

# Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework

Revised April 2017

---

Annex I, AC/UNITAR/2017.08

---

03 April 2017

Geneva, Switzerland





# Contents

<b><u>Introduction</u></b>	<b>5</b>
Definitions	6
Complementary and Interdependent Roles	6
<b><u>Monitoring</u></b>	<b>6</b>
Logical Framework Requirements	7
Monitoring Criteria	7
Risk Management	7
<b><u>Evaluation</u></b>	<b>7</b>
Purposes	7
Guiding Norms and Standards	8
Criteria	8
Categories of Evaluation	8
Evaluation Requirements	11
Discretionary Evaluations	11
Evaluation Planning, Costing and Management	12
<b><u>Reporting</u></b>	<b>13</b>
<b><u>Dissemination and Disclosure</u></b>	<b>15</b>
<b><u>Evaluation Capacity Development</u></b>	<b>15</b>
<b><u>Knowledge Management and Organizational Learning</u></b>	<b>15</b>
<b><u>Roles and Responsibilities</u></b>	<b>15</b>
Executive Director	15
Planning, Performance and Results Section	16
Programme Management	16

---

<b>Coverage and Scope</b>	<b>17</b>
---------------------------	-----------

<b>Review</b>	<b>17</b>
---------------	-----------

<b>Annex 1 – Glossary of Terms</b>	<b>18</b>
------------------------------------	-----------

## Introduction

1. The United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) was established with the purpose of enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving the major objectives of the Organization. Since its inception in 1965, UNITAR has grown to become not only a respected service provider of professional, executive training, but also a trusted partner in the broader realm of developing organizational and institutional capacities, with its activities closely aligned to its Statute, guidance from the Board of Trustees, and the outcomes of United Nations instruments and conferences.
2. UNITAR works in diverse fields, including strengthening multilateralism, promoting economic development and social inclusion, advancing environmental sustainability, promoting peace, increasing resilience and humanitarian action, and supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The Institute complements its diverse training and capacity development work with research on knowledge systems, including research on learning approaches, methods and tools and their application to different learning settings.
3. As a training and research organization, the Institute naturally places much emphasis on delivering learning-related products and services, on transferring knowledge, imparting skills and raising awareness with the aim to bring about changes in behaviour, to enhance on-the-job performance and to develop other capacities of its beneficiaries, with a view to achieving or contributing to the achievement of higher order, longer-term objectives. Parallel to learning, the Institute also engages in programming aimed at achieving broader social and economic development outcomes, such as developing institutional capacities of learning centres, strengthening public participation in decision-making and improving relief coordination in the wake of humanitarian emergencies and natural disasters.
4. The projects which seek to produce these results are highly diverse and range from the organization of short-term, small scale, stand-alone learning events to long-term, large-scale technical capacity development projects, many of which are implemented with partners and involve activities linked to multiple outputs and outcomes. The means of delivery are equally diverse and include face-to-face, technology-enhanced and blended forms of training, networking and knowledge sharing and analysis.
5. In the past, the Institute's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) practices have focused for the most part on the activity level of programming and have tended to reflect process- (as opposed to outcome-) based approaches. This has been largely due to the lack of an overarching result-based M&E policy framework as well as limited institutional capacities, resources, guidance and tools on which to draw.
6. As part of its strategic reforms, the Institute designed an integrated RBM framework, linking strategic planning, results-based budgeting, and annual and individual work planning to monitoring and evaluation, and programme and staff performance reporting. In 2009, UNITAR established a corporate M&E function to take the lead in the development and implementation of a Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework, which was promulgated in 2012. The Institute also identified strengthening accountabilities, effectiveness and efficiencies in delivering results as one of the key priority areas of its 2010-2012 Strategic Plan.
7. The present revision to the M&E Policy Framework reflects the results of an internal assessment on the framework's application, consultations with the UNITAR Board of Trustees on strengthening the independent evaluation function, the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for

Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals and the revised Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

## Definitions

8. The Institute defines **monitoring** as the routine process of collecting and recording data and information in order to track progress towards expected results. **Evaluation** is defined as “an assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy topic, sector, operational area or institutional performance. It analyses the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results, chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.”<sup>1</sup> The intention of evaluation is to provide credible and useful information, in view of determining the worth or significance of the undertaking, incorporating lessons learned into decision-making and enhancing the overall quality of the Institute’s programming and operations.
9. Functions similar to evaluation include appraisal (an assessment of the potential value of an undertaking during the conception phase), audit (an assessment of management controls and compliance with administrative rules, regulations and policies), investigation (an examination or enquiry into irregularities or wrong doing) and review (a rapid assessment of the performance of a topic or undertaking in absence of evaluation criteria e.g. usually operational issues). The definitions of other terms used in this policy framework are found in Annex 1.

## Complementary and Interdependent Roles

10. While monitoring and evaluation are distinct functions, UNITAR recognizes their complementary and interdependent roles. Findings from prospective evaluation (or similar processes such as appraisal or baseline studies), for example, are useful in defining indicators for monitoring purposes. Moreover, results from monitoring progress towards results can help identify important evaluation questions. It is primarily for these reasons that M&E are integrated into the present policy framework.

## Monitoring

11. The Institute has introduced various tools to monitor progress towards results from the corporate to the individual levels. These tools include medium-term strategic frameworks, results-based programme budgets, work planning and project logical frameworks.
  - a. **Medium-term strategic frameworks:** At the corporate level, medium-term plans shall be prepared every four years providing direction in areas of strategic priority.
  - b. **Results-based budgets:** Results-based programme budgets are prepared on a biennial basis outlining objectives and expected results. Institute divisions are required to monitor and report progress on achieving pre-defined performance indicators.
  - c. **Annual work plans:** Institute divisions are required to prepare and monitor annual work plans based on the approved budget.
  - d. **Individual work plans:** All regular staff members and remunerated training and research fellows are required to prepare and monitor individual work plans.

<sup>1</sup> United Nations Evaluation Group Norms and Standards (2016), <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

## Logical Framework Requirements

12. The Institute recognizes the usefulness of logical frameworks or other results formulations/presentations as a tool to manage for results. Project documents or proposals should include logical frameworks or other appropriate formulations/presentations of results and specify major activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts.<sup>2</sup> Performance indicators and means of verification should be specified for output and outcome level results; for projects or other undertakings in which an impact evaluation is to be performed, indicators of achievement and means of verification should also be specified for intended impacts.
13. Performance indicators should include baseline and target measures for expected results. In the event baseline information may not be available in the design phase or at the submission time of a project document or proposal, managers should plan to obtain baseline or other relevant information within a reasonable period from project start-up (e.g. inception workshop) to ensure evaluability of results. When projects or undertakings are to be implemented jointly, logical frameworks should be discussed and agreed with respective partners.

## Monitoring Criteria

14. For effective results-based monitoring and to ensure evaluability, indicators should be formulated using SMART criteria (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound):
- Specific:** The indicator is sufficiently clear as to what is being measured and specific enough to measure progress towards a result.
  - Measurable:** The indicator is a reliable measure and is objectively verifiable. Qualitative measures should ideally be translated into some numeric form.
  - Attainable:** The indicator can be realistically met.
  - Relevant:** The indicator captures what is being measured (i.e. it is relevant to the activity/result).
  - Time-bound:** The indicator is expected to be achieved within a defined period.

## Risk Management

15. Risk management plans are to be developed and monitored for all projects budgeted at \$1.5 million and above. This requirement is discretionary (although recommended) for projects budgeted below the \$1.5 million threshold.

## Evaluation

### Purposes

16. Evaluation serves the following purposes:
- Organizational learning and quality improvement:** Perhaps more than other purposes, UNITAR views evaluation as an opportunity to learn how to do things better, more

<sup>2</sup> This requirement does not apply to (a) projects budgeted less than \$50,000; (b) projects related to the production of a guidance document or training package, or to rapid mapping and satellite imagery; (c) projects limited to the procurement of goods or services; (d) non-donor-funded activities, such as fee-based courses; (e) high-level knowledge-sharing or other projects which, for political reasons, may not make evaluation feasible; and (f) non-earmarked donor contributions to programmes. The particularities of some projects may require additional exceptions to be approved by the Planning, Performance and Results Section.

effectively, with greater relevance, with more efficient utilization of resources and with greater and more sustaining impact. The results of evaluations need to contribute to knowledge management and serve as the basis for enhancing the quality of its products and services.

- b. **Accountability:** As an organization receiving funds in the form of voluntary contributions from public and private donors, in addition to funds from fee-based training services, the Institute is answerable to its sources of funding for delivering results.
- c. **Improved decision-making:** Results from evaluations provide the basis for informed, responsible decisions. Such decisions may include, for example, scaling up, replicating or phasing out a programme, project or undertaking; adjusting learning objectives; redesigning content, changing methodologies, assessment activities or modes of delivery; etc.

## Guiding Norms and Standards

17. The international capacity development and evaluation communities have developed guiding principles and good-practice norms and standards to ensure that evaluations meet quality requirements. As a member of UNEG, UNITAR aspires to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation, although it recognizes that the extent to which its evaluation function is aligned with the norms and standards depends on various factors, including the size and scale of projects, funding and other considerations.<sup>3</sup>

## Criteria

18. The Institute adopts the five widely-recognized criteria for evaluation that have been recommended by the OECD Development Assistance Committee:
  - a. **Relevance:** The degree to which an undertaking responds to the needs and priorities of the targeted beneficiaries, a contextual situation to be addressed and donor priorities.
  - b. **Effectiveness:** The extent to which an undertaking has achieved its objectives.
  - c. **Efficiency:** The cost effectiveness of transferring inputs into outputs taking into consideration alternative approaches.
  - d. **Impact:** The cumulative and/or long-term effects of an undertaking or series of undertakings which may produce positive or negative, intended or unintended changes.
  - e. **Sustainability:** The likelihood that benefits derived from an undertaking will continue over time after its completion.
19. The Institute acknowledges that not all criteria may apply to all evaluations and that decisions on which criteria shall apply to a given undertaking should be based on the type of evaluation, the main evaluation questions and considerations related to methodology and feasibility.

## Categories of Evaluation

20. The Institute undertakes two broad categories of evaluations: corporate and decentralized evaluations. Corporate evaluations are independent assessments conducted and/or managed by the Institute's Planning, Performance and Results Section (PPRS). They may be undertaken at the Section's own discretion within its approved budget, or at the request of the Executive

<sup>3</sup> In accordance with the UN System-Wide Action Plan for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN SWAP) and the UNITAR Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women Policy, UNITAR assigns importance to gender equality and will strive to incorporate gender and human rights considerations in its evaluative undertakings. In addition, in accordance with the principle of reaching the furthest behind first, enshrined in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, UNITAR will also assign importance in its evaluative undertakings to countries in special situations, including the Least-Developed Countries, the Landlocked Developing Countries and the Small Island Developing States.



Director or the Institute's divisions.<sup>4</sup> Corporate evaluations may also include independent mid-term reviews of projects and independent peer reviews of decentralized evaluations for quality assurance purposes.

21. Decentralized evaluations are self-assessments conducted by the Institute's divisional entities. While not considered to be in-depth evaluations, they should contain some degree of evaluative thinking. For the most part, decentralized evaluations are undertaken at the project level, but they may conceivably include any subject under an entity's purview. While self-evaluation has similarities with the monitoring function and is often integrated into narrative reporting, the assessment exercise should seek to ask and respond to key evaluation questions and include critical analysis and reflection based on the data collected.
22. In addition to corporate and decentralized evaluations, external evaluations may also be undertaken by donors or other partners. External evaluations are managed entirely by entities outside the Institute, with the Planning, Performance and Results Section acting as the main institutional focal point.
23. Given the characteristics of the Institute and the sources of funding for much of its programming, most evaluations will likely take the form of decentralized, self-assessments. The Institute recognizes that decentralized self-assessments and corporate independent evaluations are complementary, and that the evaluation of some undertakings may include both approaches.
24. Corporate and decentralized evaluations may be undertaken individually (i.e. in the absence of any partners), jointly (with at least one other partner e.g. donors and/or implementing partners) and/or through participatory (i.e. involving stakeholders and/or beneficiaries) approaches.

Table 1 summarizes the categories and provides examples of evaluation that may be undertaken at the Institute.

<b>Table 1: Categories of evaluation</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Examples</b>
<b>Decentralized</b>	Self-assessments conducted by divisional entities	Project evaluations (baseline studies, formative evaluations, outcome evaluations)
<b>Corporate</b>	Independent evaluations or peer reviews undertaken or managed by the Planning, Performance and Results Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategic and policy evaluations</li> <li>- Meta evaluations</li> <li>- Thematic evaluations</li> <li>- Independent evaluation of programmes or projects</li> <li>- Reviews of decentralized, self-evaluations</li> </ul>
<b>External</b>	Independent evaluations led, funded and undertaken by donors or other partners	Cluster evaluation in which UNITAR programming is included as part of the evaluand

<sup>4</sup> Independent evaluation is conducted by entities free from control and undue influence of those responsible for the design and implementation of an undertaking.

## Timing of Evaluations

25. Evaluation may be performed at different times and address different elements of the results chain, from assessing needs or determining baseline conditions at project conception to evaluating the impacts of a project's contribution to development goals. Between these two points evaluation may include formative or other types of process-related assessments, evaluations of outputs, and/or summative evaluations focusing on different levels of outcomes.
26. Given the Institute's high number of learning-related services, it is useful to distinguish between intermediate outcomes (e.g. enhanced knowledge and skills of beneficiaries) and institutional outcomes (e.g. strengthened organizational capacities as the result of applied knowledge/skills, increased policy coherence or efficiency, etc.).

Table 2 summarizes different types of evaluations based on timing and the level of the results chain.

Table 2: Timing and types of evaluation in relation to levels of results				
Timing	Types	Levels of Results		Remarks/Sample Evaluation Questions
Before the undertaking (ex ante)	Appraisal; quality at entry; baseline study, needs assessment	n/a		Depending on the scope of the project, evaluation may vary from a thorough examination of the entire results chain logic to a (rapid) assessment of training needs and determining baseline data indicators.
During the undertaking (process)	Real-time, formative, mid-term evaluation	Inputs		E.g. To what extent are human, financial and material resources <u>adequate</u> ?
		Actions		E.g. How <u>relevant</u> is the course to learning needs of beneficiaries?
After the undertaking (ex post)	Summative evaluation	Outputs		E.g. How <u>relevant</u> and <u>effective</u> were the delivered products (action plan) or services (training)? How <u>efficient</u> were outputs produced?
		Outcomes	Intermediate (short-term)	The <u>first level effect</u> of products and services delivered, directly attributed to outputs. E.g. How much knowledge increased? Did skills improve? Was awareness raised?
			Institutional (medium-term)	<u>Subsequent effects</u> of products or services delivered? E.g. Was there retention and/or on-the-job application of knowledge/skills? Have organizational capacities increased? Are policy instruments more efficient?
		Impact		What is the <u>impact</u> of the outcomes? Were project goals met? How durable are the results over time?

## Evaluation Requirements

27. The following evaluations are required:

### Projects in which learning outcomes are sought

- a. Evaluation to obtain beneficiary reaction for all project training events of two days or more in duration.<sup>5</sup>
- b. Evaluation of learning outcomes (e.g. strengthened knowledge or skills) for all project training events of two days or more in duration.<sup>6</sup>
- c. Evaluation of institutional capacity outcomes (e.g. increased individual performance and/or organizational capacities resulting from the application of knowledge, skills, awareness) for all projects budgeted at \$300,000 or more.<sup>7</sup>

### Projects in which broader economic and social development results are sought

- d. Outcome evaluation for projects budgeted at \$500,000 or more.<sup>8</sup>

### Mandatory independent project evaluation

- e. All projects budgeted at \$1.5 million and above shall be subject to an independent evaluation.<sup>9</sup>

28. The requirements in paragraph 27 will be operationalized through a set of templates, guidance documents, checklists and other tools prepared or made available by the Planning, Performance and Results Section.

29. The Institute acknowledges that not all undertakings necessarily merit evaluation and some may not be feasible for political or other reasons. Exceptions to evaluation requirements under paragraph 26 include high-level political or special events/projects as defined in Annex 1, as well as projects to which donors have expressed opposition to evaluation.

30. The requirements and exceptions above shall not prejudice any evaluation requirements or preferences that a donor of a project or undertaking may have.

## Discretionary Evaluations

31. Apart from the requirements enumerated in paragraph 27, other evaluations may be desirable to provide information on a project or undertaking's implementation (e.g. formative evaluation, mid-term review, etc.) or contribution to higher-level achievements (e.g. impact evaluation, return on investment evaluation). Such evaluations are discretionary, unless specifically required by a donor. Given cost and methodological considerations, any decision to perform impact evaluation should be based on an evaluability assessment prior to project implementation.

<sup>5</sup> Equivalent to level 1 of the Kirkpatrick model. This requirement also applies to learning-related events delivered on a fee-paying basis.

<sup>6</sup> Equivalent to level 2 of the Kirkpatrick model. This requirement also applies to learning-related events delivered on a fee-paying basis.

<sup>7</sup> Equivalent to level 3 of the Kirkpatrick model. Budget values as recorded in letters or memoranda of agreement.

<sup>8</sup> Budget values as recorded in letters or memoranda of agreement.

<sup>9</sup> Budget values as recorded in letters or memoranda of agreement. Exceptions to this requirement include projects which are already subject to an independent evaluation e.g. Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded projects which are subject to independent evaluation by the GEF implementing agencies.

## Evaluation Planning, Costing and Management

### Evaluation Planning

32. All projects, activities and other undertakings should be conceived in a results-based manner to ensure evaluability, as outlined in paragraphs 11-13.
33. All donor-funded projects or other undertakings subject to evaluation should include a clause in the project document/proposal specifying evaluation requirements and relevant modalities. In the absence of such a document, the relevant letter or memorandum of agreement should specify monitoring and evaluation modalities.
34. For corporate evaluations, the Planning, Performance and Results Section shall formulate an annual evaluation work plan within the established budget appropriations.
35. For mandated independent project evaluations, terms of reference will be prepared using international standards and good practice, and include the following elements: the context and purpose of the evaluation, scope, main evaluation questions, methodology (data collection tools and analysis), work plan, learning products of the evaluation, intended use of results and qualifications.

### Evaluation Costing

36. The costs to carry out evaluation vary depending on the purpose/type/scope of the evaluation, evaluation questions to be addressed, data collection methods and other factors. Adequate resources should be identified and made available for both decentralized and corporate evaluations and be reflected in project budgets.
37. Mandatory independent project evaluations (paragraph 27e) should be costed at 2.5 per cent of the project's budget, unless otherwise determined by the Planning, Performance and Results Section in consultation with the relevant divisional entity, and be identified on a separate budget line. These costs are distinct from project monitoring and narrative reporting costs.

### Evaluation Management

38. In conducting evaluations, the Institute acknowledges that different evaluation designs as well as quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods for data collection and analysis exist. The most appropriate design(s), method(s) and approach should be selected, taking into consideration the evaluation question(s), scope, criteria, human and financial resource requirements and availability, as well as guiding principles and good practice standards.
39. All independent evaluations should include a peer review for quality assurance purposes prior to finalization.
40. All independent evaluations should include a response from management in relation to the evaluation's findings, conclusions, and recommendations and lessons-learned.
41. In managing mandatory independent project evaluations, the Planning, Performance and Results Section may access the expenditure account within the ledger account of the relevant project and raise obligations for expenditure.

42. In due consultation with the Executive Director and Management, the Planning, Performance and Results Section may issue and disclose final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions.

## Reporting

43. Results from the Institute's monitoring and evaluation exercises are to be recorded in the following formats: Programme Performance Reports, Results Summaries, Completion Reports, Independent Evaluation Reports, Corporate Evaluation Reports and Peer Reviews of Decentralized Evaluations. Other types of reporting formats, including inception reports, mid-term reviews, annual progress reports, final narrative or implementation reports, etc. may also be used if required or preferred by donors.

- a. **Programme Performance Reports** (PPRs) record programme performance based on expected accomplishments, indicators of achievement and performance measures, as recorded in results-based budgets. PPRs should be prepared by all Institute entities, including both operational and programming divisions and submitted to the Planning, Performance and Results Section by the end of the first quarter of the subsequent biennium.
- b. **Results Summaries** provide a narrative summary of the project, record results in relation to performance targets and integrate some degree of evaluative thinking. Results summaries are typically used for small scale projects budgeted at \$100,000 or less.
- c. **Completion Reports** provide a narrative summary of the project, record findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (if relevant) and integrate some degree of evaluative thinking based on self-assessments. Completion Reports should be prepared by all divisional entities if an evaluation is required.
- d. **Independent Evaluation Reports** are issued by the Planning, Performance and Results Section and record findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned from independent evaluations.
- e. **Corporate Evaluation Reports** (CERs) are issued by the Planning, Performance and Results Section at the end of each biennium based on a review and analysis of completed decentralized and corporate evaluations. The CER will highlight outcome-level results and summarize recommendations and lessons-learned, as well as provide an assessment of how evaluation processes have generated learning, quality improvement and enhanced decision-making.
- f. **Peer Reviews of Decentralized Evaluations** are independent reviews conducted by the Planning, Performance and Results Section of decentralized self-evaluations, primarily for quality assurance purposes.

Table 3 below summarized the different reporting formats and requirements.

<b>Table 3: Reporting tools and requirements</b>				
<b>Report Type</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Primary use</b>	<b>Requirements</b>	
			<b>Who</b>	<b>When</b>
<b>Programme Performance Report</b>	Records actual results measures as compared to targets as indicated in the results-based budget, and provides a general assessment statement, challenges and lessons (if relevant)	Accountability and learning	All divisional entities in the programme budget	A full report is issued by the end of the second quarter of the subsequent biennium; An interim report is issued during the second year of each biennium.
<b>Results Summaries</b>	A concise reporting template summarizing results at the output and outcome level for projects budgeted at \$100,000 or less.	Accountability	All divisional entities completing small scale projects	Periodically, within three months of project completion, unless if specified otherwise in the donor agreement
<b>Completion Reports</b>	A detailed project narrative report with evaluative thinking focusing on the attainment of results for medium to large scale projects.	Accountability and learning	All programmes and offices and other entities	Periodically, within three months of project completion, unless if specified otherwise in the donor agreement
<b>Independent Evaluation Reports</b>	Records findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned from independent evaluation undertakings.	Accountability and learning	PPRS	Periodically, in accordance with the terms of reference or work plan of independent evaluations
<b>Corporate Evaluation Report</b>	Provides a review of decentralized and corporate evaluations.	Learning	PPRS	By the end of the second quarter of the subsequent biennium
<b>Peer reviews of Self-Evaluation Reviews</b>	Provides independent review of self-evaluations.	Quality assurance and application of standards and guidelines	PPRS	Periodically

## Dissemination and Disclosure

44. Reports from corporate and external evaluations will be accessible in a public depository with a view to ensure transparency and facilitate knowledge management and application of lessons learned. Selected narrative reports from divisional entities which include a significant evaluation component and meeting quality standards will be included in the public repository.

## Evaluation Capacity Development

45. Evaluation is an important function in both national and international public service. The policy framework recognizes the importance of strengthening evaluation capacities within UNITAR for an enhanced decentralized evaluation function, and the Planning, Performance and Results Section and the Human Resources Section should collaborate towards this objective through training and other appropriate means.
46. As recognized by the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation and General Assembly resolution 60/237 of 14 December 2014, building national evaluation capacities at the country level is important for development activities, and the Planning, Performance and Results Section will contribute to such efforts upon request and in accordance with the principle of national ownership.

## Knowledge Management and Organizational Learning

47. The creation, storage, management, dissemination and uptake of knowledge is essential, including knowledge produced from evaluative undertakings. To promote evaluation use, organizational learning and quality improvement of the Institute's products and services, a learning forum will be organized periodically to share lessons learned on evaluation processes and outcomes.

## Roles and Responsibilities

48. The Institute has a shared system of roles and responsibilities in performing monitoring and evaluation functions.

### Executive Director

49. The Executive Director provides the overall direction, leadership and management of the Institute. The roles and responsibilities of the Executive Director are the following:
- a. Submits the Institute's results-based programme budget to the Board of Trustees for consideration and adoption;
  - b. Submits the Institute's Strategic Frameworks, Programme Performance Reports, Corporate Evaluation Reports, and other relevant reports to the Board of Trustees for consideration; and



- c. Requests the Planning, Performance and Results Section to undertake corporate evaluations.

## Planning, Performance and Results Section

50. Reporting directly to the Executive Director, the Planning, Performance and Results Section acts as the custodian of the monitoring and evaluation functions. The section's roles and responsibilities are the following:

- a. Oversees the application of the policy framework, identifies bottlenecks and constraints and makes recommendations for updating the requirements or other elements of the framework, in line with international good practice, lessons learned as well as the evolving programming and operational needs and characteristics of the Institute;
- b. Facilitates regular interaction in-house with managers and other staff, collects feedback and facilitates learning on the framework;
- c. Conducts research and engages in critical and analytical reflection as well as issues recommendations to management for compliance with the framework;
- d. Prepares and circulates guidelines, checklists, templates and other tools to facilitate the application of the framework;
- e. Develops and promotes standards for evaluation and quality assurance;
- f. In due consultation with the Executive Director and Management, formulates annual corporate evaluation plans within the established budgetary appropriations;
- g. In due consultation with the Executive Director and Management, issues and discloses final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions;
- h. Acts as focal point for any external evaluation being undertaken by a donor or other partner;
- i. Undertakes periodic peer reviews of decentralized evaluations for quality assurance purposes;
- j. Prepares a biennial Programme Performance Report based on submissions from programme management;
- k. Prepares a biennial Corporate Evaluation Report based on a review of completed corporate and decentralized evaluations;
- l. Maintains a public repository of evaluation reports with a view to ensuring transparency and facilitating the integration of lessons learned and best practices into the broader concept of knowledge management;
- m. Oversees the development and maintenance of an intranet-based knowledge management tool to store, manage and disseminate lessons-learned from evaluations and performance reporting exercises;
- n. Promotes knowledge management, organizational learning and lessons learned by keeping abreast of innovative practices in the field of evaluation and monitoring, identifying relevant techniques, tools and methods, and providing divisional units with guidance on the use of respective tools and methods;
- o. Commits to sharing best practices and lessons learned to enhance the quality of the Institute's products and services; and
- p. Collaborates and coordinates with UNITAR divisional entities and other United Nations agencies and organizations on issues related to monitoring and evaluation, and contributes to efforts to strengthen national evaluation capacities.

## Programme Management

51. Programme management is a generic term comprising the manager-level posts of all entities, including programmes, sections, offices and units. Programme management's roles and responsibilities are the following:



- a. Undertakes monitoring and evaluation functions in accordance with the present policy framework, including monitoring progress towards results, as well as planning and conducting decentralized, self-evaluations/assessments;
- b. Informs donors and implementing partners of the Institute's evaluation requirements when preparing and negotiating project agreements and modalities for cooperation, and ensures that monitoring and evaluation modalities are specified in project documents or related agreements;
- c. Budgets and allocates resources for evaluations in accordance with applicable evaluation requirements;
- d. Informs the Planning, Performance and Results Section of the scheduling of evaluations on a rolling basis;
- e. Submits copies of narrative results and/or reports of decentralized, self-evaluations to the Planning, Performance and Results Section upon completion;
- f. Follows-up on findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons-learned of independent evaluations in the form of a management response;
- g. Implements accepted evaluation recommendations and informs the Planning, Performance and Results Section when implemented; and,
- h. Commits to sharing best practices and lessons learned with a view to further strengthening the quality of the Institute's products and services.

## Coverage and Scope

52. The framework applies to the entirety of the Institute's operations and programming at headquarters and out-posted offices. Should the monitoring, evaluation or reporting requirements of donors deviate from the present policy framework, programme management should inform the Planning, Performance and Results Section accordingly.

## Review

53. The application of the policy framework as revised in this present version will be reviewed in 2019 and amended to account for adjustments and other elements as required, based on the evolving nature of monitoring and evaluation functions and taking into consideration international good practices.

## Annex 1 – Glossary of Terms

### **Accomplishment**

The achievement of specific results producing changes in behaviour or developmental conditions. See outcome.

### **Activity**

Any action undertaken or work performed with the objective of transforming inputs into measurable outputs.

### **Baseline**

Data describing a situation to be addressed by an undertaking which serve as the starting point for measuring performance.

### **Beneficiaries**

Individuals, entities or groups which may be targeted or not and which may benefit directly or indirectly from a programme, project or other undertaking.

### **Best practices**

Planning, organizational and/or managerial methods, processes, techniques or other practices which have produced consistent superior results to those achieved by other means.

### **Corporate evaluation**

Independent evaluations undertaken and/or managed by the Planning, Performance and Results Section.

### **Decentralized evaluation**

Self-assessment evaluations conducted by programmes or other divisional entities of the Institute.

### **Divisional entities**

A collective term that refers to the Institute's programmes, offices, sections, units and other administrative entities.

### **Effectiveness**

The extent to which a programme, project or other undertaking achieves its planned results (outputs outcomes and/or goals).

### **Efficiency**

The cost effectiveness of transforming actions into outputs, taking into consideration alternative paths.

### **Evaluability**

The extent to which an activity, project, programme or other undertaking can be subject to evaluation in a credible and reliable manner.

### **Evaluation**

“An assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy topic, sector, operational area or institutional performance. It analyses the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.” (UNEG 2016)

**Event**

A major activity organized in the form of a briefing, conference, course, fellowship programme, lecture, meeting, seminar, workshop, side-event, webinar, etc. and announced on the Institute's online events management system.

**Ex ante evaluation**

An evaluation performed prior to the implementation of an undertaking. See baseline.

**Ex post evaluation**

An evaluation performed after the implementation of an undertaking.

**Formative Evaluation**

A type of evaluation conducted during the implementation of a project or other undertaking with the aim to provide information that will guide project improvement. This type of evaluation typically focuses on determining whether a programme is being implemented according to plan.

**Impact**

The totality and/or long-term effects of an undertaking. Effects may be positive or negative, intended or unintended.

**Indicator**

A quantitative or qualitative measure of programme performance that is used to demonstrate change and which details the extent to which results are being or have been achieved.

**Institutional outcome**

Effects produced as the result of intermediate outcomes. E.g. increased organizational effectiveness as the result of the application of knowledge or skills by beneficiaries or as the results of other intermediate outcomes.

**Intermediate outcome**

Subsequent effects of products and/or services (outputs) delivered. E.g. increased level of knowledge or skills, or knowledge and skills retained/applied on the job after training.

**Knowledge management**

The systematic processes, or range of practices, used by organizations to identify, capture, store, create, update, represent and distribute knowledge for use, awareness and learning across the organization (JIU 2016).

**Lessons learned**

A generalization derived from an evaluation and applicable to a generic rather than a specific situation.

**Logical framework**

A results-based project framework design based on a causal relationship linking inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact, with objectively verifiable indicators to measure progress towards the achievement of results.

**Monitoring**

The routine process of collecting and recording information in order to track progress towards expected results.

**Output**

Final products or services delivered.

**Outcome**

Changes in behaviour or development conditions.

**Project**

A set of planned and interrelated activities designed to achieve specific objectives within a given budget, period of time and operating framework.

**Programme**

A set of sub-programmes, projects and/or activities producing outputs and accomplishments with a defined budget and under a set of specific objectives linked to the Institute's mandate and organizational goals.

**Special event**

An event organized at the corporate level with the participation of high-ranking personalities. Special events include e.g. meetings of the Board of Trustees; meetings organized at the request of the United Nations Secretary-General (Annual Retreat of the Secretary-General, Annual Seminar of the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, Annual Retreat of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Political Affairs); as well as the Geneva Lecture Series and Panel Discussions.

**Summative Evaluation**

A type of evaluation intended to provide information about the merit, worth and impact of a programme or project (OIOS). Summative evaluation is usually conducted at the end of a programme or project to determine if anticipated results were achieved.

**Undertaking**

A general term for any programme, project, activity, policy, strategy, etc. which may be subject to evaluation.