**Evaluation Audit Trail Template**

*(To be completed by Project Management to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the evaluation report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the evaluation report.)*

**To the comments received on (31 *July 2023*) from the evaluation of the “Strengthening Crisis Management Capacities of Malian National Police, Gendarmerie and National Guard during Elections” Project**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author**  | **#**  | **Para No./ comment location**  | **Comment/Feedback on the draft evaluation report**  | **Evaluator response and actions taken**  |
| PTP  | 1 | Executive Summary  | Under efficiency, par.1, note that the deadline of 30 June 2023 refers to UNITAR reporting to the donor, not IP reporting. All IP reports were submitted as per the deadlines included in the grant out documents. |  Noted and adjusted. Reference to additional financial reports from EMPABB was removed for clarity and it was added that the report missing concerns the UNITAR-donor report |
| PTP  | 2 | Executive Summary | Under efficiency, par. 4, program notes that the challenges encountered in verifying expenditures and comparing budget utilization were not communicated. | Noted and adjusted. The challenge included not being able to review the final financial report from UNITAR.  |
|  PTP | 3 |  Executive Summary | Under early signs of impact, program would appreciate guidance from PRMU / evaluator on the integration of quality indicators to measure trainees performance. |  PPME would be happy to meet and discuss. Kindly suggest a date and time.  |
|  PTP | 4 |  Executive Summary | Under recommendations, program notes that recommendations summarized here only partially match with those at the end of the report. |  Noted and harmonized. |
|  PTP | 5 |  Executive Summary | Recommendation 5 is beyond UNITAR and/or IP responsibility and control. |  Noted and recommendation adjusted. |
|  PTP | 6 |  Executive Summary | Recommendation 6 is already addressed by the new reporting format adopted by UNITAR as part of the revisions to grant out policy. |  Noted and removed.  |
|  PTP | 7 | Pg. 5 par. 16 | Program considers reference to the composition of MINUSMA deployed forces not relevant in this context as the project addressed Malian Security Forces. |  Noted and adjusted. Reference to MINUSMA was removed. |
|  PTP | 8 | Pg. 5 par. 18 | Program recommends avoiding the use of “deployed” forces in reference to MSF as this may be confusing. |   Noted and adjusted. Reference to “deployed” was removed.  |
| PTP  | 9 | Pg. 5 par. 19 | Program recommends integrating reference to security concerns related to the sharing of trainees contact information. |  Noted and added. |
| PTP | 10 | Pg. 6 par. 24 | See #1 |  Noted and adjusted.  |
| PTP | 11 | Pg. 7 par. 27 | Programs recommends ensuring consistency in the reference to IP, i.e. EMPABB and not EMP. | Noted and corrected. |
| PTP | 12 | Pg. 8 par. 31 | Program notes that the preliminary assessment wasn’t conducted virtually, but through field visit. Report from field visit was shared with the evaluator. | Noted and corrected. |
| PTP | 13 | Pg. 10 par. 39 | Program notes that the reference to the Wagner Group may be confusing as it relates to military activities not carried out by MSF. | Noted and adjusted.  |
| PTP | 14 | Pg. 12 to 14  | Program notes a confusion between the original log frame and the updated log frame, where part of the original activities were replaced, hence not implemented (for example, provision of equipment). | The evaluation took good note of the amended logframe, however, the amended project document still refers to equipment as a project deliverable.  |
| PTP | 15 | Pg. 14 par. 48 | Program notes a confusion between targets and actual number of participants trained. Refer to final log frame. | Noted and corrected. Logframe targets missing in amendment, however.  |
| PTP | 16 | Pg. 17 par. 57 | Program disagrees with the statement related to integration of disabled participants. Security forces have very specific exclusion criteria related to persons with disabilities related to the specific nature of the operations. | Noted. Perspective from Project Management added.  |
| PTP | 17 | Pg. 18 par. 60 | See #14 as well as evaluator own observation under paragraph 64. | Noted. See response to #14. |
| PTP | 18 | Pg. 20 par. 65 | Program underlines that reporting in CFA is a UNITAR requirement as per grant out policy. In addition, reporting from IP was based on the updated log frame that was submitted to the donor. | Noted and adjusted.  |
| PTP | 19 | Pg. 22 par. 71 | Program would appreciate guidance from PRMU / evaluator on the reformulation of outcomes and indicators. | PPME would be happy to meet and discuss. Kindly suggest a date and time. |
| PTP | 20 | Pg. 28 | Recommendation 1 is not implementable due to the closure of the project and withdraw of international support to the transitional government. Same applies to recommendations 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 | noted and recommendations adjusted for future projects.  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |