

**UNDP management commentaries on the**

**2021 Annual Report on Evaluation**

1. **INTRODUCTION**
2. UNDP welcomes the 2021 Annual Report on Evaluation, submitted by the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) to the Executive Board, which provides the summary of key findings from the independent evaluations for organizational lessons and analytical data both from independent and decentralized evaluations to help UNDP improve evaluation functions. Management commentaries reflect UNDP perspectives of critical elements related to evaluation tasks, independent and decentralized evaluations, actions taken by UNDP in 2021, and those that will be elaborated in collaboration with the IEO to strengthen UNDP evaluation functions during the 2022-2025 strategic plan period.
3. **LESSONS LEARNED[[1]](#footnote-2)**
4. UNDP highly values findings reflected in the report, synthesizing lessons from thematic and independent country programme evaluations (ICPEs), as well as the Reflection Series produced by IEO. UNDP found lessons from evaluations to be useful, not only in guiding the design of the strategic plan for 2022-2025, but also in shaping several critical policies and programmes that support the implementation of the plan. This section illustrates how UNDP has learned lessons from various evaluations and is taking actions to fulfill commitments the organization made in the strategic plan.
5. UNDP is pleased to be recognized by its stakeholders as *a neutral, responsive, and trusted provider of development services in support of diverse national priorities*, which is a core value of the organization. The Strategic Plan 2022-2025 reflects priorities *deemed vital by programme governments—such as elections, justice reforms, access to energy, reactivation of governing institutions, and development of national capacities in fragile contexts—*as key components of signature solutions. Learning from the lessons of the last four years, signature solutions will be adapted to better match countries’ evolving needs.
6. As an organization striving to be flexible, agile, and adaptable, UNDP is pleased to be appraised for its *quick response to the COVID-19 crisis, demonstrating extraordinary flexibility and leadership*.As noted in the report, UNDP rapidly reprogrammed some activities and mobilized additional resourcesto respond to the pandemic. Under the Strategic Plan 2022-2025, UNDP remains committed to supporting the next generation of country programmes and United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks (UNSDCF) with a focus on inclusiveness and sustainability for COVID-19 recovery as recommended in the strategic plan evaluation. Furthermore, several evaluations noted that UNDP *accelerated innovative ideas* under the pandemic, such as*digitalizing services for government and supporting micro, small, and medium enterprises*. In leveraging these lessons, UNDP committed to expanding its support to partner countries in the areas of innovation and digital transformation as development enablers.
7. UNDP is pleased to report key actions have already been taken to address several challenges identified in the evaluations. For instance, the strategic plan evaluation for 2018-2021 and several ICPEs pointed out the *fragmented nature of UNDP programmes, with projects often limited in scope and scale.* To address this issue, UNDP is taking steps to shift from project-driven fundraising to more holistic portfolio approaches with longer-term, transformative goals and in terms of brokering stronger public-private collaboration. To start, UNDP rolled out a portfolio acceleration protocol in 40 country offices.
8. While gender equality and women’s empowerment continue to be a key accelerator of development results, several evaluations stated that *gender equality programmes in UNDP remain underfunded with overall investments well below the organizational commitment of 15 per cent toward gender transformative projects.* In response to these findings, UNDP took decisive steps to reverse the trend. The roll-out of the Rapid Funding Facility for the COVID-19 response required country offices to include gender equality and women’s empowerment as principal or significant objectives of interventions. In addition, UNDP allocated 15 per cent of TRAC3 core resources for gender-dedicated programme activities. Detailed actions to strengthen gender equality and women’s empowerment are included in the Gender Equality Strategy for 2022-2025, which will be submitted to the Executive Board in the 2022 annual session.
9. Several evaluations, both thematic and ICPEs, identified that *promising engagements with the private sector to advance innovation and economic opportunities have been made, but there is still room to further leverage these partnerships beyond financial assets.* In the strategic plan for 2022-2025, UNDP made a commitment to use its convening power to continue building new alliances with the private sector, cognizant that strengthening existing partnerships and forging new ones will require flexible instruments, modalities, and funding. In-country programme documents (CPDs) adopted in 2021, several country offices included new initiatives aiming at supporting the private sector, wealth creation, and improving the quality of businesses implemented by micro, small, and medium enterprises.
10. *Monitoring and evaluation systems, and evaluation culture*are other areas of challenge identified in several evaluations, including the strategic plan evaluation for 2018-2021. Acknowledging evaluation recommendations to strengthen results-based management and systems, UNDP is holistically redesigning current results planning, monitoring, risk assessment, and reporting systems that link results at all levels to support the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2022-2025 by leveraging the new enterprise resource planning system and existing platforms. This new architecture will enhance capabilities for results planning, performance monitoring, risk assessment, and lesson learning at all levels along with increased transparency. Detailed actions to strengthen UNDP evaluation performance and culture are articulated in this paper, as well as in the *Roadmap for Strengthening Decentralized Evaluations in UNDP* document that will be presented to the Executive Board at the 2022 annual session.
11. UNDP will continue to, and further evolve, its policies and programmes for responding to the changing needs of programme countries. UNDP will continuously analyze key findings that arise from evaluations as objective evidence to improve its work for delivering results for maximum impact.
12. **INDEPENDENT EVALUATIONS**

**THEMATIC EVALUATIONS**

**Implementation of thematic evaluations**

1. UNDP appreciates the IEO for conducting three thematic evaluations on critical and timely topics, namely the evaluation of UNDP support to youth economic empowerment, evaluation of UNDP support to energy access and transition, and the formative evaluation of the UNDP response to the pandemic and SDG financing. UNDP presented its management response to the first two evaluations at the first regular session in February 2022, where UNDP accepted all recommendations made in the evaluations. The management response to the formative evaluation of the UNDP response to the pandemic and SDG financing will be presented to the Executive Board at the 2022 annual session.
2. The thematic evaluations conducted over the last strategic plan period covered all six signature solution areas. These contributed to an enhanced understanding of UNDP strengths and areas for improvement in strategic programmatic prioritization. UNDP especially welcomes IEO efforts to strengthen evaluation quality and utility by appointing seven IEO staff members as thematic focal points.

**Implementation of management actions of thematic evaluations**

1. Given the criticality of knowledge and lessons emanating from thematic evaluations to strengthen UNDP programmes and projects, the organization intensified efforts to implement management actions. Over the last five years, the IEO completed 11 thematic evaluations, resulting in 90 valuable recommendations. UNDP is pleased to inform that UNDP implemented 96 per cent of management actions (73 per cent “completed” and 23 per cent “ongoing or initiated”), which is a 10 per cent point increase from 2020. For evaluations completed in 2021, 43 per cent of actions were completed and 49 per cent are in progress. Out of five thematic evaluations from 2021, two were presented and endorsed at the Annual Executive Board session for 2021. The use of thematic evaluations, and the extent to which they informed management decisions and design of the strategic plan for 2022-2025, are detailed in Addendum I.

Figure 1: Implementation of management response key actions for thematic evaluations conducted in 2017-2021

**INDEPENDENT COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATIONS (ICPEs)**

**Implementation of ICPE**

1. *In 2021, the IEO produced 16 independent country programme evaluations (ICPEs)*[[2]](#footnote-3)*and also completed three ICPEs***[[3]](#footnote-4)** *that started in late 2020.* UNDP valuescredible evaluationevidence from ICPEs to support the development of new CPDs and strengthen UNDP accountability to national stakeholders, as well as the Executive Board.

**Coverage of ICPEs/ICPRs**

1. To ensure the UNDP framework of support at the country level is anchored in an independent assessment of development results, it is crucial that all new CPDs submitted for board approval are backed by high quality and timely ICPEs. The 2018 Executive Board decision (2018/1) noted the IEO decision “to achieve full evaluation coverage of all country programmes prior to the Board’s consideration of new country programme documents, as guided by decision 2015/8.” While 100 per cent of CPDs were covered by ICPEs in 2019, coverage has constantly gone down to 66 per cent in 2022[[4]](#footnote-5). Annex IV, Table 2 summarizes the coverage of ICPEs/ICPRs in 2017-2022.
2. UNDP welcomes the IEO commitment to evaluate all country programmes through ICPEs, with timely submissions informing Executive Board decisions on approval of new CPDs. UNDP will continue to coordinate with IEO on the timing of these evaluations, so findings and recommendations feed into the preparation of new CPDs.

**Quality and use of ICPEs/ICPRs**

1. IEO concluded 19 ICPEs in 2021. These inform the design of the ten new country programmes that will be approved by the Executive Board in 2022. As of March 2022, 11 out of 19 ICPEs still have to be posted on the Evaluation Resource Center. Annex IV, Table 1 shows data on the availability of 2021 ICPEs.
2. The timely availability of evaluation is critical for ensuring the maximum use of evaluation findings and recommendations for decision making. The satisfaction rate of evaluation utility in the IEO 2021 Stakeholder Survey was 72 per cent, relatively low compared to other areas such as credibility and competence, which saw the satisfaction rate rise to 81 per cent. UNDP will design and introduce a user feedback mechanism to increase the usability of evaluation recommendations.
3. To maximize the uptake of ICPEs in the design of new country programmes, timely completion, and publication the ICPE (at least a year prior to the conclusion of ongoing CPDs) will be appreciated.Along the same lines as assuring the quality of decentralized evaluations, UNDP suggests IEO introduce independent reviews to assess the quality of ICPEs and related recommendations.
4. UNDP takes note of IEO piloting an ICPE rating system along with refining its methodologies for ICPEs. UNDP looks forward to hearing key findings and lessons from the piloting exercise and continuing to collaborate with IEO on improving ICPE quality and utility.

**Implementation of management actions of ICPE evaluations**

1. Along the same lines as the thematic evaluations, UNDP took decisive actions to implement management actions in response to the valuable recommendations made in the ICPEs. In 2017-2020, IEO conducted 74 ICPEs in five regions, for which UNDP agreed to 989 out of 1,002 management actions. By the end of 2021, there was a considerable improvement in the implementation rate of agreed actions compared to the previous years. The implementation rate of management actions reached 92 per cent (67 per cent completed, 25 per cent ongoing), an eight-percentage point increase from 84 per cent in 2018, which demonstrates that implementation was timely and without delay (Figure 2).
2. Given the importance of tracking the annual implementation of management actions in a consistent manner (disaggregated by completed, ongoing, not completed, and overdue tasks), UNDP requests IEO align tracking and documenting systems for completing management actions to the agreed timeframe for their completion rather than measuring performance according to a specific time of year. Such alignment will avoid underestimating efforts as reported in the ARE such as *the implementation of recommendations appears also as not always timely, with only 42 per cent of actions to recommendations presented to the Executive Board in 2021 fully implemented while rest had to be initiated or were overdue.*

Figure 2: Implementation of management actions in 2021 for ICPEs evaluations conducted in 2017-2020

1. Between 2017 and 2020, 74 ICPEs were conducted, with one-third of ICPEs in Africa. In 2019, the highest number of ICPEs were conducted across Europe and CIS (n=13), followed by Latin America and the Caribbean in 2021 (n=7). Four regions had more than 90 per cent of ICPE management actions implemented (completed and ongoing). Asia and the Pacific (99 per cent) and Europe and CIS regions (98 per cent) saw ICPE management actions move into the implementation phase. In Latin America and the Caribbean, most ICPEs were completed in the last quarter of 2020, which led to a relatively low implementation rate of 80 per cent.

Figure 3: Implementation of management actions for ICPEs conducted in 2017-2021, disaggregated by region

1. Knowledge and lessons backed by credible evidence from ICPEs, when shared and published in a timely manner, reinforced the design of new CPDs to determine the theory of change and approach for new programme cycles. In this regard, UNDP conducted case reviews from five regions to demonstrate how ICPE recommendations are incorporated in new CPD formulations in 2021 and 2022. These are detailed in Annex II with five case reviews from five regions.
2. The uptake of ICPE recommendations in the design of new CPDs is evident in programme quality assurance ratings in 2020 and 2021. Out of 43 new CPDs, more than 50 per cent explicitly used knowledge and lessons learned backed by credible evidence from evaluation, with appropriate referencing, whereas 46 per cent of new CPDs were informed by evaluation findings and other outcome-level evidence (but where references were not explicitly used). UNDP will make continuous efforts to enhance the quality of new country programmes backed by credible evidence and track the improvement of quality scores between two program cycles.
3. **DECENTRALIZED EVALUATIONS**
4. Despite uncertainties posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, volatile situations in protracted crisis countries, and shifting political dynamics, UNDP and its partners remained committed to deliver results. The ARE highlighted several positive aspects of the implementation and quality of UNDP decentralized evaluations.

**Implementation of decentralized evaluation plans**

1. While planning and implementation of decentralized evaluations was impacted by COVID-19 related travel restrictions, the reprioritizations of activities, delays in stakeholder approval, and difficulty in engaging evaluators in a timely manner, *UNDP managed to complete 352 decentralized evaluations against 559 planned (63 per cent).* *The implementation rate of decentralized evaluations in 2021 provides a highly encouraging signal with more than 100 additional evaluations completed compared to 2020, fully reversing the downward trend that began in 2017.*
2. Two years of pandemic restrictions, delays, and lockdowns necessitated UNDP country offices to review and reprioritize evaluation plans. In 2021, UNDP made considerable efforts to systematically review the quality and sensitivity of annual evaluation plans at the beginning of the year and mid-year for necessary adjustments. Where scoping exercises and evaluability assessments were recommended, evaluation plans were adjusted by combining evaluations, sharpening the scope, and in some cases, postponing a few evaluations while ensuring balanced coverage of portfolios and adhering to mandatory benchmarks for evaluations. This is verified and evident with ARE 2021 findings—except for *RBA. All Regional Bureaux successfully completed more evaluations than the average from 2017-2020, with higher increases in Asia and the Pacific.*
3. UNDP annually implemented approximately 300 decentralized evaluations, providing rich information on UNDP project performance, results achieved, areas of improvement, and lessons for future programming. UNDP acknowledges the need for more strategic planning and deliberate actions to increase the timely completion of planned evaluations. In the meantime, UNDP noted IEO used different cut-off dates (beginning, mid, or end of the year) over the last five years to calculate evaluation completion rates. To support effective trend analysis, UNDP requests IEO use consistent cut-off dates, which would facilitate effective evaluation planning and implementation. Annex IV, Table 3 shows cut-off dates used to populate the evaluation completion rate in 2017-2021.

**Implementation of Management Actions of Decentralized Evaluations**

1. UNDP strengthened its system for uptake of decentralized evaluation by institutionalizing mechanisms, processes, and accountability for the timely implementation of management actions via management response systems. In 2021, UNDP made sustained efforts to implement management actions on time through regular follow-up, oversight, and quarterly reviews with regional bureaux and UNDP headquarters on evaluation performance issues.
2. For evaluations conducted in the last five years, 98 per cent of decentralized evaluations had a management response, a four-percentage point increase from 94 per cent in 2020. The implementation rate of agreed actions of decentralized evaluations conducted in the past five years (2017-2021) stood at 92 per cent (“completed” and “ongoing/initiated”). UNDP completed 75 per cent of planned key actions, while 16 per cent were ongoing/initiated, 8 per cent had not been initiated, and 1 per cent were overdue.
3. UNDP takes note that*although the majority (70 per cent) of actions included in decentralized evaluation reports since 2017 were fully acted upon, evidence of actual implementation is limited.* To strengthen the evidence of actual implementation,UNDP will take concrete actions to enhance the practice of uploading credible evidence in the Evaluation Resource Center in addition to updates on completed implemented actions.

**Quality of decentralized evaluations**

1. Another positive trend noted in the Annual Report on Evaluation 2021 is *the improvement of the quality of decentralized evaluations* *compared to 2020*. *Of the 272 evaluations assessed in 2021 for quality, 42 per cent were rated as satisfactory (an eight-percentage point increase compared to 2020); 47 per cent moderately satisfactory, and 11 per cent moderately unsatisfactory or unsatisfactory.*
2. The chart below shows the quality of decentralized evaluations over the past five years based on 240 decentralized evaluations (85 per cent) quality assured annually. UNDP is pleased to report that decentralized evaluations rated as satisfactory increased from 19 per cent in 2017 to 42 per cent in 2021 whereas unsatisfactory decentralized evaluations decreased from seven per cent in 2017 to one per cent in 2021. As such, UNDP recognizes the need for further efforts to shift the quality of evaluations, reducing the number of ‘unsatisfactory’ and increasing more ‘fully satisfactory’ ratings.

Figure 4: Decentralized evaluation quality, 2017-2021

Note: Number of evaluations completed in year 2017 =315; 2018= 283; 2019 =290; 2020 = 249 and 2021 = 352

1. Regional disaggregation shows a notable trend in the improvement of the quality of decentralized evaluations. In Asia and the Pacific, over 40 per cent of decentralized evaluations were rated as satisfactory. The Annual Report on Evaluation also acknowledged *significant improvements in the quality of evaluations conducted by the country offices in the Arab States and Europe and Central Asia region*, where 58 per cent (20 per cent in 2020) and 47 per cent (21 per cent in 2020) of evaluation reports were rated as satisfactory.
2. This positive trend was made possible by Regional Bureaux efforts in strengthening quality assurance systems at regional and country levels, including capacity development of monitoring and evaluation specialists and programme staff when managing decentralized evaluations. This resulted in well-developed terms of reference, sound inception reports, and improved management processes engaging senior management and evaluation focal points to validate final evaluation reports. Moreover, Regional Bureaux continue to explore key contributing factors for high-quality evaluations, areas for improvement and to facilitate the use of valuable experience to strengthen decentralized evaluation quality across country offices. UNDP established the evaluation roster under the GPN/Experts Roster for Rapid Response to engage quality/expert evaluators within minimum procurement timeframes. UNDP is also making sure that independence is fully maintained by separating duties (e.g. roster coordination by BPPS and implementing decentralized evaluations by the independent consultants).
3. To sustain and further lift the quality of evaluations, UNDP highly appreciates IEO support to conduct quality assessments of decentralized evaluations on a quarterly basis and enable country offices to take timely actions and make course corrections, as necessary.

**Coverage of Decentralized Evaluations**

1. While the implementation and quality of decentralized evaluations have trended in a positive direction, UNDP continued to face challenges in terms of decentralized evaluation coverage. As noted in the Annual Report on Evaluation, *91 per cent of decentralized evaluations conducted in 2021 were project-level evaluations* *and not strategic in nature*, *including 35 per cent of evaluations conducted for mandatory GEF-funded projects.* UNDP conducted 12 outcome or thematic evaluations and 19 UNDAF or CPD evaluations in 2021, which constitutes 9 per cent of total decentralized evaluations carried out in 2021.
2. Evaluation guidelines and funding partner requirements currently focus on project-level evaluations (including GEF projects)—a mandatory requirement for projects of a certain duration and budget. Outcome or portfolio evaluations are not mandatory and are difficult to finance from projects, resulting in a large concentration of project-level evaluations, hindering opportunities to learn lessons from portfolios to achieve higher-level results.
3. Building on lessons from the 2018-2021 evaluation trend of an unrealistic high number of project evaluations each year and low completion rate, UNDP committed to more strategic evaluations than stand-alone project evaluations in the new UNDP strategic plan cycle. Several corporate actions have been prioritized by UNDP to operationalize the vision like stronger indicators in the results framework on completing strategic evaluations (programme, portfolio, and outcome), and providing support and guidance to regional bureaux through programme appraisal committee reviews on prioritizing the most strategic evaluations during programme formulation.
4. The roadmap for strengthening decentralized evaluations in UNDP[[5]](#footnote-6) prioritizes efforts by IEO to produce additional evaluation guidance, including on portfolio approaches and impact evaluations. These additional guidance notes will be critical enablers for placing a stronger emphasis on attaining higher-level results and assessing development impact. UNDP appreciates the IEO plan to review the portfolio to ensure mandatory benchmarks for evaluations are being met and to revisit benchmarks as needed to consider the balance of evaluations on large and strategic projects.

**Capacity building for strengthening of decentralized evaluations**

1. UNDP welcomes IEO *continued support to country and regional offices to strengthen evaluation capabilities through tailored regional training, online training sessions, and ‘Evaluation Ask Us Anything’ webinars*. UNDP especially welcomes efforts to strengthen decentralized evaluation capacities by offering M&E focal points of country offices 20 scholarships to virtually attend the 2021 International Program for Development Evaluation and Training. The Evaluation Excellence Awards recognized the high quality of decentralized evaluations helped stimulate learning and motivate staff toward better evaluation performance. UNDP is reinforcing staff capacity development in evaluation planning and management to mitigate the dearth of country office evaluation expertise. By the end of 2021, 97 offices out of 129 (75 per cent) had at least one focal point certified in UNDP evaluation standards.
2. UNDP especially appreciates IEO efforts to *strengthen oversight and technical support to improve planning, quality, and coverage of decentralized evaluation network of IEO Regional Focal Points (RFPs)*. Their capacities are well-positioned to support regional bureaux in the implementation of regional decentralized evaluation strategies and increase involvement in the decentralized evaluation processes, in addition to country programme evaluation and support to Programme Appraisal meetings. Moving forward, UNDP hopes to leverage the capacities of IEO regional focal points through regional evaluation training and technical guidance to support the conduct strategic portfolio, outcome, and impact evaluations.

**V.** **ACTION TAKEN IN 2021**

1. In response to the Annual Report on Evaluation 2020,[[6]](#footnote-7) which identified gaps in the quality, coverage, and utility of decentralized evaluations, the Executive Board encouraged UNDP to *“continue this effort to identify and build evaluation capacities and resources to increase the satisfactory rating of decentralized evaluations significantly.”* In response, and jointly with IEO, UNDP Management took several key actions in 2021.

**Quarterly monitoring of the Evaluation Scorecard key performance indicators**

1. In 2021, UNDP systematized the monitoring, analysis, and dissemination of evaluation performance by region and central bureaux using the key performance indicators (KPIs) introduced in the Evaluation Scorecard in 2020. The introduction of KPIs offered an overview of high-risk or critical areas that require thorough analysis and management actions and increase efficiency by reducing manual analysis. Special attention was given to the country offices with 1) a high number of evaluations planned, 2) high overdue evaluations, and 3) no evaluations planned in the year. Real-time data on critical evaluation performance enabled timely tracking of high-risk and critical areas for bureaux to take timely remedial actions.
2. As shown in Figure 4, compared to 2020, the performance of all KPIs improved in 2021, including a 14-percentage point increase in KPI 1 (evaluation completion rate) and a notable 31-percentage point increase in KPI 5 (M&E focal points certified in evaluation).

Figure 5: Trend of decentralized evaluation Key Performance Indicators (2017-2021)

**Bureau-level strategies for strengthening decentralized evaluations**

1. In November 2021, UNDP senior management reviewed the status of evaluation KPIs and requested central (GPN) and regional bureaux to develop tailored strategies for implementation starting in January 2022. Strategies contained commitments from the bureaux to strengthen management accountability and strategic actions to improve the coverage, quality, and use of decentralized evaluations in decision making. All bureaux are required to report quarterly on their performance and status of the KPIs through the established oversight and mechanisms for engaging senior management.

**Strengthening UNDP programming tools related to evaluation**

1. UNDP updated and strengthened its programme Quality Assurance (QA) tools in 2021 so credible evidence generated from evaluations can be compared against key assumptions and expected outcomes and outputs as established in the programme ‘theory of change’. These QA tools require explicit referencing of evaluation in programme and project design, and availability of fully costed evaluation plans. For ongoing projects, the QA assesses the use of evaluation in decision-making and the quality of decentralized evaluations.

**Stronger indicators in the Integrated Results and Resources Framework for 2022-2025**

1. In the second annual session of 2021, the Executive Board adopted the Strategic Plan for 2022-2025, accompanied by the Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF). Building upon lessons learned in the previous strategic plan, UNDP introduced stronger and more robust indicators to monitor organizational evaluation performance as part of the UNDP pursuit towards organizational effectiveness. IRRF indicator performance against annual milestones is reported in the annex of the Annual Report of the Administrator. Key indicators are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.1.1 | Quality of fully costed evaluation plan (part of the Programme Quality Index). |
| 3.2.1 | Percentage of decentralized evaluations quality assessed which are highly satisfactory or satisfactory. |
| 3.2.2 | The implementation rate of actions in evaluation management responses. |
| 7.1.1 | Percentage of impact, thematic, programme, outcome, and portfolio evaluations out of total evaluation. |

1. UNDP actions on strengthening decentralized evaluation for 2022-2025 are presented in the report “Roadmap for strengthening decentralized evaluations in UNDP” to the Executive Board. An excerpt from that report is presented in Annex III.
2. **INVESTMENT IN EVALUATION**

1. In 2021, UNDP evaluation expenditure was $16.4 million US dollars whereas IEO evaluation expenditure was $11.4 million. The share of UNDP programme expenditure (core and non-core) for evaluation was 0.58 per cent (0.57 per cent in 2020), representing a gap of the one per cent prescribed in the 2019 UNDP Evaluation Policy.
2. As guided by the revised Evaluation Policy, UNDP financial investment in the evaluation was $27.8 million US dollars in 2021 (vs. 25.7 million in 2020). UNDP allocation to the IEO increased from $11.2 million US dollars in 2020 to $12 million in 2021, reflecting 0.24 per cent of UNDP programmatic expenditure in 2021.
3. UNDP country offices spent $14.27 million US dollars on evaluation in 2021, which included evaluation implementation ($9.04 million), staff ($5.16 million), and additional evaluation-related costs ($0.07 million). Headquarters and regional bureaux expenditures for implementing, supporting, and overseeing evaluation amounted to $2.13 million US dollars, including evaluation ($0.8 million) and staff costs ($1.32 million), and additional evaluation expenditures ($0.015 million).
4. **CONCLUSION AND THE WAY FORWARD**
5. As UNDP aspires to shift its culture from project-driven to more holistic longer-term portfolio approaches, UNDP continues to value the IEO commitment to adopting a systems approach to evaluation, strengthening both decentralized and independent evaluation functions, and adhering closely to United Nations values.
6. While several positive trends were noted in the Annual Report on Evaluation 2021, such as the steady improvement of the implementation and quality of decentralized evaluations, several challenges remained. As summarized in this report, UNDP took several decisive actions to enhance UNDP evaluation performance, including the institutionalization of the quarterly evaluation review of KPIs by senior management and the development of bureaux-specific strategies to enhance decentralized evaluations.
7. At the first regular session of 2022, the Executive Board requested UNDP management and IEO develop “*a plan to improve the independence, reliability, and quality of decentralized evaluations and to present it to the Executive Board at its annual session 2022*.”[[7]](#footnote-8) As such, UNDP and IEO are pleased to present the “*Roadmap for strengthening decentralized evaluations in UNDP”* to the Executive Board in the annual session of 2022.
8. Evaluation will continue to be an area where critical lessons inform UNDP decisions and choices to improve programme quality and results around the world. UNDP looks forward to further strengthening its partnership with IEO in implementing planned actions articulated in the roadmap with the aim to reinforce management accountability and responsibilities for improved evaluation planning, implementation, and decision making.

**ADDENDUM – I**

**THEMATIC EVALUATIONS (2020-2021)**

**USE OF THEMATIC EVALUATION IN THE NEW SP FORMULATION IN 2022-2025**

This section summarizes lessons UNDP learned from the six evaluations conducted in 2020 and 2021, and the management actions reflected in the formulation of the Strategic Plan 2022-2025 that informed UNDP decision-making and programming.

**Evaluation on UNDP development support services to middle income countries (MICs)**

Completed in 2020

The evaluation assessed UNDP contributions to national development results in MICs, considering the diversity of development conditions. One of the key evaluation findings was the organization had not established differentiated approaches to programming strategies for MICs. UNDP acknowledges heterogeneity among middle-income countries and other indicators beyond income might provide a more accurate categorization of national development challenges. The evaluation emphasized inequality, vulnerability, and exclusion as key priorities in MIC programming.

In response to the evaluation, UNDP developed a multidimensional vulnerability index (MVI) to account for long-term structural vulnerabilities, as well as recent weaknesses uncovered by the COVID-19 pandemic. In Offer 2.0 to address the COVID-19 pandemic, three shifting trends were identified, which underpinned UNDP development support to MICs in the Strategic Plan 2022-2025: 1) shifting social expectations and trust indicating a deeper move towards rule of law, human rights, and right-based offers, 2) shifting towards accelerated energy transitions and nature-based solutions, and 3) tackling debt overhang and fiscal stress post-COVID-19, including protecting the poorest and most vulnerable groups, expanding social assistance and insurance systems, and supporting micro, small and medium-sized enterprises.

**Evaluation of UNDP support for Climate change adaptation (CCA)**

Completed in 2021

The evaluation of UNDP support for Climate Change Adaptation took stock of UNDP achievements and performance in helping partner countries adapt to new climate conditions created by global warming. The evaluation looked across the UNDP climate change adaptation offer but gives special attention to support for countries especially vulnerable to climate shocks.

In response to the evaluation, UNDP made climate-risk screening an essential part of the updated Social and Environmental Standards. In the new strategic plan, the UNDP adaptation portfolio was consolidated under its specific CCA offer, which evolved to support transformative, high-impact, at-scale programming in countries and by communities to reduce fragmentation across climate change adaptation programmes. UNDP strengthened partnerships across the United Nations development system (UNDS) and with international financial institutions (IFIs) to advance adaptation action. Efforts are ongoing to explore regional and programmatic approaches to adaptation with a strong emphasis on integrated approaches for delivering on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

To expand support to small island developing states (SIDS), UNDP is supporting the design and implementation of five adaptation projects by mobilizing public and private sector finance in the new Strategic Plan 2022-2025. These include climate action, blue economies, and promoting digital transformation.

Given the criticality of private sector engagement and scaling up private finance, UNDP developed a structured approach in the CCA Private Sector Strategy for engaging the private sector in climate change adaptation that is informed, in part, by a new framework focused on de-risking private sector investments in the adaptation space.

**Evaluation of UNDP support to Conflict-affected Countries**

Completed in 2021

The evaluation of support to conflict-affected countries assessed the UNDP role and contributions in 34 conflict-affected countries in the key areas of crisis prevention, response, peacebuilding, and state-building for transitions to medium- to long-term development.

In response to the evaluation, several new policies and programmatic offers were designed with a view to strengthening UNDP work in conflict-affected countries, including the new Crisis Offer and updated Standard Operating Procedures for UNDP assistance to, and work in, crisis settings. In addition, UNDP operational response systems are being enhanced and expanded to ensure that the organization is “fit-for-fragility.” New cadres of experienced crisis professionals are being identified, trained, nurtured, and included in the Global Policy Network, UNDP SURGE, and the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus Academy.

UNDP also strengthened gender considerations in crisis contexts through the new Gender and Crisis Facility launched in 2021. Further actions that took place included greater deployment of gender-related technical and programmatic capacities on the ground in crisis-affected countries, the allocation of 15 per cent targets of TRAC3 core resources for gender-dedicated programme activities, and developing a specific Gender Seal certification track for county offices in crisis settings.

To further prioritize private sector engagement, investment, and development in fragile and conflict-affected contexts, UNDP created a private sector development framework including tools and guidance on inclusive market development, financing, and risk management to support bureaux and country offices.

**Evaluation of UNDP support to the Syrian refugee crisis response and promoting an integrated resilience approach**

Completed in 2021

The evaluation of UNDP support to the Syrian crisis response, and promoting an integrated resilience approach, assessed the extent to which the humanitarian-development nexus and resilience-based development approaches have underpinned the Syrian refugee response framework, as well as other UNDP refugee responses and corporate frameworks. The evaluation confirmed the 3RP model is the first of its kind in combining humanitarian support and resilience-based development to address the needs of refugees, host communities and national governments

Acknowledging the need for a corporate strategy for engagement in protracted crises, UNDP is developing a framework on crisis and fragility, building on lessons learned from its early recovery and resilience offering and based on renewed integrated development solutions informed by country context and demand. To play a catalytic role in enabling private sector solutions to promote the resilience of both host communities and refugees, stakeholders in Iraq, Turkey, and Jordan, in the context of the 3RP, have implemented livelihood programmes in partnership with the private sector to increase the employability of vulnerable populations.

UNDP will continue investing in methods and instruments to ensure gender analysis is at the center of its policy, advocacy, and programming work in forced displacement situations throughout the strategic plan period. Building on the organizational gender and recovery toolkit, UNDP is scaling up transformation in priority sectoral areas through gender-responsive prevention, peacebuilding, rule of law, local governance, and digital livelihood offers.

**Evaluation of the UNDP Strategic Plan, 2018-2021**

Completed in 2021

The Evaluation of UNDP Strategic Plan, 2018-2021, assessed whether the Strategic Plan ​offered a coherent vision, purpose, and sense of mission for the organization​. It was recognized across the organization as a guide for action to help countries meet their development needs - especially pertaining to the SDGs - and contributed to improved development results within the three broad development settings identified in the Strategic Plan​.

In the new strategic plan for 2022-2025, UNDP made deliberate efforts to maximize the development impact of all signature solutions with the aim of supporting countries on the path towards the Sustainable Development Goals and making breakthroughs across the 2030 Agenda. In response to evaluation recommendations, UNDP is taking concrete steps to shift from a project-driven approach toward fundraising and advocacy for implementing at the portfolio level, as well as supporting efforts to attract better-quality funding that is less projectized and transactional, and supports systemic change.

To meet increasing demands driven by changes in context brought by the COVID-19 pandemic, UNDP is expanding its support to partner countries in the Strategic Plan, 2022-2025 and this includes in areas of development financing, strategic innovation and digital transformation (enablers), and creating opportunities to deliver more responsive and effective services to citizens. As part of these efforts, UNDP implemented its first Data Strategy, drawing on the UNSG Data Strategy to establish foundations across governance, people, technology, and partnerships. In addition, through the creation of the Strategic Innovation Unit and pivot in approach of the Innovation Facility, UNDP will continue to explore a transformational method of innovating through “deep demonstrations.”

Following evaluation recommendations, UNDP works towards integrating gender equality and women’s empowerment as a development accelerator. UNDP country offices and regional hubs will prioritize investments for strengthening government capacities to formulate and implement public policies that deliver for all. The ongoing Gender Equality Seal 2021-2023 has seen the enrollment of 83 country offices. UNDP will use the new Gender and Crisis Engagement Facility to tailor its responses in crisis contexts, with transformational approaches that increase women’s leadership, economic empowerment, and access to justice.

Acknowledging the evaluation recommendation to strengthen results-based management and systems, UNDP is holistically redesigning results planning, monitoring, and reporting systems (the corporate planning system) to link results at all levels in support of the implementation of the Strategic Plan 2022-2025, streamlining the new enterprise resource planning system with existing platforms. This architecture will enhance capabilities for results planning, performance monitoring, sharing lessons, improving results at all levels, and increasing transparency.

**Evaluation of the GEF Small Grants Programme**

Completed in 2021

The Small Grants Programme (SGP), a flagship corporate programme of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) implemented by UNDP, was evaluated jointly by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office and UNDP Independent Evaluation Office. The purpose of the joint evaluation was to provide the UNDP Executive Board and GEF Council with evaluative evidence of SGP relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability while examining whether any changes are required to improve efficacy.

As per evaluation recommendations, the GEF Secretariat, UNDP, and SGP Central Programme Management Team developed a draft concept note for a long-term visioning exercise for SGP with a focus on growth, synergies, and scaling up. Based on GEF Secretariat suggestions, the consultation process is now envisioned to be a longer-term exercise that will take place during GEF-8 (2022-2026), with consultations initiated mid-2022. The draft concept note proposes strategic directions of the SGP be in alignment with GEF-8 programming directions and the UNDP Strategic Plan, 2022–2025.

Several steps have been implemented towards ensuring sustainability of the SGP and its Country Programmes. The SGP is continuing to expand its CSO-government-private sector dialogue platform - systematically investing in the capacity development of local civil society stakeholders; directly engaging socially marginalized groups in all stages of the grant cycle to enable community ownership and enhance inclusion; promote stronger linkages with relevant national policies and programmes, as well as scale-up larger donor- and government-led programmes and projects.

To support business-oriented approaches in country programmes and projects, SGP is developing a private sector guidance note as part of its resource mobilization and partnership strategy (2020-2024). This will assist in enhancing private sector engagement and adoption of relevant business models, including support to small and medium-scale enterprises and in the exploration of different financing scales and modalities through the SGP Country Programmes.

**ADDENDUM – II**

**INDEPENDENT COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATIONS**

**CASE REVIEWS: USE OF ICPES IN CPD FORMULATION 2021-2022**

This section presents five case reviews, covering all five regions, to showcase how ICPE recommendations have been incorporated in the new CPD formulation in 2021 and 2022.

**Guinea Bissau**

The Guinea Bissau CPD for 2022-2026 was approved at the first regular session of 2022. Its design was informed by the ICPE 2019 and covered the country programme evaluation for the period of 2016-2020. The evaluation identified several areas for improvement and presented recommendations for UNDP consideration. According to the ICPE, UNDP should invest more strategically in inclusive growth, employment creation, and sustainable livelihoods programmes to respond to the most critical needs of the population alongside breaking internal silos, creating a collaborative workspace and expanding partnerships. In the CPD for 2022-2026, UNDP merged environmental conservation and economic growth into a single outcome that shifts the focus onto green and blue economic growth, and puts a new lens on sustainable livelihoods. To address recommendations on adaptive management approaches in fragile contexts, UNDP contributed to the conflict analysis and Common Country Analysis that informed the UNSDCF theory of change and CPD, and resulted in a specific outcome that takes into account peacebuilding priorities identified during the transition. To promote a coherent and integrated programme approach, thematic clusters are more connected through cross-cutting working groups on gender, digital transformation, and resilience. The newly established Accelerator Lab, and innovation connector group that links acceleration throughout office programmes, makes use of a systemic approach to innovation and digital transformation, allowing for a shift in institutional culture. Furthermore, the evaluation found that UNDP lacked a systemic approach to human rights, youth, and gender mainstreaming. Based on these findings, UNDP plans to support peacebuilding priorities and merge them into its support to inclusive political processes. UNDP also included new initiatives that support the private sector, wealth creation, and improving the quality of businesses implemented by micro, small, and medium enterprises with a clear focus on start-ups and digital solutions. Youth and women are at the heart of the new CPD as they are agents of change that will be empowered through UNDP programming and partnerships. New partners from foundations, private sector, and Member States are already collaborating with the country office as a result of these new programmatic approaches.

**Vietnam**

The Vietnam ICPE 2021 covers the programme period of 2017 to 2020. The Vietnam CPD for 2022-2026 was approved at the first regular session of 2022. Some evidence showed the new CPD was informed by ICPE findings and recommendations, five were offered for new programming theory of change, M&E system, capacity building, sustainability, and ensuring a leading role in governance. Onboarding ICPE recommendations, the theory of change was formulated for the new CPD through a programme sense-making exercise to better define and develop links between different solution pathways. To strengthen the M&E system, the new CPD reflected improvements across roles, capacities, and mechanisms to advance project monitoring and evaluation throughout the programme cycle (sections III and IV). Output level indicators in the CPD were formulated to measure behavior change, improvement in community livelihoods, quality of life, and transformative changes on gender equality and social inclusion according to disaggregated data. Output 3.4 was specifically dedicated to gender and inclusion. Capacity building is integrated into the CPD 2022-2026, which will guide the formulation and implementation of all UNDP projects and interventions. In the new CPD, governance and access to justice are standalone and strong-focus outcomes. The theory of change for the governance and justice outcome was elaborated and validated according to the national government’s Socio-economic Development Strategy with key policy resolutions emerging as national strategies priorities: IR.4.0, digital transformation and anti-corruption.

**Tunisia**

Tunisia’s CPD 2021-2025, informed by ICPE 2018, was approved in the first regular session of the Executive Board in 2021. The CPD represents a good model of using evaluations to enhance new programming and shows how UNDP extensive efforts in applying lessons from past experiences is a net benefit. The ICPE highlighted four recommendationsconsidered in the formulation of the current country programme: (1) pursuing greater adaptive planning and management approaches; (2) strategic review to identify a differentiated and strategic niche in job creation; (3) partnerships with civil society at the strategic level, and (4) engagement in strategic partnerships with other actors.

The current CPD adopts a systemic approach that prioritizes the development and consolidation of new aptitudes internally and among partners to respond to complexities and uncertainties, and promote greener, more inclusive and strategic choices that accelerate and widen the impact of development, “leaving no one behind.” The new CPD was guided by many innovative adaptive approaches and studies, including a “signal mapping” exercise to identify “new normal” baselines, a study of tendencies and perceptions on social media, and a “Speculative Design”methodology by young people. UNDP Tunisia developed a portfolio of project documents that allows greater integration and flexibility to adapt to the changing context in the country. Iterative M&E mechanisms were devised to document achievements and guide implementation, whereas informative evaluations are the central modality for analyzing multidimensional challenges and the COVID-19 “new normal.”

While integrating the ICPE recommendations, UNDP also identified a differentiated and strategic niche in the area of job creation by developing an entrepreneurship project to support the Government of Tunisia implementing a national strategy on entrepreneurship. The strategy will generate greater impact on job creation through the integration of new technologies and innovative approaches as vectors to a more adapted, innovative, and open environment to entrepreneurship. For the strategic expansion of partnership with civil society, large sector NGOs were identified and involved in the design and implementation of new projects, on community policing, human rights and access to justice, and youth involvement. To continue increasing engaging in joint UN interventions, UNDP designed, as part of the current CPD, three joint projects with UN Women, UN Habitat, FAO, and UNICEF, and submitted two new joint proposals with UN Women and WHO. UNDP continues to support the UNCT in the implementation of an aid coordination platform in the currentprogramme cycle. UNDP Tunisia diversified its donor base through the application of the resource mobilization strategy for programmes, leveraging the SDGs, Prevention of Violent Extremism (PVE), and environment concerns. Moreover, UNDP Tunisia dedicated special attention to knowledge and data generation, development of decision-making tools, and inputs to national policy dialogue on socio-economic issues, such as dialogues with World Bank experts and others to generate proposals and inputs to policies on inequalities and excluded issues.

**Georgia**

Informed by ICPE findings and recommendations, the Georgia CPD for 2021-2025 was approved at the first regular session in 2021. Out of six recommendations, one was to align the new CPD with SDG commitments focusing on human rights, gender equality, rural-urban disparities, and youth. Acknowledging evaluation recommendations, the new CPD was developed with a focus on “leaving no one behind” and boosting country efforts to achieve the SDGs. The CPD builds on MAPS findings to address issues identified as core to the country’s SDG agenda. In the new country program, UNDP plans to work with partners and donors to deepen and broaden engagement in human rights and gender equality, with a focus on the care economy, unlocking the potential of Georgia’s rural areas and its young people, and building a greener economy and society.

Another  recommendation emphasized UNDP develop issue-based theories of change against which expected results can reveal opportunities for synergies across projects and activities implemented by UNDP, as well as donors operating in specific areas. Accordingly, the theory of change was elaborated for the CPD 2021-2025 in line with national challenges and priorities, capturing possible strategies for addressing development challenges in complementarity with other local development partners. Regarding UNDP support for the implementation of the decentralization strategy, the new CPD emphasized local economic development to enhance socioeconomic benefits for rural and vulnerable populations. UNDP plans to put efforts to enhance cross-portfolio synergies among similar projects in the regions and support to civil society in rural areas. To address the recommendation to strengthen its monitoring and evaluation practices by establishing outcome-level indicators that reflect behavioral change, UNDP will pilot initiatives across all the portfolios in the programme cycle 2021-2025 and also track their success. Moreover, UNDP collaborated with other UN agencies and the donor community on adopting a resource mobilization strategy/plan for 2021-2025 that prioritizes coordination and maximizes complementariness in a bid to minimizing over-reliance on EU funding.

**Peru**

The new CPD 2022-2026 for Peru was presented and approved in the first regular session of 2022. Supported by the ICPE conducted in 2021, which evaluated the country programme for 2017–2021, the evaluation identified 20 findings, six conclusions, and four recommendations. The new CPD incorporated all four recommendations, the first being developing a theory of change for the CPD 2022-2026 that built on the momentum and gains made during the previous programme cycle. The theory covers portfolio integration and additional cross-sector and cross-portfolio interventions where UNDP has strategic positioning and comparative advantages. Secondly, given that digitalization is one of three enablers laid out in the UNDP 2022-2025 Strategic Plan—and digital disruption is one of the Beyond Recovery COVID-19 response main lines of action—the country office is mainstreaming its abilities and reach towards digitalization, including with the government. The third adopted recommendation is prioritizing youth and women, as well as indigenous populations, informal workers, and refugee and migrant communities. The theory of change considered the specific needs of women and youth, integrated solutions for both, and several output indicators include youth and women as a disaggregate categories to ensure impact can be measured. The 2022-2026 CPD design also included the final recommendation, which was the development of a robust Partnerships and Communications Strategy that will strengthen the UNDP position as a system leader focused on catalyzing collective transformation, includes a tailored value proposition and emphasizes multiple dimensions of UNDP added value versus other organizations.

**ADDENDUM – III**

**DECENTRALIZED EVALUATIONS**

**EXCERPTS FROM REPORT: ROADMAP FOR STRENGTHENING DECENTRALIZED EVALUATION**

**Strengthening Decentralised Evaluations, 2022 to 2025**

To further strengthen and improve the quality of the decentralized evaluations and improve the management and oversight as well as the culture of evaluation across the organisation, the UNDP Executive Office, BPPS, Regional Bureaus and IEO collaborated in 2021 to develop a roadmap. Approved in November 2021, the roadmap (2022-2025) includes implementation and oversight enhancement for decentralized evaluations to improve their independence, quality and use for management decision making.

**Pillar 1: Implementation, Independence and Quality**

1. **Bureau-level Decentralized Evaluation Strengthening Strategy (Regional Bureaux and BPPS/Crisis Bureau) 2022-2025:** In support of UNDP's commitment to strengthening decentralized evaluations, all programme and policy bureaus (Regional Bureaux and BPPS/Crisis Bureau) have developed bureau-specific strategies for implementation startingin January 2022. The strategies contain commitments from the bureaus to strengthen management accountability and strategic actions to improve the coverage, quality, and use of decentralized evaluations in decision making. The strategies are being operationalized through the annual work plans of each bureau and tracked on a quarterly basis by senior management.
2. **Strengthening UNDP programming tools related to evaluation (BPPS) 2021-2025:** In 2022-2025, UNDP will enhance the use of programming tools to ensure that lessons from past evaluations are used for programme and project design, and programmes and projects produce evaluable evidence.
3. **Enhanced quality assurance and completion of evaluation plans (BPPS**) **2021-2025**:UNDP has strengthened the mechanisms to review the quality, robustness, and coverage of evaluation plans as part of the quality assurance (QA) process for new country programme documents (CPDs) through the programme appraisal committee (PAC) reviews. The quality of evaluation plans is included as part of the Programme Quality Index in the Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF) for 2022-2025 and will be closely monitored in the next four years.
4. **Evaluation Express Roster (BPPS) 2021- 2023:**In 2022, a new call for applicants to the roster will be carried out. The aim is to strengthen the evaluator pool for coverage across the six signature solutions and three enablers; improve geographic and language coverage, including French, Portuguese and Arabic; improve the on-boarding of consultants once they are recruited; and better track good quality evaluators.
5. **Evaluation Training (RBx and IEO) 2022-2025:** A needs assessment survey of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) focal points by IEO and Regional Bureaus will be conducted in 2022 to identify areas for targeted training and support. The training listed below are currently ongoing and are to be conducted in 2022-2025.

* Evaluation Certified M&E focal points
* Regional Bureau training
* Short, targeted training
* IPDET
* Other trainings

1. **Quarterly Quality Assessment process (IEO**) **2022-2025:** Starting from 2022, the IEO will undertake quality assessments of decentralized evaluations on a quarterly basis to ensure timely input to country offices.
2. **Evaluator and Commissioner Dispute resolution process (IEO and Programme units) 2022:** Rolled out as part of the evaluation guidelines, the evaluator and commissioner dispute resolution process provide clear channels for evaluators to both report wrongdoing in programmes and projects.
3. **IEO Regional Focal Points (IEO and Regional Bureaus) 2021-2025:** IEO regional focal points will continue to work with Regional Bureaus to provide technical support to decentralized evaluations including support in training of M&E focal points, clarification of guidance and evaluation approaches and planning for evaluation.
4. **Additional Evaluation Guidance (IEO) 2022-2023:** Number of areas where additional evaluation guidance may be needed have been identified: Portfolio approach and complex evaluation guidance; Inclusion of the Social and Environmental standards in evaluations; Evaluating Innovation; Impact Evaluations
5. **Key programme/project evaluations implementation (IEO) 2022:** The IEO will review the portfolio to ensure that mandatory benchmarks for evaluations are being met and will recommend additional mandatory benchmarks as needed.

**Pillar 2: Accountability and Use**

1. **Evaluation Scorecard and Key Performance Indicators (BPPS) 2021 - 2025:** Evaluation Scorecard provides UNDP managers and staff with real-time data of critical evaluation performance to enable on-time tracking and oversight with Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). These KPIs are related to decentralized evaluation coverage, quality, accountability, use, and evaluation capacity.
2. **Quarterly monitoring and senior management review of decentralized evaluation performance (UNDP, 2022-2025):** Leveraging the Evaluation Scorecard, performance is being closely monitored, analysed, and disseminated quarterly to support the identification of critical areas that allow regional bureaux to take timely management actions. In November 2021, the OPG decided that senior management will quarterly review the KPIs on decentralized evaluation and the status of implementation of bureau-specific decentralized evaluation plans.
3. **New IRRF Tier 3 indicators on evaluation performance for the strategic plan (BPPS) 2022-2025:** Building on the lessons UNDP learned from the 2018-2021 Strategic Plan period, stronger indicators to monitor UNDP’s evaluation performance were introduced in the IRRF for 2022-2025. These indicators will provide evidence-based performance information covering: (1) Quality of evaluation plan (2) Percentage of highly satisfactory or satisfactory decentralized evaluations (3) Implementation rate of actions (4) Percentage of strategic evaluations.
4. **Bureau Director and Country Office Resident Representative Compact/Annual Performance and inclusion of evaluation KPIs (ExO, RBx, BPPS, Crisis Bureau) 2022-2025:** Each Regional Strategy for Strengthening Decentralization Evaluation will be incorporated into the 2022 Integrated Work Plans. In addition, KPIs will be included in the 2022 performance compact of bureau directors and country office senior management.
5. **Further enhancement to the Evaluation Resource Centre (IEO) 2022-2023**: The process of distilling important lessons from UNDP evaluations in the ERC has been enhanced using artificial intelligence tools, through the AIDA (Artificial Intelligence for Development Analytics) platform which enables users to scan across all 5,000 evaluations and extract lessons for use in programme and project design and implementation.
6. **Evaluation Use (IEO and BPPS) 2022-2025:** IEO will conduct periodic examinations on the impact and use of evaluations and in the extent to which they are informing management decision making as well as new programme and project design. Further guidance and required actions will be developed as needed based on the outcome of these examinations.
7. **Evaluation Awards (IEO, ongoing since 2021):** To promote the recognition and the use of high-quality decentralized evaluations, IEO launched the Evaluation Excellence Awards in 2021, which grant recognition to decentralized evaluations in three categories: outstanding evaluation; innovative evaluation; and gender-responsive evaluation.

**ADDENDUM – IV**

**EVALUATIONS FACTS AND FIGURES**

**Table 1: Availability of 2021 ICPEs for CPDs to be approved in 2022**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Countries with ICPEs completed in 2021** | **Executive Board Session 2022 for approval of new CPDs** | **ICPE final report posted in ERC** |
| RBA | 1. Cape Verde |  | Not posted |
| 1. Central African Republic | 2nd Regular Session 2022 | **Not posted \*** |
| 1. Chad |  | Posted |
| 1. Ghana | 2nd Regular Session 2022 | Posted |
| 1. Guinea |  | Not posted |
| 1. Kenya | Annual session 2022 | **Not posted \*** |
| 1. Nigeria | 2nd Regular Session 2022 | Posted |
| 1. South Sudan | 2nd Regular Session 2022 | **Not posted \*** |
| RBAS | 1. Egypt |  | Not posted |
| RBAP | 1. India | 2nd Regular Session 2022 | **Not posted \*** |
| 1. Nepal |  | Not posted |
| 1. Pacific MCO |  | Not posted |
| RBEC | 1. Moldova | 2nd Regular Session 2022 | Posted |
| 1. Ukraine | 2nd Regular Session 2022 | **Not posted \*** |
| RBLAC | 1. Bolivia |  | Not posted |
| 1. Brazil |  | Posted |
| 1. Ecuador |  | Posted |
| 1. Honduras | 1st Regular Session 2022 (Approved) | Posted |
| 1. Peru | 1st Regular Session 2022 (Approved) | Posted |
| **Total** | | **10 new CPDs (with 2021 ICPEs) for approval in 2022** | **Only 8 out of 19 ICPEs are posted by March 2022** |
| **Note**: \* 10 out of 19 ICPE countries are submitting new CPDs for approval in 2022. Out of those ICPE countries, 5 countries ICPEs aren’t posted in ERC. | | | |

**Table 2: Coverage of ICPEs/ICPRs to new CPDs submitted to the Board 2017-2022**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **CPDs submitted to the Executive board** | **CPDs covered by ICPE/ICPRs** | **Coverage (%)** | **New CPD Countries without ICPEs/ICPRs** |
| **2017** | 19 | 3 | 16% |  |
| **2018** | 35 | 13 | 37% |  |
| **2019** | 17 | 17 | 100% |  |
| **2020** | 20 | 18 | 90% | South Africa, Congo (DRC) |
| **2021** | 23 | 20 | 87% | Albania, Laos\*, Eritrea\* |
| **2022** | **44** | **29** | **66%** | Gambia, Guyana, Iran, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco\*, Niger, Pakistan, Sao Tome and Principe, Sudan, Suriname\*, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago |
| **Total** | **158** | **100** | **63%** |  |
| **Note:** (1) In 2020, IEO conducted 5 Independent Country programme reviews (ICPRs). (2) \* = In 2021 & 2022, IEO provided technical/ financial support for country programme evaluations led by country offices. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3a: Use of different cut-off dates for calculating**  **Decentralized Evaluations Completion rate, 2017 to 2021**  (Source: ARE report) | | | |
| **Year** | **Planned evaluations**  (Cut off dates used by IEO for ARE) | **Completed evaluations** | **Completion rate** |
| **2017** | 562 (October 1, 2017) | 315 | **56%** |
| **2018** | 504 (July 16, 2018) | 283 | **56%** |
| **2019** | 531 (February 1, 2019) | 290 | **55%** |
| **2020** | 504 (February 1, 2020) | 249 | **49%** |
| **2021** | 559 (August 1, 2021) | 352 | **63%** |
| Note: Cutoff dates for calculating the number of planned evaluations in a year   * 2017 - **End** of the year (October) * 2018 – **Middle** of the year (July) * 2019 and 2020 – **Beginning** of the year (February) * 2021 – **Middle** of the year (August) A total of 559 is the highest recorded planned evaluation for 2021 | | | |

**Table 3b: 2021 Evaluation completion rates using different cutoff dates**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Completed evaluation in 2021**  (31 Jan 2022) | **Cutoff dates for planned evaluations in 2021** | | | | | |
| **Beginning of the year**  (March 1, 2021) | | **Mid-year**  (1 August 2021) | | **End of the year**  (November 18, 2021) | |
| **Planned** | **% Completed** | **Planned** | **% Completed** | **Planned** | **% Completed** |
| RBA | 89 | 116 | 77% | 150 | 59% | 149 | 60% |
| RBAP | 98 | 125 | 78% | 125 | 78% | 120 | 82% |
| RBAS | 31 | 72 | 43% | 67 | 46% | 57 | 54% |
| RBEC | 64 | 58 | 110% | 100 | 64% | 86 | 74% |
| RBLAC | 57 | 92 | 62% | 92 | 62% | 88 | 65% |
| Global | 13 | 26 | 50% | 25 | 52% | 22 | 59% |
| **Total** | **352** | **489** | **72%** | **559** | **63%** | **522** | **67%** |
| Note:   * January 31, 2022: This is the cutoff date for accounting total number of completed evaluations in 2021 * March 1, 2021: Beginning of year when COs completed IWP/Annual evaluation plan for 2021 * **August 1, 2021: The cutoff date used by IEO with the highest number of evaluations recorded in ERC** * November 18, 2021: OPG meeting – senior management review | | | | | | | |

Note: If 2019 and 2020 been used as cutoff dates for calculating completed evaluations, overall performance on this indicator would have been 72 per cent instead of 62 per cent in 2021.

1. Text in *italics* have been extracted from the 2021 Annual Report on Evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. RBA (Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Nigeria, and South Sudan); RBAS (Egypt); RBAP (India, Nepal, Pacific Multi-Country Office); RBEC (Moldova, Ukraine); RBLAC (Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. RBA(Chad); RBLAC (Brazil, Honduras). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. New CPDs (15 out of 45) submitted or going to be submitted to the Executive Board 2022 without ICPE/ICPRs are Gambia, Guyana, Iran, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Pakistan, Sao Tome and Principe, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. [Information note](https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/Information%20note_Road%20map%20to%20strengthening%20DE.docx) dated 22 April 2022. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. DP/2021/19 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. 2022/3 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)