

**Management commentaries to the 2017 Annual Report on Evaluation and its addendum ‘Status of implementation of the independent Evaluation Office recommendations”**

**Background**

The commentaries submitted herewith provide a UNDP management perspective on the results presented in the 2017 Annual Report on Evaluation [DP/2018/12], and its addendum “Status of implementation of the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) recommendations” [DP/2018/12/addendum.1]. The commentaries also include a brief analysis of decentralized evaluations conducted in 2017, a performance analysis of the evaluation function as well as an update on the implementation status of management responses to independent evaluations.

The evaluations conducted by the IEO and UNDP programme units, and their related management responses, as well as the status updates on implementation of commitments made in those responses, are available through the [Evaluation Resource Centre](http://erc.undp.org/index.html;jsessionid=2825BA456DA1408C7BC53F6267CDC59E) database (ERC).

**UNDP Evaluation Policy**

UNDP is committed to strengthen the quality of the evaluation function by implementing the Evaluation Policy and the Decentralized Evaluation Strategy, and through close collaboration with the IEO undertake capacity development efforts of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) staff, and revise processes, guidance and systems. Following the adoption of the new [Evaluation Policy](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/2016/Evaluation_policy_EN_2016.pdf) by the Executive Board in September 2016, the evaluation function now enjoys a more stable regulatory environment, which allows UNDP to live up to its commitment of utilizing evaluations in its promotion of evidence-based programming, strategic decision-making, learning and to ensure better use of resources.

1. **Follow up on evaluation recommendations and management responses**

**A. Independent evaluations**

Between 2012 and 2017, the IEO conducted a total of 64 evaluations[[1]](#footnote-1), out of which 91% had a management response. The six evaluations without management responses in ERC were all Assessments of Development Results (ADRs).Out of the key actions planned, 61% have been completed, 27% are initiated or ongoing without a due date, 9% overdue, 1% have not yet been initiated and 2% are no longer applicable. These figures are updated based on ERC data as of 31st of January 2018 and include evaluations completed in 2017. The percentage of actions that are considered ‘on track’ for 2017 in terms of implementation was 91%, compared with 82% in 2014[[2]](#footnote-2). This improvement stems from increased, strategic and targeted efforts made by UNDP to strengthen the evaluation function during the last couple of years, including capacity building and the revision of prescriptive content and guidance.

UNDP welcomes the proposed efforts by the IEO to enhance the management response tracking and reporting system. UNDP remains committed to continue working with the Office to ensure a more effective ERC, which will enable the organization to strengthen its overview, implementation and results reporting on evaluation related management responses. UNDP will continue to work together with the IEO to put in place clear guidance, and effective structures and processes to monitor and report on evaluation plan and management response implementation, while at the same time looking at ways of how to strengthen oversight and reporting internally.

The implementation status of management responses to independent evaluations is briefly summarized in section 8. The full details of all evaluations and the related management responses are available in the ERC.

**B. Decentralized evaluations**

In 2017, UNDP saw a continued high compliance with the management response requirement at country, regional and central level with 93% of all evaluations conducted in 2017 having a management response[[3]](#footnote-3). The percentage of completed and ongoing actions have furthermore improved over the last four years. In 2017, 27% of the planned key actions had been completed while 60% were ongoing. The percentage of overdue actions remained in 2017 at 12%, representing a considerable decrease compared to 29% in 2014. The total percentage of completed or ongoing actions was in 2017 88%[[4]](#footnote-4), which indicates an increase compared with 78% in 2014[[5]](#footnote-5).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation of management responses to decentralized evaluations** | | | | | | | | | |
| **STATUS OF KEY ACTIONS** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Year** | **No. of Key Actions** | **Sum of completed** | **%** | **Sum of ongoing** | **%** | **Sum of no longer applicable** | **%** | **Sum of overdue** | **%** |
| **2014** | **1,379** | **305** | 22% | **456** | 33% | **16** | 1% | **403** | 29% |
| **2015** | **1,805** | **379** | 21% | **901** | 50% | **18** | 1% | **271** | 15% |
| **2016** | **2,065** | **514** | 25% | **1,111** | 54% | **32** | 2% | **248** | 12% |
| **2017**[[6]](#footnote-6) | **2,397** | **653** | 27% | **1,431** | 60% | **25** | 1% | **290** | 12% |

**2. Focus on the quality of decentralized evaluations**

The Annual Report on Evaluation, 2017 notes that a total of 74% of the assessed decentralized evaluations were of satisfactory or partially satisfactory quality. The scope of the quality assessment process was in 2017 expanded to include UNDAF evaluations, otherwise no other adjustments were made to the tool. UNDP notes that the percentage of evaluations rated as satisfactory or higher declined from 2016, and reiterates its commitment of continuing efforts to strengthen the quality and utility of decentralized evaluations. Management wishes however to highlight that reporting through the Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF) for the Strategic Plan 2014-2017 period shows an increase in the percentage of decentralized evaluations that have been rated satisfactory or partially satisfactory from 52% in 2014 to 74% in 2017.

The IEO notes that a more detailed analysis of the findings of the decentralized evaluation quality assessment will be undertaken in 2018. UNDP welcomes such analysis as it will provide the organization with valuable information and help UNDP identify capacity gaps and recurrent issues with evaluability of projects. UNDP would encourage an alignment between the IEO criteria and the UNDP programme and project quality assurance system, for the organization to realize the full potential of the investment being made in quality programming and results.

The Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) continued in 2017 with a dedicated section on evaluation utility, providing Country Offices and Regional and Central Bureaus with the possibility to reflect on evaluation recommendations and their relevance for future programming. Per the data reported, out of the 1,982 recommendations provided by independent evaluators to project and outcome evaluations, 39% were viewed as supported by an evidential basis, credible and practical, action-oriented, and with potential to be used in decision making (compared to 40% of the recommendations in 2016 and 33% in 2014-2015). 38% of the recommendations were viewed as supported by an evidential basis and credible, but as not relevant, specific and/ or action-oriented for subsequent follow up (compared to 38% in 2016 and 35% in 2014-2015). In conclusion, 77% of the recommendations were considered useful or moderately useful. Country Offices primarily found evaluation recommendations to be useful for achieving prioritized and more focused programming, scaling-up projects/programmes to areas of UNDPs’ comparative advantage, and strengthening results-based management (RBM) and partnership arrangements. Recommendations were less useful for understanding and responding to potential or realized social and environmental impacts, grievances and risks, strengthening gender responsiveness and/or human rights based programming and decision making, and to mobilize resources.

**3. Evaluation capacities of Country Offices**

In 2017, 80% of Country Offices met the prescriptive benchmarks for M&E capacities in UNDP, totaling 167 full time equivalents (FTE). Of these, 49.57 (29.68%) of FTE time has been dedicated solely to the evaluation function. The 80% indicates a steady increase when comparing to 2016 (73%), 2015 (54%) and

2014 (46%). The FTE time spent on decentralized evaluation has also increased compared to 2016 when out of the 137 FTEs, 38.36 (17.5%) had been spent on decentralized evaluation only.

**4. Decentralized evaluation support**

UNDP continued in 2017 to further strengthen evaluation capacities at country, regional and headquarter level through training and development of quality assurance and support systems for decentralized evaluation, in line with the Decentralized Evaluation Strategy and the Action Plan[[7]](#footnote-7). In 2016 and 2017, UNDP and the IEO conducted six regional level workshops[[8]](#footnote-8), which reached 126 M&E Country Office focal points from 121 Country Offices and covered topics such as the Evaluation Policy, evaluation planning and budgeting, the status of quality of decentralized evaluations, use of the ERC and evidenced-based programming. UNDP and the IEO will in 2018 utilize the lessons learned and inputs provided through the workshops to revise guidance and plan capacity building initiatives. UNDP proposes that an updated joint 2018 workplan be developed to guide these efforts going forward.

UNDP entered into a partnership with United Nations Volunteers (UNV) in the end of 2016 with the aim to establish a viable evaluation-related quality assurance function at the regional level. To date an Evaluation Specialist Volunteer has been deployed to the Arab States region during 2017. Recognizing that the quality of decentralized evaluations is influenced by the quality of programmes and projects, UNDP also enhanced in 2017 the Quality Assurance System adopted in 2016, which sets corporate benchmarks for evaluations. In addition, UNDP commenced in 2017 to revise the Programme and Project Management section within the UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP), which includes guidance related to decentralized evaluations and Country Programme Document (CPD) evaluation plans. UNDP also provided inputs to the IEO-led processes of revising the ERC and decentralized evaluation related guidelines and templates.

**5. Efforts made by Country Offices to strengthen M&E capacities**

In 2017, 42 (31%) Country Offices recruited short term external support to provide evaluation expertise, 22 (16%) Country Offices recruited new UNDP specialized staff to provide evaluation expertise, 44 (33%) Country Offices strengthened the role of evaluation staff, 45 (33%) Country Offices provided training for CO staff on conducting or managing high quality decentralized evaluations, 49 (36%) Country Offices provided training for project staff or national counterparts on conducting or managing high quality decentralized evaluations, and 45 (33%) Country Offices increased budget for decentralized evaluation for key projects. In addition, 84 (62%) enhanced quality assurance processes for monitoring and reporting data and 92 (68%) supported national partners to strengthen national systems and capacities for collection and analysis of data.

**6. Financial benchmarks and 2017 expenditures**

The Evaluation Policy has strengthened the evaluation foundation by including a financial benchmark. UNDP is committed to adhering to this benchmark[[9]](#footnote-9), and has in the UNDP Integrated Resources Plan and Integrated Budget Estimates for 2018-2021 allocated 0.2% of the estimated combined programmatic resources (regular and other) for the functions of the IEO. This increases the estimated allocation by $7m compared to 2014-2017. According to [DP/2017/39 table 1] UNDP allocated 0.2% of its programmatic resources to the IEO between 2014-2017.

The total amount spent by Country Offices, Regional and Central Bureaus on M&E combined in 2017was $58,76m (or 1.31% of the total programmatic expenditures of $4.5b). This represents an increase compared to 2016 when the total M&E expenditure amount was $42m (or 1.06% of the total programme expenditures in UNDP, amounting to $3.95b).

In 2017, all regions met the COSI benchmarks by spending a minimum of 1% of their annual development expenditures on M&E (compared with 2016 when only four out of five regions met the COSI benchmarks). In terms of Country offices, 59% spent 1% or more of their 2017 budget on activities related to M&E, compared to 57% in 2016. Analysis made of the percentage of time spent on monitoring vs. evaluation among UNDP staff show the close interlinkage between the functions. While UNDP appreciates that the Evaluation Policy's financial threshold intends to fund better quality and more useful evaluations, UNDP agrees with the IEO that guidance on financial and human resources allocations need to be further clarified, and that the Evaluation and Monitoring Policies[[10]](#footnote-10) ought to be aligned.

**7. Other Evaluation Activities**

***Independent Country Programme Evaluations***

UNDP welcomes the transition from ADRs to Independent Country Programme Evaluation (ICPE), which will be carried out to inform all new CPDs as per request by the Executive Board [DP/2015/8]. Management considers that these evaluations will greatly benefit the programming of the organization. To maximize utility of the ICPEs, planning and methodology should be consulted with Regional Bureaus and BPPS and timed to feed into the development of new CPDs, while ensuring close coordination with UNDAF outcome evaluations at the country level.

ADRs were in 2017 completed[[11]](#footnote-11) in Mexico, Equatorial Guinea, Pakistan, Kyrgyzstan, Cameroon and Jordan. In addition, IEO commenced in 2017 to conduct ICPEs in Bhutan, Chile, Republic of the Congo, Kuwait, Namibia, the Republic of the Philippines, Rwanda and Togo, as noted in the Annual Report on Evaluation. These eight ICPEs are required to accompany the CPDs tabled for the Executive Board in 2018, and UNDP looks forward to their timely completion.

***Independent Evaluation Office support, collaboration and overview***

UNDP management appreciates the information provided in the Annual Report on Evaluation on the strengthened collaboration with, and support provided by, the Evaluation Advisory Panel, and the Office’s continued prominent role within the United Nations Evaluation Group.

**8. Status of implementation of management response commitments for independent evaluations (2014 to 2017)**

**Thematic Evaluations**

*Status of Management Response commitments for thematic evaluations completed in 2017*

The **Joint Assessment of the Institutional Effectiveness of UNDP** included 6 recommendations, to which UNDP committed to implement 17 key actions. 9 (53%) have already been completed, 7 are ongoing and one is no longer considered applicable. The CPD guidance has been updated to provide clear guidance on how to reflect UNDP’s comparative advantage based on evidence, and the preliminary project appraisal of CPDs now includes a review of the completeness and internal logic of the Theory of Change. A policy review of the programming standards was conducted in 2017, following the completion of the first year of project quality assurance roll-out. The results of this review were released in November 2017. In response to the policy review of the programming standards, the parameters of quality programming are currently being revised. This is expected to be concluded in Q1 2018. Coherent RBM training modules were developed in 2017 and delivered through a series of trainings delivered with for example Regional Bureaus, and JPOs. The People Search function is ready to be introduced to staff in Q2 2018, pending further definition of the policy function of the organization. The past year has seen a 30% growth in users on UNDP’s social networking platform (Yammer).

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

The **Evaluation of the UNDP Strategic Plan and Global and Regional Programmes** provided critical guidance to UNDP in the selection of its future priorities and business model and processes, and in the development of the Strategic Plan 2018-21. In response to the 16 recommendations, UNDP committed to implement 29 key actions, out of which 3 (10%) have been completed, 21 are ongoing and 5 have not yet been initiated. One result achieved thus far is that the global programme has been converted into a service line to support staff positions at global and regional levels.

*Status of Management Response commitments for thematic evaluations completed in 2016*

The **Evaluation of UNDP support to disability-inclusive development** had 16 recommendations, to which UNDP committed to implement 31 key actions. 5 (16%) have been completed, 21 are ongoing and 4 have not yet been initiated.UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021 identifies persons with disabilities as a critical target group in its multi-sectoral integrated poverty eradication efforts, as well as the inclusion of civil society representing persons with disability to implement the 2030 Agenda and in mechanisms for peaceful resolution of conflict and advancing social cohesion. UNDP has developed internal tools on how to align employment and livelihoods improvement with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. During 2017 a policy document was developed entitled “Ensuring the Participation of People with Intellectual and/or Psychosocial Disabilities in Political and Public Life’. By December 2017 and annually thereafter the Human Impact assessment guidelines will include a section on assessing impacts of people living with disabilities. The UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards will be updated in 2018 to ensure greater alignment with the evolving UN common approach to social and environmental safeguards and that disability inclusion is addressed. The first draft guidance note on reasonable accommodation has been prepared in the context of the new talent programme for persons with disabilities and will be piloted as part of the programme in 2018. A review of HR polices has furthermore been completed by the National Organization on Disability, which UNDP partnered with to advance inclusion of persons with disabilities.

The **Evaluation of UNDP contribution to anti-corruption and addressing drivers of corruption** providedUNDP with 7 recommendations, to which UNDP committed to implement 15 key actions. 4 (27%) have been completed, while the other 11 are ongoing.Anti-corruption is included in the Strategic Plan 2018-21 and anti-corruption targets have been integrated into the SP IRRF and the results frameworks of the regional programmes. Anti-corruption has also been integrated into the MAPS approach, and UNDP together with other UN partners aim to integrate anti-corruption into national plans and development processes through UNDAFs and other country-level UN programmes and projects. Within the context of UNDP work on the SDG indicators (particularly for goal 16), the guide for measuring corruption for SDGs 16.5.1 and 16.5.2 have been finalized together with UNODC. Seven country level projects linked to anti-corruption and governance integrity diagnostics and measurement are supported by the global Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies (ACPIS) programme.

*Status of Management Response commitments for thematic evaluations completed in 2015*

The **Evaluation of the Role of UNDP in Supporting National Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals** provided a comprehensive and forward-looking assessment of UNDP’s role in supporting the achievement of the MDGs. It stated that “UNDP is well positioned to approach the post-2015 era and help countries to achieve the sustainable development goals. The evaluation provided UNDP with 5 recommendations that UNDP responded to by identifying 15 key actions, which all had been completed as of mid-March 2017.

The **Evaluation of the contribution of the Global and Regional Human Development Reports to Public Policy Processes** had 8 recommendations to which UNDP responded with 17 key actions. 15 (or 88%) have been completed or are ongoing without a due date and four are ongoing, as of mid-March 2018. Analytical papers on topics such as capability approaches, linkages between inequalities and human development, horizontal inequality and human development in a globalized world, and in-house research on barriers to universal human development and analytical linkages between human development and the 2030 Agenda/the SDGs have contributed to rethinking the concept of human development within UNDP. Prof. Stephan Klasen, a leading thinker on human development measurements, has produced a final review paper taking a historical perspective which contributed to the ongoing HDRO work on refining various human development measures. In order to revisit the purpose of human development indices and examine the value added, substantial discussions were held with the Statistical Advisory Panel, meetings took place with leading thinkers, and bilateral meetings were pursued on statistical issues during the UN Statistical Commission meeting with heads of National Statistical Offices from Cuba, Nigeria, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan and Senegal. With the active guidance and advice from Nobel laureate Prof. Amartya Sen, Prof. Sudhir Anand has completed a final paper on ‘Recasting Human Development Measures’, which critically evaluates all human development composite indices and suggests alternative methodologies. The paper has been shared with leading thinkers on human development measurements for their feedbacks and comments. In March 2018, there will be a high-level expert group meeting to have a debate on various suggestions and decide on the refinements.

In response to the 5 recommendations of the **Evaluation of the UNDP Contribution to Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment**, UNDP committed to implement 19 key actions out of which 13 (or 68%) have been completed, and six are ongoing. Two publications were launched in 2015 to support the integration of gender in energy and environment programming (Gender Responsive National Communications Toolkit and Gender Mainstreaming in Mitigation and Technology Development and Transfer Interventions produced in partnership with UNEP). The Social and Environmental screening procedures include gender equality as a key principal, gender analysis is now a requirement in the project QA process and the gender marker rating is included in the project document template. The gender marker guidance note has been revised to include specific instructions on how to improve gender marker accuracy. Discussions are ongoing with OAI regarding how to develop gender-responsive auditing. Gender equality and women's empowerment have been integrated in the new Strategic Plan (2018-2021), and the Gender Strategy will be presented to the Executive Board in September 2018. During the Strategic Plan 2014-2017 period, UNDP enhanced the ability of UNDP Country Offices to contribute to national gender equality goals through the UNDP Gender Equality Seal. This is an innovative corporate certification process which provides Country Offices with a practical roadmap to reduce gender gaps in the workplace, enhance staff capacity, strengthen programme planning and evaluation, foster partnerships and stimulate innovation. The Seal accelerates organisational change to improve gender equality results. During 2014-2017, 46 Country Offices were certified in recognition of their significant progress on gender mainstreaming in a range of performance areas aligned to the UN SWAP, including gender parity and eradication of sexual harassment.

The **Evaluation of the UNDP contribution to Mine Action** provided UNDP with 3 recommendations, to which UNDP committed to implement 15 key actions. As of mid-March 2018, 4 actions (or 26%) have been completed, while 11 are ongoing. The UN Policy on Victim Assistance in Mine Action was finalized in 2016 through collaboration with the Inter-Agency Coordination Group on Mine Action, and in June the same year UNDP produced an Issue Brief on “Development and Mine Action Policy and Programming”. The Directorate of Mine Action (DMA) knowledge platform now includes an online community of practice of 115 members sharing experiences, lessons learned, innovations and best practices on gender and diversity in mine action. Gender is also included in exchanges on socio, economic and environmental impact assessments of mine action within the framework of the SDGs. Institutional capacity assessments were conducted in Lebanon, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Zimbabwe, South Sudan, Turkey and Ukraine in 2017, which led to re-focused strategies and/or plans. In 2017 support was also provided to the Country Offices of Azerbaijan, Armenia, BiH, Lebanon, Turkey, Ukraine and Zimbabwe on linking mine action to local development challenges. A webinar on Mine Action for Sustainable Development brought together BPPS and CO colleagues in the first of a series, which will be further developed in 2018. UNDP entered into a partnership with the Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining on producing a study on the link between mine action and SDG implementation.

The **Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme by GEF/UNDP** included four recommendations, to which UNDP committed to implement four actions. Three of these (75%) have been completed while one is ongoing. Progress is being made towards developing a more practical monitoring function adapted to the needs, resources and community focus of the SGP. In FY 2017, SGP recruited a Results Management, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist to advise and strengthen the function at global, country and project levels. Focus onstrengthening SGP’s monitoring and evaluation is a key priority for SGP- using both monitoring and evaluation methodologies, a system that supports measurement of environmental impact, and provides evidence-based thought leadership and results-based management is envisioned. Building on the recommendations of Joint GEF-UNDP Evaluation, efforts are being made to improve existing M&E, design more streamlined and useful M&E tools and activities that balance the need to measure with the need to provide support to local communities in tackling environmental issues. For OP6, the Country Programme Strategy process included wide consultations with country stakeholders, including CSOs, NSC members, government, UNDP and other donors and partners- with the aim of identifying SGP’s priority areas of intervention, in alignment with national priorities and relevant programmes. A total of 104 strategies were approved and are under implementation by mid-2017. The Global SGP Steering Committee convened twice during the reporting year providing strategic guidance to the programme and are held in conjunction with GEF Council meetings.

**Other independent evaluations**

**The Review of the UNDP Evaluation Policy** (*completed in 2014*)provided a comprehensive review of the UNDP evaluation function, and offered guidance on how to improve the Evaluation Policy going forward. UNDP addressed the 5 recommendations by committing to implement 11 key actions, out of which 9 (or 81%) have been completed and two are ongoing as of mid-March 2018. UNDP and the IEO are implementing the Evaluation Policy and the joint Action Plan. Six UNDP-IEO M&E workshops were carried out in 2016 and 2017. The workshops were highly appreciated and requests for additional training on evaluation planning and budgeting, as well as new guidance have been made. The UNV-UNDP partnership in the Arab States region was successfully implemented and resulted in a lesson learned report which will be circulated within UNDP and with the IEO. UNDP has provided inputs to the revision process of the ERC (to enable better oversight, reporting and follow-up of management responses and lessons learned), and evaluation related guidance. Both processes are expected to be finalized in 2018.

**Assessments of Development Results 2017**

*Status of Management Response commitments for ADRs completed in 2017[[12]](#footnote-12) Mexico, the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, Pakistan, Kyrgyzstan, Cameroon, Jordan,*

UNDP management is pleased to note that the assessments confirmed that UNDP’s interventions have been relevant and aligned with national development priorities, and that UNDP has been considered a longstanding, trusted, credible and responsive partner. UNDP’s long-term, close relationship with many Governments has provided the organization with unique access to work in sensitive regions, resources to address specific government needs through government cost-sharing agreements and opportunities to lead and champion important national-level development topics. Out of the committed actions: Kyrgyzstan has completed 10/13 (77%) and Cameroon 3/23 (13%). None of the planned actions in Mexico (34), Pakistan (5) or Jordan (5) have been completed. The Republic of Equatorial Guinea does not have a management response to their ADR as of mid-March 2018.

Details of how each Country Office has responded to the ADR recommendations can be found in their respective management responses, which are made public through the ERC.

1. Including ADRs, Global Programme evaluation, five Regional Programme evaluations, the Review of the Evaluation Policy and thematic evaluations. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. According to IRRF reporting the corresponding percentage in 2015 was 83.50% and 96% 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The corresponding figure was in 2016 98% and 86% in 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Completed and ongoing actions divided by total planned actions minus no longer applicable actions. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. According to IRRF reporting the corresponding percentage in 2015 was 85.20% and 88% in 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The figures are based on ERC data as of January 31st, 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. “Action Plan for implementing provisions of the new Evaluation Policy”, presented to the Board in Jan 2017 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Arab States in November 2016, Asia Pacific in May 2017, two workshops in Africa in June/ July 2017, Latin America and the Caribbean in September 2017, and Europe and CIS in October 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Para 26 of the Evaluation Policy notes “At the overall organizational level, UNDP *will aim* at allocating 1% of combined programmatic (core and non-core) resources to the evaluation function, with no less than 0.2% reserved for the work of the IEO, subject to availability of resources” [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The UNDP Monitoring Policy (effective as of February 2016) notes under ‘Resources for Monitoring’ that “a minimum of 1% of annual development expenditures by region must be spent on monitoring and evaluation’. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Based on publication date of the ADR reports [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Based on publication date of the ADR reports. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)