievement of outcome. In addition it is also responsible collectively with other partners for monitoring the gradual achievement of the overall outcome.

At the outcome and/or higher levels of results (national or sector goals, outcomes), key stakeholders should typically form sector-wide or inter-agency coordination mechanisms or outcome groups around each major outcome or sector for monitoring and coordination. Whenever there are existing national structures such as sector-wide coordination mechanisms/outcome groups, UN/UNDP should engage them and participate in these. They should not set up parallel mechanisms/groups for such purposes. Sectoral/outcome-level coordinating mechanisms are not UN(DP) management arrangements, but national mechanisms/structures which are charged with the coordination of the sector/outcome from a development perspective within the national/local context.

UNDP supports such national mechanisms/institutions focusing especially on developing their capacities for monitoring and evaluation. This support can extend to developing national monitoring systems. Such capacity development activities should however be elaborated within the overall capacity development approach. Please see Supporting Capacity Development: the UNDP Approach.

2.7 Review of audit arrangements

During drafting of the CPAP, the arrangements for the audit of government expenditures should be discussed with the Government Coordinating Agency per HACT Framework. Further information on
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audits pertaining to national implementation, NGO implementation and direct implementation is available at the Office of Audit and Investigations website.

2.8 Appraisal and approval of CPAP/UNDAF-AP

The Programme Manager is responsible to organize a local appraisal of the draft CPAP/UNDAF-AP with government, UNCT and other partners. COs are required seek RBx approval for direct implementation if the CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan entails any component to be implemented by UNDP.


3.0 Flowchart

Not applicable.

4.0 Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Mandatory Step</th>
<th>Tasks and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 07  | Prepare UNDP CPAP or contribute to the preparation of UNDAF Action Plan. | - The Programme Manager is responsible for initiating the process to draft the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) or to contribute to the preparation of to UNDAF Action Plan in accordance with the respective guidelines hyperlinked. This should commence while awaiting formal approval of the CPD by the Executive Board. The CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan preparation process and instruments must:  
  ✓ Follow and adhere to the standard mandatory clauses in the templates, guidance notes and annexes: (CPAP Template, UNDAF-AP Technical Guidance Annex I and Annex II)  
  ✓ Take into account the comments provided by the Executive Board in approving the CPD;  
  ✓ Engage relevant stakeholders throughout the CPAP drafting process.  
  ✓ Maintain that the Results and Resources Framework of CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan is in line with the UNDAF and Country Programme Results Framework. However in the preparation of CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan results statements can be further clarified to increase the understanding of the results strategically stated in UNDAF and CPD.  
  ✓ Identify further opportunities for joint programmes.  
  ✓ Finalize agreements on the management arrangements including the selection of implementing modalities and to the extent possible the Implementing Partners from among: government agencies, UN agencies (including UNDP), CSOs, direct implementation or IGOs. It is possible that at this stage the Implementing Partners would be indicative pending the capacity assessments. IPs are confirmed after carrying out the UNDP Capacity Assessment for Project Implementation. Based on the results of the assessments select/confirm IPs and formulate capacity development strategies as relevant. See Defining a Project section for more details on selecting an Implementing Partner. |
In selecting UNDP as an Implementing Partner, the following should be considered:

- Do other capacities to implement (national institutions, UN agencies or CSOs) exist?
- Is the **Annual Work Plans (AWP)** in response to conflict situations to allow for speed of delivery and accountability over resources?
- Does the AWP respond to situations that require sensitivity and neutrality where UNDP would have more credibility in achieving results?
- Is there an exit strategy to develop national capacities for implementation?

The **Programme Manager** should ensure that there is an entry point in the CPAP/UNDAF-AP for UNDP to apply fast tracking policies and procedures readily. Such entry points include adding a new generic output(s) under an already existing outcome and/or provision for a dormant project to be implemented by UNDP if needed.

- Apply the Gender Marker for all UNDP supported outputs in the results and resources framework in line with the UNDP Gender Equality Strategy (**http://content.undp.org/go/topics/gender/**).  

08 Set up for programme and outcome monitoring.

**UNDP Programme Manager is responsible for preparing a detailed programme level M&E Framework for UNDP country, regional and global programme respectively.**

- For country programmes a detailed M&E framework should be prepared along with the preparation of the CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan. This is done after the submission of the draft country programme document for Executive Board approval and prior to the signing of CPAP/UNDAF-AP.

- For regional and global projects this should be done prior to the beginning of the implementation of regional/global projects.

- In preparing the M&E frameworks the following should be carried out:
  - Specific indicators should be elaborated based on those developed for the CPD/UNDAF. Baselines should be established for each indicator, reflecting the status at the start of the programme cycle, prior to the beginning of the implementation of intervention/project. Targets should also be established against the same indicators.
  - To ensure progress towards achieving the target, and to establish accountability, annual output targets should be established and be given in the results matrix and annual work plans.
  - Identify a suitable strategies and mechanisms to monitor outcomes. Where possible outcome monitoring should be carried out through developing and using capacities of national mechanisms set up for coordination and monitoring of sectors or national results/outcomes. **UNDP Programme Manager** is responsible for ascertaining the existence of such mechanisms, engagement with them and developing them as appropriate. If they do not exist initiatives should be made to set them up, if necessary, by setting up initially a UN group with a view to integrating with national mechanisms at the earliest.

09 Appraise the CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan and finalize the M&E Plans.

**The Programme Manager is responsible to organize** a local appraisal of the draft CPAP/UNDAF-AP with government, UNCT and other partners. This could be joint meeting to review and validate CPs of several agencies coming under UNDAF.
• CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan are appraised locally to ensure that (a) it is consistent with the CPA/UNDAF results; (b) appropriate management/implementation arrangements are in place with potential implementation partners are identified to the extent possible; (c) the standard clauses of CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan template are included; (d) its implementation is coordinated and monitored jointly with other relevant national programmes and UN agency programmes.

• Programme manager submits the draft CPAP/UNDAF-AP to the respective RBx if the CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan entails direct implementation of any component.

• Regional Bureau will process such submission according to the Policy on Oversight of Implementation of Country Programmes by UNDP Country Offices under Common Country Programming Process and communicate to the country office delegation of authority for UNDP direct implementation.

• The evaluation plan should be reviewed and periodically revised to include all planned evaluations, including those which may not have been known at the time of CPD preparation. All evaluations should be adequately budgeted within the plan before the finalization of the CPAP. Any changes in the evaluation plan should be updated in the plan on the Evaluation Resource Centre following agreement by the regional bureau and government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>Approve and sign the CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Government Coordinating Agency and UNDP should sign the CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan in January of the first year of the Country Programme preferably a joint ceremony. This signature indicates that the government and UNDP have agreed on the development outcomes to be supported through the CPAP/UNDAF Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 Inputs

- Draft Country Programme Document (CPD)
- UNDAF
- Initial M&E Framework
- UNDP Gender Equality Strategy
- UNDAF Checklist 2010: Assessing the quality and strategic positioning of the UNDAF

6.0 Deliverables

- Signed Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)/UNDAF-AP
- Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan
• Initial annual targets for outputs entered in corporate management information systems (Atlas and RBM Platform).

7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

• UNDP Programme Manager: Carries out primary responsibility from UNDP office to formulate CPAP/UNDAF-AP working closely with the Government Coordinating Agency. Ascertains existence, and/or ways of promoting the setting up of national mechanisms such as sector-groups, outcome groups in order to engage in the coordination and monitoring of higher level results and outcomes.

• Country Programme Board: identification of potential joint programmes, CPAP/UNDAF-AP appraisal and approval and coordination with different parties throughout this process.

• Regional Bureau: reviews draft CPAP/UNDAF-AP and authorizes direct implementation modality.

• Government Coordinating Agency: Represents the government and ensures national priorities are addressed through CPAP/UNDAF-AP.

• The Government, through its Coordinating Agency, has overall responsibility for all UNDP-supported activities. This Agency is responsible for ensuring that all relevant departments are fully involved in these activities. It is also responsible for ensuring the achievement of the overall achievement of results/outcomes of UNDP support in the country. In particular, the Government Coordinating Agency often works in consultation with the UNDP country office to co-ordinate external assistance, and to determine the appropriate management arrangements. There is only one Government Coordinating Agency for UNDP support in each country..

8.0 Templates and Forms

• CPAP Template

• UNDAF-AP Template and accompanying guidance

• Memoranda of Understanding and Letters of Agreement for joint programmes found in the Joint Programming Guidance Note

• Security Risk Management (SRM) Process

• M&E Template - see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results

• Checklist for Quality Control of CPAPs.

9.0 Additional Info. and Tools

Programme and Project Management Resource Center
Implementing a Programme

Programme and Project > Programme Management > Implementing a Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Capacity Development Group – Bureau for Development Policy</th>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Asoka Kasturiarachchi</th>
<th>Issuance/IPPOP Publishing Date</th>
<th>15/12/2010</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>24/11/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td>Planned Review Date</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
<td>Last Revision Date</td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td>Approval Date</td>
<td>24/11/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of changes (one entry per revision)</td>
<td>Programme management focused on the monitoring of the programme results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0 Description

Based on the signed CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan, a country programme is implemented primarily through a set of projects that generate outputs. Similarly the regional and the global programmes are implemented through a set of regional and global projects as per the approved regional and global programmes respectively. In contributing to higher level results as envisaged in the CPAP/UNDAF-AP, UNDP also engages in activities and interventions that go beyond generating agreed outputs. Although they cannot always be captured in outputs or placed in RRFs in advance, these interventions are very important to achieving results. They include policy and other advocacy efforts, championing, consensus building etc.

Implementing (or running as it was referred to in earlier versions of the POPP) a programme means ensuring that all the outputs as identified in the CPAP/UNDAF-AP, as well as in regional programmes and global programme are produced systematically; and that they contribute to achieving the national outcomes that are stated in the UNDAF and Country Programme Document (CPD), or the outcomes in regional and global programmes.

2.0 Relevant Policies

2.1 Monitoring

Monitoring is a continuous function that aims primarily to provide the main stakeholders of a programme or project with early indications of the quality, quantity and timeliness of progress towards delivering the intended results. During an implementing programme stage, the programme level M&E framework that was developed during programme strategic planning and detailed during initiating a programme is implemented on an ongoing basis. Following are key points of UNDP’s monitoring policy applicable during implementing a programme:

- All outcomes to which UNDP is contributing through generating outputs and other relevant activities must be monitored regularly in a planned way regardless of budget and duration. Adequate resources must be allocated for M&E.
Each output should be linked to an outcome group or thematic or sectoral group responsible for monitoring the progress on the achievement of corresponding outcome. In accordance with the CPAP/UNDAF-AP monitoring and evaluation framework, each outcome should prescribe who is responsible for monitoring data collection, how often the data is collected, who will receive it and in what form.

Annual review process is key part of the monitoring. The annual review of the CPAP/UNDAF-AP is carried out within the overall UNDAF Annual Review process, in order to avoid a major separate review, reduce transaction cost and ensure coordination.

Monitoring data should be readily available to management decision making and evaluations; likewise information derived from project and outcome evaluations should feed into monitoring.

Lessons and evidence extracted should be fed back into programme management and future programming.

Programme monitoring and project monitoring are interlinked. To a great extent programme level monitoring depends on effective project level monitoring (discussed in Project Management sections of POPP). UNDP and the Government Coordinating agency must ensure that: outputs of different projects are coordinated and inter-relate cost-effectively; and new projects are developed in the programme’s pipeline as relevant. UNDP and the government management partners, (where applicable in consultation with other partners involved) should make informed decisions based on monitoring information to ensure that the projects and programmes supported by UNDP are managed accountably, efficiently and effectively.

The above principles also apply to regional programmes and global programme.

The UNDAF annual review guidelines and Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results provide key principles, guidance for implementation of the UNDAF annual review process.

2.2 Annual Programme Review

The systematic review of the UNDP country programme is mandatory and should be carried out as part of the UNDAF Annual Review process. UNDP must actively participate in the UNDAF Annual Review process which is an integral part of the monitoring function at the country level of the UN System. The purposes of the UNDP participation in the UNDAF annual review are to:

- assess the achievement of the overall annual targets of UNDP funded activities in the context of UNDAF and national results/outcomes;
- identify and address operational issues of the CPAP/UNDAF-AP implementation, including those that could lead to revisions to CPAP/UNDAF-AP if required;
- ensure UNDP’s contribution to a systematic comprehensive country level results review process.

The UNDAF annual review process has several stages during which UNDP will carry out sequenced monitoring actions: (1) Hold AWP/project reviews; (2) Prepare progress reports (to the extent possible
using Standard Progress Report (SPRs)); (3) Review and analyze results by thematic or outcome or sector/inter sectoral groups; (4) Participate in the UNDAF Annual Review Meeting.

The Annual Review Meeting should verify that the recommendations of the previous annual review were appropriately followed-up by the parties concerned and make suggestions/recommendations to overcome any new issues or seize opportunities identified. The conclusions and recommendations from the annual review enable UNDP to update and/or revise the CPAP for the coming year, review and finalize project revisions and AWPs, and prepare inputs into Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) of UNDP and other reporting required by stakeholders/donors.

2.3 Revisions of UNDP Country Programmes

2.3.1 Revision CPAP/UNDAF-APs

The CPAP/UNDAF-AP should remain a relevant living document. Monitoring and review processes provide opportunities to consider challenges, new partnerships and other opportunities to make refinements in the CPAP/UNDAF-AP and constituent projects that would enhance the chances of achieving the agreed overall results and outcomes. The CPAP/UNDAF-AP) can be substantively revised at any time as long as such changes remain within the framework of the CPD as approved by the Executive Board and are formally agreed with the Government Coordinating Agency. Note that the CPD results are strategic. Therefore removal of redundant outputs that would not adversely affect the achievement of agreed outcomes, or, adding new outputs necessary to achieve a given agreed outcome which were identified only after the approval of CPD, does not constitute a change in the CPD. Such changes must however be agreed in writing with all relevant partners especially the Government Coordinating Agency.

The annual review provides a regular opportunity to collectively and systematically review the full CPAP/UNDAF-AP within the context of UNDAF, and a basis to make any changes to the programme as well as to the allocation of resources. In all cases such changes should be recorded in minutes or the report of review meeting stating the justification for and agreement to the changes by the key stakeholders especially the Government Coordinating Agency. Such record should be available to future audits and evaluations.

Once formally agreed such changes constitute a formal revision to the CPAP. These can be operationalized through revising corresponding AWPs and/or project documents with clear reference in them to the agreements made with due consultations with the key partners, especially the Government Coordinating Agency. Additionally, if required by local practices, the respective revised AWP/project document reflecting the agreed changes may be signed by the Government Coordinating Agency.

2.3.2 Revision of CPDs:

The implementation of CPD is delegated to RR/CD through the Regional Director, who remains accountable to the Administrator and Executive Board. Therefore the Regional Bureau should be
informed of all potential or envisaged changes to CPD. This is necessary for the Regional Bureau to fulfill its oversight of CPs and to be in a position to judge the significance of any change(s) in the approved CPD in order to decide whether notifying the EB of such changes is required.

Changes in CPD that would warrant notifying the EB would include: addition of new or isolated outcomes not directly related to approved outcomes; or omission of agreed outcomes or outputs that will adversely impact the achievement of the already approved results in the CPD results framework; or (re)allocation of resources earmarked in the CPD for results that are outside the approved results matrix of CPD. Such changes should be considered and processed as amendments to the CPD.

The Regional Bureau Director in consultation with other relevant Headquarters units such as Executive Board Secretariat, OSG will review such proposed changes to CPDs and advise on suitable action. An approved CPD may be amended if significant changes in the national development situation affect the content and relevance of the CPD. The following procedures apply to amendments:

- The government prepares the amendment in consultation with the UNDP country office. The amendment document follows the CPD format. It explains in chapter I the reasons for amendment and which sections of the CPD are to be revised. In each relevant section, the amendment document details the changes.
- As with the CPD, the amendment document is reviewed by the LPAC which is organized by the regional bureau. Thereafter the regional bureau obtains clearance of the Associate Administrator through OSG and forwards the draft amendment to the Executive Board Secretariat to secure Executive Board approval;
- In the event that a revised duration is proposed, the procedures set out in Changes to the CPD must be followed.

2.4. Evaluation

Decentralized evaluations should be carried out according to the approved Evaluation Plan. The full implementation of the approved plan is the basis for compliance. The country offices should plan and commission its decentralized evaluations accordingly so that critical information from the decentralized evaluations is made available before the conduct of a higher-level analysis of UNDP’s work (e.g. UNDAF or country programme evaluation) or the ADR. For more information, see Evaluating a Programme.

3.0 Flowchart

Not applicable.

4.0 Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref Step</th>
<th>Mandatory</th>
<th>Tasks and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Update the</td>
<td>Programme Manager must ensure that a detailed monitoring and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M&E Framework. 

evaluation framework (as described in Initiating a Programme stage) with information needed to monitor is available. This includes ensuring availability of key information for periodic monitoring such as clear results (outcomes and outputs), indicators, baselines, risks, annual targets as applicable as well as necessary resources, especially for outcome monitoring and outcome evaluations.

- If not already prepared during the preparation of CPAP/UNDAF-AP (and/or updated during project defining) stage, detailed M&E frameworks must be prepared for CPAP/UNDAF-AP and projects. In this regard it is essential to note that:
  - The project level outputs should be the same as those in current overall planning documents of programmes (for UNDP: CPAP/UNDAF-AP, Regional and Global Programmes) and their M&E frameworks;
  - There is consistency in the results logic—from outputs to outcomes; and from projects to the CPAP/UNDAF-AP and
  - Annual targets are set for outputs and clearly reflect in annual work plans. The annual output targets in AWPs of projects serve as the reference points in the corporate results monitoring systems. They are therefore first entered in Atlas and then captured by the Results Based Management (RBM) Platform
- Ensure that outputs from different projects are coordinated and inter-relate cost effectively, and they contribute to outcomes in CP, UNDAF, and objectives of Strategic Plan. Whenever possible outcome groups or sector coordination mechanisms should be used for these purposes. See UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results for further information.

12 Monitor and evaluate programme. 

- Implement monitoring actions, using selected tools for collection and analysis of data and reporting. Commission outcome reviews and evaluations:
  - Obtain monitoring information for each UNDP funded project through the respective APRs and other related activities such as soft assistance relevant for a given outcome. This should answer the questions: what progress has UNDP made in delivering the agreed CPAP outputs? And also what progress has UNDP made towards the CPAP outcomes?
  - Determine if outputs being generated with UNDP support remain valid and contribute to achieving corresponding outcomes
  - Participate in two way dialogue with relevant outcome/sectoral entity/entities.
  - Determine how other partners are contributing with their contributions as planned, any gaps or potential opportunities stronger partnerships.

- Conduct the evaluations as per the evaluation plan.

- Programme and Project Boards must take appropriate management action based on the monitoring and evaluation evidence. This would also involve making management responses to evaluations and taking follow up action on them.

13 Annually review the Programme and hold the annual review meeting

- Conduct annual CPAP/UNDAF-AP review as a part of UNDAF annual review process. Note the following:
  - Preferably this should be carried out in last quarter of the year.
  - It should be based on the findings and lessons from AWP/annual project reviews, SPRs, outcome/thematic group comments, project evaluations, outcome evaluations as well as any related ‘soft’ initiatives.
  - Triangulate annual progress reports of projects with information gathered from other sources through dialogue at different levels to obtain an objective assessment of UNDP’s contribution to each outcome, issues involved and
changes that may be needed. This analysis should also indicate to what extent UNDP has integrated key concerns such as capacity development, gender equality, national ownership, South-South cooperation.

- In addition to reviewing progress, the CPAP/UNDAF-AP review considers management arrangements and partnerships necessary to achieve the outcomes of the programme. Findings of any evaluations carried out should also inform annual review.
- CPAP/UNDAF-AP review should lead to identifying what changes are needed in the CPAP/UNDAF-AP that needed to be agreed upon by UNDP and the Government Coordinating Agency.
- Summarize key points for entire programme for corporate reporting purposes for example ROAR, and for decision making at UNDAF Annual Review Meeting.
- Review at the Annual Review Meeting with the national partners, including the Government Coordinating Agency the progress towards outcomes and any changes deem needed to the programme as well as to the allocation of resources.
- Any changes such as: addition of new or isolated outcomes or omission of outcomes or outputs that could adversely impact the achievement of the already approved results in the results framework of the approved CPD; or (re)allocation of resources earmarked in the CPD are considered as amendments to the CPD must be submitted to the Regional Bureau for prior consideration and advice. See also Changes to the CPD.

### 5.0 Inputs
- **Signed Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)/UNDAF-AP**
- CPAP/UNDAF-AP M&E frameworks
- **UNDAF Checklist 2010: Assessing the quality and strategic positioning of the UNDAF**

### 6.0 Deliverables

The following are expected to be delivered by the process:

- Systematically compiled regular monitoring information and evidence as per the M&E frameworks
- Common reports such as Standard Progress Report (SPRs) for the programme components and summaries of outcome/thematic group reviews as agreed at country level(These would also provide inputs to the preparation of Annual Results Report to UNDP headquarters),
• **Annual CPAP/UNDAF-AP Review Report** – This report is the product of the CPAP Review (UNDP implementation of the UNDAF Annual Review process), and should feed the Country Office Results Report.

- Country Office inputs to Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR)
- Updated AWPs and AWP Monitoring Tool matrices for forthcoming year;
- Agreed updated CPAP/UNDAF-AP.
- Updated CPAP/UNDAF-AP M&E frameworks

### 7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

**Country Programme Board:**

- Programme Manager: s/he is responsible for the overall monitoring of progress towards predetermined outcomes as well as the projects’ contribution in terms of strategic outputs. He or she ensures that monitoring and reporting at different programming levels, projects and from different sources are brought together to provide complete information on progress towards outcomes in line with the monitoring and evaluation plan Sector-wide coordination mechanism or outcome groups. He or she is also responsible for ensuring that project review standards are maintained.

- Government Representative: S/he works closely with the Programme Manager for monitoring and review activities.

### 8.0 Templates and Forms

- **Evaluation Report**

### 9.0 Additional Info. and Tools

See the [Programme and Project Management Resource Centre](#).

### Evaluating a Programme

Programme and Project > Programme Management > Evaluating a Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Capacity Development Group – Bureau for Development Policy</th>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Issuance/POPP Publishing Date</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Planned Review Date</th>
<th>Last Revision Date</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Date</strong></td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td>24/11/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
<td>All UNDP funded programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Summary of changes (one entry per revision) | Focuses on evaluations that are to be managed by country offices (outcome and project evaluations) - commissioning, quality assurance, management responses and learning from evaluations. |
1.0 Description

Programme units (country offices, regional bureaux, policy and practice units/bureaux) are required to have an evaluation plan, which derives from the UNDAF M&E plan.

Full implementation of the evaluation plan (i.e. all planned evaluations) is the basis for evaluation compliance. If the evaluation plan has been revised with agreement and clearance from national counterparts and the regional bureau, the implementation of the latest approved evaluation plan, made available in the ERC, is the basis for compliance.

Please consult evaluation planning for more guidance on how to develop and manage an evaluation plan.

2.0 Relevant Policies

Evaluation in UNDP should be conducted in line with the Executive Board endorsed UNDP Evaluation Policy (2011).

2.1 Commissioning an Evaluation

In accordance with the evaluation plan, UNDP country offices commission external independent consultants to conduct evaluations. The commissioning process involves a number of tasks, as described in the procedures below. UNDP country offices are responsible for managing the commissioning process by undertaking these tasks together with their key national stakeholders. The involvement of national partners throughout the evaluation process ensures the credibility, ownership and use of evaluation by national partners and helps evaluation products meet the quality criteria established by the Evaluation Office at each stage of the process.

Detailed guidance on how to proceed with each step below is provided in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results.

2.1.1. Selecting and working with evaluators

In line with the UNDP procurement rules and regulations, the UNDP country office together with stakeholders selects evaluation consultants or institutions. Evaluators must be external and independent from the organizations that have any past, current or impending future connection with the design, formulation and implementation of the UNDP programmes, projects or activities that are being evaluated.

The UNDP country office and relevant stakeholders are expected to support the evaluators, as required, while avoiding any interference that will undermine the objectivity and impartiality of the evaluation. The evaluators must be able to work free from undue influence, and be given full authority to submit reports directly to appropriate levels of decision-making, while being assured of cooperation and access to all relevant information.
Key roles of the country office/evaluation task manager in supporting the evaluation consultants include the following:

- Provide the evaluators with the Code of Conduct for Evaluation, the UNDP evaluation policy, Norms and Standards for evaluation for the UN system, UNDP quality criteria for commissioning evaluations and other useful references and guidelines relating to evaluation in UNDP/UN.
- Make all information available to the evaluators, and provide necessary support, if they encounter any difficulty in obtaining information that is critical for the conduct of the evaluation.
- Provide, if asked by the evaluators, a preliminary list and contact information of stakeholders to support the stakeholder mapping exercise. Based on this preliminary information, the evaluation consultants will make their independent decision as to whom to meet (to safeguard the independence of the exercise, UNDP cannot interfere with their decision).
- Arrange interviews, meetings and field visits. However, UNDP and/or government staff working for the organization responsible for the project/programme should not participate in the meetings or visits. Interviewees and participants might not always feel comfortable to speak freely in the presence of UNDP or the government staff representing the organization responsible for the project/programme.

2.1.2 Preparing a Management Response to Evaluation

In accordance with the evaluation policy, all evaluations require a management response outlining the response of UNDP management to the evaluation’s key findings and recommendations, and follow-up actions with clear timelines (i.e. due dates) and responsible parties for delivery. The responsible country office, bureau or programme unit should enter the management response and update the implementation status of key actions in the ERC.

In order to keep momentum of learning from evaluation, within one month after the evaluation report is finalized, the Programme Manager together with key stakeholders should prepare a management response to the evaluation. In some cases such as joint evaluations where there are many contributors to the development of a management response, it may take longer than one month. However, efforts should be made to meet this timeframe. Discussions on the development of management response can start earlier than the finalization of the report through a close dialogue between the commissioner of evaluation, evaluators and stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Close consultation with national partners in developing the management response is critical as it enhances transparency of the process and gives credibility to UNDP as a results-based and learning organization.

In the case of ADR, the country office and relevant national partners (e.g. programme government), with guidance and oversight of the regional bureau, prepares a management response to the ADR. The Evaluation Office enters recommendations from the ADRs in the ERC. The country office must enter follow-up actions, as outlined in the evaluation management response, and regularly update the status of their implementation in the ERC.

The annual report on the Strategic Plan will draw on decentralized evaluations and their management responses.
2.1.3 Leaning, Knowledge Sharing and Dissemination

Findings, recommendations and lessons from evaluations should be considered in the formulation of new programme and project documents. UNDP country office is responsible for widely sharing the information generated from evaluation through various evaluation products (executive summary, evaluation brief) and dissemination methods (internet, e-mailing lists, CD). UNDP country office is required to disclose all evaluation reports and their management responses by making them available in the ERC. When necessary, summary findings and recommendations from evaluations should be translated into official languages of the country(s), and widely disseminated.

Go to top

2.1.4 Assessing the quality of decentralized evaluations

The quality assessment of decentralized evaluation reports is one of the activities undertaken by the Evaluation Office to improve the quality of evaluative evidence for better results management and to support the oversight functions of the regional bureaus. The Evaluation Office has the task of carrying out the quality assessment of completed decentralized evaluations and reporting to the Executive Board of UNDP.

The quality assessment of the evaluation reports will provide a review of the evaluation design, quality of findings and evaluative evidence, and the robustness of the conclusions and recommendations using a set of parameters and rating system. In the case of GEF evaluations, the assessment will include the extent to which the project outputs/programme outcomes were achieved or expected to be achieved.

The quality assessment is a desk review intended to provide an independent assessment of the quality of the evaluation report. The quality assessment will include decentralized evaluations (including GEF evaluations) that are part of the evaluation plan. For more information, please consult a note developed by the Evaluation Office on quality assessment system for decentralized evaluation reports.

3.0 Flowchart

Not applicable.

4.0 Procedures

For more guidance on how to manage an evaluation process, please consult the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Develop the <strong>Terms of References</strong> (TOR) for evaluation</td>
<td>Programme Manager (or designate)</td>
<td>The TOR should be developed in close consultation with key stakeholders to ensure ownership of the evaluation. The TOR for the evaluation should meet the EO established minimum quality criteria and the <strong>Norms and Standards for evaluation for the UN system</strong>. For guidance, see Annex 3 in the Handbook. The preparation of key documents and identification of evaluation stakeholders should already commence at this stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Select external evaluation consultant(s)</td>
<td>Programme Manager (or designate)</td>
<td>The process of selecting the evaluation consultant(s) should be done in consultation with key stakeholders, in accordance with UNDP procurement guidelines, based on competency and professionalism. Evaluators must be <strong>external</strong> and <strong>independent</strong> from the organizations that have any past, current or impending future connection with the design, formulation and implementation of the UNDP programmes, projects or activities that are being evaluated. For this reason, UNDP and government staff directly or indirectly involved in the project/programme being evaluated should not take part in the evaluation team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Brief evaluation consultant(s) and provide all relevant and required information and documentation to the consultants</td>
<td>Programme Manager (or designate)</td>
<td>Evaluation consultants should be given a proper briefing at the outset to clarify expectations about the assignment. They should also be provided with the evaluation policy, the Norms and Standards for Evaluation for the UN system, UNDP quality criteria on evaluation reports (and the Handbook) and the Code of Conduct for Evaluation. While ensuring independence of the exercise, the programme units may also facilitate the identification of stakeholders whom the evaluation team should meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Review a draft evaluation work plan together with proposed evaluation methodology for evaluation (inception report)</td>
<td>Programme Manager (or designate)</td>
<td>The work plan should be developed based on the TOR and a review of available documentation. UNDP country office should discuss and agree on the details of the work plan and the proposed evaluation methodology with the evaluation consultant(s) to avoid any misunderstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Review a draft evaluation report</td>
<td>Programme Manager (or designate)</td>
<td>The review process should be consultative to give relevant stakeholders a chance to provide feedback on factual errors or omissions while...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
safeguarding the impartiality and objectivity of the consultant’s work. The minimum quality criteria for the evaluation report should be applied during the review. For guidance, see Annex 7 of the Handbook.

| 21 | Upload it in the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC) | Programme Manager | Members of the outcome/project board and key stakeholders should play a critical role in assuring the quality of the final report. In line with the evaluation policy, all evaluation reports are required to be made publicly available in the ERC. |
| 22 | Develop a management response and enter it in the ERC for tracking | Programme Manager (or designate) | All evaluations require a management response. In consultation with key stakeholders UNDP country office is required to enter the management response in the ERC and track the follow-up to committed actions. See Annex 6 of the Handbook |
| 23 | Share lessons and knowledge through outreach and dissemination | Programme Manager (or designate) | Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be broadly disseminated and used. |

5.0 Inputs

- Evaluation plan for the programming cycle

6.0 Deliverables

- Evaluation TOR
- Evaluation inception report
- Evaluation Report
- Management Response to Decentralized Evaluations
- Management Response to ADRs

7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

Roles and Responsibilities in evaluation as outlined in the UNDP evaluation policy.

The Administrator of UNDP:
(a) Ensures compliance with the evaluation policy as integral to effective accountability across the organization;
(b) Provides sufficient resources and capacity for decentralized evaluations;
(c) Approves any revisions to evaluation plans attached to regional, global and thematic programmes;
(d) Ensures that UNDP prepares a management response to decentralized evaluations;
(e) Ensures that senior management responds to and utilizes decentralized evaluation in their operational, strategic, policy and oversight functions and that appropriate follow-up action to the findings and recommendations of decentralized evaluations is taken by the relevant units.
The senior management (Programme Manager) of practice and policy bureaux, regional bureaux and country offices that manage global, regional, country and thematic programmes:

(a) Ensures the evaluability of programmes by identifying clear results, developing measurable indicators, and establishing performance targets and baseline information;
(b) In collaboration with stakeholders and partners, ensures the effective monitoring of implementation and performance of programmes to generate relevant, timely information for management for results and evaluation;
(c) With partner governments and key stakeholders, develops a costed evaluation plan attached to programme documents. In the case of country offices, budgets the plan no later than at the time of adoption of the country programme action plan. Periodically reviews and updates the plan to ensure its relevance to national priorities;
(d) Establishes an appropriate institutional arrangement to manage evaluation;
(e) Ensures adequate resources for evaluation;
(f) Safeguards the independence of the evaluation process and product;
(g) Ensures the implementation of the evaluation plan in line with established quality standards, including the UNEG Norms and Standards, Code of Conduct, Ethical Guidelines and UNDP evaluation guidance;
(h) Advocates country-led and joint evaluations to promote national ownership and leadership of evaluation while ensuring the independence, quality and utility of evaluation;
(i) Makes all necessary information available to the evaluation team;
(j) Promotes joint evaluation work with the United Nations system and other partners, while ensuring accountability for the specific contributions of UNDP to development results. In the case of country offices, it contributes to the UNDAF evaluation;
(k) Prepares, in consultation with national partners, management responses to all evaluations, and ensures and tracks appropriate, timely implementation of the agreed evaluation recommendations;
(l) Draws on evaluation findings to improve the quality of programmes, guide strategic decision-making on future programming and positioning, and share knowledge on development experience;
(m) Ensures the transparency of and public access to all evaluation reports;
(n) Promotes organizational learning through analysis and application of evaluation findings across regions, themes and results areas, including through knowledge systems and products.
(o) In their exercise of line oversight and support to evaluations commissioned by country offices, the Directors of regional bureaux:
(p) Ensure evaluability of country programmes, quality of evaluation plans and evaluation practices by country offices and the full implementation of costed evaluation plans;
(q) Support and guide country office capacity in evaluation, including establishing regional expertise and regional evaluation support systems;
(r) Review and clear revisions of evaluation plans attached to country programmes;
(s) Ensure effective use of evaluations for oversight.

The Evaluation Office:

(a) Sets evaluation standards for planning, conducting and using decentralized evaluations, and assesses the quality of evaluation reports;
(b) Disseminates methodology and good practice standards for evaluation management in UNDP;
(c) Provides a roster of evaluation experts;
(d) Supports a network of evaluation practitioners;
(e) Maintains a public depository of evaluation resources to facilitate sharing of evaluative knowledge.

For good practice in roles and responsibilities during the evaluation process, see table 23 of the Handbook.

8.0 Templates and Forms

- Management Response to Decentralized Evaluations
- Management Response to ADRs
9.0 Additional Info. and Tools

See the Programme and Project Management Resource Centre

Programme Completion and Transition

Programme and Project > Programme Management > Programme Completion and Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Capacity Development Group – Bureau for Development Policy</th>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Issuance/POPP Publishing Date</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>24/11/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td>Planned Review Date</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
<td>Last Revision Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>All UNDP funded programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of changes (one entry per revision)

Arrangements connected with the transition from one to the next cycle.

1.0 Description

UNDP Country, Regional and Global Programmes, unlike their constituent projects, do not often start from a substantive zero point or end with complete achievement of all the envisaged outcomes. While the UNDP programmes have fixed time durations, substantively, they normally flow from the previous one and transit into the next.

This chapter addresses the arrangements connected with the transition from an existing programme to the next.

2.0 Relevant Policies

It is mandatory for each UNDP Country, Regional and Global Programme to make an orderly transition from one programme cycle to the next. The transition from the existing programme to the next/new programme should be planned. In this regard the Programme Manager should carefully consider:

1. Synthesizing the achievement of the current programme with reference to the respective signed Country, Regional and Global programme.
2. Lessons learnt in a forward looking manner to inform the next programme and developing other knowledge products for wider sharing.
3. Identifying those results that require timeframes that go beyond the duration of current cycle in order to achieve the desired benefits, and would therefore need to be in the next programme for continuity.
4. Identifying results areas that would not be continued beyond the current programme cycle due to either achievement of planned activities or change in priorities. These should be completed orderly at the earliest.

The Assessment of Development Results (ADR) or the Country Programme Performance Summary must be submitted along with the (next) draft Country Programme Document for approval of the latter. Therefore it is important to schedule the ADR in a timely manner to enable Executive Board to have access to the ADR Report. If the ADR Report would not be accessible in time, then the Country
Programme Performance Summary should be prepared and submitted to for onward transmission to the EB.

3.0 Flowchart

Not applicable.

4.0 Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Mandatory Step</th>
<th>Tasks and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 24  | Ensure completion of ADR and all evaluations and submission of lessons learned. | • The transition from the existing programme to the next/new programme should be planned in the last two years of the programme, which overlap with the analyzing, prioritizing and planning the next programme. During this period the Programme Manager should:  
  ✓ Arrange completion of the Assessment of Development Results (ADR) or the Country Programme Performance Summary in order to submit the findings to the Executive Board along with the (next) draft Country Programme Document for approval of the latter.  
  ✓ If the ADR Report would not be accessible to the EB in time, then the Country Programme Performance Summary should be prepared and submitted to the regional bureau for onward transmission to the EB.  
  • Review findings and recommendations of all outcomes and project evaluations, focusing in particular on the management responses, stated follow-up actions and commitments. Evaluations or reviews of similar work conducted by other partners in the same area shall also be used, especially when they could serve as justification for further interventions in this area. |

| 25  | Plan programme transition | • Transition arrangements to the next new programme should be first considered in the Annual Review two years prior to the scheduled ending of the current programme cycle. This is necessary in order to gather and organize the experience of UNDP programme as a whole to inform the preparations of the next country programme that normally commences in the middle of the penultimate year. The transition actions as detailed below should be managed in the last two years.  
  • In the last two years progressively identify:  
    a) the potential UNDP support and existing projects that need to be continued for achieving the intended outcomes that remain priorities; and  
    b) those existing projects that would need to be completed either due to the achievement of the intended results, or those projects being no longer remaining strategic or priorities.  
  • Projects in the first category above should be included in the new CP and the CPAP/UNDAF-AP. Those projects that will not be continued in the latter category should be closed as soon as possible prior to the commencement of the new programme. |

5.0 Inputs
• **Findings of past monitoring and evaluation event and reviews**: Evidence generated by monitoring, evaluations and reviews of UNDP and partner agencies should be drawn upon in carrying out above actions.

• **Strategic Plan**

• **Relevant National and Sector Analysis**

• **MDG and National Human Development Reports**

• **Knowledge Products and Communities of Practice (COP) Consultation**: Existing knowledge products, such as policy notes and briefs, how-to-guides, lessons learned, consolidated replies and analytical studies.

• **2010 CCA/UNDAF Guidelines**

### 6.0 Deliverables

Either the [Assessment of Development Results](#) or [Country Programme Performance Summary](#) should be completed in a timely manner and submitted together with the draft Country Programme Document of the next country programme.

### 7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

**Programme Manager**

The Programme Manager takes primary responsibility and consults with the Programme Board during this process to ensure above actions.

### 8.0 Templates and Forms

None.

### 9.0 Additional Info. and Tools

See the [Programme and Project Management Resource Centre](#).

### Project Management

- Justifying a Project
- Defining a Project
- Initiating a Project
- Implementing a Project
- Closing a Project
Projects are integral components of a UNDP country regional or global programme. At the country level they are also imbedded in the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) or United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Action Plan (as applicable). The project cycle begins by justifying a project’s business case based on the initial articulation in the country programme, and ends with achievement of outputs to be assessed in the programme review. The rounded-corner rectangles in the centre of the diagram in the figure below represent the processes of a project, essentially the high-level activity areas starting and ending at decision points that must be complied with to manage a project.

**Figure: The UNDP Project Cycle**

This approach covers the entire project life cycle from idea generation to formulating a project, implementing the activities in the project, monitoring and evaluating the project, and realizing project outputs and their intended contribution to programme outcomes. At each process, the Project Management section of the UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP) will provide information to ensure appropriate UNDP policies are followed, key stakeholders are kept informed, appropriate project management structure exists, outputs and activity deliverables are monitored, and the project is well managed.

The diagram also illustrates (with dotted lines) the key management review points within the cycle. The dotted lines at the far left and far right indicate the start and stop points of the project management cycle, and the other dotted lines indicate management approval or decision points between or within processes. The dotted lines intersecting the “Implementing a Project” process indicate that there will be reviews at
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each major decision point during the implementation of the project, as many or as few as required to ensure that the project is under control (these reviews are typically aligned with calendar years).

The bottom ovals in the diagram indicate different review mechanisms applicable to UNDP projects to make approval decisions. For example, the first three “Decision Point” ovals are points to consider the questions:

- 1st (Primary) Decision Point: Is this project the best response to the country needs as identified in the country programme? Will it contribute substantially to the results expected from the UNDP programme? This decision is made by UNDP country office management, to confirm the project idea as initially identified during development of the country programme;
- 2nd (Secondary) Decision Point: Is the project scope realistic – both with regards to the outputs and the specified time frame? How can the expected outputs be achieved most effectively? Do these intended outputs contribute to related national outcomes? This decision is considered during appraisal of the project by the local Project Appraisal Committee (PAC) to review the project scope and approach;
- 3rd (Tertiary) Decision Point: Does the design of the project demonstrate an achievable plan to implement and assess progress towards delivering results to ensure success? Is monitoring clearly defined? This decision is considered by the Project Board when reviewing a detailed project budget and activity schedule.

“Project Reviews” indicates multiple scheduled decision points that must be made while a project is being implemented typically at monitoring and evaluation events, to answer the questions: Is the project still relevant? Is the project yielding the desired results? Are those results still relevant and effectively contributing to the intended higher-level outcome? Is the project being run as planned? Is there a need to redesign, cancel or modify the project in any way in order to ensure meaningful contribution to development results?

Further information can be found under the sub-sections below on the main project processes.

2.0 Relevant Policies

Justifying a Project

Programme and Project > Project Management > Justifying a Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Capacity Development Group (CDG)/Bureau for Development Policy (BDP)</th>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Dien Le</th>
<th>Issuance/POPP Publishing Date</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Planned Review Date</th>
<th>Last Revision Date</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Summary of changes (one entry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justifying a Project - making a decision whether to further develop an idea into a project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All UNDP programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Dien Le</th>
<th>Issuance/POPP Publishing Date</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Planned Review Date</th>
<th>Last Revision Date</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Summary of changes (one entry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justifying a Project - making a decision whether to further develop an idea into a project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 Description

The primary purpose of the project justification process is to answer the questions: “Is this project the best response to the country needs as identified in the country programme? Will it contribute substantially to the results expected from the UNDP programme?” The overall justification and rationale for a project are developed in either:

- The country programming processes “Programme Strategic Planning (formerly called Defining a Country Programme)” and “Initiating a Country Programme,” as described in the UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP), where country-level plans are documented in the Country Programme Document and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) or United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Action Plan as applicable; or
- The present process (“Justifying a Project”), as unplanned opportunities are presented in crisis and special development situations, when a rapid change in a country’s situation requires different priorities, or in newly emerging development areas.

The purpose of this process is to capture the project idea or concept, test it against UNDP’s corporate planning instrument (the UNDP Strategic Plan) and country-level strategies for achieving development results (national development strategies, UNDAF, CPD and CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan as applicable), and make a decision whether to further develop the project concept into a project to be implemented. A key factor to be considered is the potential of the project to contribute significantly to strengthening national capacities and/or changing the development prospects for a large part of the population.

During this process, a project proposal shall be created in Atlas - the UNDP corporate management system - to capture the project concept and to document the justification of the project by providing the rationale and consistency with the above-mentioned UNDP and country-level strategic instruments.

2.0 Relevant Policies

2.1 National Ownership

The country programme is typically nationally-owned, a designation that is expressed through a Government Coordinating Agency serving as executing agent. All project results are by extension nationally-owned and entail the commitment of national human and financial resources along with external resources, and this even though the projects/Annual Work Plans (AWPs) may be implemented through various modalities, including but not limited to national implementation by governments.

- UNDP support to projects is provided only at the request of a programme country Government;
- An essential strategy of the UNDP country office is to engage key government officials and other national stakeholders, including those in civil society in a dialogue to analyze problems and to identify the consultative process that will be followed in deciding what support UNDP should provide in a chosen programme area.

Stakeholder engagement and national ownership should be ensured in justifying a project. Even in special development situations, where no government is in place, efforts should be made to ensure national ownership, for instance by involving representatives of civil society organizations and indigenous peoples at the very outset of the justification process.

2.2 Required Documentation
The project justification process will serve as a base for the further elaboration of a project in Programme Strategic Planning. There is no mandatory documentation required for this process.

2.3 Atlas Requirements

In this process, a Proposal should be created in Atlas to capture the project idea. This proposal, if pursued, becomes the Award, and has one or more outputs linked to it (output = “Project” ID in Atlas). The Award corresponds to annual work plans or projects and, since UNDP allows only one implementing partner per annual work plan, all outputs linked to an award should be implemented by the same implementing partner. In this phase only some general information about the project has to be entered, as indicated in the procedures section 4.0 below. Neither activity details nor budget are required. The purpose of the proposal is to:

- Record all proposed projects in Atlas to assist the office in better managing its pipeline;
- Record the project idea and the decision to either continue with the project or not;
- Capture initial thinking about the major goals and resource mobilization strategy.

3.0 Flowchart

Click here to view the jpeg file.

4.0 Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Tasks and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Atlas Action Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programme level processes, as part of the CPAP OR UNDAF Action Plan definition.

- **A proposal should be developed** [normally by UNDP staff member] to provide an initial indication of the project concept. If required by the country office management or other partners, the concept may also be documented in the form of a concept paper. The proposed content includes:
  - ✔ Output(s) and linkage to CP outcome(s);
  - ✔ Approach, method and capacity development strategies;
  - ✔ Stakeholder analysis;
  - ✔ Potential Implementing Partner;
  - ✔ Potential main financing partner(s);
  - ✔ Indicative funding requirements.

- **To decide on further development of the project proposal,** the Programme Manager shall validate that the project proposal reflects national development priorities, as well as UNDP strategies and plans as identified in the CPD and CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan, and is consistent with the Strategic Plan. This validation should also consider whether the project has the potential to contribute significantly to the strengthening of national capacities and to making improvements in the development conditions for a large portion of the population. Consideration should also be given to whether the project should be part of a joint programme.

- At the end of this process, a **Project Developer** is also appointed by the Programme Manager to carry out the further development of the proposed project.

Create proposal in Atlas under Grants. Record key information to reflect the outcome to which the project is linked (Atlas field: “Major Goals”), duration, proposed outputs, potential implementing partner and main financing partner (if known), and type of project (whether country or regional project, or a management service arrangement (MSA) under the following sections:

- Proposal Header;
- Major Goals;
- Resources Type and comments.

The status of the Proposal should be changed, depending on the decision (approval or rejection).

### 5.0 Inputs

- National Human Development Reports;
- Strategic Plan, UNDAF, national plans;
- **Country Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) or UNDAF Action Plan:** project concepts are typically defined in existing programming documents. If the project is outside the scope of the existing CPD and CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan (for instance in response to national disaster or newly emerging development area), the project concept must be clearly defined and justified, and should fall within one of the organization's focus areas;

- Consultation process with all stakeholders: Project concepts can be derived from requests from partners including government institutions, civil society organizations, the donor community, or UNDP itself. Any request should be analyzed for alignment with national development strategies, UNDP’s corporate planning instrument (the Strategic Plan), the agreed United Nations strategy in the country (the UNDAF) and UNDP’s target outcomes specific to the country (CDP/CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan).

- **Evaluations and reviews:** Evidence generated from evaluations and reviews of UNDP and partner agencies should be drawn upon in developing a project concept. All related outcomes and project evaluations should be reviewed, focusing in particular on the management response, follow-up actions and commitments. Evaluations or reviews of similar work conducted in the same area or utilizing a similar programming approach shall also be used, especially when they could serve as justification for the relevance of further interventions in this area. Please refer to the section on Evaluation below for additional information on UNDP’s policies and procedures with regards to evaluations. Step-by-step guidance on conducting and using evaluations can be found.
6.0 Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atlas Proposal developed and approved (or rejected)</th>
<th>Deliverable Description</th>
<th>Learn</th>
<th>Do it in Atlas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no prescribed MS Word template for this deliverable (see headings under 4.0 Procedures above)</td>
<td>On-Demand Training – Justifying a Project</td>
<td>Atlas – Add a new Proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

In this process, the following roles, as defined in the management structure section of the POPP, should be involved:

**UNDP Staff Member**
- A UNDP staff member develops the approach, justification and rationale for the project idea in consultation with appropriate partners and stakeholders. This project idea or concept must be documented in Atlas.

**Programme Manager**

In consultation with the Government Coordinating Agency, the programme manager:
- Takes primary responsibility during this process to approve the project concept and Proposal in Atlas;
- Ensures that the project justification is consulted and reviewed as appropriate;
- Appoints a Project Developer (it can be the UNDP staff member above or another person) to further develop the project.

For more details, please see Programme & Project Management Organization Structure in POPP.

8.0 Templates and Forms

None.

9.0 Additional Info. and Tools

Check the Programme and Project Management Resource Center.
Defining a Project

Programme and Project > Project Management > Defining a Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Issuance/POPP Publishing Date</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>15/12/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Development Group (CDG)/Bureau for Development Policy (BDP)</td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td>Approval Date</td>
<td>24/11/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Planned Review Date</th>
<th>Last Revision Date</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>All UNDP programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of changes (one entry per revision)
Defining a Project – drafting a Project Document - scope, approach, expected outputs and management arrangements - for appraisal by Project Appraisal Committee (PAC). Identification and selection of the Implementing Partner.

1.0 Description

The purpose of 'defining a project' is to answer the questions: “Is the project scope realistic – both with regards to the outputs and the specified time frame? How can the expected outputs be achieved most effectively? Do these intended outputs contribute to related national outcomes?” To answer these questions, a draft project document/annual work plan (AWP) is prepared and is appraised in a Project Appraisal Committee (PAC) meeting especially convened for this purpose. The draft project document/annual work plan outlines the project scope, expected outputs in the form of a completed results and resources framework, management arrangements, and project approach incorporating capacity development. The draft project document shall also take into account the principles and approaches for development effectiveness as outlined in the UNDP Strategic Plan. Prior to the PAC, the project shall be reviewed based on Considerations for Quality Programming and Checklist for Review of Project Documents. During this process, an Initiation Plan may be created and submitted for appraisal in the PAC along with the draft project document/annual work plan if financial resources are required prior to the actual start of the project (i.e., during the Initiating a Project process). If this is the case, and following the endorsement of the initiation plan, a budget shall be approved and signed by UNDP in the form of an annual work plan. If a project does not require a budget for the “Initiating a Project” process, the initiation plan is not required.

An important element of this process includes the identification and selection of the implementing partner, based on an assessment of its capacity to effectively manage the project and deliver the intended outputs.

2.0 Relevant Policies

2.1 Participation

A wide range of stakeholders should participate in the formulation of projects. Stakeholders include any parties with an interest in the project, including target beneficiary groups, civil society organisations, government, the media, UN agencies and donors. In particular:
The participation of the stakeholders ensures that potential opportunities and risks, including lessons drawn from experience, are taken into account in the project design. This participation promotes ownership, sustainability and commitment, without which the results are unlikely to be lasting.

Ensuring participation requires investment of time and resources, for which adequate provisions should be made;

Women participation, and participation of disadvantaged groups including indigenous groups as applicable, should be ensured throughout the project cycle. For involvement of civil society organizations and participation and consultation with indigenous peoples, please see “Assessing Partnerships with Civil Society Organizations and Indigenous Peoples”.

2.2 Required Documentation

A draft Project Document shall be prepared and submitted to the Project Appraisal Committee for review and appraisal. This document should contain:

- Results to be achieved that are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-based, through the completion of a Results and Resources Framework and/or annual work plan (see section 2.3 below);
- Management arrangements that clearly articulate project roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities (see section 2.6);
- An initial risk analysis using the standard Risk Log (see section 2.8);
- Initial Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the project (2.9);

Joint Programmes

For joint programmes, a Joint Programme Document should be prepared and appraised in accordance with the UNDG Joint Programming Guidance Note – Annex D. If UNDP is to be selected as the Administrative Agent under a pass-through fund management option, delegation of authority to carry out this function must be obtained from the Multi-Donor Trust Fund Office. Guidance for the delegation of authority can be found on “UNDP’s Accountability when acting as Administrative Agent in MDTFs and/or UN Joint Programmes using the pass-through fund management modality.”

2.3 Defining Project Results

The articulation of clear and measurable project results is the most important aspect of this process. With clear results defined, the selection of how to do the work, and by whom, becomes clearer. The purpose of the Results and Resources Framework (RRF) is to assist in the definition of project results to support the planning, management and monitoring of development activities. The RRF places the project in its larger framework within the country programme, and ensures consistency among outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs. It translates a concept into a plan for achieving specific results that will contribute to country programme outcomes supporting national development priorities. For further guidance on defining
outcomes, outputs and indicators please refer to Handbook on Planning Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results.

2.4 Definitions and Accountabilities of Implementing Partner and Responsible Party

As stated in Financial Regulation 27.02 of the UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules, an implementing partner is “the entity to which the Administrator has entrusted the implementation of UNDP assistance specified in a signed document along with the assumption of full responsibility and accountability for the effective use of UNDP resources and the delivery of outputs, as set forth in such document.” By signing a project document an implementing partner enters into an agreement with UNDP to manage the project and achieve the results defined in the relevant documents. The accountability of an implementing partner is to:

- Report, fairly and accurately, on project progress against agreed work plans in accordance with the reporting schedule and formats included in the project agreement;
- Maintain documentation and evidence that describes the proper and prudent use of project resources \[1\] in conformity to the project agreement and in accordance with applicable regulations and procedures. This documentation will be available on request to project monitors (project assurance role) and designated auditors.

Categories of Possible Implementing Partners

UNDP may select an implementing partner for a project from one of five different types of partner organizations. These categories are:

1. Government entities. The use of a government entity is referred to as national implementation. Eligible government entities include:
   (a) A ministry of the government;
   (b) A department within a ministry;
   (c) A governmental institution of a semi-autonomous nature, such as, the central bank, a university, a regional or local authority or a municipality.

2. United Nations agencies that have signed the Implementing Partner Agreement.
3. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).
4. UNDP - this is referred to as direct implementation.
5. Approved inter-governmental organizations that are not part of the UN system (see 2.5.1)

Based on the above operational definition of accountability for implementing partners, the table 1 below summarizes their accountability under various implementation arrangements.

Table: Accountabilities of Implementing Partner under Different Implementation Modalities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability Component</th>
<th>Implementation Arrangements</th>
<th>National Implementation</th>
<th>Direct Implementation By UNDP</th>
<th>CSO Implementation</th>
<th>IGO or UN Agency Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting on Progress towards Achievement of Results</td>
<td></td>
<td>National partner is accountable to UNDP and Government Coordinating Agency</td>
<td>Resident representative is accountable to UNDP Administrator and Government Coordinating Agency</td>
<td>CSO is accountable to UNDP and Government Coordinating Agency</td>
<td>IGO or UN agency is accountable to UNDP and Government Coordinating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting Prudent and Proper Use of Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>National partner is accountable to UNDP</td>
<td>Resident representative is accountable to UNDP Administrator</td>
<td>CSO is accountable to UNDP</td>
<td>IGO or UN agency is accountable to UNDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated in the Financial Regulation 17.01 of the UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules, an implementing partner may enter into agreements with other organizations or entities, known as responsible parties, who may provide goods and services to the project, carry out project activities and produce project outputs. Responsible parties are accountable directly to the implementing partner.

A **Responsible Party** is defined as an entity that has been selected to act on behalf of the implementing partner on the basis of a written agreement or contract to purchase goods or provide services using the project budget. In addition, the responsible party may manage the use of these goods and services to carry out project activities and produce outputs. All responsible parties are directly accountable to the implementing partner in accordance with the terms of their agreement or contract with the implementing partner. Implementing partners use responsible parties in order to take advantage of their specialized skills, to mitigate risk and to relieve administrative burdens. The following types of organizations may act as responsible parties: UNDP, other UN agencies, Government agencies, inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), civil society organizations (CSOs) and private firms. Firms and CSOs (except micro-capital grant recipients) shall be selected as responsible parties only on the basis of a competitive procurement process undertaken by the implementing partner. UNDP, UN agencies, IGOs, Government agencies, or CSOs as micro-capital grant recipients are exempted from competitive procurement process and shall be selected under programming modalities (PAC or Project Board decisions). To the extent that responsible parties exempted from competitive procurement process can be identified or anticipated during project formulation, they should be listed in the annual work plan and draft terms of reference for their services should be attached to the project document.

**UNDP as Responsible Party.** UNDP country offices commonly act as responsible parties for the provision of support services to national implementing partners. These services have traditionally been concentrated in the areas of procurement and recruitment. However, in accordance with the definition of responsible party above, these support services should not be seen as a unique intervention but as UNDP acting in the role of responsible party. As the role of responsible party includes not only the
purchase of goods and services but also may include their use in carrying out activities and producing outputs, UNDP services can go beyond the mobilization of inputs. In other words, such UNDP services can include substantive as well as administrative responsibilities. This is particularly important for UNDP Regional Service Centers who are mandated to provide advisory support to country programmes in their respective regions.

UNDP may act as a responsible party for any implementing partner. The legal context for UNDP to act as responsible party is embedded in the CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan and project document legal sections. As responsible party, UNDP would be accountable for any specific services provided under such agreements to the implementing partner, and is entitled to reimbursement for the costs of service provision. This cost reimbursement is negotiated at the time of project formulation and included in the project budget.

In the unique case when UNDP provides only direct payments on behalf of an implementing partner, UNDP’s accountability is limited to 1) assurance that request has come from an authorized official; 2) verification that the requested payment is in accordance with the project work plan; and 3) verification that payment is made to the designated party.

The following table summarizes the legal instruments used by an implementing partner to engage a responsible party in implementing a project. The accountability of a responsible party to an implementing partner should be clearly specified in these legal instruments.

**Table: Legal instruments used by an implementing partner to engage a responsible party**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Arrangements (Implementing partner)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government institution (NIM)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 Designation of Inter-Governmental Organizations and UN Agencies as Implementing Partners of UNDP

2.5.1. When the inter-governmental organization is not part of the UN system

The following procedures cover the channels of communication and the criteria to be applied in considering an application from an eligible inter-governmental organization (IGO) not in the United Nations system, to the UNDP Administrator, to become an implementing partner of UNDP. An intergovernmental entity is eligible when it is established by treaty and meets the other conditions or requirements as specified in the above criteria.

These procedures do not apply to Governments, to organizations in the United Nations system or to UNDP itself, and will not affect the status of those organizations currently operating under executing entity agreements signed with UNDP or its predecessors (Expanded Programme for Technical Assistance or Special Fund).

All communications regarding the designation of inter-governmental organizations as implementing partners of UNDP shall be directed to the Director, Partnership Bureau. The Director of the Partnerships Bureau shall be the focal point for this matter, but shall consult the Directors of the Bureau of Management (BOM), Bureau of Development Policies (BDP), Executive Office (Operations Support Group - OSG), Legal Support Office (LSO) and other UNDP headquarters units as appropriate.

On the basis of the above consultations the Director of the Partnerships Bureau shall make recommendations to the Associate Administrator on whether or not to grant an applicant inter-governmental organization Implementing Partner status. In formulating recommendations concerning Implementing Partner status, the Director of the Partnerships Bureau will assess the capacity of the applicant organization in line with the criteria for designation of inter-governmental organization.

After consideration of the recommendation of the Director of the Partnerships Bureau, the Associate Administrator shall decide whether or not to grant the applicant organization implementing partner status. If the decision is negative, the Partnerships Bureau shall so inform the applicant organization and close the application. If the decision is positive, the organization shall be invited to sign an implementing partner agreement with UNDP based on the Model Standard Basic Executing Entity Agreement (SBEAA).

Negotiation of implementing partner agreements shall be conducted on behalf of UNDP by the Director of the Partnerships Bureau, subject to the consultations described above. All draft agreements shall be submitted to the Legal Support Office, for review and final clearance. The applicant organization shall have one year from the date of its notification that its application has been accepted in which to conclude and sign an implementing partner agreement with UNDP. After signature, a signed copy shall be sent to the Treaty Section of the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs for filing and recording.
The Legal Support Office shall establish and maintain on its website a centralized web-based file concerning the designation of implementing partners, including a comprehensive set of signed implementing partner agreements (List of Implementing Partner agreements.)

2.5.2 Designation of United Nations Agency

A SBEAA should be signed by UNDP and the UN agency. For detailed guidance, please contact the Partnership Bureau.

2.6 Selecting an Implementing Partner

UNDP selects a single implementing partner for each project in consultation with the government coordinating agency.

2.6.1 Principles for Selection of Implementation Modalities

To guide the selection of the most appropriate category of implementing partner, the following sections describe the selection principles that pertain to each implementation modality.

1. National Implementation

National implementation will be the norm for UNDP programme activities, taking into account the capacities of programme countries and the nature of UNDP programme activities. This implementation modality will be appropriate when:

- There is a government entity directly concerned with the project's activities and results;
- There is a government entity whose intended role is to sustain project results;
- The relevant government entity has adequate capacity and is committed to carrying out the project as determined by a capacity assessment (see below).

The corporate Guidance and Procedures for National Implementation of UNDP-supported Projects (NIM manual) is available in English, French and Spanish.

2. United Nations Agency Implementation

A UN agency will be an appropriate implementing partner when:

- A UN agency has technical expertise that is critical to project success;
- The relevant substantive national agency is unwilling or unable to undertake project implementation;
- A global or regional project has no institutional counterpart at the global or regional level.

3. Civil Society Organization Implementation
A Civil Society Organization (national or international) will be an appropriate implementing partner when:

- The project substance deals with a subject where an CSO may have experience, expertise and comparative advantage, including *inter alia*, micro-credit, disaster relief and rehabilitation, advocacy, HIV/AIDS, rural water supply, and working with poor and disadvantaged groups;
- The project requires extensive use of participatory methodologies and/or facilitation of dialogue between government and civil society;
- Government agencies are unable or unwilling to effectively carry out project activities;
- The CSO has adequate capacity and is committed to carrying out the project as determined by a capacity assessment (using CSO Capacity Assessment Tool).

4. **Direct Implementation**

Direct implementation by UNDP will be appropriate when:

- The host government requests UNDP to directly implement project activities.
- Project implementation requires speedy delivery and decision-making, such as in crisis situations;
- National authorities are unable to function or their capacity has been severely reduced, such as in cases of natural disasters or conflict;
- Project implementation would add an administrative burden to government and other implementation options would be inefficient in such cases as projects with small delivery, one-output projects, projects in support of the resident coordinator system;
- The relevant regional bureau has determined that the concerned country office has adequate capacity to carry out the project;
- Project is part of a UNDP global or regional programme.

5. **Inter-Governmental Organization Implementation**

A non-UN inter-governmental organization (IGO) will be an appropriate implementing partner when:

- The IGO is directly concerned with the project's activities and results;
- The IGO is intended to sustain project results;
- The IGO has specialized experience and expertise in the substantive area of the project;
- The IGO has adequate capacity and is committed to carrying out the project as determined by a capacity assessment.

An IGO must have signed an implementing partner agreement with UNDP to be eligible to implement a UNDP-funded project.

6. **General Criteria for Selection of an Implementing Partner**
Considerations that apply to the selection of all implementing partners for programme activities should include the potential partner’s ability to:

- Ensure ownership at the national level;
- Carry out the key technical, financial, and administrative capacities required for the project;
- Ensure that project outputs will be produced;
- Sustain project outputs over time;
- Deliver good value for money.

### 2.6.2 Guidelines for the Selection Process

The selection process for an implementing partner should ensure that:

- The maximum number of appropriate organizations are considered to ensure objective comparison;
- There is impartial and comprehensive evaluation of prospective candidates.

The selection process for implementing partners has the following steps (please see details below under each step):

1. Identification of potential partners;
2. Assessment of each potential partner’s capacity for project implementation (using the Implementing Partner checklist);
3. Preliminary decision on selection of partner;
4. Financial and other specific capacity assessment (for partners that receive or are expected to receive over $100,000 per year in total funds from UN agencies. However, this does not apply to UN agencies and IGOs that have signed the Implementing Agreement with UNDP). Other additional assessments, as needed or required, of procurement and recruitment capacities would be carried out to identify specific problem areas.
5. On the basis of the preliminary selection of the implementing partner and findings from all capacity assessments, completion of components in the project document template that deal with:
   a. Management arrangements
   b. Definition of responsible parties in the annual work plan
   c. Risk mitigation and assurance measures
6. Circulation of draft for comments and subsequent revision as needed
7. Submission of draft for project appraisal and approval

1. **Identification of Potential Partners**

A decision may have been taken during the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) or United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Action Plan formulation on the type of implementation modality (For additional information, refer to Programme Management, Initiating a Programme, Section 2.4). If so, potential partners are identified from within that modality. If not, project developers should identify potential partners during project formulation regardless of modality. In accordance with the guidelines for the selection process, developers should identify as many appropriate potential partners as possible. However, since the implementation capacity of each potential partner must be assessed, it may
be useful to carry out some kind of informal screening of potential partners to reduce the number of such assessments. Government should provide input into the list of potential partners.

2. Assessment of Project Implementation Capacity

Project developers and concerned country office programme personnel should assess the project implementation capacity of all potential partners that have been identified. The assessment should be conducted using the Capacity Assessment for Project Implementation checklist which includes instructions for use. This checklist is intended to be used as a screening tool for the preliminary selection of the best candidate for implementing partner from among several potential partners. The checklist enables a rapid assessment of each proposed candidate’s appropriateness and capacity to implement a proposed project. The checklist is also designed to satisfy UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules 16.05 on the determination of whose financial procedures would apply if the candidate organization is selected to be the implementing partner. The assessment covers managerial, technical and administrative capacities. The latter include recruitment, procurement and financial management capacities. Project developers should prepare a brief written report on the findings of the capacity assessment, highlighting strengths and weaknesses of the capacities of the proposed partners. UNDP offers a Capacity Assessment Methodology that national partners can use to assess their own capacity assets and needs. For more information, see the UNDP Capacity Assessment Practice Note.

3. Preliminary Decision on Proposed Partner

The purpose of a preliminary decision on the implementing partner is to increase transparency by making that decision a discrete step and to encourage use of capacity assessment findings to support a fact-based decision. Furthermore, a preliminary decision on the selection of implementing partner is essential for the completion of a number of steps in project formulation. Final approval of an implementing partner is incorporated in the final approval of an entire project by the UNDP official authorized to approve projects. Government must be consulted and ultimately confirm the choice of implementing partner. To secure this preliminary agreement, the country office programme manager should advise Government in writing of the proposed implementation arrangements, based on the findings of the capacity assessment, and request its concurrence. A “no objection” format with a time limit can be used for this communication.

4. Financial Capacity Assessment

After securing preliminary agreement to the proposed partner, a detailed financial management capacity assessment is required for partners that receive or are expected to receive over $100,000 per year in total funds from UN agencies. Partners that receive a smaller amount per annum may also be assessed if deemed necessary. The purpose of this assessment is to identify capacity gaps or problems in the partner’s financial management system and practices and to determine ways and means of addressing them. The conditions and procedures for this assessment are contained in the UNDG document, “Framework for Cash Transfers to Implementing Partners” Any funds required to carry out the above assessments should be advanced by UNDP and subsequently charged to the project once approved.
5. **Completion of Management and Implementation Arrangements.**

On the basis of the preliminary selection of the implementing partner and all capacity assessment findings, the project developers should complete formulation of project components that cover:

a. Management arrangements;

b. Definition of responsible parties in the annual work plan;

c. Assurance mechanisms.

(a) **Management arrangements**

The project document/AWP template (MS Word Template) defines the information to be included in regard to management arrangements. The accountability of the implementing partner is set out in standard text in this section. This section of the project document should explain the partner’s role in managing the project, carrying out the activities and providing oversight.

In addition, the following information should be included:

- Role of the Government Cooperating Agency;
- Prior obligations and prerequisites;
- Collaborative arrangements with related projects (if any);
- Brief description of the inputs to be provided by the implementing partner and any other Government inputs;
- Arrangements for cash transfers to the project and any related assurance activities; these arrangements would vary depending on whether the Implementing Partner is UNDP, UN agency, IGO, etc.
- Audit arrangements;
- Organization chart of the project;
- Annexes containing terms of reference for key personnel and any other significant information;
- Terms of reference for responsible parties (see (b) below);
- Description of assurance mechanisms (see (c) below).

(b) **Definition of responsible parties for activities**

Financial Regulation 17.01 of the UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules applies: “...With the agreement of the programme country Government and UNDP, such selected ... implementing partner, may associate one or more other entities with it in carrying out UNDP programme activities."

The “other entities” that may be associated with the implementing partner in project implementation are known as responsible parties under the harmonized programming arrangements. The implementing partner may act as its own responsible party for some or all activities.

(c) **Assurance mechanisms**
In accordance with the findings of the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) micro-assessment of financial management capacity, UNDP will use three mechanisms to provide assurance that funds provided to each implementing partner were received, expended and reported according to the agreed system for internal controls. These mechanisms are:

- Periodic on-site reviews of the partner’s financial records for cash transfers;
- Programmatic monitoring of the implementation of the Annual Work Plan;
- Scheduled audits (in collaboration with other UN organizations that use the same implementing partner) of the partner’s internal controls for the management of cash transfers.

Additional information on these mechanisms is provided in the UNDG document, Framework for Cash Transfers to Implementing Partners. These mechanisms are described in the appropriate sections of the project document.

(6) Circulation of draft for comments and subsequent revision as needed

(7) Submission of draft for project appraisal and approval

For more details on the steps (6) and (7), see section 2.10 below.

2.7 Direct Implementation Approval Process

In selecting UNDP as an implementing partner, the following should be considered:

- Do other capacities to implement exist (national institutions, UN agencies or CSOs)?
- Is the project in response to conflict situations and require speed of delivery and accountability over resources?
- Is the project in response to situations that require sensitivity and neutrality?
- Is there an exit strategy?

The relevant UNDP regional bureau must assess the country office capacity prior to a selection of UNDP as an implementing partner.

1. Review and assessment of country office capacity for implementation

At the time of finalization of the Country Programme Action Plan or UNDAF Action Plan, country offices are required to submit a draft CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan to the respective regional bureau and indicate the expected level of UNDP direct implementation. In reviewing country office capacity, the regional bureau would consult with BoM and other headquarters units as necessary. Assessment of country office capacity to implement can be carried out through the UNDP Balanced Scorecard, Financial Data Quality Dashboard, executive snapshot, field visits and monitoring activities by the regional bureau. The Regional
Bureau will communicate to the country office the results of the assessment, including recommendations and support for improving country office capacity. Such assessment will take place once during the programme cycle unless there are changes in country office performance identified through the UNDP Balanced Scorecard, change management toolkit, audits, and other monitoring mechanisms.

2. Authority for country office to implement projects.

Based on the review of country office capacity, the regional bureau can:

a) Delegate authority to CO to approve all UNDP implemented projects within the CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan;

b) Delegate authority to CO to approve UNDP implemented projects subject to conditions specified by the Bureau;

c) Require CO to submit all UNDP implemented projects for approval by the Bureau.

3. Annual consolidated report on UNDP implemented projects

Country offices must provide a report on projects which are implemented by UNDP, focused on results achieved and compliance with audit, financial and operational regulations and rules. The report should also specify how UNDP implementation supported national ownership and capacity development needs. The regional bureaux will take these reports into account in review of the delegated authorities for UNDP implementation and in preparing Bureau’s annual reports to update the Operations Group (sent through the Operations Support Group - OSG) on this issue.

For projects outside the CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan, current procedures for DEX approval will continue to apply.

2.8 Risk Management

UNDP’s overall risk policy is guided by its Enterprise Risk Management Framework.

Risk is a major factor to be considered in designing and managing any project. Risk can be defined as the possibility that an event would occur and affect the achievement of outputs. As such, it can represent a threat or a missed opportunity.

Risks must be identified, assessed and prioritized. The possible actions to deal with these risks need to be considered and an appropriate action plan needs to be developed. These actions must be incorporated in the project work-plan, and require periodic monitoring and reporting to ensure that all risk management activities are having the desired effect.

Risks, including security risks should be identified and assessed using the project Risk Log, which shall be submitted to the Project Appraisal Committee as an annex to the project document. Once the project
Award has been created in Atlas, the risks should be recorded in the Atlas Project Management module. The risk log should be maintained and updated as required in Atlas for the duration of the project.

2.9 Project Monitoring and Evaluation

During the project formulation process, UNDP in close collaboration with national counterparts and other stakeholders should plan for monitoring in accordance with guidelines in UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. The project developer should prepare an initial Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework for the project using as appropriate the M&E Framework described in chapter 3 of Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results under Programme Strategic Planning. Project monitoring is linked to and should feed programme level and outcome level monitoring. The planning for project monitoring should:

1. Clarify the precise results elements to be monitored: clear outputs, indicators, baselines, and targets;
2. Set up arrangements to collect monitoring evidence that the pre-identified outputs are being produced as intended and efficiently, and that the activities are being implemented according to the targets in the annual work plan;
3. Identify and engage in/contribute to relevant mechanism such as an outcome group or sector-wide coordinating mechanism to which the project should be linked and that would enable UNDP to jointly review with other relevant partners the contribution of project to progressive achievement of the outcomes;
4. Ensure that monitoring evidence would reliably inform whether the project outputs being generated would remain relevant to achieving the corresponding CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan outcome; Ensure that activities/events needed to monitor are scheduled and responsibilities assigned. Monitoring arrangements and actions should take into account that project monitoring has to inform and be informed by the overall monitoring processes such as the UNDAF annual review process and/or national results management processes such as outcome groups and sector-wide arrangements;
5. Ensure that the project budgets include adequate human and financial resources for monitoring and evaluation;
6. Ensure capture of issues and lessons;
7. Decide whether or not the project will be evaluated.

Project evaluations are required when they are mandated by partnership protocols, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Country offices and programme units may use their discretion in selecting other projects to be evaluated to better manage for results. The members of the Project Appraisal Committee (PAC) should assess the relevance and timing of the proposed evaluation(s) to ensure that the evaluation(s) generate(s) useful information in a timely manner. The PAC should also ensure that adequate financial resources are allocated for monitoring and evaluation(s).
The Programme Manager should ensure that the planned project evaluations are included in the evaluation plan for the country programme. For further details, see the section Evaluation in the Policies and Procedures.

2.10 Project Appraisal

According to the definition given by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), “appraisal is an overall assessment of the relevance, feasibility and potential sustainability of a development intervention prior to a decision on funding. Note: In development agencies, the purpose of appraisal is to enable decision-makers to decide whether the activity represents an appropriate use of resources.”

The function of project appraisal in UNDP is derived from the Administrator’s authority to approve programme activities. Financial Regulation 16.02 of the UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules states: “Under such limits prescribed by the Executive Board and within the limits of resources allocated for UNDP programme activities, the Administrator is authorized to approve UNDP programme activities at the country, regional and global levels.”

Financial Rule 116.02 stipulates that the authority to approve programme activities is delegated along with the requirement to establish necessary instructions and operational procedures:

(a) The authority to approve UNDP programme activities, within the limit of resources allocated to those activities is delegated to the Associate Administrator. The Associate Administrator may delegate this authority, through the Director of the Regional Bureau concerned, to UNDP Heads of Office in the programme countries;
(b) Approval of UNDP programme activities becomes effective upon signature of the project document/annual work plan.

An objective appraisal is essential for an informed decision on project approval. Therefore, UNDP has established a mandatory project appraisal process for all projects receiving UNDP funding.

Project Appraisal Committee

UNDP convenes a local Project Appraisal Committee (PAC) at each country office and at appropriate headquarters units to appraise proposed projects. The PAC members will make recommendations to the UNDP official with delegated authority to decide whether a proposed project should be approved or rejected. In most cases, the official with delegated authority will be the resident representative.

The appraisal process directly supports the UNDP Administrator’s accountability for approval of programme activities. The membership of the PAC should be comprised of UNDP staff members, representative of the Government Coordinating Agency and representative of the implementing partner. Other project stakeholders such as technical experts, representatives of cost-sharing donors and representatives from beneficiaries may attend the PAC and participate in an ex-officio capacity. Senior UNDP official should chair the meeting and appoint a rapporteur to prepare minutes.
It is recommended that Country Office might also hold one or more internal pre-PAC meetings to assist in ensuring the best project formulation process.

**Steps in the Appraisal Process**

The appraisal process has the following steps (please see details below under each step):

1. **UNDP desk review** for completeness, clarity, correctness and overall substantive quality;
2. Corrective action as necessary;
3. Desk review and preparation of comments by PAC members;
4. Appraisal meeting;
5. Preparation of appraisal meeting minutes and forwarding for further action.

1. **UNDP desk review.** After the project developer has completed the draft project document, the concerned UNDP programme officer will review the draft using the Considerations for Quality Programming and Checklist for Review of Project Documents. The purpose of the desk review is to ensure:

   - Alignment – whether the proposed project or annual work plan is aligned with the CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan;
   - Clarity – all narrative text and the results and resources framework have been written logically and clearly;
   - Completeness – all required information and annexes are included in the draft in accordance with instructions;
   - Correctness – all text is editorially correct and budget figures are arithmetically correct;
   - Results orientation – the results and resources framework is logical and contributes clearly to CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan outcome;
   - Substance – relevant UNDP policies applicable to the substantive area have been taken into account.

2. **Corrective action as necessary.** The UNDP project developer makes necessary corrections. In addition, the project developer prepares a short project presentation that outlines the rationale, intended results, strategy and any other essential information. The project developer forwards the project document/annual work plan and project brief where applicable to participants of the PAC meeting.

3. **Desk review and preparation of comments by PAC members.** The PAC members review the project document/annual work plan and project presentation and prepare their own comments. The PAC members with comments will circulate them to other PAC meeting participants prior to the meeting.
4. **Appraisal meeting.** The chairperson will convene a PAC meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to determine recommendations in regard to the next steps for the proposed project. The agenda should include:

- Brief presentation of the project;
- Review and discussion of key issues and decision by PAC members to recommend approval, rejection or revision of the proposed project.

Suggested topics for discussion include:

- **Relevance.** Whether or not there is a consensus on the problem being addressed and the results the project/annual work plan intends to produce; and whether the proposed project is a priority for Government and UNDP;
- **Feasibility.** Whether or not the project strategy will present a credible approach towards intended results;
- **Commitment.** Whether there is evidence that all concerned parties are committed to implementation of the project/annual work plan and whether the selected implementing partner is the best choice for the work to be done;
- **Accountability.** Whether or not the proposed management and implementation arrangements clearly articulate accountabilities and roles and responsibilities;
- **Cost effectiveness.** Whether the project/annual work plan is designed to be cost effective and whether it promises to yield good value for money;
- **Sustainability.** Whether the project results will be sustained with the capacity to be developed;
- **Environmental and Social Impacts.** Whether or not potential environmental and/or social impacts and opportunities have been adequately addressed;
- Risk management: whether or not risks have been identified, assessed and prioritized, and the possible actions to deal with these risks have been incorporated in the project work-plan;
- Monitoring and Evaluation: whether a Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework has been adequately developed.

Any other unresolved issues raised in the PAC members’ comments.

5. **Preparation of appraisal meeting minutes and forwarding for further action.** The PAC rapporteur prepares and circulates the minutes of the meeting, including the recommendation of the PAC to the PAC members for comments. The chairman transmits the final minutes to the UNDP official with delegated authority to approve projects if the recommendation is for approval or rejection or to the relevant UNDP project developer if the recommendation is for further revisions. In the event of the latter, when revisions are completed, the revised document is sent to the PAC chairman to verify that revisions have been made as requested. The PAC chairman then forwards the revised document to the UNDP official with delegated approval authority.

### 2.11 Atlas Considerations

The Results and Resources Framework (RRF) should be "mirrored" into Atlas, so that there is a clear correspondence between the outputs and activities identified in the RRF and the "outputs" and "activities"
established in the system. Once the project has been successfully appraised in the PAC meeting, its proposal in Atlas should be “awarded” in the system. After the Award are generated, multi-year budgets clearly indicating the responsible parties, funding sources, and planned budget amounts as per the annual work plan must be finalized. Each output under the award must also be linked to a relevant country programme outcome.

2.12 Initiation Plan

The Initiation Plan is only necessary when financial resources are required to finalize the project design or to begin certain project activities. For example, an initiation plan could include the recruitment of consultant(s) to develop a comprehensive monitoring framework, the undertaking of data analysis, conducting the environmental screening process or the start-up of pilot activities. The initiation plan documents the purpose, activities and budget required for the “Initiating a Project” process (see specific section in this Manual below). The UNDP resident representative approves this document following the recommendations of the PAC. The initiation plan contains three elements:

- A standard cover page;
- A description of the activities/key deliverables and how they will be managed;
- A standard budget in the form of an Annual Work Plan.

The duration of the initiation plan may not exceed one year. If the full project document is not ready 12 months after the signature of the initiation plan, the budget must be closed and PAC members must be informed.

The Initiation Plan replaces the previously defined approach known as Preparatory Assistance.

[1] Prudent and proper use of resources refers to transparency, fairness and integrity in use of resources, compliance with administrative regulations and procedures, and attainment of best value for money.


3.0 Flowchart

Click here to view the jpeg file.

4.0 Procedures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Tasks and responsibilities</th>
<th>Atlas Action Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 02 | Develop project document/ AWP | **Define results and capture in the Results and Resources Framework (RRF)** [Project developer]  
- Following the endorsement of the proposal in the previous process, there is at this stage a clear understanding of the best strategy to be used for the project. The project developer should now work out the project design, starting with a hierarchy of output(s), activities and inputs.  
- The CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan Results and Resources Framework shall serve as a base to define key activities for each output. Output targets and indicators initially identified in the CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan should be reviewed/re-validated to ensure that they still correspond to the current situation  
- The RRF should be developed in consultation with all stakeholders. Depending on the scope and complexity of the project, the RRF may be further elaborated during the next process “Initiating a Project”.  
- During this step, as stated in section 2.9, determine how the project should be monitored and evaluated (latter, if required). The information should be captured in an initial project monitoring and evaluation framework.  
- The decision to conduct a project evaluation should also be reflected in the overall evaluation plan for the country programme, submitted to the Executive Board. Ensure that adequate resources for monitoring and evaluation are reflected in the project budget. | The Atlas proposal should be updated to reflect information deriving from the RRF, in particular:  
- Proposal header;  
- Budget header;  
- Budget periods;  
- Budget line summary.  
The project budget periods in Atlas should be equal to calendar years. Indication of resource mobilization opportunities and utilization of core resources as well as in kind contributions can be entered in the Atlas Resources page. |
|   |   | **Determine the implementation modality and review the capacities of the potential implementing partner** [Project developer]  
- It is essential to determine the most appropriate implementation modality and how the activities will be carried out so that project outputs can be achieved within the established limits of time and costs, and meet quality criteria.  
- The project developer should carry out the following activities:  
- Identification of potential partners;  
- Assessment of each potential partner’s capacity for project implementation using the implementing partner checklist (Checklist for assessing the capacities of potential Implementing Partners on Project Management);  
- In consultation with the CO management, preliminary decision on selection of partner;  
- Financial capacity assessment (for partners that receive or are expected to receive over $100,000 per year in total funds from UN agencies) and other additional assessments (procurement, human resource managements) as required;  
- On the basis of the preliminary selection of the implementing partner and findings from all capacity assessments, completion of components in the project document template that deal with:  
- Management arrangements;  
- Definition of responsible parties in the annual work plan;  
- Risk mitigation and assurance measures.  
- When a national institution lacks the managerial capacity for certain tasks, based on the above assessment, the UNDP country office may assist the institution to carry out its role as implementing partner by providing country office support services – UNDP then becomes a responsible party. In such case, the project document | None |
must not only specify nature and scope of these services, but also outline a plan for phasing out such assistance (exit strategy).

### Draft project document/AWP [Project developer]
- Use the project document/AWP template (MS Word Template). The purpose of the template is to further articulate a number of important components initially developed in the CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan. Such components may also require further development due to changes in a country’s situation. The Considerations for Quality Programming should also be consulted to ensure substantive quality of the project.
  - The components of the project document that would need particular attention are:
    - Results and resources framework;
    - Project management arrangements and structure, including project board composition;
    - Monitoring and evaluation needs and initial framework (see section 2.9 above and the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results);
    - Risks analysis and risk management.
  - If the project is a ‘joint programme’ with other UN agencies, please refer to the UNDG Joint Programming Guidance Note. If UNDP is selected as the Administrative Agent, please refer to “UNDP accountability when acting as Administrative Agent in Multi-donor Trust Funds and/or UN Joint Programmes”;
  - If the project is to involve multiple country offices, please refer to section on Regional Programming, in particular the Guidelines on multi-country projects setup in Atlas.

### Develop Initiation Plan (as required) [Project developer]
- If immediate resources are required to help finalize the project design or begin certain activities of the project itself, an Initiation Plan should be prepared to supplement the draft project document, and submitted to the PAC. The Initiation Plan contains three elements:
  - A standard cover page;
  - A description of the activities/key deliverables and how they will be managed;
  - A standard budget in the form of an Annual Work Plan.

### Appraise Project
- Change proposal status to “Submitted”.
aspects: Relevance; Feasibility; Accountability; Cost effectiveness; Commitment; Monitoring and evaluation requirements; Sustainability; Environmental and social performance; Risk Analysis; Management arrangements; and any other unresolved issues raised in the PAC members' comments;

- Through the minutes of the meeting, the PAC critically assesses the project against established criteria, including the potential for significant and sustainable impact, advises the Programme Manager (UNDP official with delegated authority for project approval) on the soundness of the design of the project, and provides recommendations for approval, rejection or revision of the draft project document;
- Minutes of the PAC meeting must be circulated to and get endorsement by participants and kept on file for later review by audits and/or evaluation teams. They must also be uploaded to Atlas.
- PAC chairman will check revision and transmit for approval by programme manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>04 Approve Project</th>
<th>Make decision on project document [Programme manager]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Based on PAC recommendation, a decision (approval, approval subject to modification, or rejection) by the UNDP official with delegated authority should be made and communicated to all parties concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Based on PAC’s recommendation on on the composition of project board and its responsibilities in directing project implementation, Project Board members should be endorsed by the respective agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generate Award in Atlas [Programme Manager, Project Assurance]</th>
<th>Generate Award. For each Project ID, set Project Status to “A” in order to activate the functionalities of the Project Management Module. At the Award level, set the Award Status to “Initiating” in order to properly reflect the Award in the Project Data Quality Dashboard.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The UNDP staff member with appropriate level of authority in Atlas generates the Award, based on the recommendations of the PAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The project assurance should perform a quality check to ensure that the project output/activity structure in Atlas is consistent with the RRF, prior to the generation of the Award.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activate the Project Management Module in Atlas [Project developer, project assurance]</th>
<th>Activate the Output Definition page. Activate the initial Risks and Issues Logs in the Project Management module. Connect the Project ID(s) to the corresponding Outcome of the Project Tree.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Based on information deriving from the results and resources framework, enter in Atlas the Output details, including baseline, indicators and targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Record in Atlas the agreed project risks and risk management actions, deriving from the risks log as endorsed by the PAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval of Initiation Plan (if required) [PAC/Programme Manager]</th>
<th>If budget is required for the initiating phase, send this budget to Commitment Control (KK).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The PAC must review the initiation plan budget in the form of an annual work plan. Following the approval of the programme manager, a UNDP manager with appropriate Atlas authority must...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
activate the initiation plan.

5.0 Inputs

- CPAP or UNDAF action plan
- Contribution of stakeholders to formulation
- Project proposal approved in Atlas (concept note, if initially required)
- IP capacity assessments
- Knowledge Products and Communities of Practice Consultation: Existing knowledge products, such as policy notes and briefs, how-to-guides, lessons learned, consolidated replies and analytical studies, should inform the justification of a project
- Desk review. PAC member comments and PAC minutes

6.0 Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>What is it?</th>
<th>Learn on-line</th>
<th>Do it in Atlas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results &amp; resources framework</td>
<td>See the project document</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Management Module – Award Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project document</td>
<td>Deliverable Description MS Word Template</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial project monitoring and evaluation framework</td>
<td>See section 2.9 above and section 2.9 of Programme Strategic Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial risk log</td>
<td>Deliverable Description MS Word Template Sample Atlas Risk Log Sample Risk Log report</td>
<td>On-Demand Atlas Training – Defining a Project</td>
<td>Project Management Module – Award Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved initiation plan (as required)</td>
<td>Deliverable Description MS Word Template</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

During this process, the following roles are involved:

- **Project developer**: Takes the lead in formulating the project and in organising required actions in project appraisal and finalization;

- **Project assurance**: Ensures that the required formulation and appraisal procedures are followed and the Atlas Project Management module has been properly activated;

- **PAC members**: Participate in PAC meetings to appraise and make recommendations for approval of projects; as part of the PAC process, make recommendations on the composition of project boards and the responsibilities of board members in directing project implementation. Review and make recommendations on the initiation plan budget prior to approval.

- **Programme manager**: Signs the initiation plan budget (if required) which takes the form of an annual work plan. He/she is the UNDP official with delegated authority for project approval.

For more details, please see Programme and Project Management Arrangements in the POPP.

8.0 Templates and Forms

- Implementing Partner Capacity Assessment Checklist
- Considerations for Quality Programming
- Checklist for Review of Project Documents
- Project Appraisal Committee - Sample TOR
- Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework
- Enterprise Risk Management Work Sheets (For more information, Enterprise Risk Management under the Programme and Project Management Overview).
- Security Risk Management Work Sheets

9.0 Additional Info. and Tools

Check the Programme and Project Management Resource Center.
**Initiating a Project**

Programme and Project > Project Management > Initiating a Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Capacity Development Group (CDG)/Bureau for Development Policy (BDP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focal Point</td>
<td>Dien Le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuance/POPP Publishing Date</td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Date</td>
<td>24/11/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Review Date</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Revision Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>All UNDP programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of changes (one entry per revision)**

- Initiating a Project - based on the draft project document as appraised, ensure effective and efficient implementation of the project. Deliverables include signed Project Document, activation of the Project Budget, and signed Contribution Agreements.

---

### 1.0 Description

The purpose of this process is to answer the question: “Does the design of the project demonstrate an achievable plan to implement and assess progress towards delivering results to ensure success? Is monitoring clearly defined?” The project board reviews project plans, budgets, schedules, and monitoring approaches to answer this question.

The work to be done in this process is fundamentally to further develop project details, budgets, and plans based on the draft project document/AWP appraised in the previous process, to ensure the effective and efficient implementation of the project. A key element of this process is also to develop a sound and comprehensive monitoring framework, which shall determine how the project performance will be measured. This work may be guided by an initiation plan (not mandatory), developed in the “Defining a Project” process, for which financial resources have been allocated and approved to complete the above tasks or start up the implementation of the project (see 4.0 Procedures below).

The end of this process is primarily identified by a signed project document, activation of the project budget, and receipt of signed contribution agreements as appropriate.

### 2.0 Relevant Policies

#### 2.1 Approval Authority and Accountability

This process is the last step in the formulation and planning of a project before actual project activities begin in the next process, “Implementing a Project”. The key approval required in this process is the signing of the project document. The project document constitutes a commitment to implement the project in accordance with UNDP’s mandate, policies, regulations and rules.

The project document must be signed by, at a minimum, UNDP and the implementing partner. This minimum applies when:

- A signed Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) or United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Action Plan is in place;
• The project is included in the CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan as output(s);

• The implementing partner is listed in the CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan as the implementing partner for the project.

If the conditions for this minimum do not apply, then the project document must be signed by UNDP, the implementing partner, and the Government Coordinating Agency. For UNDP, the resident representative has the delegated authority to sign a project document (see 2.10 Project Appraisal in the section on “Defining a Project”). For more information, see also the sections on Legal Framework and Accountability and Delegation of Authority.

Another key approval required in this process is the activation of the project budget in Atlas, the UNDP corporate management system (i.e., under “Commitment Control” or “KK”). The authority for this activation rests with the delegated authority in the UNDP unit or office where the project resides, as described in UNDP’s Internal Control Framework.

2.2 Required Documentation

The project arrangements defined during this process are important in order to ensure the project is set up appropriately to deliver results as planned and to ensure, in the ongoing monitoring and management of the project, that the project is on track from financial, results, schedule, management, and stakeholder perspectives. Relevant information is captured in the finalized project document to be signed.

Additional documentation to be finalized during this process include, as required:

• Detailed terms of reference for key project positions (suggested key technical advisors, project manager);

• Detailed annual work plan (AWP) and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework;

• Standard agreements, such as Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) - when a Civil Society Organization (CSO) is implementing partner - and cost-sharing agreement;

• Standard Letter of Agreement between implementing partner and responsible parties for the implementation of the project.

2.3 Monitoring Framework and Reporting

All processes and results to which UNDP is contributing must be monitored regardless of budget and duration. A monitoring and evaluation framework, initially defined with the draft project document, (as presented in section 2.9 Monitoring and Evaluation under the “Defining a Project” stage) must be further developed and finalized during this process, describing activities and outputs to be monitored, reviewed and assessed, how and by whom. The framework must articulate the types of communication and associated scheduling required during the project, as well as methods of communication with...
stakeholders. Using a combination of templates and Atlas tools, the following elements shall be part of the monitoring framework for the project:

- **Output level**: Each output requires an indicator, baseline and target in order to measure and clearly understand the expected products and services as outputs;

- **Annual targets**: Where applicable annual targets should be set for each output in order to enable the tracking of progress of generating the output, and to facilitate yearly reporting as part of the Annual Review (please see Implementing a Project process);

- **Activity Level**: key monitoring activities should be identified and built in to the project M&E framework.

### 2.4 Project Funding

Project funds are financial resources mobilized from various sources to be used for project expenditures as defined in the project budget. Project financial arrangements must be planned in this process, which may include funding from UNDP regular resources, government cost sharing, donor contributions, trust fund financing, etc. A project can be approved based on the financing plan; therefore not all project funding must be committed or available at the start of the project. The procedures and policies applicable for the funding source must be followed to the extent that they are consistent with UNDP policies and procedures. For example, contribution agreements must be signed for project-level donor contributions; Thematic Trust Fund (TTF) procedures must be followed for TTF funded projects; and Global Environment Fund (GEF) policies and procedures must be followed for GEF projects. Project funding procedures are detailed in the **Resources and Funding Mechanisms section** in the Financial Resources Management chapter of the UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP).

### 2.5 Project Budgeting

The project budget, captured in Atlas by year per activity, defines the required expenditures to produce the deliverables for each activity. The project budget is explicitly linked to project results through activities defined in the results & resources framework. The estimation of costs for each activity in the project budget should be based on what is required to produce the results of that activity, as defined in the Activity Definition in Atlas. Cost estimating should therefore be results-based (what is required to achieve the result) rather than input-based or based on available financial resources. Cost estimates should include all costs related to the achievement of project deliverables and outputs, whether direct or indirect. The project budget should include such indirect costs as monitoring, risk mitigation, contingency and external evaluations. (see **Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results** for more details).

### 2.6 Project Cost-Recovery
When Other Resources such as cost-sharing, trust funds are involved in the project, applicable cost-recovery mechanisms must be applied in accordance with the UNDP Cost Recovery Guidelines. Likewise, when the project – whether funded from UNDP regular or other resources - involves UNDP’s implementation support services, costs incurred to provide such services should be recovered. UNDP should design the nature and scope of these services to ensure successful project operations based on the assessment of the implementing partner’s capacity conducted in the “Defining a Project” process. Related arrangements should be described in the management arrangements section of the project document.

2.7 Implementation Arrangements

During this process, detailed implementation arrangements shall be finalized and formalized through the signature of agreements between the entities involved in the management of the project. The implementing partner as identified in the “Defining a Project” section above may engage other entities (Responsible Parties) to carry out specific activities. These agreements shall define the rules and procedures to be followed in managing project activities (including when UNDP is a responsible party). These rules and procedures include the areas of management, procurement, finance, and human resources, essentially covering the functions required to manage and administer a project.

As stated in UNDP Financial Regulation 16.05, the administration by implementing partners of resources obtained from or through UNDP shall be carried out under their respective financial regulations, rules, practices and procedures only to the extent that they do not contravene the principles of the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP. Where the financial governance of an implementing partner does not provide the required guidance to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition, those of UNDP shall apply.

Following rules and procedures other than those of UNDP does not remove the requirement for the project outputs and activities to be monitored and tracked according to the policies articulated in the Programme and Project Management chapter of the POPP.

2.8 Advance Authorization

Advance authorizations permit the implementing partner to enter into commitments and incur expenditures without delay in accordance with a project document (or substantive revision document) that has been finalized but has not yet been signed by all the parties. This may be due to bureaucratic delays in securing such signatures.

An advance authorization is valid for 60 days only. It must be replaced with a fully signed project document (or substantive revision document) within 60 days.

The programme manager must be satisfied that the formulation and appraisal processes for the full project have been completed and that all UNDP programme policies have been complied with prior to signing the advance authorization.
The UNDP country office must prepare the advance authorization cover page according to the format (See Deliverables section below). The budget of the project document (or AWP?) or revision document is attached to the cover page.

The programme manager signs the advance authorization after ascertaining that the government and the implementing partner agree to it.

3.0 Flowchart

Click here to view the jpeg file.

4.0 Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Tasks and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Atlas Action Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 05  | Operationally set up project | Refine output indicators, baseline and targets [Project Developer]  
• Before the project implementation and given the possible changing environment, it is likely that the Results and Resources Framework (RFF) should be further refined and/or detailed. In any case, this step shall represent an opportunity to re-validate the RRF and ensure that the information has been properly recorded in Atlas.  
Plan activities (Activity IDs in Atlas) [Project Developer]  
• It is important at this stage to identify key activities which shall correspond to “Activity IDs” in Atlas, and make necessary adjustments in the Atlas project set-up. Ideally, the activity deliverables should have been identified as part of the RRF formulation.  
Finalize implementation arrangements with implementing partner [Project Developer]  
• Based on the initial capacity assessment, detailed implementation arrangements with the selected implementing partner shall be finalized. The scope for UNDP support services to a government institution selected as implementing partner should also be detailed in this process and formalized through a LOA as appropriate.  
• When finalizing arrangements with a national implementing partner, it is necessary to determine which modality will be utilized for the project finances and cash transfer. See the section on Cash Transfer under the Financial Resources Management Guide  
• The implementing partner may also engage other organizations (Responsible Parties) to carry out specific activities. Appropriate agreements with these organizations should be defined using standard models (see 8.0 Templates and Forms below).  
Finalize project management arrangements [Project Developer] | Award Summary > Output Link  
• Description  
• Baseline  
• Indicator  
• Targets  
Award Summary > Activity Link  
• Start – End date  
• Purpose  
• Description  
Award Profile  
• Customer  
• Project Department  
• Institution  
Award>Projects  
Project Team |
• Following the appointment of the project board members in the previous process, detailed roles and responsibilities required to govern and manage the project must be defined. In addition to the section on Organizational Structure, detailed terms of reference can be found in the Resource Center, covering project board, project assurance, project manager, project support etc.
• Actual recruitment may take place during this process if included in the initiation plan.

**Finalize project funding (signed contribution agreements, fund allocations from regular resources, etc.)** [Project developer]
- Refer to the Financial Resource Management Section of POPP for details of programme resources and funding mechanisms.
- If not yet uploaded to Atlas as an attachment to the proposal, signed contribution agreements should be uploaded to Atlas as attachments to the project.
- If the project will utilize some pass-through or joint-programming funds, indicate it as such in Atlas by filling in the Attribute code on the Attributes page.

**Finalise project budget** [Project developer, project support]
- The project budget is captured in Atlas by year per activity. Once finalized, the information will feed the Annual Work Plan (AWP) generated from Atlas.
- See section 2.5 Project Budgeting above under 2.0 Relevant Policies.

**Prepare procurement plan** [Project developer]
- Procurement planning is essential for the timely solicitation of quotations, bids or proposals, and to ensure cost efficiency through possible bulk procurement. Procurement planning entails more than the selection of a procurement method for various goods, civil works and services and when to schedule activities. It also combines the legal and institutional frameworks in which procurement must be carried out. In addition, the procurement plan represents an opportunity to secure the timely delivery of key inputs for the start-up of the project.
- More information on procurement planning is available in Contract and Procurement Management of the POPP. Based on this plan, actual procurement for goods and services may take place during this process if included as deliverables under the approved initiation plan.

**Create project monitoring schedule plan** [Project developer]
- The Atlas Project Management module can be used to maintain a dated list of key project management and monitoring events, including key reports, reviews, monitoring visits, audits, and evaluations. This should be considered as part of the overall M&E Framework as given in Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results.
- A query in Atlas allows for the display of monitoring events at the office level, and can be used as a planning tool to ensure the coordination of monitoring activities and the...
participation of key stakeholders. The information is also available on the UNDP Executive Snapshot.
- A Word software template is available for this plan if necessary (see 6.0 Deliverables below).

**Update risk log** [Project developer]
- See section Defining a Project under Relevant Policies for more information about the purpose of the risk log.
- The risk log is supported by Atlas. In certain circumstances, it may however be necessary to maintain these logs off-line using Word software templates. Risks entered in Atlas are available on the Executive Snapshot.

**Complete and produce project plans** [Project developer]
- The following plans described in the above steps should be produced for review by the project board:
  - annual work plan for the first year (and subsequent years as required);
  - Procurement plan;
  - Project management arrangements;
  - Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, including Project monitoring schedule plan;
  - Updated risk log

**Review project plans, including first AWP, monitoring frameworks and risk log** [Project board]
- The project board shall review the project plans, the proposed team structure and roles as well as other relevant documents to ensure the relevance, feasibility and cost effectiveness of the project, and endorse the proposed AWP for the first year.
- The project board should also review the progress report for the initiation plan (if an initiation plan was required and approved in the process “Defining a Project”).

**Finalize the project document** [Project developer]
- The AWP and other plans shall be revised based on the recommendations of the project board review as required. Following the review, the project developer finalises the project document. The project developer shall ensure that the requirements for the project document/AWP are met based on the harmonized programming arrangements.

**Sign project document** 06

**Approve and sign project document** [UNDP programme manager, implementing partner]
- The project document shall be signed by, at a minimum, the programme manager (UNDP RR or delegated authority) and the implementing partner. See section 2.1 above on approval authority.
- The signed project document forms a basis for the budget allocation, which is approved in Atlas by a UNDP staff with appropriate authority.
- See the section on Global and Regional Programming in the POPP regarding specific requirements on project document signature.
- For projects using TRAC 3 allocations for sudden emergencies, a fully signed project document must be
5.0 Inputs

- Draft project document recommended by the Project Appraisal Committee (PAC) for finalization and approval.
- Generated Award in Atlas.
- Knowledge products and Communities of Practices (CoP) Consultation: Existing knowledge products, such as policy notes and briefs, how-to-guides, lessons learned, consolidated replies and analytical studies should serve as inputs during this process.

6.0 Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Description</th>
<th>What is it?</th>
<th>Learn</th>
<th>Do it in Atlas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Authorization Cover</td>
<td>MS Word Template</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Document</td>
<td>Deliverable Description MS Word Template</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Log</td>
<td>Deliverable Description MS Word Template Sample Atlas Risk Log Sample Risk Log report</td>
<td>On-Demand Atlas Training – Initiating a Project</td>
<td>Project Management Module – Award Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

The following roles should be involved in this process:

Project developer:
- Takes the lead in carrying out most of the tasks in this process;
- Responsible for finalizing the project document and project plans.

Project board:
- Agrees on project manager’s responsibilities, as well as the responsibilities of the other key members of the project management team;
- Delegates any project assurance function as appropriate;
- Reviews the progress report for the Initiation stage (if an initiation plan was approved);
- Reviews and appraises detailed project plans, including the AWP and Atlas reports covering activity definition, updated risk log and the monitoring schedule plan;
• Shares annual reports and relevant information on achievement of the outcomes with Programme Board and Outcome Group.

**Project assurance**

• Ensures that project plans are being developed according to standards and that management procedures are properly followed;

• Ensures that project outputs definitions and activity definition (as appropriate) have been properly recorded in the Atlas Project Management module to facilitate monitoring and reporting;

• Ensures that the final project document meets the standard requirements based on the harmonized programming arrangements;

• Ensures that project board’s recommendations are followed and revisions are managed in line with the required procedures.

**UNDP programme manager** (UNDP resident representative or delegated authority):

• Ensure that the project monitoring framework is aligned with the programme monitoring framework;

• Approves and sign the project document;

• Approves budget for the first year in Atlas.

**Implementing partner:**

• Endorses and signs the project document.

• Signs standard agreements with responsible parties (as applicable)

**Government Coordinating Agency:**

• Represents the Government and signs the project document (for project in non-CPAP countries and/or projects that are not within the scope of the signed CPAP or UNDAF Action Plan)

For more details, please see [Programme and Project Management Arrangements](#) in the POPP.

### 8.0 Templates and Forms

In addition to templates already provided under 6.0 Deliverables above, the following templates and forms apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Grant Agreement</td>
<td>Accord de Subvention</td>
<td>Acuerdo de subsidio de microcapital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmes and Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov-20-2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Micro-Capital Grant Agreement) for Non-Credit Related Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Accord de subvention en micro-capital) Pour les activités non liées au crédit</strong></td>
<td><strong>para actividades no relativas a crédito</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Grant Agreement (Micro-Capital Grant Agreement) for Credit Related Activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard Grant Agreement (Micro-Capital Grant Agreement) for Credit Related Activities (French Translation)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Note: Spanish translation is pending - please check the UNCDF website at a later stage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Letter of Agreement between Government and a UN agency under NIM</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lettre d'accord type entre le gouvernement et UN organisme des Nations Unies pour l'appui à une réalisation nationale</strong></td>
<td><strong>Modelo de carta de acuerdo entre el gobierno y un organismo de las Naciones Unidas bajo implementación nacional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard LOA between UNDP and UN or UN funds or programmes when UNDP serves as Implementing Partner (i.e. under Direct Implementation or DIM)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lettre d'accord standard entre le PNUD et les Nations Unies ou UN Fonds/Programme des Nations Unies concernant la réalisation de projet lorsque le PNUD fait fonction de partenaire de réalisation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Modelo de carta de acuerdo entre el PNUD y las Naciones Unidas o Un Fondo/Programe de las Naciones Unidas sobre la implementación cuando el PNUD actúa como asociado en la implementación</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard LOA between UNDP and a UN Agency on the implementation of a UNDP project when UNDP serves as Implementing Partner (i.e. under Direct Implementation or DIM)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lettre d'accord standard entre le PNUD et un organisme des Nations Unies concernant la réalisation de projet lorsque le PNUD fait fonction de partenaire de réalisation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Modelo de carta de acuerdo entre el PNUD y las Naciones Unidas sobre la implementación del proyecto cuando el PNUD actúa como Asociado en la Implementacion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Letter of Agreement between United Nations Development Programme and the Government for the Provision of Support Services (including Description of Support Services)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lettre d'accord type entre le PNUD et le gouvernement pour la fourniture de services d’appui</strong></td>
<td><strong>Modelo de carta de acuerdo entre el PNUD y el gobierno para la prestación de servicios de apoyo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard PCA between UNDP and a NGO</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accord de coopération type au titre d’un projet entre le PNUD et une organisation non gouvernementale</strong></td>
<td><strong>Modelo de acuerdo de cooperación relativa a un proyecto entre el PNUD y una ONG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard LOA between UNDP and a Government Ministry/Institution/IGO on the implementation of a project when UNDP serves as implementing partner</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lettre d'accord standard entre le Programmes des Nations Unies pour le Développement et Ministère/Institution Gouvernementale/OGI concernant la réalisation de [Nom du Project du PNUD] lorsque le PNUD fait fonction de partenaire de réalisation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Modelo de Carta de Acuerdo entre el Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo y [Un Ministerio/Institución/Organización Intergubernamental] para la implementación de [Nombre del Proyecto del PNUD] cuando el PNUD actúe como asociado en la implementación</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Considerations for Quality Programming

• Checklist for Review of Project Documents

• Standard contributions agreements and policies, including cost-sharing agreement between the United Nations (or other UN Agency) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) - Check the Partnership Bureau/Division for Resource Mobilization (DRM);

• Additional project management templates as appropriate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>What is it?</th>
<th>Learn</th>
<th>Do it in Atlas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues Log</td>
<td>Deliverable Description, MS Word Template, Atlas Sample</td>
<td>On-Demand Atlas Training – Initiating a Project</td>
<td>Project Management Module – Award Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons-Learned Log</td>
<td>Deliverable Description, MS Word Template, Executive Snapshot Sample</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Monitoring Schedule Plan</td>
<td>Deliverable Description, Atlas Sample</td>
<td>On-Demand Atlas Training – Initiiting a Project</td>
<td>Project Management Module – Award Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.0 Additional Info. and Tools

Further to the above mandatory requirements as specified in 6.0, the following optional tools would also be used as appropriate:

• Project Monitoring Schedule: Using Atlas, the project monitoring schedule maintains a date list of key project management and monitoring events, including key reports, reviews, monitoring visits, audits, and evaluations. This schedule is maintained by the project manager and tracks the dates of key project events for all project members to follow;

• Issues Log: The issues log is used to capture and track the status of all project issues throughout the implementation of the project. During the process “Implementing a Project”, it will be the responsibility of the Project Manager to track, capture and assign issues, and to ensure that all project issues are appropriately addressed. At this stage, pending the recruitment of the Project Manager, the initial set of project issues should be captured by the Project Developer. Issues may be captured and tracked in Atlas, or they may be tracked through other means.

• Lessons Learned Log: The lessons learned log is maintained throughout the project to capture insights and lessons based on good and bad experiences and behaviors. It is the responsibility of the project manager to maintain and update the lessons learned log. During this process, the
lessons learned log is started by the project developer, and any initial project lessons or insights are captured;

- For activity level monitoring, the monitoring system in Atlas can be used as appropriate;
- **Check the Program and Project Management Resource Center.**

### Implementing a Project

Programme and Project > Project Management > Implementing a Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Capacity Development Group (CDG)/Bureau for Development Policy (BDP)</th>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Dien Le</th>
<th>Issuance/POPP Publishing Date</th>
<th>15/12/2010</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>24/11/2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td>Planned Review Date</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
<td>Last Revision Date</td>
<td>All UNDP programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of changes (one entry per revision)</td>
<td>Managing &amp; overseeing activities to achieve outputs in approved PD; managing overall conduct of proj mobilizing goods &amp; services, checking on progress &amp; watching for plan deviations, changes are controlled &amp; problems addressed, monitoring &amp; reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.0 Description

The focus of this process is to achieve project outputs as defined in the approved project document/AWP through implementation and monitoring. Project outputs are produced through a set of activities. The plan to achieve outputs for a given year is articulated in the Annual Work Plan (AWP). Fundamental responsibilities for this process lie with the project manager who is appointed by and responsible to the implementing partner. The project manager is responsible for:

- Managing the overall conduct of the project;
- Implementing activities by mobilizing goods and services;
- Checking on progress and watch for plan deviations;
- Ensuring that changes are controlled and problems addressed;
- Monitoring progress and risks;
- Reporting on progress including measures to address challenges and opportunities.

UNDP can be the implementing partner and appoints the project manager only when the project is directly implemented by UNDP.

Typically most projects are implemented through other implementing modalities such as national implementation, Civil Society Organization (CSO) implementation, Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO)
implementation and United Nations (UN) agency implementation. When projects are being implemented by other implementing partners, UNDP’s role is mainly to:

- Monitor the project’s progress towards intended outputs;
- Monitor that resources entrusted to UNDP are utilized appropriately;
- Ensure national ownership, ongoing stakeholder engagement and sustainability;
- Ensure that the project’s outputs contribute to intended country programme outcomes;
- Participate in the project management board;
- When UNDP is identified as a responsible party, perform duties as associated with this role including, when requested and agreed to, provide implementation support services;
- Report on progress to donors and to UNDP through corporate reporting mechanisms.

As the project progresses, the project board must continually address the following questions: Is the project still relevant and effectively contributing to the intended outcomes? Is the project yielding the desired results? Are risks managed? Is the project being implemented as planned? Is there a need to redesign, cancel or modify the project in any way in order to ensure meaningful contribution to development results?

In addition to periodic reviews within the year, an annual review shall take place to assess results achieved against yearly targets and to approve the next annual work plan, inducing UNDP’s related financial commitment.

**2.0 Relevant Policies**

**2.1 Provision of Financial Resources and Monitoring their Use**

Based on the approved annual work plan, UNDP provides the required financial resources to the implementing partner to carry out project activities during the annual cycle. Under the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT), four cash transfer modalities are available, based on operational agreements described in the project document:

- Direct cash transfers to implementing partners, for obligations and expenditures to be made by them in support of activities;
- Direct payments to vendors and other third parties, for obligations incurred by the implementing partners;
- Reimbursement to implementing partners for obligations made and expenditure incurred by them in support of activities;
- Direct agency implementation through which the agency makes obligations and incurs expenditure in support of activities.

Further details can be found in the Financial Resources Management Guide (**Financial Management and Execution modalities**). In all cases, the implementing partner is accountable for:
• Managing UNDP resources to achieve the expected results specified in the project document, in accordance with the principles of the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP;

• Maintaining up-to-date accounting system to ensure accuracy and reliability of financial reporting;

• Sending expenditures reports on a quarterly basis (or more frequently as appropriate).

Based on the expenditures reports received from the project and recorded in Atlas (the UNDP corporate management system), UNDP prepares a Combined Delivery Report (CDR) at the end of the quarter. The CDR is the report that reflects the total expenditures and actual obligations (recorded in Atlas) of a Project during a period (quarterly and mandatory at the end of each year). The CDR combines expenditures from three disbursement sources:

• Implementing partner;

• UNDP;

• UN agencies (when acting as responsible parties).

The CDR constitutes the official report of expenditures and obligations of the project for a given period. This report is prepared by UNDP, using Atlas.

2.2 Management of Inputs

When the management arrangements have been determined, the implementing partner arranges for the procurement of the inputs to initiate activities. This section explains the policies and principles to be observed in procuring and using inputs, with a view to producing the expected outputs.

Definitions and Key Principles

Inputs are the personnel, goods and services, and micro-capital grants that are necessary and sufficient to produce the planned outputs. Inputs are obtained on the basis of the project work plan and the corresponding budget. Where the progress towards planned outputs is not advancing as expected, the project board should review the strategy of the project, including the work plan, budget and inputs.

As per UNDP’s Financial Regulations and Rules (Reg. 21.02), the following general principles must be given due consideration:

• Best value for money;

• Fairness, integrity, transparency;

• Effective international competition;

• The interest of UNDP.

See Principles of UNDP Procurement for more details. The implementing partner may follow its own procedures provided they conform to the UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules principles as per Financial Regulation 16.05 (see 2.7 Implementation arrangements in the section on Initiating a Project above). The implementing partner may alternatively apply UNDP practices.

The UNDP country office may mobilize certain inputs on behalf of the implementing partner. In this case, UNDP establishes the contracts following UNDP rules and procedures, as well as the policies for country office support services. UNDP is then a Responsible Party for the provision of support services.
Personnel

Government staff

Since UNDP-supported projects form part of the development activities of the programme country, the Government assigns its own personnel to participate in project activities as part of their work responsibilities. Such personnel are referred to as "government staff". This category of staff is reflected in the government budget, not in the project budget. Note: the government in-kind contribution should be reflected in the project document.

UNDP-supported personnel

The implementing partner is responsible for ensuring that job descriptions (sometimes called “terms of reference”) are prepared for all UNDP-supported personnel. The partners concerned must agree on their content. These must be updated and must clearly identify the outputs the person is expected to produce. Individual work plans are also recommended for all staff.

As general principles, the following must always apply:

- All personnel are recruited by the implementing partner (or its contractors) unless otherwise specified (e.g., UNDP provides support services, see below “Recruitment by UNDP”);

- The salaries and other entitlements of locally-recruited personnel must not exceed those within the United Nations system for comparable functions and types of contracts in the country concerned;

- The entitlements for travel of personnel funded by the project must not exceed those for UNDP staff;

- UNDP adheres to the policy of the Joint Consultative Group on Policy (JCGP) on contracting government personnel, which disallows direct payments to government staff for their additional work contributions on donor-supported development projects. Government officials cannot be funded by UNDP projects since this would undermine ownership and sustainability. (For more information, please see the United Nations policy on payments to government staff);

- However, the UNDP Policy and Procedures for Engagement on National Salary Supplementation Schemes (NSSS) and National Salary Payment Schemes (NSPS) states that UNDP can engage in:
  - National Salary Supplementation Scheme: UNDP is asked to engage on the salary supplements to civil service or other government-contracted posts covering direct state functions. The scheme cannot cover UNDP programme, operations or policy posts, which would be covered by standard UNDP project contracts and related procedures;
  - National Salary Payment Schemes: in a limited number of crisis and post conflict country situations, where government is as yet unable to provide the required administrative and management support to ensure the payment of such salaries, it may request UNDP to make these payments directly to the recipient on government contract;

- An engagement in any of these two areas should be considered as part of a larger wage or civil service reform process (even in times of post crises such would be the initial stages of a longer-term reform strategy); a risk assessment should always be included in such engagement; any direct service support would be for an agreed limited duration only with an explicit and monitored exit strategy; and the engagement requires the approval of the Office of the Administrator and Regional Bureau concerned. More details on the policy and procedures can be found in the link of UNDP Policy and Procedures for Engagement on National Salary Supplementation Schemes (NSSS) and National Salary Payment Schemes (NSPS).
Recruitment by UNDP

As part of UNDP country office support services to national implementation, the UNDP country office may recruit personnel for projects according to UNDP rules. For UNDP recruitment, see the Human Resources Management section of the Policies and Procedures for more information.

Contracting to provide goods and services

Reference is made to the procurement plan as developed in Initiating a Project process. Under a project, a contract is an agreement between the implementing partner and another institution, private firm or non-governmental organization to carry out specific activities, or to provide specific goods or services. Contracting is used where the parties agree that it would be the most cost-effective way of achieving the desired results. This may, for example, occur when a coherent approach is needed to carry out a specific set of activities, or when a component or large part of a project needs to be undertaken by a single entity.

- When national contracting procedures are used, UNDP must ensure consistency with UNDP principles and procedures as described above (see Definitions and Key Principles).

- When UNDP provides procurement as support service, UNDP must ensure an exit strategy and UNDP’s procedures must be used. See the Contracts, Assets and Procurement Management section of the Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures for more information.

The implementing partner must ensure the oversight and monitoring of all contractors’ work. For this, the contract should describe progress benchmarks and indicators for measuring the outputs of the contract.

Training

The project can fund training designed to contribute to the expected results and the capacity development strategy of the project. The key policies and principles on organizing training, namely fellowships and other training are:

- Participants in training are project beneficiaries and government staff. Consultants are not eligible for training within a project since they are recruited to perform specific tasks for which they must already be qualified. This however does not apply for the purpose of orientation training on UNDP approaches. In addition, all personnel may participate in local group training activities;

- UNDP programme resources may not be used for the training of UNDP staff alone;

- Sitting fees cannot be paid for training, although UNDP may finance travel and allowances for participants who live somewhere in the country other than where the training event takes place;

- Only training necessary to produce the outputs and achieve results, as identified in the project document and work plans should be funded from project resources;

- The implementing partner must establish procedures to ensure that the right and best-qualified candidates are selected for training;

- Beneficiaries of training must prepare a report not more than one month after their training ends. The employer, normally the government, is responsible for ensuring that the participant puts the training to good use to achieve results. Impact of training must be regularly assessed as part of project monitoring.
Fellowships

A fellowship is a specific training activity for a qualified individual, referred to as a fellow. The individual is entitled to payment of a stipend. For more information, see DESA Training and Fellowships

Other training

Other types of training include short-term courses or workshops, study tours and conferences, mentoring programmes, etc.

Micro-capital grants

UNDP provides micro-capital grants for both credit and non-credit purposes as inputs to its programme and project activities. Micro-capital grants are provided to support the activities of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs). An individual micro-capital grant may not exceed US$150,000. A recipient organization may receive multiple grants provided the grants do not exceed on a cumulative basis $300,000 within the same programme or project.

The following types of activities are supported by grants for non-credit purposes:

- Strengthening the institutional capacity of local NGOs and CBOs;
- Supporting community-based self-help initiatives, which may include income-generating activities designed to alleviate poverty;
- Promoting advocacy activities and networking between civil society organizations (CSOs), government and donors;
- Supporting NGOs and CBOs involved with local environmental protection and poverty eradication activities.

The project document should provide for an independent mechanism such as a grant steering committee that will review and endorse the selection of recipient institutions, and assess the performance of these institutions in managing the grants.

The implementing partner of the project is responsible for:

- Approving, in consultation with the steering committee, requests for grants;
- Establishing the agreement between itself and the recipient institution;
- Managing the release of the grant;
- Monitoring and reporting to UNDP on the implementation of the activities covered by the grant and the achievement of results from the grant.

More details on the policy and procedures on micro-capital grants can be found in the Guidance on Micro-Capital Grants.

2.3 Monitoring

At the project level, monitoring is one of the most important responsibilities of the project manager. Monitoring actions carried out during the “Implementing a Project” stage is founded on planning for monitoring discussed in the “Defining a Project” and “Initiating a Project” processes, and captured in the monitoring and evaluation framework. (See more details in UNDP Handbook on Planning Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results). Monitoring also serves evaluations and vice versa. Effective monitoring requires that the project team, in consultation with the project board, finds the right mix of tools and is able to balance the analysis of reports, reviews and validation, and participation.
UNDP’s monitoring role during the “Implementing a Project” process should be to ensure that:

- The project’s is making progress towards intended outputs;
- Resources entrusted to UNDP are utilized appropriately;
- There is continued national ownership, ongoing stakeholder engagement and sustainability;
- The project’s outputs contribute to intended country programme outcomes, also informing the relevant outcome group [1] or coordination mechanism.

Monitoring tools and mechanisms
A variety of formal and informal monitoring tools and mechanisms described below are available, including risk log updating, field visits and annual reports and reviews. The project manager selects different monitoring approaches to monitor the project, using, inter alia, the different tools and mechanisms described below to collect data. The format and approaches are adapted to local needs (such as specific donor requirements), provided that minimum standards in terms of content are reflected.

Regular progress reporting to the project board
Based on agreed regular reporting and review schedule, (minimally annually, but recommended quarterly) the project manager should submit a report to the project board (and where applicable to the outcome group/sector coordination mechanism). As a basis for this reporting, the standard report format available in the Atlas Executive Snapshot can be used (see the Deliverable Description of the Project Progress Report (section 6.0) for further explanations on how to customize the report according to specific needs). The project manager should agree in advance with the project board on the exact progress reporting format and periodicity.

Update of the Risks Log
Based on the initial risk analysis submitted to the local project appraisal committee, the risk log previously activated in Atlas (in the process “Defining a Project”) should be regularly updated by the project manager to re-assess the status of existing risks. New risks shall also be recorded in Atlas, based on consensus by the project board that these new risks may affect the project implementation. As a minimum, on annual basis, UNDP must perform the following monitoring activities:

Field visits
A representative from the UNDP office should visit each project at least once a year. Field visits serve the purpose of results validation and should provide latest information on progress for annual reporting preparation. Field visits should be documented through brief and action-oriented reports, submitted within the week of return to the office. (Further information is available at Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results)

Annual Review Report
An Annual Review Report of the project shall be prepared by the project manager and shared with the project board and the relevant outcome group or coordinating mechanism. As minimum requirement, the annual review report shall consist of the Atlas standard format for the project progress report (PPR) covering the whole year with updated information for each element of the PPR as well as a summary of results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level. As such, it can be readily used to spur dialogue with the project board and partners. The annual review report should also:

- In light of operational experience, revalidate the logic of project and programme results and discern what issues have emerged during implementation: Have the foreseen risks and
assumption materialized? Have other unforeseen challenges, opportunities and risks materialized? And are they all being managed?

- Confirm that the delivery of outputs would lead to the desired outcome. If not, state what changes are needed. If revisions to project and programme plans are needed, then revisions, results framework with new cost estimates, annual targets etc. should be drafted to facilitate decision making at higher levels.

**Annual Project Review**

Based on the above report, an annual project review shall be conducted during the fourth quarter of the year or soon after, to assess the performance of the project and appraise the annual work plan for the following year. In the last year, this review will be a final assessment. This review is driven by the project board and may involve other stakeholders as required. It shall focus on the extent to which progress is being made towards outputs, and that these remain aligned to appropriate outcomes. Once cleared, key elements of the reports shall feed directly into the annual reporting exercise on results at the outcome level. Findings of the annual project review should feed: (a) UNDP programme (country programme action plan) review; (b) Outcome level review by outcome group or sector coordinating mechanisms where applicable; and (c) United Nations Development Assistance Framework annual review process.

**2.4 Project Revisions**

A project document may be revised at any time by agreement among the signatories to the document. The purpose of the revision is to make substantive or financial adjustments and improvements to the project.

**Substantive revisions**

A formal change in the design of the project is called a substantive revision. Substantive revisions are made in response to changes in the development context or to correct flaws in the design that emerge during implementation. Examples of such flaws justifying revision are, inter alia: difficulty to measure progress of the project due to unclear definition of expected results or absence of indicators; unrealistic assumptions or conditions that are not likely to materialize; activities that are insufficient to produce the planned outputs. In some cases, corrections may be introduced in the work plan instead of in a full revision.

Substantive revisions may be made at any time during the life of the project. They may be prompted by progress reports, or by other monitoring, evaluation or review activities. Conclusions and implementing decisions of programme board and UNDAF annual reviews should be fully taken into account in revising projects. Where a project is not proceeding as planned, the project manager is expected to raise the issue in the regular progress reporting to the project board, so that the board can decide on how to improve the situation at the next project review. When there is a change in the substantive design, the inputs and the budget will also normally need to be changed. Substantive revisions should be reviewed through a project appraisal committee meeting to ensure a participatory process involving key stakeholders (this could be done virtually; however, it must be ensured that stakeholders have been duly consulted). Such revisions are reflected in a document describing changes in the relevant sections of the project document. The revision document is signed by all the signatories to the original project document.

Where there are extensive changes to the project and serious difficulties in achieving results are encountered, a redesign may not bring a permanent solution. In such cases, the parties must consider suspension of activities (see below), and, where appropriate, a new project document can be formulated.
The parties may decide to extend the duration covered by a project document to take account delays in implementing certain activities and therefore in producing results. Such extensions do not entail a substantial change in the overall budget. If one or more of the parties proposes a substantial change in the budget, it might be a sign of a serious defect in the design. The other options set out above or in section 2.5 below could then be pursued.

**Budget Revisions**

On the basis of the year-end combined delivery report, the annual work plan shall serve as annual budget revision while providing a realistic plan for the provision of inputs and the achievement of results for a given year. In Atlas, resources that were budgeted for but not spent in prior years should be reallocated to current or future years. However, there is no need to revise prior years’ budgets to equal actual expenditures.

Within the year, in the interest of sound financial management, budgets must be kept up to date and aligned with agreed plans in order to properly assess progress and performance. Atlas is providing flexibility to re-deploy resources among different inputs and change in activities to ensure achievement of an output. As expenditures are not controlled at the activity level, it is possible to exceed an activity budget, within the tolerance level agreed by the project board. It is nevertheless a good practice to make regular budget adjustments that could be reviewed by the project board when the regular progress report is submitted. Further changes in project budgets may result following these reviews.

Changes to a project budget affecting the scope (outputs), completion date, or total estimated project costs do require a formal budget revision that must be signed by the signatories of the original project document. In other cases, the UNDP programme manager alone may sign the revision provided the other signatories have no objection. This procedure may be applied for example when the purpose of the revision is only to re-phase activities among years.

**Tolerance**

Tolerance is the permissible deviation from a plan (in terms of time and cost) without bringing the deviation to the attention of the next higher authority.

In this process, the project board may agree with the project manager a tolerance for each detailed plan under the overall annual work plan. If there is a forecast that the tolerance is to be exceeded, the project manager must refer the matter to the project board, and this may result in a revision. However, within the agreed tolerances, the project manager can operate without intervention from the project board. For example, if the project board sets a budget tolerance of 10% for a plan, the project manager can expend up to 10% beyond the approved project budget amount for the year without requiring a revision from the project board.

**2.5 Suspension and Cancellation**

A project may be cancelled if circumstances arise that jeopardize the achievement of the expected results and where a redesign may not bring a permanent solution.

The UNDP programme manager takes the final decision to suspend or cancel a project and confirms this in writing to the parties concerned, in consultation with the government coordinating agency and the project board. In keeping with his/her accountability for the use of UNDP resources, the UNDP programme manager must cancel projects that are unlikely to achieve the expected results.

- **Suspension.** A project is cancelled only after a period of suspension. During this period, the parties consult and try to resolve the problems by corrective measures. If the problems are
resolved, the project activities may be resumed. The programme manager confirms to the parties the date for resuming the activities. In an emergency situation, it is often clear that corrective measures cannot be taken. If so, UNDP proceeds directly with cancellation.

- **Cancellation.** If the problems have not been resolved in a reasonable period of time, the project must be cancelled. Unspent Target Resource Assignment from the Core (TRAC) funds from a cancelled project may be reprogrammed, taking into account the outstanding obligations of the cancelled project. Third-party contributions may be re-programmed subject to approval by the donor. The implementing partner proceeds with the steps required for financial completion as described in the process “Closing a Project” below. If cancellation means significant changes in the approved country programme document, an amendment to this document may be needed.

2.6 Atlas Considerations

In this process, Atlas shall be used for both financial management and substantive monitoring. This will enable the production of reports that are part of UNDP country office central oversight and monitoring while serving as the building blocks for periodic reviews and communications with stakeholders, such as the web-based reports (Project Progress Report and Project Budget Balance) in the Executive Snapshot. An assumption being made when developing monitoring procedures using the Atlas Project Management module is that project personnel will be granted external access to Atlas, in which case, there must be a clear division of responsibilities regarding the use of the various monitoring tools. In situations when project staff do not have access to Atlas, Word software templates and forms are available as alternatives. Any adjustments to the initial approved budget shall be reflected as budgetary revisions in Atlas to be finalized for the year(s) affected by the adjustment (see budget revisions signed by programme manager or signatories of project document under 2.4 Project Revisions above).

External Access: Implementing partners can access their projects in Atlas through the External Access function. For detailed information or for requesting the set up of external access in a country office, please see Atlas External Access Portal or contact atlas.external.access@undp.org.

2.7 Audit

Audit is an integral part of sound financial and administrative management, and of the UNDP accountability system. UNDP projects are audited regularly and the findings are reported to the UNDP Executive Board. The audit of projects provides UNDP with assurance that resources are used to achieve the results described in the project document and that UNDP resources are adequately safeguarded. Audit requirements may differ depending on the implementation modality (see the OAI website). Detailed procedures on audit for project implemented by a national institution or a non-governmental organization (NGO) can be found in the Financial Management section.

2.8 Evaluation

If mandated by partnership protocols, a project evaluation will take place during this process. For further details, see the section Evaluation in the POPP.

[1] **Outcome Group:** In consultation with the government Coordinating Agency, the Programme Manager (or his/her designate) should ensure that there would be a sector wide or inter-agency group around each major outcome or thematic area in which UNDP is working. Whenever there are existing national structures such as sector-wide coordination mechanisms, UNDP should engage them and participate in these rather than setting up parallel systems.

3.0 Flowchart
## 4.0 Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Tasks and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Atlas Action Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 07  | Mobilize Project Resources | **Make funds available to the project** [Project assurance]  
• Financial resources can be made available through various means which are described in further details in the Financial Resources Management Guide.  
• See above section 2.1 Provision of Financial Resources.  
• Progress report/financial reports will form the basis for continued funds availability. | Atlas Financials module |
|     | Mobilise inputs to initiate activities | **[Project manager]**  
• Inputs are the personnel, goods and services, training and micro-capital grants that are both necessary and sufficient to produce the planned outputs.  
• See key policy issues in the above section 2.2 Management of Inputs.  
• If not developed in the Initiating a Project process, initial tasks to be carried out by the project manager include the drafting of terms of reference and inputs specifications.  
• For detailed procedures related to inputs mobilization for a DIM project, see the Contracts, Assets and Procurement Management section and the Human Resources Management section of the Policies and Procedures. | None. When UNDP carries out procurement, Atlas PO/AP module should be used. |
| 08  | Monitor Project Implementation | **Monitor progress of key activities as defined in the Atlas Activity Definitions pages** [Project manager, project assurance]  
• See above section 2.3 Monitoring.  
• Activity (Activity ID in Atlas) should have been defined in the process “Initiating a Project” as part of the monitoring and evaluation framework definition. It may, however, be necessary to review the monitoring framework and make adjustments with the project manager when s/he is in place.  
• As part of this task, the project monitoring schedule in Atlas should also be updated. | Award Summary > Activity Link > Assess Quality  
• Quality Rating  
• User Perspective  
• Timeliness  
• Resource Usage  
• % Progress  
Monitoring Schedule  
• Update status |
|     | Monitor risks | **[Project manager/ project assurance]**  
• Detailed information on the update of the risk log can be found in the Deliverables Description of the PPR.  
• See also the process “Defining a Project” during which risks are assessed. (For background information, please refer to the Enterprise Risk Management section of the Policies and Procedures.) | Award Summary > Risks Log  
• Management Response  
• Status |
**Prepare and submit financial report to UNDP**
*Project manager, project support*
- A financial report is prepared on a quarterly basis by the project manager and submitted to UNDP in order to record the expenditures made during the period (and to request advances if needed).
- Under the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT), national Institutions and NGOs serving as implementing partner should prepare the Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE).
- See above section 2.1 Provision of Financial Resources.
- For detailed procedures on financial reporting and FACE, please see the section on Direct Cash Transfers and Reimbursements under the Financial Resources Management Guide.

**Prepare Combined Delivery Report (CDR)**
*Project assurance, project support*
- The Combined Delivery Report (CDR), summarizing all project expenditures, is mandatory and should be issued quarterly.
- Based on the financial reports received and recorded in Atlas, UNDP prepares the CDR using Atlas. It should be sent to the project board for review and the implementing partner should certify it.
- See above section 2.1 Provision of Financial Resources.
- For detailed procedures, please see the section on CDR under the Financial Resources Management Guide.

**Prepare Project Progress Report (PPR) as required by the project board**
*Project manager*
- The project manager and project board should agree on the reporting format and periodicity. If the standard PPR available in the Executive Snapshot is used, it will automatically generate report using the information entered in the Award Summary – Project Management module.

**Assess project progress**
*Project board*
- The project board should assess the continuing relevance of the project and review progress made within agreed tolerance. Depending on the cash transfer modality being used, the review shall confirm the availability of financial resources for the next period.
- If, during the project implementation, any defined project tolerance (set by the project board, mainly in terms of budget and schedule restrictions) is exceeded, a project revision in the form of a revised Atlas AWP must be developed for review by the project board (see also section 2.4 Project Revisions).

**Perform oversight functions through field**

---

**Update the Project**

---
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visits and periodic audits [UNDP Project Assurance]

- Although a field visit may be planned for any time of the year, consideration should be given to the timing of the visit, its purpose in terms of monitoring and what to look for in order to measure progress (see section 2.3 Monitoring). Visits shall increasingly be joint efforts of several partners involving cluster of projects within an outcome. Such joint efforts are often an efficient way to obtain a comprehensive overview of progress.

- Refer to the OAI website for more information about audit requirements. Detailed procedures on audit for project implemented by a national institution or a NGO can be found in the Financial Management section.

Commission project evaluation required by partnership protocols and prepare a management response [Project manager, programme manager]

- See the Evaluation section of the POPP.

- Management responses for all evaluations are required. Progress made in committed actions should be tracked in the Evaluation Resource Centre system.

Capture lessons learned [Project manager, project assurance]

- The lessons learned can be viewed and updated in ATLAS through a log

09 Annually review project

Prepare and forward Annual Review Report [Project manager]

- This is a report from the project manager to the project board and the outcome board, using the format available in the Executive Snapshot or as agreed in advance. The former offers a coherent and structured assessment of progress based on the chain of results initially defined in the Resources and Results Framework (RRF). It may be supplemented by additional narrative to meet specific reporting needs of stakeholders, especially bilateral donors.

Executive Snapshot:
- Annual Review Report
- Project Budget Balance

Revise Budget Award Summary>Activity Link
- Purpose
- Description
- Quality Criteria
- Quality Method
- Start & End Date

Award Summary>Output link
- Next Year Target

Develop the annual work plan for the next year [Project manager]

- This plan includes developing and/or refining the project results with respect to:
  - Output targets;
  - Activity details and schedule;
  - Budget;
  - Management arrangements;
  - Funding.

- These elements shall be validated by the project board, based on the review of the project annual report.
5.0 Inputs

- Project document, including monitoring and evaluation (?) framework for outputs and activities;
- Risk log;
- Issues log if available;
- Lessons-learned log if available;
- Project monitoring framework;
- Knowledge products and Communities of Practice (COP) consultations: Existing knowledge products, such as policy notes and briefs, how-to-guides, lessons learned, consolidated replies and analytical studies, should inform the substantive revision of a project when required.

6.0 Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised Annual Work Plan (AWP) The AWP template in Word software is available in the Project Document format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlas RBM OnDemand training - Implementing a project &gt; Plan the next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do it in Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Reports &gt; Project Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

Project manager

- Plan the activities of the project and monitor progress against the approved work-plan;

- Mobilize personnel, goods and services, training and micro-capital grants to initiative activities, including drafting terms of reference and work specifications and overseeing all contractors’ work;

- Monitor events as determined in the project monitoring schedule plan, and update the plan as required;

- Manage requests for the provision of financial resources by UNDP, through advance of funds, direct payments, or reimbursement using the FACE (Fund Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures);

- Monitor financial resources and accounting to ensure accuracy and reliability of financial reports;

- Be responsible for preparing and submitting financial reports to UNDP on a quarterly basis;

- Manage and monitor the project risks initially identified and submit new risks to the project board for consideration and decision on possible actions if required; update the status of these risks by maintaining the project risks log;

- Capture lessons learnt during project implementation – a lessons learnt log can be used in this regard (MS Word template)

- Perform regular progress reporting to the project board as agreed to with the board;
• Prepare the annual review report, and submit the report to the project board and the outcome group;

• Prepare the annual work plan for the following year, as well as quarterly plans if required;

• Update the Atlas Project Management module if external access is made available.

**Project board**

• Provide overall guidance and direction to the project, ensuring it remains within any specified constraints;

• Address project issues as raised by the project manager;

• Provide guidance on new project risks and agree on possible countermeasures and management actions to address specific risks;

• Agree on project manager’s tolerances as required;

• Review the project progress and provide direction and recommendations to ensure that the agreed deliverables are produced satisfactorily according to plans;

• Review combined delivery reports prior to certification by the implementing partner;

• Appraise the project annual review report, make recommendations for the next annual work plan, and inform the outcome group about the results of the review;

• Provide ad-hoc direction and advice for exception situations when project manager’s tolerances are exceeded;

• Assess and decide to proceed on project changes through appropriate revisions;

**UNDP project assurance**

• Ensure that funds are made available to the project;

• Ensure the project is making progress towards intended outputs;

• Perform regular monitoring activities, such as periodic monitoring visits and “spot checks”;  

• Ensure that resources entrusted to UNDP are utilized appropriately;

• Ensure that critical project information is monitored and updated in Atlas;

• Ensure that financial reports are submitted to UNDP on time, and that combined delivery reports are prepared and submitted to the project board;

• Ensure that risks are properly managed, and that the risk log in Atlas is regularly updated;

**Project support**

• Set up and maintain project files;

• Collect project related information data;

• Assist the project manager in updating project plans;

• Administer project board meetings;
Administer project revision control;

Establish document control procedures;

Compile, copy and distribute all project reports;

Assist in the financial management tasks under the responsibility of the project manager;

Provide support in the use of Atlas for monitoring and reporting;

Review technical reports;

Monitor technical activities carried out by responsible parties.

**UNDP programme manager** (UNDP resident representative or delegated authority):

- Ensure that resources entrusted to UNDP are utilized appropriately;
- Ensure that the project is making progress towards intended outputs;
- Ensure national ownership, ongoing stakeholder engagement and sustainability;
- Ensure that the project’s outputs contribute to intended country programme outcomes;
- Ensure that key results and issues pertaining to project performance are fed into the outcome and programme level monitoring;
  - Approve budget for the first year in Atlas;
  - Approve and sign the annual work plan for the following year.

**Implementing partner** (authorized personnel with delegated authority):

- Approve and sign the annual work plan for the following year;

- Approve and sign the Combined Delivery Report (CDR) at the end of the year;

- Sign the Financial Report or the Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE).

For more details, please see **Programme & Project Management Arrangements** in the POPP.

### 8.0 Templates and Forms

- Atlas Access - Letter of Agreement between UNDP country office and implementing partner;
  - [English - Spanish](#)

- Audit Procedures - OAI Web site:

- Standard Revision Cover Page:

- Additional templates for project management as appropriate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is it?</th>
<th>Learn</th>
<th>Do it in Atlas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues Log</td>
<td>Deliverable Description</td>
<td>Atlas RBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS Word Template</td>
<td>OnDemand training – Initiating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlas Sample</td>
<td>Project Management Module – Award Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons-Learned Log</td>
<td>Deliverable Description</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Monitoring Schedule Plan</td>
<td>Deliverable Description</td>
<td>Atlas RBM OnDemand training – Initiating a Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Progress Report</td>
<td>Deliverable Description</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-No MS Word Template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-See samples of PPRs in the Executive Snapshot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.0 Additional Info. and Tools

Further to the above mandatory requirements, the following optional activities can be carried out as appropriate:

- **Activity Quality Assessment.** An activity quality assessment shall record progress towards the completion of key activities, using the Atlas Activity Definition page in which quality criteria were previously defined (see "Initiating a Project"). The assessment shall capture feedback from the beneficiary perspective as well as information related to timeliness and resources usage. It should be first completed by the project manager and shall be validated by the project board;

- **Update of the Issues Log.** The issues log, activated in Atlas in the Initiating a Project process, shall be updated by the project manager to facilitate tracking and resolution of potential problems or requests for change;

- **Quarterly Progress Report.** In addition to annual progress reporting as mandated, a quarterly progress report can be requested by the project board. Based on the information recorded in Atlas, using the standard report format available in the Executive Snapshot, reports can be generated at any frequency. The project board may decide to organize formal meetings to review the project progress report. As needed, there may be additional narrative required by partners to supplement the report (see the Deliverable Description of the project progress report for further explanations on how to customize the report according to specific needs);

- **Lessons-learned Log.** The project Lesson-learned log, activated in the Initiating a Project process, should be updated by the project manager to ensure on-going learning and adaptation within the organization, and to facilitate the preparation of the lessons-learned report at the end of the project.

- Check the Programme and Project Management Resource Center.
**Closing a Project**

Programme and Project > Project Management > Closing a Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>BDP/CDP</th>
<th>Focal Point</th>
<th>Dien Le</th>
<th>Issuance/POPP Publishing Date</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Planned Review Date</th>
<th>Last Revision Date</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td>15/12/2010</td>
<td>01/09/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>24/11/2010</td>
<td>All UNDP funded programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of changes (one entry per revision)**

Closing a Project - formally ending a project, both operationally and financially, including necessary handover as well as ensuring that lessons learned are captured

---

**1.0 Description**

One of the defining features of a project is that it is finite - it has a start and an end. The “Closing a Project” process formally ends a project, both operationally and financially.

Preparation for closing a project is triggered:

- By the approaching end of the final Annual Work Plan (AWP), when a project delivers its planned outputs; or

- By it becoming apparent that the project is no longer viable, thus making UNDP decide to cancel the project, based on the project board's recommendation.

When the project annual reviews have been properly conducted, then this process shall be straightforward, as each project annual cycle would have been approved before moving on. Therefore, the focus of this process will be placed on overall performance of the project, evidence of completion, lessons learned, and necessary hand-over to ensure sustainability. In this respect, a Final Project Review Report should be prepared and assessed by the project board during a formal meeting.

If the project has been closed prematurely, the process shall document what has been achieved and recommend the way forward.

---

**2.0 Relevant Policies**

**2.1 Project Completion**

**Operational completion**

A project is operationally complete when the last UNDP-financed inputs have been provided and the related activities have been completed. Through the project board, the implementing partner promptly notifies the UNDP country office when this has been done. Should the implementing partner not do so, the UNDP programme manager must determine when the project is operationally complete.
When a project is operationally complete, the parties must agree on the disposal of any equipment that is still the property of UNDP.

Financial completion

A project is financially completed when:

- It is operationally completed or has been cancelled;
- The implementing partner has reported all financial transactions to UNDP;
- UNDP has closed the accounts for the project;
- UNDP and the implementing partner have certified a final Combined Delivery Report (which serves as final revision).

Projects should be financially completed not more than 12 months after being operationally completed or after the date of cancellation. Between operational and financial closure, the implementing partner is required to identify and settle all financial obligations and prepare a final expenditure report. No adjustments can be made to a financially completed project.

For more information about cancellation, please see section 2.5 Suspension and Cancellation in the process “Implementing a Project”.

2.2 Final Project Review

A final project review will be conducted during the final quarter of the project duration. Its purpose is to assess the performance and success of the project. It should look at sustainability of the results, including the contribution to related outcomes (and the status of these outcomes) and capacity development. It will also review lessons learned and recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-funded projects. Like the annual review, the final project review is driven by the project board and may involve other stakeholders as required, especially any relevant outcome groups. The final project review is distinguished from an evaluation because the latter is an external assessment, while the former is a self-assessment exercise. The findings from the review can be used to inform the evaluation and vice versa.

2.3 Transfer or Disposal of Assets

The UNDP programme manager is responsible for deciding on the transfer or other disposal of assets financed by UNDP. He/she does so in consultation with the other parties to the project;

Assets may be transferred to the government for project activities managed by a national institution at any time during the life of a project.

Assets may be temporarily placed in the custody of the UNDP country office, pending transfer or sale. The custody period must not exceed nine months. The need for custody usually arises once UNDP support for the project has come to an end.
Under civil society organization (CSO) implementation, the CSO must return all UNDP-financed assets to UNDP upon completion of the project.

When no longer needed by the project, assets may be transferred to another UNDP financed project or to the government, or it may be disposed of by sale or donation. In all cases of transfer, a transfer document must be prepared and kept on file. More information on Asset Disposal can be found Administrative Services Management section of the POPP.

2.4 Learning & Knowledge Management

Project lessons learned should be actively captured to ensure ongoing learning and adaptation within the organization. As a component of the final project review report, a final Lessons Learned Report should be prepared at the end of the project to foster the learning process. In addition, in order to promote knowledge sharing, ideas, experiences and lessons deriving from the project should be shared with colleagues on the Practice Knowledge Networks (e.g. answer a referral, participate in an e-discussion or peer review, and contribute to the development of a knowledge product).

2.5 Atlas Considerations

In this process, Atlas shall be used to produce the final Annual Review Report, assuming that the monitoring tools of the Project Management module have been regularly updated as described in the process “Implementing a Project”. Atlas shall also be used to ensure that all financial transactions have been properly recorded in order to generate the final Combined Delivery Report (CDR). In addition, the operational and subsequent financial completion of the project should be properly reflected in Atlas.

2.6 Evaluating a Project

When developing an evaluation plan, managers, together with relevant partners, may decide to commission project evaluations as they generate critical information to support managing for results. All project evaluations identified by program managers and agreed upon with relevant partners must be included in the evaluation plan of the global, regional, country and south-south programme.

Partnership arrangements, such as Global Environment Facility (GEF), often require mid-term and final evaluations for projects. These required evaluations also need to be included in the programme unit’s evaluation plan.

Depending on the purpose, project evaluations can be commissioned by the country office management at any time during the project cycle: at mid-point, just before or after completion. They should ideally take place around the time of completing a project to determine the future of the project (e.g. continuation or termination of the project), to decide whether the concept should be scaled up or replicated elsewhere, and/or to generate lessons that are of strategic significance for the organization, and for government and other partners. Evaluations of pilot initiatives are particularly recommended.

In order to help the organization manage for development results, evaluations of projects should always assess UNDP’s contribution at the outcome level. For example, a project level evaluation should provide information on how the project contributes to transformational change at the outcome level, and should not be limited to assessing the delivery of outputs and activities. All evaluations are made available in the on-line evaluation repository, the Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). Evaluations conducted by the Evaluation Office are also made available on EO’s website. Senior managers are responsible for
ensuring that the appropriate human and financial resources are allocated for the conduct of project evaluations, and that a management response to these evaluations is prepared in a timely manner. The management responses should be uploaded and updated in the ERC system. For further guidance on project evaluation, see the sections on Evaluation and the process Evaluating a Programme.

### 3.0 Flowchart

Click [here](#) to view the jpeg file.

### 4.0 Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Tasks and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Atlas Action Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Conduct final project review</td>
<td>Prepare final project review report [Project manager]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• When completion is approaching (e.g. 3 months), the project manager must prepare a final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project review report. This is a report from the project team to the project board, using</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the same format as the Annual Project Review Report available in the Executive Snapshot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As such, it does offer a coherent and structured assessment of progress based on the chain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of results initially defined in the Results and Resources Framework (RRF). It may be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supplemented by additional narrative to meet specific reporting needs of stakeholders,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>especially bilateral donors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• As an annex, a lessons-learned report would also be prepared and shared with knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>networks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct final project review</td>
<td>[Project board]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Using the final Project Review Report, the Lessons Learned Report and other documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as appropriate, the project board should assess in this meeting the performance and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>success of the project, and its contribution to related outcomes. Topics during the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>review shall include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Achievements of last year targets;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Overall project performance and sustainability of results;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Achievement on capacity development;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Outstanding activities;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Lessons learned;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Use of remaining budget, if any;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Effective date of project closure;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Transitioning of responsibilities to national counterparts;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Hand-over of remaining assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify follow-up actions [Project</td>
<td>To ensure follow-up on aspects discussed in the final review meeting, the project</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manager]</td>
<td>manager should update the lessons-learned report to include a brief record of decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and conclusions related to follow-up actions. This updated report should be submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key documentation produced for the review should be uploaded in Atlas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Attachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commission project evaluation</td>
<td>If required by partnership arrangements or if so decided by UNDP, commission project evaluation, prepare a management response to evaluation and discuss and share findings and recommendations for learning [Project manager] 11</td>
<td>Evaluation report to be uploaded in Atlas if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Management responses to evaluations are required to all evaluations. They should be developed in consultation with key stakeholders and progress made in committed actions need to be tracked in the Evaluation Resources Centre system.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Operationally and financially close project</td>
<td>Notify operational completion of the project [Project manager, project board] 12</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The project is operationally completed when the last UNDP-financed inputs have been provided and related activities completed. The project manager should notify the project board, who in turn should notify the Programme manager about the operational completion of the project. Otherwise, programme manager decides when the project is operationally complete.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operationally close the project [Project assurance] 12</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Based on the project board decision to close the project, project status in Atlas will be set to &quot;Operationally Closed&quot;. No further financial commitment can be made from that point on.</td>
<td>Project Status set to “C”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Award Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Status set to “Closed”</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer project assets and files [Project manager] 12</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Project assets, documents, files, (if not already transferred) should be transferred to the national beneficiaries or national representatives at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• See above section 2.3 Transfer or Disposal of Assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare and submit final financial report [Project manager] 12</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A final financial report is prepared by the Project manager and submitted to UNDP in order to record the expenditures made during the last period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Under the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT), national Institutions and NGOs serving as implementing partner should prepare the final Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For detailed procedures on financial reporting and FACE, please see the section on Direct Cash Transfers and Reimbursements under the Financial Resources Management Guide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• United Nations agencies undertaking activities under national implementation must report their expenditures with a Project Delivery Report (PDR).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ensure that all financial transactions are in Atlas [Project assurance, project support]
- Based on the financial reports received and recorded in Atlas, UNDP prepares the final CDR and submit it to the project board.
- For detailed procedures, please see the section on CDR under the Financial Resources Management Guide.

Record expenditures as per Financial Report/FACE in Atlas using AP vouchers Atlas Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review and sign final CDR [UNDP programme manager, implementing partner]</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The final CDR must be reviewed by the project board, and then signed by UNDP and implementing partner, confirming final project financial accounts and expenditures. The final CDR replaces the previously defined procedure known as Final Revision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ensure project accounts are closed [Project assurance]
- Closure of any project-based financial accounts or funds. Once confirmed, project status in Atlas will be set to “Financially Closed”. No further financial transactions can be made.

Project Status set to “F”

5.0 Inputs
- Completion of project activities;
- Achievement of project outputs;
- Proposed cancellation of the project.

6.0 Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Project Review Report</th>
<th>What is it</th>
<th>Learn</th>
<th>Do it in Atlas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Deliverable Description</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Executive Snapshot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No MS Word Template</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- See samples in the Executive Snapshot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| --- | --- | --- | --- |

| Final Financial Report or Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE) | See the Financial Resources Management Guide | n/a | n/a |

| Lessons-learned Report | Deliverable Description MS Word Template | n/a | n/a |

7.0 Roles and Responsibilities
In this process, the following roles are involved:

**UNDP programme manager (UNDP resident representative or delegated authority):**
- Approve and sign the final Combined Delivery Report (CDR);
- Be responsible for deciding on the transfer or other disposal of assets financed by UNDP (in consultation with the implementing partner and other relevant stakeholders).

**Implementing partner**
- Notify to project board operational completion of project
- Identify and settle all financial obligations and prepare a final expenditure report
- Approve and sign the final CDR.

**Project board**
- Assure that all project deliverables have been produced satisfactorily;
- Review and endorse the final project review report, including lessons learned;
- Review financial reports, including final CDR prior to certification and signature;
- Make recommendations for follow-on actions to be submitted to the Outcome Group and Programme Board;
- Notify operational completion of the project to the Outcome Group and Programme Board.

**Project manager**
- Prepare final Project Review Reports to be submitted to the project board and the outcome board;
- Prepare final lessons-learned report and identify follow-on actions and submit them for consideration to the project board;
- Manage the transfer of project assets and files to national beneficiaries;
- Prepare the final financial report to be certified by the implementing partner and submit the report to UNDP;
- Support the UNDP programme manager in the commissioning, management and use of evaluation, including the preparation of a management response and implementation of committed actions (if delegated).

**Project assurance**
- Ensure that the project is operationally closed in Atlas;
• Ensure that all financial transactions are in Atlas based on final accounting of expenditures so that the final CDR can be produced;

• Ensure that project accounts are closed and status set in Atlas accordingly;

• Be responsible for ensuring that final project reports are prepared on time according to standards.

Outcome group

• Review the final project review report;

• May participate to final review meetings of projects during which the final project review report is assessed.

For more details, please see Programme & Project Management Arrangements in the POPP.

8.0 Templates and Forms

The following templates and forms should be used in addition to the ones presented under 6.0 Deliverables above:

• Transfer of Title Form

• TOR for Evaluations

• Evaluation Report format

9.0 Additional Info. and Tools

• Check the Programme and Project Management Resource Center.

Specific policies for Global & Regional Programming

OVERVIEW

• This section describes specific requirements and processes pertaining to global and regional programming, and highlights the variations from the procedures outlined in the respective processes of the Programme and Project Management section of POPP.

• UNDP activities at the global and regional level are undertaken in response to needs and priorities expressed in global and regional conferences and other forums. UNDP support is provided as part of the wider response of the United Nations system.

• Global and regional programmes outline UNDP activities at the global and regional level, respectively. These programmes address the UNDP focus areas and key result areas as expressed in the Strategic Plan, and the expected results in furtherance of the MDGs and other internationally agreed goals. The Executive Board approves the draft global programme document (GPD) and draft regional programme document (RPD). Following EB approval, and in
agreement with the respective participating countries, the outcomes outlined in the programmes are translated into outputs to be achieved in global and regional projects.

- The interventions under global and regional programmes are funded by regular resources (Lines 1.3 and 1.2 respectively) under the UNDP financial framework. Funding for global and regional activities can also come from other resources, including co-financing arrangements.

DEFINITIONS

Key terms used in global and regional programming are:

a) **Global programming** refers to UNDP programming to implement UNDP’s global mandates through responding to global development opportunities and challenges;

b) **Global issues** or activities are those of worldwide or wide-ranging, international concern;

c) **Regional programming** refers to UNDP programming for groups of countries at the sub-regional or regional level. Regional programming involves activities that are common to several countries within one region;

d) **Region** refers to an area serviced by one of the UNDP regional bureaus;

e) **Sub-region** refers to an area or a group or countries within a region, comprised of a geographical, political, economic, or ecological grouping;

f) **Principal Project Representative (PPR)** is the individual who, in collaboration with a UNDP regional bureau, is accountable for ensuring the effective utilization of UNDP resources in regional project activities. The PPR could be a UNDP Resident Representative in one of the CO, or the Regional Manager in the Regional Centre. The PPR works closely with governments, regional institutions, United Nations agencies, CSOs, development practice networks, regional service centres and donors.

POLICIES

The following policies apply to all global and regional programming:

a) **Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and UNDP Strategic Plan.** Programming must address one or more of the UNDP focus areas and key result areas expressed in the **Strategic Plan** with the UNDP mandate to support the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs);

b) **Global and regional mandates:** Programming must explore ways and means of translating global and regional mandates and priorities, in particular those emanating from United Nations conferences and international agreements, into global and regional level follow-up;
c) Matters of international concern. Programming must assess the impact of developments that have broad international implications and recommend actions that ensure that those developments are beneficial to developing countries in the context of the MDGs;

d) Policies, tools and methodologies. Programming must develop and test policies, tools and methodologies that will enable programme countries to respond effectively to national MDGs. Programming must also be forward-looking and encourage studies on concrete, practical policy measures for translating MDGs from concept to action, and for adapting the current development cooperation paradigm to the emerging challenges of the twenty-first century;

AIMS OF GLOBAL AND REGIONAL PROGRAMMING

1. The common aims of global and regional programming are to:

a) Disseminate regionally and globally the lessons learned from country-level experience and to identify innovative ways to promote the MDGs, and disseminate this knowledge regionally and globally;

b) Provide technical guidance directly and through partnerships with other international governmental and civil society organizations;

c) Undertake advocacy so that issues relevant to the promotion of the MDGs are incorporated into global, regional and country agendas;

d) Focus on high-leverage, strategic interventions that draw on the advantage of the UNDP global and regional presence, knowledge and experience.

2. Based on the UNDP focus areas and key result areas described in the Strategic Plan, the particular aims of global programming are to:

a) Analyse emerging global problems and trends;

b) Serve as a catalyst in promoting responses, at the country and regional level, to global problems and trends;

c) Forge partnerships with other United Nations system organizations, the Bretton Woods institutions, and other international organizations in order to better analyse and respond to global problems and trends.
3. The particular aims of regional programming are to:

a) Serve as a bridge between country and global initiatives; notably to promote the adaptation and application of global initiatives at the regional and country level;

b) Facilitate cooperation among countries sharing similar geographic, social and economic conditions; such co-operation is designed in particular to consolidate or improve peace and security in a given sub region.

GLOBAL PROGRAMME AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT

GLOBAL PROGRAMME (GP)

INTRODUCTION

1. Global programming is used by UNDP to translate global development aspirations and mandates into innovative and practical development interventions for application by UNDP primarily through its regional and country programme. The draft global programme document (GPD) is approved by the Executive Board, which authorizes the Administrator to proceed with the formulation and approval of global projects. The draft GPD should be accompanied by a draft evaluation plan as an annex.

2. The Administrator delegates to the Director of the Bureau for Development Policy (BDP) the overall responsibility for the management of resources, contents and outcomes of the Global Programme and the implementation of the evaluation plan.

KEY NOTES AS COMPARED WITH COUNTRY PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

1. The preparation of the global programme begins about 18 months before the current global programme expires. At the outset, BDP establishes a work plan that includes a process of analysis, conceptualization, consultation and formulation, as well as an outline of tasks, time frames, responsibilities and required support for the entire GPD preparation process.
2. Analysis. Based on the UNDP focus areas and key result areas described in the Strategic Plan, BDP prepares an analysis of global mandates and priorities taking into account the following:

a) Studies of global trends and requirements;

b) An examination of the MDGs and global commitments arising from the General Assembly, United Nations conferences and meetings, and major international agreements;

c) Views of governments, intergovernmental organizations, UNDP bureaux, units and country offices, civil society organizations, and other partners and stakeholders;

d) Consultation of relevant Global Communities of Practice (COP) and analysis of COP inputs to priority setting. Analysis of knowledge network activities (knowledge analytics on country office demand)

e) Assessments of the lessons learned, drawn from the ongoing global programme and obtained through reviews, assessments and evaluations; and

f) An examination of country and regional priorities drawn, among others, from CCAs, UNDAFs, RPDs and CPDs.

3. Conceptualization and consultation. Based on the analysis of global mandates and priorities, BDP prepares a short concept paper for the GPD covering the main elements of the proposed framework. BDP uses the concept paper as the basis for consultations with a broad range of partners, including the United Nations Development Group, United Nations specialized agencies, UNDP bureaux and units, programme country governments, donor governments, intergovernmental organizations, civil society organizations, and other stakeholders.

4. Formulation. On the basis of the concept paper and the comments and feedback received, BDP drafts the GPD and the evaluation plan. The draft evaluation plan should at least include outcome evaluations, timing of the evaluations and sources of funding for evaluations, and the independent evaluation of the global programme conducted by the Evaluation Office (EO). The key policies for global programming outlined in Policies are to be taken into account, as well as coherence and complementarity with the Strategic Plan and regional and country programmes.

5. On the basis of the final draft GPD, BDP convenes a Programme Appraisal Committee (PAC) with representation from as many stakeholders as possible and including the regional bureaux, the OSG, BOM, Evaluation Office and others as appropriate. As part of the work of this committee,
BDP validates the linkages to the global and country programmes and carry out validation by relevant Global Communities of Practice as appropriate.

6. To ensure that there are no gaps in programming from one GP period to the next, the new GP must be approved before the current GP expires. Approval takes the following steps:

a) Review of draft global programme document, along with the draft evaluation plan by Operations Group to validate/certify programme direction.

b) The BDP Director submits the draft GPD, along with the evaluation plan, to OPB/BOM for clearance on resource allocation and then to AA through OSG for endorsement;

c) The draft RPD is then submitted to the Executive Board for approval. The draft evaluation plan is made available to the Executive Board as an annex for review. The Executive Board may propose changes to the document;

d) The approval of the draft GPD by the Executive Board constitutes the authority of the Administrator to assign funds under TRAC line 1.3 of the financial framework.

The resources are then assigned to the BDP Director who arranges for the formulation of Global projects. For details, see the project management section of POPP which also applies to global projects.

7. Evaluation

BDP is responsible for commissioning decentralized evaluations within the framework of the global programme (e.g. outcome, thematic, project and mid-term programme evaluations), as outlined in the evaluation plan attached to the global programme document submitted to, and approved by, the Executive Board. The Evaluation Plan template annexed to the Evaluation Policy 2011 may be used as appropriate for this purpose.

A comprehensive and strategic evaluation plan should include an appropriate mix of outcome-level evaluations, preferably conducted jointly with other partners, of programmes or programme components, projects and themes, as well as other types of evaluations, as appropriate (see section on Evaluation). Whenever opportunities arise, joint evaluations are the preferred modality.
for evaluating UNDP’s contribution. In all cases, these evaluations need to analyze UNDP-specific contributions to results so that they fulfill the organization’s accountability and learning needs. The conduct of the entire evaluation plan is the basis for compliance. For more information on the evaluation plan, see section on

2.5.1 Evaluation Planning.

Outcome-level decentralized evaluations commissioned by BDP should meet the quality standards established by EO (see guidance provided in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results) and provide adequate coverage of global programme activities to generate sufficient “evidence” and objective information to support programme improvements, knowledge generation and accountability during the global programme cycle.

EO conducts an independent evaluation of the global programme during the penultimate year of the programme cycle, as outlined in its programme of work (evaluation plan), approved by the Executive Board, and mandated by the evaluation policy. Findings, lessons and recommendations from the global programme evaluation should inform the design of the next global programme.

Since the independent global programme evaluation is part of the programme of work and budget of EO, it is not included in the global programme evaluation plan that is submitted for approval by BDP to the Executive Board. However, when planning decentralized evaluations, BDP should take into account the conduct of the global programme evaluation by EO. Ideally, all major evaluations should be conducted prior to the global programme evaluation since they may provide useful inputs to the global programme evaluation, and help avoid duplication of evaluation efforts.

The conduct of the independent end-of-cycle programme evaluation by EO does not replace evaluation requirements for BDP or substitute for planned decentralized evaluations. Independent evaluations by EO and decentralized evaluations have distinct purposes: EO evaluations are independent evaluations mandated by the Executive Board to strengthen the accountability and learning of the organization, while decentralized evaluations aim primarily to support learning and managing for development results and are a compliance requirement for BDP.

All evaluation reports are made available in the ERC. BDP is also responsible for preparing, uploading and tracking the status of implementation of the management responses in the ERC. For more information on management response to EO evaluation of global programmes, please consult the directive.
8. Monitoring: In order to systematically monitor the Global Programme, a monitoring plan should be prepared towards the end of the formulation of the global programme and used during the implementation. The guidelines for preparing M&E Frameworks in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results should be used as appropriate for this purpose. BDP sets up mechanisms to monitor the respective global programming activities both at the headquarter level and at the country level, review and capture lessons and good practices. These mechanisms, including the arrangements for reporting, must be described in the project document.

GLOBAL PROJECTS

INTRODUCTION

1. The GPD establishes the priorities, strategies and an indication of expected results; individual global projects, however, have to be formulated in a way that translates the global programme into concrete outputs and activities. The global project document is the legal basis for carrying out activities and incurring expenditures. The Administrator delegates to the BDP Director the authority to approve global project documents.

2. Collectively the global projects must be coherent to realize the overall results of the global programme document.

3. The design process for global projects follows the same participatory approaches as for country programming, modified to reflect the larger number of governments and other stakeholders.

4. Any non-programme country may also participate in global activities under the GP provided that they meet any additional costs that arise.

5. The implementation of global projects may be entrusted to UNDP itself, United Nations agencies, governments, intergovernmental organizations or civil society organizations.
KEY NOTES AS COMPARED WITH COUNTRY PROJECT MANAGEMENT

JUSTIFYING, DEFINING AND INITIATING A PROJECT

1. Based on the GPD, the relevant substantive units in BDP develop projects.
2. The BDP substantive unit prepares a project document, in consultation with regional bureaux, ensuring that global, regional and country activities complement each other and are in line with the Strategic Plan.
3. The formulation process should be participatory, incorporating contributions and comments from stakeholders, including UNDP bureaux and units, and other stakeholders outside UNDP, such as intergovernmental bodies, programme countries, United Nations bodies and agencies, and civil society organizations. BDP is responsible for the official circulation of the draft global project document to the concerned partners for comments.
4. The standard format for country project document applies.
5. Where a project initiation plan is used in formulating a global project, the Director of BDP must ensure that the relevant policies are adhered to. See “Defining a Project” for more details on the use of the Project Initiation Plan.
6. The relevant BDP unit is responsible for ensuring the appraisal of the draft global project document through a Project Appraisal Committee (PAC), which includes representatives from the regional bureaux, OSG, EO and other appropriate bureaux and divisions. The network of UNDP country offices, the Development Practice Networks, the Regional Centres should be used to solicit a global perspective in appraising global project proposals. As appropriate, review of relevant knowledge products in focus areas and cross-cutting or operational issues, consultations with Community(ies) of Practice for comparative experience and advice as well as consultations at the country level should feed into the appraisal process.
7. The PAC must give full consideration to assessing the consistency of the project with the GPD. The agenda of the meeting must include a discussion of inputs and management arrangements.
8. Global project documents are approved by the Director of BDP on behalf of UNDP and by the implementing partner. If a project is directly implemented by UNDP, the project document should be submitted through OSG for AA’s endorsement. The Director of BDP is responsible for ensuring compliance with the policies set out in Policies particularly on participation. Government endorsement of the respective participating countries (if any) where project activities will take place must be obtained. Their letters of endorsement are referred to on the cover page under “government signature.” Whenever possible, signature of the participating countries should precede signature by the implementing partner and by the Director of BDP.
9. BDP ensures that signed copies of the global project document are returned to each signatory and that copies are distributed to concerned parties.
10. If the project is to be evaluated, it should be reflected in the GPD evaluation plan and also in the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC).

IMPLEMENTING AND CLOSING A PROJECT
1. Management and oversight of the GP. The Director of BDP is responsible for the effective management of the GP and establishes the following arrangements:

   a) To foster an integrated approach, the various components of the GP, particularly those relating to the emerging and cross-cutting issues, are to be developed and undertaken by cross-divisional teams;

   b) Focal points from cross-cutting areas such as capacity development, gender, human rights, participate in the development and monitoring of the global projects;

   c) To ensure that the GP reflects the priorities and demands of the regional and country programmes, each BDP group leader establishes an advisory group comprised of representatives from the regional bureaux and relevant UNDP units. These advisory groups provide feedback on content, progress and impact on the global programming activities;

   d) The Development Practice Networks and the Regional Centres/ provide a mechanism to ensure synergy between the projects under the GP and those at the regional and country level. The network also serves as a channel for articulating emerging challenges and opportunities at the global, regional and country levels, as well as a mechanism for the dissemination of good practices and lessons learned.

2. Managing the global projects. The Director of BDP assigns responsibility for the various components of the GP to the leaders of the BDP substantive groups. These group leaders determine the management arrangements for the specific projects under their responsibility in consultation with concerned parties. The following arrangements may be established:

   a) One institution is designated the implementing partner to manage each global project/ in accordance with the project document;

   b) Management responsibility may be entrusted to UNDP itself, eligible United Nations agencies, governmental organizations, inter-governmental organizations or other inter-country institutions, or civil society organizations. Where such institutions do not have a basic legal agreement with UNDP for managing projects, such an agreement should be established;

   c) UNDP policies on monitoring, reporting and evaluation, as outlined in the Project Management section of the POPP apply to global projects. For further details see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results should be used as appropriate for this purpose.
REGIONAL PROGRAMME AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT

REGIONAL PROGRAMME (RP)

INTRODUCTION

The regional programme document (RPD) outlines the development cooperation strategy for a particular geographic region. Regional programmes focus on defining strategies and expected results that respond to regional priorities and build upon UNDP expertise in the areas relating to the focus areas and key result areas as described in the Strategic Plan. The draft regional programme document is approved by the Executive Board, which authorises the Administrator to proceed with the formulation and approval of regional projects. The units responsible for regional programmes (e.g. Regional Bureaux) prepare an evaluation plan for the programming period.

KEY NOTES AS COMPARED WITH COUNTRY PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

The preparation of a draft regional programme and a draft evaluation plan is a consultative process involving the widest range of stakeholders, including, governments of the region through UNDP country offices, regional institutions, civil society groups, United Nations agencies, donors and other development partners. Consultation should not end with preparation of the regional programme document but continue through implementation of the programme. This is essential to ensuring ownership of the regional programme and its constituent projects by the governments in the region.

The preparation of the regional programmes begins about 18 months before the current regional programmes expire. At the outset, each Regional Bureau establishes a work plan that includes a process of analysis, conceptualization, consultation and formulation, as well as an outline of tasks, time frames, responsibilities and required support for the entire RPD preparation process.

1) Analysis. The regional bureau via regional service centres (where applicable) arranges for an analysis that will identify the needs and priorities of the region. Participatory methods for conducting the analysis must be applied to ensure that the regional programming is demand-driven and results-oriented. Based on the UNDP focus areas and key result areas as described in the Strategic Plan, the analysis is prepared on the following basis:
a) Studies of regional trends and requirements;

b) Regional agreements resulting from regional inter-governmental processes;

c) Workshops, seminars and questionnaires among governments, civil society organizations, regional commissions, regional institutions, intergovernmental organizations, resident representatives, relevant UNDP headquarters units and other partners;

d) Meetings in the region to examine the regional needs in the context of global commitments expressed by the General Assembly and United Nations conferences and UNDP focus areas and key result areas reflected in the Strategic Plan;

e) Consultation of relevant Regional Communities of Practice and analysis of COP inputs to priority setting. Analysis of knowledge network activities (knowledge analytics on country office demand)

f) Reviews, assessments and evaluations that assess the lessons learned from current RPs or other development experiences.

2) Conceptualization. The regional bureau (via Regional Service Centres as appropriate) prepares a concept paper as a basis for preparing the draft RPD, using a standard format. The paper validates and advocates the needs and priorities and proposes a framework for UNDP programming in the region. The draft paper is circulated for comments among a broad range of stakeholders and specifically among regional and sub regional organizations. It is also circulated to the other regional bureaux, the central units in UNDP headquarters and country offices within that region.

3) Formulation. Based on comments received, the regional bureau (via Regional Centres as appropriate) translates the revised concept paper into a draft RPD that articulates a strategy for promoting the MDGs through undertaking the UNDP Strategic Plan focus areas and key result areas in the region.

4) The draft RPD and the evaluation plan are reviewed by a Programme Appraisal Committee (PAC). At this point, the draft evaluation plan should, at a minimum, include outcome evaluations, timing of the evaluations and the sources of funding for the evaluations, and the EO-conducted independent evaluation of the regional programme. The PAC must include representatives from the other regional bureaux, BDP, OSG, BOM, Evaluation Office and others as appropriate. The PAC should be participatory and, whenever possible, include representation by stakeholders, including governments, United Nations agencies, intergovernmental organizations, CSOs and donors. Members of the UNDP Executive Board, based in New York, may also be invited. As part
of the work of this committee, regional bureaux validate the linkages to the regional and country programmes and carry out validation by relevant Global Communities of Practice as appropriate.

5) To ensure that there are no gaps in programming from one RP period to the next, all new RPDs must be approved before the current RP expires. Approval takes the following steps:

a) Review of draft regional programme document, along with the draft evaluation plan by Operations Group to validate/certify programme direction.

b) The regional bureau Director submits the draft RPD, along with the evaluation plan, to OPB/BOM for clearance on resource allocation and then to AA through OSG for endorsement;

c) The draft RPD is then submitted to the Executive Board for approval. The draft evaluation plan is made available to the Executive Board as an annex for review. The format for Evaluation Plan for country programme may be used as appropriate for this purpose. The Executive Board may propose changes to the document;

d) The approval of the draft RPD by the Executive Board constitutes the authority of the Administrator to assign funds under TRAC line 1.2 of the financial framework.

The resources are then assigned to the RB Director who arranges for the formulation of regional projects. For details, see the project management section of POPP which also applies to regional projects.

6) Evaluation

Regional bureaux are responsible for commissioning decentralized evaluations within the framework of their respective regional programme (e.g. outcome, thematic, mid-term programme, and project evaluations), as outlined in the evaluation plan attached to the regional programme document submitted to, and approved by, the Executive Board. The Evaluation Plan template annexed to the Evaluation Policy 2011 may be used as appropriate for this purpose.

A comprehensive and strategic evaluation plan should include an appropriate mix of outcome-level evaluations, preferably conducted jointly with other partners, of programmes or programme components, projects and themes, as well as other types of evaluations, as appropriate (see section on 2.5.1 Evaluation Planning of Strategic Planning for a Programme). Whenever opportunities arise, joint evaluations are the preferred modality for evaluating UNDP’s contribution. In all cases, these evaluations need to analyze UNDP-specific contributions to results so that they fulfill the organization’s accountability and learning needs. The conduct of the
entire evaluation plan is the basis for compliance. For more information on the evaluation plan, see section on 2.5.1 Evaluation Planning.

Outcome-level decentralized evaluations commissioned by the regional bureaux should meet the quality standards established by EO (see guidance provided in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results) and provide adequate coverage of regional programme activities to generate sufficient “evidence” and objective information to support programme improvements, knowledge generation and accountability during the regional programme cycle.

EO conducts an independent evaluation of the regional programmes as outlined in its programme of work (evaluation plan). Findings, lessons and recommendations from evaluations should inform the design of the next regional programme.

Since independent regional programme evaluations are part of the programme of work and budget of EO, they are not included in the regional programme evaluation plan that is submitted for approval to the Executive Board. However, when planning decentralized evaluations, regional bureaux should take into account the conduct of the regional programme evaluation by EO, which will be conducted during the penultimate year of the programme cycle. Ideally, all major evaluations should be conducted prior to the regional programme evaluation since they may provide useful inputs to the regional programme evaluation, and help avoid duplication of evaluation efforts.

The conduct of the independent end-of-cycle programme evaluation by EO does not replace evaluation requirements for regional bureaux or substitute for planned decentralized evaluations. Independent evaluations by EO and decentralized evaluations have distinct purposes: EO evaluations are independent evaluations mandated by the Executive Board to strengthen the accountability and learning of the organization, while decentralized evaluations aim primarily to support learning and managing for development results and are a compliance requirement for Regional bureaux.

All evaluation reports must be made publicly available in the ERC. Regional bureaux are responsible for preparing, uploading and tracking the status of implementation of management responses in the ERC. For more information on management response to EO evaluation of regional programmes, please consult the directive.

7) Monitoring: In order to systematically monitor a Regional Programme, a monitoring plan should be prepared for each RP towards the end of the formulation stage and be used during the
implementation. The guidelines for preparing M&E Frameworks in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results should be used as appropriate for this purpose. Each regional bureau sets up mechanisms to monitor the respective regional programming activities both at the regional centre level and at the country level, review and capture lessons and good practices. Linkages of these mechanisms, including the arrangements for reporting, must be described in the project document.

REGIONAL PROJECTS

INTRODUCTION

1. The RPD establishes the priorities, strategies and an indication of expected results; individual regional projects, however, have to be formulated in a way that translates the regional programme into concrete outputs and activities. The formats and procedures outlined in the POPP for country-level projects also apply to regional programming, adapted as needed to the regional context.

2. Collectively the regional projects must be coherent to realize the overall results of a given regional programme document.

3. The design process for regional projects follows the same participatory approaches as for country programming, modified to reflect the larger number of governments and other stakeholders.

4. A non-programme country may also participate in a regional project provided that it meets any additional costs that arise.

5. The implementation of regional projects may be performed by UNDP in special development situations, or entrusted to United Nations agencies, governmental organizations, intergovernmental organizations or other regional institutions.

KEY NOTES AS COMPARED WITH COUNTRY PROJECT MANAGEMENT
JUSTIFYING, DEFINING AND INITIATING A PROJECT

1. Upon approval of the RPD by the Executive Board, the Administrator delegates authority to the regional bureau director to approve individual projects. The regional bureau, together with the regional centre(s) (if applicable) and country offices, arranges consultations among a wide spectrum of concerned stakeholders. To this end, the regional bureau may seek the assistance of United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programmes, and of civil society organizations.

2. The regional bureau and the Principal Project Representative (PPR) concerned arrange consultations with stakeholders and UNDP headquarters units and designate a Project Developer to prepare a draft regional project document. The regional bureau or the PPR distribute the draft project documents to the stakeholders for comments. Based on those comments, the regional bureau prepares a final project document.

3. The Project Developer shall ensure that the management arrangements are carefully worked out during the formulation stage. After consulting with the stakeholders and assessing capacity of potential implementing partners, the regional bureau designates one institution as the implementing partner to manage the project or seeks AA authorization for UNDP direct implementation of the project. The implementing partner must be involved in the formulation to ensure its readiness to manage the activities as stipulated in the project document.

4. The regional bureau, or where applicable, the PPR, initiates a Project Appraisal Committee (PAC) involving stakeholders to appraise the draft project document. Representatives from United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, CSOs, the applicable development practice network, regional centre/ Coordination Units and field-based policy specialists, direct beneficiaries and resident representatives in the participating countries should to the extent possible, participate in the PAC. It also determines whether the project is consistent with the RPD Results and Resources Framework and meets the regional, as well as the development priorities of the countries concerned. As appropriate, review of relevant knowledge products in focus areas and cross-cutting or operational issues, consultations with Community(ies) of Practice for comparative experience and advice as well as consultations at the country level should feed into the appraisal process.

5. Following the PAC, the regional bureau may proceed with the finalizing and approval of the document. In so doing, the regional bureau or the PPR should seek endorsement from all countries that wish to participate. Government endorsement of the respective participating countries where project activities will take place must be obtained.
6. Once the endorsements have been obtained, the regional bureau director or the delegated UNDP authority signs the document. The bureau director is responsible for ensuring compliance with the policies set out particularly on participation. Regional project documents are approved by the regional director on behalf of UNDP and agreed to implement the project by the implementing partner. If a project is directly implemented by UNDP, the project document should be submitted through OSG for AA’s endorsement. Whenever possible, the signatures of the participating countries should precede approval by the implementing partner and approval by the regional director. Their letters of endorsement are referred to on the cover page under “government signature.”

7. The regional bureau, normally through the PPR, ensures that signed copies of the regional project document are returned to each signatory and that copies are distributed to concerned parties.

8. If the project is to be evaluated, it should be reflected in the RPD evaluation plan. The revised evaluation plan should be uploaded in the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC) in line with the evaluation policy.

9. UNDP policies on monitoring, reporting and evaluation, as outlined in the Project Management section of the POPP, apply to regional projects. For further details see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results should be used as appropriate for this purpose.

RUNNING AND CLOSING A PROJECT

1. Management and oversight of the Regional Projects. The regional bureau director is responsible for ensuring effective management and monitoring of the regional projects.

2. Responsibilities of the principal project representative (PPR). The PPR is selected by the regional bureau during the early stages of formulation based on criteria such as country office/ regional centre interest, substantive and managerial capacity in the country office/ regional centre, and presence of regional institutions and expertise in the country. The responsibilities are as follows:
a) The PPR is accountable to the director of the regional bureau, who is accountable to the Administrator. The PPR is the focal point in the formulation, monitoring and evaluation of regional project activities;

b) The PPR carries out his/her responsibilities in cooperation with the regional stakeholders concerned and the resident representatives in the other participating countries. These responsibilities include making necessary arrangements to ensure that participating governments, resident representatives and other key stakeholders participate in decision-making affecting the project.

3. Managing the regional projects. The following management arrangements for the specific projects may be established:

a) One implementing partner is designated to manage each regional project, in accordance with the project document; alternatively, regional bureau may seek UNDP implementation.

b) Management responsibility may be entrusted to UNDP itself, or to intergovernmental organizations or other inter-country institutions, based on capacity assessment to determine which institutions is the most appropriate to manage the project. Where such implementing partners do not have a basic legal agreement with UNDP for managing projects, such an agreement should be established. For more details, please see Defining a Project..

c) Regional projects follow the policies and procedures for design, operations, monitoring and evaluation of country-level projects as defined in the Project Management Section of the POPP;

d) The implementing partner appoints a Project Manager (or Coordinator) who is responsible for the day-to-day management of activities. He/she works in close collaboration with the PPR. For more guidance please see Programme and Project Management Arrangements.

e) Where an CSO has been selected as the implementing partner, the Governments and UNDP sign the project document. In addition, the CSO must sign a standard project cooperation agreement with UNDP, which will serve as the basic legal framework with the CSO. The PAC must ensure that issues of capacities and competition in selecting the CSO are addressed;

f) The implementing partner may use the services of national and regional institutions and civil society organizations as responsible parties in carrying out activities. It is the responsibility of the regional bureau to ensure that the implementing partner has the capacity to manage and carry out the activities and achieve the expected results. For more details, please see Implementing Partner Checklist.
4. UNDP policies on monitoring, reporting, reviewing and capturing lessons and good practices apply to regional projects. The project manager is responsible for providing copies of reports to the resident representatives, who, in turn, distribute copies to their host governments and other participating parties.

5. UNDP policies, quality standards and guidelines on evaluating country projects apply to regional projects.

6. Revisions may be made to a project document at any time by agreement among the signatories based on recommendations from the Project Board. The authority to sign revisions on behalf of UNDP may be delegated by the bureau director to the PPR. The regional bureau or PPR ensures that such revisions are countersigned by the implementing partner to carry out the project.
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Description

1.0 Introduction

Evaluation is judgment made of the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of development efforts, based on agreed criteria and benchmarks among key partners and stakeholders. It involves a rigorous, systematic and objective process in the design, analysis and interpretation of information to answer specific questions. It provides assessments of what works and why, highlights intended and unintended results, and provides strategic lessons to guide decision-makers and inform stakeholders. (UNDP evaluation policy)

Evaluation involves a rigorous, systematic and objective process in the design, collection, analysis and interpretation of information to answer specific evaluation questions. Evaluation addresses what works and why, as well as what does not work and unintended outcomes.

Evaluation is distinct from monitoring, review (which is closer to monitoring), audit, investigation, and research.
The information from evaluation supports accountability, informs decision-making and allows UNDP to better manage for development results. Evaluation also improves learning and knowledge for development among UNDP and its partners. In order to ensure national ownership in evaluation and use of evaluative information, stakeholders should be engaged in the evaluation process from the planning stage. Engagement of all key stakeholders in the evaluation process will also enhance capacity for evaluation.

This section of the PPM/POPP provides an overview of evaluation in UNDP. For detailed guidance, please consult relevant sections of the PPM/POPP as follows:

- Strategic planning for a programme
  - Planning Evaluation
- Initiating a Programme
- Evaluating a Programme
- Implementing a Programme
- Specific roles of regional and global programmes (on independent and decentralized evaluations of regional and global programmes)

**Policy**

**2.0 UNDP Evaluation Policy**

Evaluation in UNDP is guided by the Executive Board approved Evaluation Policy (2011). The first UNDP evaluation policy, approved in 2006, was revised to clarify roles and responsibilities for evaluations. The revised policy places greater emphasis on national ownership and capacity development in evaluation, as well as learning from evaluation.

As outlined in the following sections, the policy establishes the guiding principles and norms; explains key evaluation concepts; outlines the main organizational roles and responsibilities; defines the types of evaluation covered; and identifies the key elements of a system for learning and knowledge management.

The policy applies to all programmatic activities of UNDP and its associated fund and programmes (UNCDF and UNV).

**3.0 Guiding principles**

The following principles must be honored in all UNDP evaluations:

**National ownership.** Evaluation should be guided by national priorities and concerns and should be conducted in alignment with national systems. It should be inclusive and take into account diverse national interests and values. Evaluation should strengthen partnerships with governments and key stakeholders. It should build the capacity of national institutions to implement, monitor and evaluate.

**Managing for results.** Evaluation supports UNDP to manage for results by assessing the extent to which UNDP processes, products and services contribute effectively to development results affecting people’s lives. Evaluation highlights the need for quality in the design of programmes so that results are clear,
measurable and can be monitored and evaluated. Through the generation of evidence, evaluation enables more informed management and decision-making for strategic planning and programming.

**Human development and human rights.** Evaluation is guided by the people-centred approach of UNDP to development, which enhances capabilities, choices and rights for all men and women. Evaluation abides by universally shared values of equity, justice, gender equality and respect for diversity.

**United Nations system coordination and global partnership.** Evaluation draws on and contributes to collaboration within the United Nations system to improve effectiveness and reduce transaction costs for development cooperation. UNDP advocates strengthened professional collaboration under the aegis of UNEG and country-level coordination in evaluation under the Resident Coordinator system. With the increasing engagement of UNDP in global initiatives and partnership programmes with other donors, non-governmental organizations and civil society, the conduct of joint evaluations enhances global partnership.

4.0 **Types of evaluation in UNDP**

The evaluations conducted by UNDP fall into two categories:

- **Independent evaluations** that are conducted by the Evaluation Office
- **Decentralized evaluations** that are managed by country offices, regional bureaux and practice and policy bureaux, and conducted by external experts. Decentralized evaluations are carried out ‘independently’ as they are commissioned to independent consultants

Together they represent a coherent system of evaluation that provides the necessary coverage to manage for results and to support organizational accountability.

4.1 **Independent evaluations conducted by the Evaluation Office**

The Evaluation Office is mandated to conduct evaluations for corporate accountability, strategic planning, and the development of information for global knowledge use. The Evaluation Office prepares a two-year rolling programme of work (equivalent of the evaluation plan), which is presented and approved by the Executive Board, and conducts independent evaluations according to the programme of work.

Thematic evaluations assess UNDP performance in areas that are critical to ensuring sustained contributions to development results in the context of emerging development issues and changing priorities at the global and regional levels. Thematic evaluations may cover, for example, UNDP policies, focus and results areas, partnerships, cross-cutting concerns, programmatic approaches, cooperation modalities, or business models.

Global, regional and South-South programme evaluations assess the performance and intended and achieved results of those programmes. They are intended to reinforce the substantive accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board, and will be timed to contribute to the preparation and approval of the next programme.
Assessments of Development Results (ADRs) assess the attainment of intended and achieved results as well as UNDP contributions to development results at the country level. Their scope includes, but is not necessarily confined to, UNDP responsiveness and alignment to country challenges and priorities; strategic positioning; use of comparative advantage; and engagement with partners. The number and selection of countries, and the timing of these evaluations, will be determined to ensure coverage and to allow findings and recommendations to feed into the preparation of the subsequent programme. Wherever possible, these evaluations will be conducted jointly or at a minimum, in coordination with other UN organizations.

4.2 Decentralized evaluations commissioned by programme units to independent consultants

Programme units are required to develop a costed evaluation plan for the programme period and annex it to the country, regional, global or south-south programme document (for country offices, the evaluation plan is based on the UNDAF M&E plan). For country offices, their evaluation plans should be an integral part of the overall UNDAF M&E plan at the country level.

In line with the evaluation plans, country offices, regional bureaux, and practice and policy bureaux commission independent consultants to conduct decentralized evaluations in the programmatic frameworks for which they are responsible.

Whenever possible, programme units are encouraged to carry out joint evaluations with other partners, such as programme country governments and UN organizations. In deciding what to evaluate, national evaluation contexts (who is doing what evaluation, when) should be carefully analyzed so that evaluation efforts can be harmonized to the extent possible for optimal use of evaluation and lessons learned.

Decentralized evaluations should always address UNDP’s contribution to development results at the outcome level, and address the short-term, medium-term and long-term contributions of UNDP to the attainment of outcomes in the framework of:

- Global, regional and country and south-south programmes (looking at the programme as a whole). These evaluations are referred to as global, regional, country or south-south programme evaluations. [Note that since the Evaluation Office is responsible for end-of-cycle independent evaluations of global, regional and south-south programme evaluations, BDP, regional bureaux and the SU/SSC may commission mid-term programme evaluations of their respective programmes. In the case of country offices, they may commission mid-term or end-of-the-cycle programme evaluation, in the absence of an ADR]

- Project clusters and/or programme components that aim to contribute to an outcome or outcomes as defined in global, regional, country and south-south programmes (outcome evaluation).

- Individual projects that aim to contribute to outcomes as defined in project documents or broader programme frameworks (project evaluations). They can be invaluable in managing for results, and serve to reinforce the accountability of project managers. Additionally, project evaluation provides a basis for the evaluation of strategic and programmatic evaluations and ADRs, and for distilling lessons from experience for learning and sharing knowledge.

- Themes covering, for example, UNDP results areas, cross-cutting issues such as gender and capacity development, partnerships, programmatic approaches, cooperation modalities, or business models (thematic evaluations).
Decentralized evaluations could also include other types of evaluations that management of programmes units may consider appropriate and useful. What, how and when to evaluate – see box 28 of the Handbook- is a strategic management decision and should be based on the sound analysis of information needs and the evaluation context, as well as close consultation with national governments.

**UNDP evaluations, including project evaluations, should not be limited to assessing UNDP’s inputs, activities and outputs. They should assess the extent to which UNDP’s investments have contributed to the attainment of stated outcome(s). Therefore, all evaluations in UNDP are outcome-level evaluations (see the Handbook compendium guide on outcome-level evaluations).**

For more information on how to develop an evaluation plan, please consult section on evaluation planning [2.5.1].

For information on evaluations conducted by the MDG Achievement Fund secretariat, please visit their website.

**5.0 Decentralized evaluation compliance**

The Evaluation Office (Annual Report on Evaluation) and the management of UNDP (Annual Report of the Administrator – see annex) report on decentralized evaluation practice and compliance in the respective annual reports to the Executive Board, focusing on the following key aspects, inter alia:

- **Coverage**: Implementation of the costed evaluation plans, which have an appropriate mix of different types of evaluations and meet quality standards adopted by the UN Evaluation Group.

- **Transparency and use of evaluation**: Evaluation results should be made public through disclosure of key evaluation products: evaluation plans (original, as well as most up-to-date), Terms of Reference, evaluation reports, management responses and status of follow up in the Evaluation Resource Centre (erc.undp.org)

- **Quality**: Quality assessment of decentralized evaluations –the Evaluation Office assess the quality of all decentralized evaluations, using an instrument based on UNEG norms and standards and guidance provided in the Handbook.

In terms of evaluation coverage, each plan must ensure that planned evaluations assess UNDP’s contribution to development results at the outcome level. A comprehensive and strategic evaluation plan should include an appropriate mix of outcome-level evaluations of programmes or programme components, projects and themes, as well as other types of outcome-level evaluations, as relevant.

**The implementation of the entire approved evaluation plan, with subsequent approved up-dates, constitute the minimum standard of compliance for evaluation coverage.**

Evaluation plans are reviewed as part of the annual programme review process to ensure relevance of the planned evaluations. With the advance clearance by the regional bureau and government agreement, the evaluation plans for country offices can be revised for compelling reasons such as major changes in policy, programme or evaluation context. The regional bureau should discuss any suggested changes with the country offices before the revision process is initiated with the government and also clears the
revised plan for the country offices before making the plan publicly available in the ERC. The Administrator clears any changes in the regional, global, thematic and South-South programme evaluation plans.

The latest evaluation plan, which has gone through the appropriate review and clearance process, serves as the basis for compliance in terms of decentralized evaluation coverage. The most up-to-date evaluation plans should be made available in the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC).

*Evaluation requirements for associated funds and programmes* include the following

for UNCDF:

- At least one strategic or thematic assessment per year in response to corporate priorities;
- Mid-term or final evaluations of selected projects in critical areas of relevance to the two UNCDF practice areas of local development and inclusive finance;
- Project evaluations when required by a partnership protocol;
- Participation in evaluations of joint programmes as required by approved joint programme documents.

for UNV:

- One strategic or thematic assessment per year in response to demands identified during a corporate consultative process;
- Mid-term or final evaluations of selected projects and initiatives financed from the Special Voluntary Fund, in critical areas and/or areas where there is a need to learn about the contribution of volunteerism to peace and development;
- Project evaluations when required by a partnership protocol;
- Participation in evaluations of joint programmes when required by the programme design.

**6.0 Use of Evaluation**

In accordance with the UNDP disclosure policy, all evaluations are made available in the ERC, which is UNDP’s important management tool for accountability and transparency in evaluation. It also promotes learning and sharing of lessons from evaluation. Since it is a public website, information uploaded in the ERC must be accurate and up to date.

The annual reports on Evaluation and of the Administrator, mid-term and final reviews on the Strategic Plan will draw on independent and decentralized evaluations and their management responses. Progress on the implementation of the actions agreed in the management responses to independent and decentralized evaluations will be reported by UNDP senior management in the annual report to the Executive Board.

The evaluation policy emphasizes the importance of evaluations systematically contributing to the organization’s on-going work as a learning and knowledge-based organization. UNDP needs to ensure that everyone in the organization draws lessons from evaluations and internalize evaluation knowledge in programming and knowledge-sharing efforts.
7.0 Roles and responsibilities

Roles and responsibilities of key constituents of the organization and the Executive Board for independent evaluations and decentralized evaluations (create link to evaluating a programme) are stipulated in the UNDP Evaluation Policy and relevant sections of the POPP.

The Evaluation Office, as an independent unit responsible for the conduct of independent evaluations, sets standards and guidance on evaluation in UNDP. It does not have direct oversight or support responsibility for decentralized evaluations.

The senior management of programme units, inter alia:

- Ensures the evaluability of programmes by identifying clear results, developing measurable indicators, and establishing performance targets and baseline information;
- Ensures the effective monitoring and decentralized evaluation of projects and programmes to generate relevant, timely information for managing for development results and learning, and the conduct of independent evaluations;
- Makes all requested and relevant information available to evaluators;
- Develops a costed evaluation plan, commissions planned decentralized evaluations, makes evaluation reports and management responses publicly available in the ERC.
- Uploads and tracks the status of follow-up actions in the ERC.
- Draws on evaluation findings to improve the quality of programmes, guide strategic decision-making on future programming and positioning, and share knowledge on development experience;
- Promotes organizational learning through analysis and application of evaluation findings across regions, themes and results areas, including through knowledge systems and products.

In addition to carrying out decentralized evaluations of regional programmes, regional bureaux are responsible for providing technical support and oversight for their respective country office evaluations. For detailed roles and responsibilities of the programme units, please consult the section on evaluating a programme.
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8.0 Resources in Evaluation

- Relevant sections in the POPP
  - Developing an evaluation plan
  - Evaluating a programme
- UNDP Evaluation Office webpage
  - Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results
  - GEF Guidelines on Monitoring and Evaluation
- Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC) – The ERC is UNDP’s information management system to support management accountability for evaluation. It provides timely data on evaluation planning, management response and follow-up. The ERC is also a repository of evaluation reports and serves as the organization’s primary tool for knowledge management in evaluation. To date, it contains over 600 evaluations and 150 Terms of References.
• EvalNet – EvalNet is a knowledge practice network, which aims to promote sharing of experiences, lessons and good practices in evaluation among its members. It has a number of products, including bi-monthly resource packages consolidated replies and e-discussions.
• Regional Communities of Practice. LAC CoP
• TeamWorks space on evaluation
• Vetted expert roster – Evaluation Office manages a roster of vetted evaluation experts.
• United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) website
  o UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation
  o UNEG Evaluation Ethical guideline
  o UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in UN System
  o UNEG Checklist for Evaluation report
• UNCDF

Resource Center
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Fast Track Procedures