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**Introduction**

Monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) is an operational enabler of Phase IV of the *Global Programme for Strengthening the Rule of Law, Human Rights, Justice and Security for Sustainable Peace and Development* (hereafter the Global Programme or GP4) to ensure learning, knowledge and evidence are captured, shared and used to inform and influence programming and global policy developments. The establishment and implementation of a robust MEL system is also a specific intended output of the Global Programme (output 5).

The MEL system will enable the GP4 to apply the tools, knowledge and capacities needed for a systematic approach to evidence-based learning and knowledge creation and exchange. This approach is designed to enable better project management and decision-making, increase efficiency, support risk mitigation, enhance accountability for the use of resources and enable innovation.

This document sets out the out the strategic framework within which targeted MEL efforts will be identified and developed throughout the lifecycle of GP4. It identifies key action points for the remainder of 2022, alongside strategic guidance and recommendations for future roll-out of the GP4 MEL approach.

The strategic framework will evolve over time and will be implemented through detailed annual MEL workplans and learning agendas that will be developed and overseen by the MEL and Innovation Unit within GP4.

For the purposes of this framework document, MEL is understood to involve:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Monitoring | the routine monitoring of project performance, resources, activities and  results, and analysis of the information to guide project implementation |
| Evaluation | the periodic (e.g. mid-term and final) assessment and analysis of  an on-going or completed project |
| Learning | the process through which information generated from M&E is  reflected upon and intentionally used to continuously improve a project’s ability to achieve results |

Traditionally, M&E as a practice has focused on producing data for accountability – in other words did we do what we said we would with the allocated resources. MEL takes a more rounded approach to accountability, by focusing on using data and analysis to intentionally learn and then adapt based on that learning, in order to improve the quality and effectiveness of projects and programmes.

A MEL approach to development involves mainstreaming MEL throughout the life cycle of a project and sensitizing the entire implementing team to its principles and practices. In this sense, everyone involved in programme implementation is responsible for MEL, and its iterative approach expands well beyond a single review exercise conducted at midterm and/or end points of a project or programme.

The establishment of a MEL system involves building an understanding of and commitment to MEL across the team (and wider organization) and the design and implementation of user-friendly tools and processes that enable a strengthened MEL approach.

**Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning and the Global Programme**

*Lessons Learned from Phase III*

Drawing on the recommendations of the May 2021 midterm evaluation (MTE), the series of International Security Sector Advisory Team (ISSAT)-led country-level evaluations,[[1]](#footnote-1) and other relevant UNDP evaluations and studies,[[2]](#footnote-2) several overarching recommendations were made for how the GP4 could improve and strengthen its overall impact. Recommendations related to MEL were broadly around:

* Investing more in results-based management
* Developing meaningful monitoring and measurement approaches and tools
* Strengthening knowledge management and thought leadership

Additionally, measuring and reporting on impact remains a key area for improvement and is a recognized organizational priority for UNDP in its current Strategic Plan (2022-2025).[[3]](#footnote-3) However, the impact of rule of law and human rights interventions can be challenging to measure especially as change processes are rarely linear nor rapid. Further, the pathway to achieving the goals of strengthened rule of law, human rights and people-centred justice and security will look different in every specific context.

Therefore, GP4 will be implemented within a robust strategic MEL framework to ensure that day-to-day knowledge and experience gained at the country level is better captured and mined for learning to inform quality programming and policy engagement. This includes seizing opportunities to apply tools and approaches more rigorously and intentionally – for instance political economy and conflict analysis, gender mainstreaming, the human rights–based approach and emphasis on leaving no one behind, systems thinking and adaptive management. The use of these tools will help ensure that GP4 operates in line with its five guiding principles:

1. *People-centred*: Putting people and their justice, security and human rights needs at the centre of our work by identifying and addressing the root causes of inequality and exclusion that drive injustice and insecurity, empowering and promoting human agency and participation
2. *Politically informed and conflict-sensitive*: Ensuring that GP4 interventions are underpinned by a strong understanding and analysis of cultural, political, social and conflict dynamics and trends. When coupled with a systems and learning approach, this practice facilitates more risk-informed programming, which is of particular importance in fragile and conflict-affected contexts.
3. *Gender equality*: Ensuring women’s full enjoyment of their rights and their meaningful participation in all aspects of society, including in leadership, decision-making and peacemaking roles by ensuring gender is integrated as a cross-cutting issue in the programme’s rationale, activities, indicators and budget.
4. *Human rights*: GP4 promotes human rights both as a goal and as a principle and upholds the mandatory application of a human-rights–based approach across UNDP programming. It also aims to ensure that there is a greater consciousness and explicit articulation of the potential and actual human rights implications for and consequences of all its efforts.
5. *Transformative*: Enabling transformative change requires viewing the complex systems in which the Global Programme operates from a multidisciplinary perspective, identifying leverage points and building coalitions for change. GP4 will harness innovative tools and approaches, such as systems thinking and advances in digitalization, to further efforts towards transformative change.

*The GP4 Results Framework*

Strengthened MEL systems and processes will yield more robust reporting on the GP4 results framework. In alignment with the MTE recommendations, the GP4 results framework moves away from outputs that are thematic-based (for example, A2J, TJ etc.), focusing instead on the elements needed to achieve transformational change (as reflected in the GP4 Theory of Change). Additionally, the GP4 results framework seeks to address previously raised concerns around attribution to ensure that the efforts and/or actual effects of GP4 interventions are clearly distinguished among the breadth of broader UNDP results on rule of law, human rights, justice, and security. In the dynamic and complex development contexts within which the Global Programme operates, claims of attribution are difficult to validate on a one-to-one causal basis. Shifting to a learning-focused approach that validates contribution to observable change (versus singularly focused attribution) can help demonstrate important, positive impacts of programme efforts.[[4]](#footnote-4)

The GP4 results framework consists of two programme outcomes and six interlinked outputs, all with related global-level indicators. Four of these indicators specifically relate to operational effectiveness.

**Programme Outcome 1**: Inclusive, people-centred systems that provide quality justice and security services and uphold and protect human rights are trusted and accessible, especially in contexts affected by crisis, conflict or fragility.

This outcome reflects the “downstream” focus of the programme and its ability to support UNDP Country Offices (COs) and regional hubs to better enable and ensure:

* people’s agency and participation in efforts to strengthen rule of law, justice, security and human rights, including access to justice (see Output 1);
* duty-bearers and powerholders are accountable for their actions and uphold their obligations and responsibilities for protecting and promoting human rights and ensuring rule of law (see Output 2);
* systems, services and institutions have the resources and capacities to address people’s everyday justice and security needs and protect their human rights as a key step towards becoming more trusted and transformed (see Output 3); and
* communities experience greater safety, security and resilience (see Output 4).

**Programme Outcome 2**: Regional and global policy on rule of law, justice, security and human rights is evidence-based, affirms a development perspective and informs high-quality programming.

This outcome reflects the Global Programme’s upstream nature and influence and its ability to ensure that:

* data and learning captured through robust MEL systems inform high-quality rule of law, justice, security and human rights programming by UNDP and others (see Output 5); and
* evidence and learning-informed and high-quality regional and international policy and agenda-setting support efforts to build political will for and advance rule of law and human rights priorities at the country level (see Output 6).

The results framework therefore captures the full scope of the Global Programme’s work, i.e. not only its country-level support, but also its focus on programmatic learning, research and global policy development. The below diagram visually represents how a strengthened MEL framework can support impact-level achievement on these outputs and outcomes. More details can be found in the project document and the methodological note accompanying the GP4 project document.[[5]](#footnote-5)
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**The GP4 MEL Strategic Framework**

This MEL Strategic Framework is intended not only to help glean insight into what’s needed at the core of the Global Programme’s work but also for building and implementing intentional systems and processes to test and adapt the Global Programme’s high-level theory of change year-on-year.[[6]](#footnote-6) The focus on ensuring a more systematized and targeted approach to data collection and analysis will also directly contribute to the Global Programme’s role as a thought leader and influencer within the regional and global policy space.

The four-part framework focuses on: increasing GP4 MEL capacities; building the capabilities of those responsible for GP4 implementation; strengthening MEL-focused country support; and strengthening strategic MEL partnerships.

GP4 has invested in building capacities for strengthened MEL systems by investing in additional staff and earmarking financial resources and time to ensure that those responsible for implementing GP4 – primarily the Global Rule of Law, Security and Human Rights (ROLSHR) Team within the UNDP Crisis Bureau – is fully equipped to implement this MEL system and ultimately deliver on the Global Programme’s commitment to advance transformative change. These dedicated investments will allow UNDP to better collect more meaningful data and analyse and report on results that can be tracked over the lifecycle of GP4. Ultimately, the aim is to reach the end of GP4 implementation with the ability to create an overarching narrative about both the impact and learning of the Global Programme during Phase IV.

**Part 1. Increasing GP4 MEL Capacities**

To support the implementation of GP4, UNDP will establish a MEL and Innovation Unit (MEL Unit) that will anchor the rollout, implementation and standardization of the GP4 MEL Strategy in Phase IV.

The MEL Unit will report directly to the GP4 Programme Manager and will consist of a P3-level MEL Specialist, a P2-level MEL Officer and a P2-level Strategic Reporting and Learning Analyst. [[7]](#footnote-7)

The primary aim of the MEL Unit is to ensure that the Global Programme can better deliver rule of law, human rights, justice and security initiatives that result in meaningful impact. It will work to better enable global, regional and country-level UNDP stakeholders to design and implement GP4-supported rule of law, human rights, justice and security initiatives through systematized processes and operations. This includes strengthening results-based management as well as developing and piloting MEL tools and approaches.

The MEL Unit is responsible for:

* Strengthening GP4 data collection methods to better inform policies and programmes on rule of law, justice, human rights, and people-centred security.
* Providing MEL guidance and support to UNDP COs for rule of law and human rights–related programming.
* Disseminating MEL lessons and good practices from GP4-supported COs and enabling the exchange of cross-country and cross-regional lessons through mechanisms such as the UNDP Communities of Practice (including consultations on the SparkBlue platform), the Strategic Innovation Facility’s MEL Sandbox sessions, and other GP4-specific platforms such as the Justice Futures CoLab.
* Designing and developing, through a participatory approach, and aligned with UNDP corporate learning goals, the annual MEL workplan and learning agenda which will align to the MEL strategic framework, the GP4 project document, including the theory of change and results framework. The MEL workplan will also ensure that GP4 efforts contribute to corporate goals[[8]](#footnote-8), for instance, the Knowledge Management Strategy, the Digital Strategy and any other relevant UNDP-wide efforts that may arise. Stakeholders to be consulted will include, for example, the ROLSHR team, UNDP’s Effectiveness Group, and existing external MEL partners (see Section 4 on Collaboration).
* Regularly scanning the fields related to rule of law, justice, security and human rights, development, and MEL for new developments, tools, approaches and research that could support UNDP and GP4 MEL efforts.

The MEL Unit will have four primary areas of focus:

*Monitoring*

GP4 supports interventions in dynamic contexts that are affected by crisis, conflict and fragility. In these settings, and as evidenced by previous Global Programme efforts, inevitable hurdles will be encountered that may complicate project implementation. In Phase IV, GP4 pipeline-supported Country Offices are required to submit a midterm report – utilizing the provided GP4 template. The midterm report provides the opportunity for Country Offices to reflect on the status of the project midway through its implementation, and to plan the way forward to completion – including any shifts or course corrections that need to be taken to adapt the project to current circumstances or respond to obstacles.

To support monitoring efforts at the country level, the MEL Unit will:

* Engage regularly with the ROLSHR focal points and their CO counterparts (technical and MEL personnel) to ensure that GP4-supported initiatives are being adequately monitored to track actual activity and progress.
* Provide expertise and assistance in the development and use of MEL tools and approaches, such as adaptive management methodologies and robust indicators, to support improved monitoring by Country Offices.
* Review midterm reports and provide feedback and guidance to COs as required.

At the global level, the MEL Unit will:

* Amalgamate and analyze GP4 progress related to both country-level interventions and global policy engagement to ensure that GP4 is implemented in line with its guiding principles and is on track to deliver its intended results.
* Advise and support necessary course corrections that may need to be taken to ensure the programme remains on track to deliver, both for the programme itself, as well as for the UNDP Strategic Plan (2022-2025).
* Provide updates on programme implementation status to the Partners Advisory Group or the Experts Advisory Group during their regular meetings, at the discretion of the Global Programme Manager and the Head of the ROLSHR team.

*Reporting*

In accordance with the GP4 methodological note, the MEL Unit will review the results framework annually to ensure it remains fit for purpose for measuring progress, effectiveness and impact of GP4-supported initiatives and activities. A primary component of this review will be ensuring that GP4 reporting complies with both UNDP corporate requirements, as well as any stipulations set forth in donor contribution agreements.[[9]](#footnote-9) Any necessary adjustments or changes to the results framework will be presented to and approved by the Project Board and shared with the Partners Advisory Group.

To ensure rigorous reporting throughout GP4, the MEL Unit will:

* Facilitate systematic reporting for better data collection aggregating both country-level and global-level results to build an evidence base to inform GP-supported initiatives (and the trajectory of the Global Programme itself).
* Quality assure reported results as they feed into the GP4 Annual Report[[10]](#footnote-10), including through the harmonizing of CO reporting on the corporate IRRF with GP4 results framework.
* Review and assure the quality of CO data collection plans to ensure that the information collected is balanced in terms of qualitative and quantitative data, and will yield impact-oriented information.

*Evaluation*

The MEL Unit, alongside the ROLSHR Programme Manager, will be responsible to:

* Ensure adequate preparation and implementation of both mid-term and final evaluation processes.
* Ensure recommendations from both the final Phase 3 evaluation in 2022 and the mid-term evaluation at the end of 2023 inform any changes or directional shifts that need to be made to GP4 to ensure it remains on track to achieve its intended outcomes at country and global levels.
* Feed the experiences and lessons of GP4 (as well as previous iterations of the Global Programme) into corporate evaluation processes.
* Support country-level efforts as needed to ensure that meaningful evaluation processes are able to occur in a timely manner.
* Explore options for establishing a standardized methodology – similar to the series of ISSAT-led evaluations during Phase 3 – for evaluating GP4-supported projects and initiatives that would yield findings which could be aggregated, analyzed and synthesized into a coherent narrative regarding GP4 impact and lessons learned.
* Identify and build strategic partnerships with organizations (such as DCAF-ISSAT) that could provide consistent support to country-level midterm and final evaluations, and to learning-oriented initiatives across GP4 to improve performance and impact (see Part 4 on strategic partnerships).

*Learning*

GP4 aims to integrate and mainstream a MEL approach across its programmatic activities and within the ROLSHR team, in support of UNDPs corporate commitment, as stated in the 2022-2025 Strategic Plan, to continuous learning and impact measurement.

The MEL Unit will:

* lead on developing and implementing an annual GP4 learning agenda, in line with UNDP corporate learning goals, the activities from which will be featured each year in the MEL workplan. (See Part 2 on Capabilities.)
* With guidance from the Programme Manager, lead an annual strategic review of the Global Programme’s theory of change, underlying assumptions and results framework and adapt them as required based on programme learning. This could include an analysis of the Global Programme’s aggregate contribution to bigger changes over time.[[11]](#footnote-11)
* Liaise with GPN colleagues and teams engaged in advancing MEL- related work, including the Strategic Innovation Unit, Global Knowledge Collective, Accelerator Labs and CB Knowledge and Learning focal point (see Part 4 on collaboration for further information), and identify opportunities to leverage ongoing corporate efforts in support of GP4-specific MEL initiatives and goals.

**Part 2. Building GP4 Learning Capabilities**

GP4 adopts an intentional approach to learning and knowledge exchange to support day-to-day programming and inform regional and global policy engagement. This approach includes not only prioritizing learning-focused, innovative initiatives for GP4 pipeline funds, but also the learning of the global ROLSHR team and others for knowledge brokering and policy influence. Increasing the capabilities of the global ROLSHR team – both in terms of skills and substance – will likely yield more robust support to the implementation of GP4 and to improved programme and policy outcomes.

In 2022, the MEL Unit will validate the 2022 provisional learning agenda (see Annex II) and adjust as necessary. Ideas for the 2023 learning agenda should be brainstormed prior January 2023 so that validation can be obtained during the 2023 global ROLSHR team retreat.

The MEL Unit will review the GP4 2022 workplan with the Programme Manager to begin planning for 2023 and beyond. Support for learning initiatives, both at the individual and team levels, should be given dedicated budget lines in accordance with available resources (or those that can be additionally mobilized to support learning).

*Annual GP4 Learning Agendas*

The MEL Unit will facilitate the development of an annual GP4 learning agenda that will align to the corporate goals of the UNDP Knowledge Management Strategy (2022-2025) and the evolving learning agendas of the UNDP Governance Community of Practice (COP) in coordination with the Global Knowledge Collective.

The annual learning agendas will also aim to build up the capabilities of the ROLSHR team and other stakeholders to GP4 implementation to effectively deliver the GP4.

GP4 learning agendas may include, for example, the development and testing of tools, frameworks and processes to support GP4-oriented learning initiatives; systemized learning exchanges and online trainings/workshops; and capability-building efforts led and supported by the MEL Unit.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Learning initiatives will focus on **developing skills** as well as **deepening** **knowledge/substance**.

Examples of MEL-specific skills-based learning may include: training on the use of analytical methodologies and tools such as systems thinking, political economy analysis, behavioral insights, problem-driven adaptation, the Most Significant Change tool, adaptive management, sensemaking, etc. Initiatives will also focus on the skills necessary to improve project/programme design and delivery, including for example, strengthening communications skills, learning second (or third) languages, wellness-focused initiatives to reduce burnout and improve work/life balance, or trainings for developing skills such as facilitation, planning and executing results-oriented meetings, workload prioritization or time management.

Knowledge or substance-oriented learning aims to deepen thematic understanding of a particular rule of law, human rights, justice or security topic, as well as the capability to apply this knowledge to result in higher-quality projects and initiatives that are conducive to transformative change. Learning initiatives in this regard may include, for example, in depth research to inform global policy development followed by activities such as external launches with expert-level participation, internal trainings, piloting small-scale initiatives to test new approaches or policy frameworks, or follow-on knowledge-generating activities such as the application of a gender lens to a particular topic.

*Levels of learning*

Learning for GP4, should occur at three distinct levels.

First, at the **individual level**, each member of the global ROLSHR team is responsible to contribute to overall GP4 learning efforts. Therefore, each individual Performance Management and Development (PMD) plan will include an annual learning goal, which will be supported and monitored by the Head of the ROLSHR team. In some cases, these learning goals may be skills-based – for instance, aiming to acquire skills in facilitation, languages, programme development – or knowledge-based, where team members aim to deepen their level of knowledge in a particular substantive area that is relevant to their thematic or country portfolios.

Secondly, at the **team level**, the MEL Unit will lead on developing a learning agenda for GP4 through a participatory process involving the global ROLSHR team and other stakeholders to GP4 implementation. In alignment with the corporate learning agendas of the UNDP Communities of Practice, the annual GP4 learning agenda should include three components:

* Learning questions (to address critical skills and/or knowledge gaps)
* Learning activities (to help generate answers or solutions to learning questions)
* Learning products (to accompany the learning activities by disseminating findings and promote their application for higher quality programming that yields more impactful results)[[13]](#footnote-13)

Team-level learning initiatives may be implemented using various methodologies that may include:

* Social learning: This includes peer-to-peer relationships and activities such as mentoring by pairing new team members with experienced colleagues; crowd-sourcing information through tools such as surveys or social platforms (for instance Sparkblue); brainstorming sessions focused on producing many possible options or approaches for a problem at hand; or building a systematized information based (for instance the ROLSHR Teams Platform) to capture and make available captured knowledge and good examples of things like project documents, terms of reference, procurement forms, evaluations, etc. from across the team and the Country Offices increase easy access to and strengthen the retention of institutional memory.
* Facilitated learning: This includes activities that require sufficient advance planning, likely with outside experts and/or facilitations, which aim to achieve specific objectives and produce actionable outcomes. Examples may include clinics and workshops, such as the recent workshops on results-based management and systems thinking, annual team retreats (usually held in late January or early February), and other types of structured “strategic conversations” such as the Justice Futures CoLab’s [CoLab Conversations](https://undp.sharepoint.com/sites/ROLHRGP/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?FolderCTID=0x01200077F88A059B1DD44F8DA593C77AD539C8&id=%2Fsites%2FROLHRGP%2FShared%20Documents%2FJustice%2FJustice%20Futures%20CoLab%2FCoLab%20SOP1%2DCoLab%20Conversations%20July%202022%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FROLHRGP%2FShared%20Documents%2FJustice%2FJustice%20Futures%20CoLab). This could also include participation in the new GPN Academies (HDP Nexus Academy, Crisis Academy, etc.).
* Challenge or project-based learning: These activities should require participants to solve simulated challenges based on real world problems or events. For instance, small groups could work together over a series of weeks to develop a full project document based on a fictional scenario that presents a rule of law, human rights, justice, or security problem. A simulation such as this should utilize UNDP’s RBM process and principles. Groups could come together upon completion of such a simulation to compare and contrast experiences and discuss the skills that were “learned by doing” that could be further built upon to improve team capabilities. This could also include creating new spaces and initiatives for testing current thinking and experimenting with new approaches, such as the Justice Futures CoLab. Available gamification software, such as [Mission Zhobia](https://www.missionzhobia.org/) of the [Human Security Challenge](https://www.hscollective.org/our-resources/the-human-security-challenge/) are potential tools for enabling project-based learning.
* Experience-based learning: Opportunities for team members to build their own capabilities through hands-on experience can be provided through detail assignments, participating in missions, job shadowing, participating in corporate training offerings such as the SURGE Academy. Following participation in such activities, team members should liaise with the MEL Unit to share highlights of the knowledge and skills they’ve acquired so that these can be captured and shared around the team. Space could be provided (for instance in team meetings) for team members to share their learning.

Thirdly, at the **community level**, GP4 learning efforts will align to the new UNDP corporate knowledge management strategy so that corporate tools, especially relating to data collection and digitalization, can be accessed and utilized to mutually support GP4 and Strategic Plan goals. Through the policy framework of GP4, the global ROLSHR team can make a robust contribution to the organization’s corporate knowledge generation and thought leadership. Additionally, the global ROLSHR team should aim to consolidate its corporate network and online presence, including through more systematized engagement in the UNDP Communities of Practice. Continuing to build external expert networks and partnerships can also help to facilitate community-level learning. For example, the establishment of the GP4 Experts Advisory Group, as well as the People-Centred Security and Constitutional Assistance sub-Communities of Practice are examples of existing community-level learning initiatives in support of GP4 learning efforts. (Also see Part 4 below).

*Knowledge Management*

Robust and systematized knowledge management processes will be key to ensuring that learning is codified and made accessible not only to the global ROLSHR team, but to COs, other relevant UNDP colleagues and external partners and donors. The MEL Unit will establish a knowledge management system that will include, for example, a yearly “roadmap” of GP4 knowledge/policy initiatives (See Annex III GP4 2022 Knowledge and Policy Roadmap). This roadmap should be accompanied by action plans for research, mapping, publication, launch, dissemination (with spin off learning, advocacy or strategic communications opportunities such as trainings/workshops, blogs, photo stories, etc.). This will be done in coordination with teams across the GPN and in line with UNDP’s corporate knowledge management strategy and framework (2022-2025).

**Part 3. Strengthening Country-level MEL Capacities for Improved Outcomes**

The ROLSHR team, comprised of HQ and regional-level advisors is primarily responsible for the implementation and delivery of the Global Programme. A major feature of the global team is the provision of bespoke country support. During Phase IV, the provision of this country support will include intentional efforts to build capabilities and strengthen MEL practices at the country level.

Efforts to strengthen MEL-focused country support will include:

*Supporting Country Offices to fulfill the new MEL-focused application, monitoring and reporting requirements for GP4 pipeline allocations*

Addressing the challenges of weak rule of law, lack of respect for human rights, injustice and insecurity requires political, distributive, behavioral and institutional change. The interconnection between rule of law, human rights, justice and security necessitates an approach that recognizes the complexity of the systems that underpin them and the need for an integrated, problem-driven response. Led by the MEL Unit, global ROLSHR focal points will work with and learn from country-level counterparts to shift thinking on traditional project and policy development cycles. For instance, corporate guidance to shift from development “projects” to “portfolios” may prove useful for addressing complex rule of law and human rights challenges in contexts that are continually in flux due to crisis or fragility, or have limited resources available.

To help facilitate this, GP4 will be more intentional in its funding application (or “pipeline”) process, including by increasing requirements for monitoring and reporting on funding expenditure and impact. All GP4 templates and guidance, from the initial funding request to final reporting, have been revised to better enable the GP4 to understand how to better enable transformative change. Good practices and lessons learned will be captured and used to inform future project and programme design and implementation across the GP4, the UNDP and the wider ROLSHR community. The revised process will also enable the MEL Unit to better identify COs where there is interest and need for additional MEL support specifically in relation to implementing ROLSHR interventions.

The MEL Unit will review the pipeline process and related documents following the second pipeline allocation for 2022, to assess their utility, both in terms of ease of use for those requesting funding, as well as for the purpose of ensuring allocations are made to high quality initiatives. Where necessary, the templates will be adjusted (potentially year-on-year) to ensure they remain fit for purpose.

*Developing and/or adapting MEL tools and resources*

A variety of MEL tools and resources exist but have yet to be scaled up for wide distribution and use amongst the UNDP rule of law, human rights, justice, and security network. The MEL Unit, supported by the ROLSHR global team, will aim to review these resources (for instance the UNDP M&E Guide for ROL, the Guidance Note on Institutional and Context Analysis for ROL (the ICA Guidance Note), and the FBA/UNDP politically-smart programming guide (see Annex 2). On the whole, these resources have existed for several years but have not been utilized consistently across Global Programme-supported country initiatives. In some cases, these tools may need to be adapted or updated to be meaningfully utilized in the current global context.

The MEL Unit will support COs to identify and apply a range of qualitative and quantitative methods and will lead the development, testing and rollout of new tools where relevant and necessary, including a set of standardized GP4-related ROLSHR indicators that can be adapted for country-level projects and initiatives and that are aligned to and inform the higher-level GP4 results framework. The MEL Unit will also review the UNDP M&E Guide and ICA Guidance Note for potential updating and/or roll-out at the country and regional levels. These documents were originally published through the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery and the Bureau for Development Policy, prior to the establishment of BPPS and the Crisis Bureau. The organizational restructuring meant these publications were never officially rolled out and should be reviewed for use at country office level in ROLSHR work.

*Knowledge exchange and network building*

The ROLSHR team will organize and facilitate opportunities for knowledge exchange and brokering specifically for MEL topics. This includes organizing workshops, trainings, and other types of events (both internal and external) on MEL tools, resources or experiences. Topics of particular interest may include systems thinking, adaptive management, building and managing portfolios (and moving away from the traditional development project cycle), using M&E for learning, etc. Knowledge exchanges and learning-focused initiatives provide platforms to strengthen MEL-focused networks of rule of law, security and human rights practitioners by utilizing platforms such as the UNDP COPs or the Justice Futures CoLab.

*Facilitating expert deployments*

The MEL Unit, supported by the ROLSHR team, will identify and collate a list of MEL consultants and experts that can be deployed to Country Offices to support MEL processes or spearhead learning-focused initiatives. This compendium of people will be vetted through the Roster Unit for rapid deployment through the UNDP ExpRes roster. In some cases, expert deployments may be financially backed by GP4 resources, though this will be determined in consultation with the Programme Manager and agreed by the Project Board.

**4. Building and strengthening strategic partnerships**

The Global Programme has earned a reputation for mobilizing strategic partnerships that have scaled up global policy development, that have streamlined in-country programming, and have leveraged its financial resources to benefit the efforts of other UN and external stakeholders. During GP4 implementation, the MEL Unit and the ROLSHR team will work to build and strengthen strategic collaborations and partnerships that advance meaningful MEL processes both to deliver on GP4 commitments as well as advance global efforts in MEL-related areas. Collaboration will occur both internally, within UNDP and the UN system, as well as externally with advocacy groups, experts, think tanks, donor partners and others.

Internally, the MEL Unit will liaise with relevant teams across the Global Policy Network to ensure that GP4 MEL efforts are aligned with relevant initiatives, corporate strategies, and guidelines. Within the Crisis Bureau, the MEL Unit should maintain regular contact with the focal points for learning and knowledge management within the CFPET Team.[[14]](#footnote-14) Engagement with the BPPS Strategic Policy Engagement Team may also support learning and knowledge management efforts. The MEL Unit will work closely with the UNDP Effectiveness Team and the Strategic Innovation Unit, which is advancing innovative learning approaches in line with UNDP’s organizational commitment to enhancing its capacity for continuous learning and impact measurement. Additionally, the global ROLSHR team should align to the efforts of the SDG Integration Team in implementing the new Knowledge Management Strategy, including through maintaining an active presence within the Governance and Resilience COPs. Close collaboration with the COP community coordinators and facilitators will help support annual learning agendas and learning-focused initiatives.

The MEL Unit will ensure regular engagement with the coordinators of the Accelerator Labs, the Strategic Innovation Facility, and other existing and emerging UNDP teams and initiatives aimed at advancing MEL objectives to promote a regular exchange of thinking, processes and tools that could benefit GP4 and the global ROLSHR team efforts on learning and innovation. This will include participation in the UNDP “M&E Sandbox” meetings that aim to identify synergetic efforts and available tools/resources for improved MEL.

The MEL Unit will aim to establish a solid foundation for strong MEL-related external partnerships. Many of these relationships already exist and could be brought together more systematically to share information and experiences, as well as discuss issues and opportunities for strengthening strategic collaboration related to MEL. Key partners with known capacities and efforts to better MEL systems and processes include but are not limited to:

* Clingendael
* DCAF-ISSAT
* Folke Bernadotte Academy
* HiiL
* IDLO
* The Pathfinders
* The Vera Institute
* World Justice Project

The MEL Unit will build on good practices established with external partners. For instance, regular meetings of the Partners Advisory Group (PAG, consisting of donors to the Global Programme) will continue, and will be supplemented by the establishment of an Experts Advisory Group (EAG). The EAG comprised of individual experts and representatives from organizations will review, discuss, and advise on GP4 substantive programmatic and policy efforts, including in the MEL area. Additionally, the MEL Unit should seek to continue external partnerships that benefit M&E efforts in the field, akin to the relationship established with DCAF-ISSAT during Phase 3. Finally, participation in important advocacy groups, such as the Justice Action Coalition, will help to ensure that UNDP maintains its substantial contribution to global policy development, including on topics such as 'measuring people-centred justice’ and civil justice indicator development on SDG 16.3.3 (in conjunction with the UNDP Oslo Governance Centre).

**Annex I: Recommended MEL tools and resources**

UN and UNDP-specific resources

* [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluating for Development Results](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/english/pme-handbook.pdf) (2009)
* [The United Nations Rule of Law Indicators: Implementation Guide and Project Tools](https://www.un.org/ruleoflaw/files/un_rule_of_law_indicators.pdf) (2011)
* [Institutional and Context Analysis – Guidance Note](https://www.undp.org/publications/institutional-and-context-analysis-guidance-note) (2012)
* [What, why and how to measure? A user’s guide to measuring rule of law, justice and security programmes](https://www.undp.org/publications/why-what-and-how-measure-users-guide-measuring-rule-law-justice-and-security-programmes) (2015)
* [Responsive and Responsible: Politically Smart Rule of Law in Conflict and Fragile States](https://fba.se/en/about-fba/publications/responsive-and-responsible-politically-smart-rule-of-law-reform-in-conflict-and-fragile-states/) (2016, with Folke Bernadotte Academy)
* [Guidance Note on Assessing the Rule of Law Using Institutional and Context Analysis](https://www.undp.org/publications/guidance-note-assessing-rule-law-using-institutional-and-context-analysis) (2017)

External resources

* [USAID Learning Lab](https://usaidlearninglab.org/)
* [Most Significant Change Toolbox](https://undp.sharepoint.com/sites/ROLHRGP/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?FolderCTID=0x01200077F88A059B1DD44F8DA593C77AD539C8&id=%2Fsites%2FROLHRGP%2FShared%20Documents%2FMEL%20and%20Innovation%2FResources%2FMost%20Significant%20Change%20Toolbox%20%2D%202009%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FROLHRGP%2FShared%20Documents%2FMEL%20and%20Innovation%2FResources) and [story template](https://undp.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/ROLHRGP/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7B89ED5B0E-AD84-4FE8-873C-9B1953906ED7%7D&file=Most%20Significant%20Change%20story%20template.docx&action=edit&mobileredirect=true&wdPreviousSession=4bd3b12c-5629-4f35-805b-61304a6d6d7e&wdOrigin=TEAMS-ELECTRON.teamsSdk.undefined) ([Better Evaluation](https://www.betterevaluation.org/resources/guides/most_significant_change), 2009)
* [Problem-Driven Iterative Adaptation Toolkit](https://bsc.cid.harvard.edu/files/bsc/files/pdiatoolkit_ver_1_oct_2018.pdf) (Harvard University, Center for International Development 2018)
* [Everyday Political Analysis](https://undp.sharepoint.com/sites/ROLHRGP/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?FolderCTID=0x01200077F88A059B1DD44F8DA593C77AD539C8&id=%2Fsites%2FROLHRGP%2FShared%20Documents%2FMEL%20and%20Innovation%2FResources%2FEverday%20Political%20Economy%20Analysis%20%2D%202016%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FROLHRGP%2FShared%20Documents%2FMEL%20and%20Innovation%2FResources) (Development Leadership Program, 2016)
* [Systems Thinking for Peacebuilding and Rule of Law](https://www.usip.org/publications/2017/10/systems-thinking-peacebuilding-and-rule-law) (USIP, 2017)
* [Supporting Adaptive Management: Monitoring and Evaluation Tools and Approaches](https://cdn.odi.org/media/documents/odi-ml-adaptivemanagement-wp569-jan20.pdf) (ODI, 2019)
* [MEL: in Conflict and and Stabilisation Settings – A Guidance Note](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/858813/Monitoring__Evaluation_and_Learning__MEL__in_Conflict_and_Stabilisation_Settings_A_Guidance_Note_7_Nov_2019_-_Final_-__1_.pdf) (UK FCO Stabilisation Unit, 2019)
* [Politically Smart and Adaptive Approaches to Rule of Law Support in Situations of Conflict and Fragility](https://ilacnet.org/publications/politically-smart-and-adaptive-approaches-to-rule-of-law-support/) (ILAC and ODI, 2021)
* [An Introduction to Complexity and Systems Thinking for Rule of Law, Security and Human Rights Professionals](https://undp.sharepoint.com/sites/ROLHRGP/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?ga=1&id=%2Fsites%2FROLHRGP%2FShared%20Documents%2FJustice%2FJustice%20Futures%20CoLab%2FSystems%20Thinking%20Approach%2FComplexity%20and%20Systems%20Thinking%5FIntro%20Paper%5FO%5FConnor%5F7%5F27%5F22%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2FROLHRGP%2FShared%20Documents%2FJustice%2FJustice%20Futures%20CoLab%2FSystems%20Thinking%20Approach) (TransformLaw, 2022)

**Annex II: 2022 GP4 Provisional Learning Agenda**

**Learning questions:**

1. What is **systems thinking** and how do we apply it in the rule of law, human rights, justice and security space? How can systems thinkingand related tools such as foresight, behavioral insights, adaptive management etc. help to achieve positive outcomes in our work? How can a systems approach effectively embrace complexity and enable innovative solutions to rule of law and human rights problems?

* **Planned activities**: 2-part workshop series on Systems Thinking and Complexity (July/August)
* **Learning products**: Recordings of meetings, including chat dialogue and shared links

1. What are **integrated portfolios** (for rule of law and human rights programming)? How do they work? Where have they worked well? How should we build them?

* **Planned activities** (through Governance COP): BPPS Governance Team to collaborate with Accelerator Labs to co-host an Interactive Reflection Session with Country Offices (possibly Tunisia, Yemen, India) who can offer lessons-learnt from good practices on building integrated portfolios (TBD, Q2 or Q3 2022)[[15]](#footnote-15)
* **Learning products**: Guiding Principles Brief (How to build integrated portfolios, what works, what doesn’t?)

1. How do we identify and engage in **contemporary and emergent** **issues** in the justice, human rights and security space in an impactful and meaningful way?

* **Planned activities**:
  + Launch of the [UNDP-UN Women Gender Justice Platform](https://www.undp.org/press-releases/access-justice-women-and-girls-undp-and-un-women-launch-gender-justice-platform) including new four-year partnership framework and workplan
  + Launch of the [Justice Futures CoLab](https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2022-07/UNDP_Justice%20Futures%20CoLab%20Explainer.pdf) and the rollout of CoLab Conversations (June, ongoing)
  + Launch of the People-Centered Security Initiative and first meeting of the PSC Community of Practice (June, follow on activities TBD Q3)
  + Ongoing meetings of the Constitutional Assistance Community of Practice (ongoing)
  + Launch of the UNDP Human Rights Strategy, including an explicit focus on Human Rights in Crisis (TBD Q3)
  + Human Rights and SDG integration (July, ongoing)
  + Business and Human Rights global scaling-up through regional forums (ongoing)
* **Learning products**: Justice Futures CoLab publications on [the Justice Emergency](https://www.undp.org/publications/beyond-pandemic-%E2%80%93-justice-emergency), [e-Justice](https://www.undp.org/publications/e-justice-digital-transformation-close-justice-gap), [Environmental Justice](https://www.undp.org/publications/environmental-justice-securing-our-right-clean-healthy-and-sustainable-environment) and [Women/Transitional Justice](https://www.undp.org/publications/womens-meaningful-participation-transitional-justice-advancing-gender-equality-and), accompanied by trainings, expert panels, launch events, the [2022 Annual Meeting](https://www.undp.org/speeches/rule-law-and-human-rights-annual-meeting-2022) etc.; [Heightened Human Rights Due Diligence for Business in Conflict-Affected Contexts](https://www.undp.org/publications/heightened-human-rights-due-diligence-business-conflict-affected-contexts-guide); [Human Rights and Voluntary National Reviews – Operational Common Approach Guidance note](https://www.undp.org/publications/human-rights-and-voluntary-national-reviews-operational-common-approach-guidance-note); [A People-Centred Approach to Security](https://www.undp.org/publications/people-centered-approach-security); Putting Human Rights into Constitutions (forthcoming Q3)

1. How can we advance our work through **politically smart thinking?** How do we use politically smart thinking to identify programmatic entry points for work? How can we create political incentives to support and advance rule of law and human rights work? What tools are best and/or available to support political engagement? (PEA, etc.)

* **Planned activities**: Annual ROLSHR Team Retreat (February); Results-Based Management training (February); Governance COP event on “How Think and Engage Politically to identify programmatic entry points to advance our governance and ROL work” Expert Webinar, in potential collaboration with ODI, Community of Practice on Engaging Politically and FBA (TBD Q3)
* **Learning products**: Recordings of meetings; RBM training package; COP Contribution to Adaptive Management Team’s New/Revised Tool on PEA / Recording of the Session / Compilation of Good-practices (‘how-to/go-to resource’)

Considerations for finalizing the 2022 GP4 learning strategy:

* The ROLSHR team should explore collaboration on the COP-anchored events, especially on politically smart thinking as the 2016 paper could feature as a key guide/product.
* The MEL Unit should regularly engage with the Governance COP community manager and facilitator and devote a percentage of time to engaging with the COP/Sparkblue platform to build a more visible presence for the rule of law, justice, security and human rights portfolios so that information is more readily accessible to UNDP’s practitioner network.

**Annex III: GP4 2022 Policy and Knowledge Roadmap**
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**Annex IV: MEL Unit Terms of Reference**

**MEL Specialist (P3)**

|  |
| --- |
| **II. Job Purpose and Organizational Context** |
| UNDP is the knowledge frontier organization for sustainable development in the UN Development System and serves as the integrator for collective action to realize the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). UNDP’s policy work carried out at headquarters, regional and country office-levels, forms a contiguous spectrum of deep local knowledge to cutting-edge global perspectives and advocacy. In this context, UNDP invests in the Global Policy Network (GPN), a network of field-based and global technical expertise across a wide range of knowledge domains and in support of the signature solutions and organizational capabilities envisioned in UNDP’s 2022-2025 Strategic Plan. The vision of the GPN is to become the cutting-edge provider of timely development advice; providing support to UNDP country offices and programmes in an integrated and coherent manner. The GPN draws on expertise globally to provide more effective responses to the complex development challenges countries face in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and responding to crisis in an integrated and coherent manner.  Within the GPN, the Crisis Bureau has the responsibility for support to prevention, crisis response, resilience and recovery work under the auspices of UNDP’s Strategic Plan. Part of the Crisis Bureau, the Rule of Law, Security and Human Rights (ROLSHR) team is responsible for practice and policy development in the areas of rule of law, justice, security, and human rights as they relate to crisis prevention, response and recovery in conflict and disaster settings through the implementation of the Global Programme on Strengthening the Rule of Law and Human Rights for Sustaining Peace and Fostering Development (the Global Programme). The Global Programme is widely recognized for its ability to mobilize funds, provide technical and strategic expertise, and collaborate and coordinate across UN entities to enable more holistic, coherent and comprehensive responses to rule of law, justice, security and human rights challenges. It provides tailored, context-specific technical, financial and strategic support to contexts across the development spectrum. Phase III of the Global Programme concludes in December 2020.  Phase IV of the renamed *Global Programme for Strengthening the Rule of Law, Human Rights, Justice and Security for Sustainable Peace and Development,* builds on experience, lessons and achievements during Phase III and is guided by and aligned to UNDP’s 2022-2025 Strategic Plan. In Phase IV, the Global Programme is committed to strengthening the quality, impact and reporting of UNDPs rule of law and human rights programming through an investment in building systems and capacities for improved monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL). This focus complements UNDPs organisational commitment towards greater impact measurement and continuous learning and adaptation. A dedicated Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) & Innovation Unit will be established through the Global Programme to support strengthened results-based management systems, including the development and piloting of MEL tools and templates and learning and knowledge exchange mechanisms. The unit will contribute to building a constructive learning environment at all levels. It will support the Rule of Law, Security and Human Rights (ROLSHR) team, UNDP country offices, regional hubs and partners to develop and apply the tools, knowledge and capacities needed for a systematic approach to evidence-based learning and knowledge creation and exchange. It will leverage existing and new mechanisms, such as the GPN’s Communities of Practice, to ensure learning and knowledge is captured, regularly shared and purposefully informs day-to-day programming, UNDPs broader organisation-wide learning, and global policy discussions and developments on matters of ROLSHR and development.  The Global Programme’s MEL and Innovation Unit will include the MEL Specialist, the MEL Officer, and the Strategic Reporting and Learning Programme Analyst who will work together to develop and lead the programme’s overall approach and activities for MEL, programme reporting, communications and knowledge management. The MEL Specialist reports to the Programme Manager. She/he will develop and oversee implementation of the Global Programme’s MEL strategy and learning agenda, including the development and piloting of ROLSHR-related MEL tools and guidelines for use at the country, regional and headquarters levels, with the support of the MEL Officer and Strategic Reporting and Learning Programme Analyst.  Under the supervision of the Programme Manager, the MEL Specialist will be responsible for the following:  1) Develop and oversee a comprehensive and dynamic monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) strategy, including a learning agenda, for the global ROLSHR team and the Global Programme.  2) Develop a standardised MEL system to roll out and implement country level in contexts supported by the Global Programme. This includes developing tools and guidelines that support evidence-based, innovative and quality programming with appropriate and context-specific baselines, targets and indicators.  3) Ensure the Global Programme facilitates thought leadership and makes global and regional level policy contributions on rule of law, justice, security and human rights that are informed by high-quality analytics and learning.  4) Foster strategic relationships and partnerships within UNDP and beyond to advance the Global Programme’s MEL strategy and results reporting. |

|  |
| --- |
| **III. Duties and Responsibilities** |
| **1) Develop and oversee a comprehensive and dynamic monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) strategy, including a learning agenda, for the global ROLSHR team and the Global Programme**.   * Design and develop, through a participatory approach, the Global Programme’s MEL strategy, annual MEL workplan and annual learning agenda in line with the Phase IV project document, theory of change and results framework, ensuring arrangements comply with UNDP corporate and donor requirements. Stakeholders to be consulted will include, for example, the ROLSHR team, UNDP’s Effectiveness Group, and existing MEL partners. * Lead the regular strategic review (annually) of the Global Programme’s theory of change, assumptions and results framework and adapt them as required based on programme learning. * Support the integration and mainstreaming of a learning-focused approach to MEL across the Global Programme and within the ROLSHR team, in support of UNDPs commitment in the 2022-2025 Strategic Plan to continuous learning and impact measurement across the organisation. * Support and input into corporate reporting processes such as the Integrated Results and Resources Framework and Quality Assurance Standards. |
| **2) Develop a standardised MEL system to roll out and implement country level in contexts supported by the Global Programme. This includes developing tools and guidelines that support evidence-based, innovative and quality programming with appropriate and context-specific baselines, targets and indicators.**   * Develop new and/or adapt existing MEL guidelines, tools, mechanisms and templates to support the Global Programme and country offices and regional hubs in implementing the MEL system. This will include developing a template or ‘index’ of standard lower-level indicators related to each of the Global Programme’s output that can be customised for use at the country and regional levels. * Provide technical support to country offices regarding the development, implementation and improvement of of monitoring activities and data collection tools that are context-relevant and able to capture the necessary data to report on project and programme results. * Provide capacity-building for the ROLSHR team and relevant country office staff in MEL approaches, tools and good practices for rule of law, justice, security and human rights programming. * Support the ROLSHR team to ensure programme learnings are identified, applied and supported activities adapted as needed for innovative and effective programming at the country and regional levels. * Regularly scan the fields related to rule of law, justice, security and human rights, development, and MEL for new MEL developments, tools, approaches and research, and compile and share key findings and lessons with the ROLSHR team and country offices where relevant. * Liaise with others across the Crisis Bureau, BPPS and the Global Policy Network to ensure relevant linkages with relevant initiatives, corporate requirements and guidelines. |
| **3) Ensure the Global Programme facilitates thought leadership and makes global and regional level policy contributions on rule of law, justice, security and human rights that are informed by high-quality analytics and learning**.   * Lead on the identification of lessons learned and good practices from Global Programme-supported interventions and support the development of products that capture the experiences and learnings from country office for wide dissemination. * Provide substantive inputs, informed by high-quality analysis and learning from programme interventions, to UNDP and Global Programme-led regional and global policy discussions and document development. * Contribute MEL findings to Global Programme knowledge products. * Facilitate and participate in lesson-learning and knowledge exchanges within UNDP and with external partners to advance innovative MEL approaches and tools for rule of law, justice, security and human rights programming. |
| **4) Foster strategic relationships and partnerships within UNDP and beyond to advance the Global Programme’s MEL strategy and results reporting.**   * Produce regular high-quality MEL reports for the Global Programme senior management including successes, data analysis, progress towards results etc. * Contribute MEL findings to Global Programme donor and other reporting and communications materials as required, including the annual report. * Build and strengthen strategic relationships and partnerships with think tanks, international organisations, non-government organistions and others to advance cutting-edge rule of law, justice, security and human rights-related MEL approaches, tools and learning for the Global Programme and more widely. * Serve as the focal point for internal/external assessments and evaluations of the Global Programme. * Strengthen relationships with and draw on expertise and resources within other UNDP teams, such as the Effectiveness Team, to advance innovative learning approaches in line with UNDPs organisational commitment to enhancing its capacity for continuous learning and impact measurement. * Support the ROLSHR team with other tasks related to the implementation of the Global Programme as needed. |

**MEL Officer (P2)**

|  |
| --- |
| **II. Job Purpose and Organizational Context** |
| UNDP is the knowledge frontier organization for sustainable development in the UN Development System and serves as the integrator for collective action to realize the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). UNDP’s policy work carried out at headquarters, regional and country office-levels, forms a contiguous spectrum of deep local knowledge to cutting-edge global perspectives and advocacy. In this context, UNDP invests in the Global Policy Network (GPN), a network of field-based and global technical expertise across a wide range of knowledge domains and in support of the signature solutions and organizational capabilities envisioned in UNDP’s 2022-2025 Strategic Plan. The vision of the GPN is to become the cutting-edge provider of timely development advice; providing support to UNDP country offices and programmes in an integrated and coherent manner. The GPN draws on expertise globally to provide more effective responses to the complex development challenges countries face in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and responding to crisis in an integrated and coherent manner.  Within the GPN, the Crisis Bureau has the responsibility for support to prevention, crisis response, resilience and recovery work under the auspices of UNDP’s Strategic Plan. Part of the Crisis Bureau, the Rule of Law, Justice, Security and Human Rights (ROLSHR) team is responsible for practice and policy development in the areas of rule of law, justice, security, and human rights as they relate to crisis prevention, response and recovery in conflict and disaster settings through the implementation of the Global Programme on Strengthening the Rule of Law and Human Rights for Sustaining Peace and Fostering Development (the Global Programme). The Global Programme is widely recognized for its ability to mobilize funds, provide technical and strategic expertise, and collaborate and coordinate across UN entities to enable more holistic, coherent and comprehensive responses to rule of law, justice, security and human rights challenges. It provides tailored, context-specific technical, financial and strategic support to contexts across the development spectrum. Phase III of the Global Programme concludes in December 2020.  Phase IV of the renamed *Global Programme for Strengthening the Rule of Law, Human Rights, Justice and Security for Sustainable Peace and Development* builds on experience, lessons and achievements during Phase III and is guided by and aligned to UNDP’s 2022-2025 Strategic Plan. In Phase IV, the Global Programme is committed to strengthening the quality, impact and reporting of UNDPs rule of law and human rights programming through an investment in building systems and capacities for improved monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL). This focus complements UNDPs organisational commitment towards greater impact measurement and continuous learning and adaptation. A dedicated Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) & Innovation Unit will be established through the Global Programme to support strengthened results-based management systems, including the development and piloting of MEL tools and templates and learning and knowledge exchange mechanisms. The unit will contribute to building a constructive learning environment at all levels. It will support the Rule of Law, Security and Human Rights (ROLSHR) team, UNDP country offices, regional hubs and partners to develop and apply the tools, knowledge and capacities needed for a systematic approach to evidence-based learning and knowledge creation and exchange. It will leverage existing and new mechanisms, such as the GPN’s Communities of Practice, to ensure learning and knowledge is captured, regularly shared and purposefully informs day-to-day programming, UNDPs broader organisation-wide learning, and global policy discussions and developments on matters of ROLSHR and development.  The Global Programme’s MEL and Innovation Unit will include the MEL Specialist, the MEL Officer, and the Strategic Reporting and Learning Programme Analyst who will work together to develop and lead the programme’s overall approach and activities for MEL, programme reporting, communications, and knowledge management. The MEL Officer reports to the Programme Manager. She/he will support the development and implementation of the Global Programme’s MEL strategy and learning agenda, including the piloting of ROLSHR-related MEL tools and guidelines for use at the country, regional and headquarters levels, with the support of and in close collaboration with the MEL Specialist and Strategic Reporting and Learning Programme Analyst.  Under the supervision of the Programme Manager, the MEL Officer will be responsible for the following:  1) Support the development and implementation of a comprehensive and dynamic monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) strategy, including a learning agenda, for the Global Programme.  2) Support the implementation of a standardised MEL system, including tools and guidelines, that enables evidence-based, innovative and quality programming with appropriate baselines, targets and indicators that are tailored to each individual context in which the Global Programme operates.  3) Ensure the Global Programme’s thought leadership and global and regional level policy contributions on rule of law, justice, security and human rights are informed by high-quality analytics, learning and robust knowledge management. |

|  |
| --- |
| **III. Duties and Responsibilities** |
| **1) Support the development and implementation of a comprehensive and dynamic monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) strategy, including a learning agenda, for the Global Programme**.   * Support the MEL Specialist in designing, through a participatory approach, the Global Programme’s MEL strategy, annual MEL workplan and annual learning agenda in line with the Phase IV project document, theory of change and results framework, ensuring arrangements comply with UNDP corporate and donor requirements. Stakeholders to be consulted will include, for example, the ROLSHR team, UNDP’s Effectiveness Group, and existing MEL partners. * Support the MEL Specialist in conducting the regular strategic review (annually) of the Global Programme’s theory of change, assumptions and results framework, and adapt them as required based on programme learning. * Support the integration and mainstreaming of a learning-focused approach to MEL across the Global Programme and within the ROLSHR team, in support of UNDPs commitment in the 2022-2025 Strategic Plan to continuous learning and impact measurement across the organisation. * Support and input into corporate reporting processes such as the Integrated Results and Resources Framework and Quality Assurance Standards. |
| **2) Support to the implementation of a standardised MEL system, including tools and guidelines, that supports evidence-based, innovative and quality programming with appropriate baselines, targets and indicators that are tailored to each individual context in which the Global Programme operates.**   * Work with the MEL Specialist to develop new and/or adapt existing MEL guidelines, tools, mechanisms and templates to support the Global Programme and country offices and regional hubs in implementing the MEL system. This will include developing a template or ‘index’ of standard lower-level indicators related to each of the Global Programme’s output that can be customised for use at the country and regional levels. * Provide technical support to country offices regarding the development, implementation and improvement of of monitoring activities and data collection tools that are context-relevant and able to capture the necessary data to report on project and programme results. * Provide capacity-building for the ROLSHR team and relevant country office staff in MEL approaches, data collection tools and good practices for use in rule of law, justice, security and human rights programming. * Support the ROLSHR team to ensure programme learnings are identified, applied and supported activities adapted as needed for innovative and effective programming at the country and regional levels. * Contribute to the preparation of regular high-quality MEL reports for the Global Programme senior management including successes, data analysis, progress towards results etc. |
| **3) Ensure the Global Programme’s thought leadership and global and regional level policy contributions on rule of law, justice, security and human rights are informed by high-quality analytics and learning**.   * Identify lessons learned and good practices from Global Programme-supported interventions and support the development of products that capture the experiences and learnings from country office for wide dissemination. * Provide substantive inputs, informed by high-quality analysis and learning from programme interventions, to UNDP and Global Programme-led regional and global policy discussions and document development. * Contribute MEL findings to Global Programme knowledge products. * Contribute MEL findings to Global Programme donor and other reporting and communications materials as required, including the annual report. * Participate in lesson-learning and knowledge exchanges within UNDP and with external partners to advance innovative MEL approaches and tools for rule of law, justice, security and human rights programming. * Support the ROLSHR team with other tasks related to the implementation of the Global Programme as needed. |

**Reporting and Learning Analyst (P2) [PLEASE INSERT]**

**Annex V: GP4 Quality Assurance Standards**

| **Project QA Assessment: Design and Appraisal** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Project** | | | | | |
| **Exemplary (5)**  **🞋🞋🞋🞋🞋** | **Highly Satisfactory (4)**  **🞋🞋🞋🞋⭘** | **Satisfactory (3)**  **🞋🞋🞋⭘⭘** | **Needs Improvement (2)**  **🞋🞋⭘⭘⭘** | **Inadequate (1)**  **🞋⭘⭘⭘⭘** | |
| At least four criteria are rated Exemplary, and all criteria are rated High or Exemplary. | All criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and at least four criteria are rated High or Exemplary. | At least six criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and only one may be rated Needs Improvement. The Principled criterion must be rated Satisfactory or above. | At least three criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and only four criteria may be rated Needs Improvement. | One or more criteria are rated Inadequate, or five or more criteria are rated Needs Improvement. | |
| **DECISION** | | | | | |
| * **APPROVE** – the project is of sufficient quality to be approved in its current form**.** Any management actions must be addressed in a timely manner. * **APPROVE WITH QUALIFICATIONS** – the project has issues that must be addressed before the project document can be approved. Any management actions must be addressed in a timely manner. * **DISAPPROVE** – the project has significant issues that should prevent the project from being approved as drafted. | | | | | |
| **RATING CRITERIA**  **For all questions, select the option that best reflects the project** | | | | | |
| **Strategic** |  | | | | |
| 1. **Does the project specify how it will contribute to higher level change through linkage to the programme’s Theory of Change?**  * **3:** The project is clearly linked to the programme’s theory of change. It has an explicit change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome level change and why the project’s strategy will likely lead to this change. This analysis is backed by credible evidence of what works effectively in this context and includes assumptions and risks. * **2:** The project is clearly linked to the programme’s theory of change. It has a change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome-level change and why the project strategy will likely lead to this change. * **1:** The project document may describe in generic terms how the project will contribute to development results, without an explicit link to the programme’s theory of change.   *\*Note: Projects not contributing to a programme must have a project-specific Theory of Change. See alternative question under the lightbulb for these cases.* | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  See Section II, 2.4 for the high-level TOC & assumptions. Specific programming assumptions/evidence are articulated in the opening paragraphs of each output description (see Section III, 3.1). Additional GP assumptions and risks are articulated at sub-section 3.3. | |
| 1. **Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?**  * **3:** The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan[[16]](#footnote-16) and adapts at least one Signature Solution[[17]](#footnote-17). The project’s RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. *(all must be true)* * **2:** The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan4. The project’s RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. *(both must be true)* * **1:** The project responds to a partner’s identified need, but this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF. | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  See Section II, 2.4, a) Overview; and Section III, 3.1, a) Introduction. The GP’s operational enablers also reflect/align to the UNDP Strategic Plan (see Section 2.5, b).)  See also Results Framework at Section V. | |
| 1. **Is the project linked to the programme outputs? (i.e., UNDAF Results Group Workplan/CPD, RPD or Strategic Plan IRRF for global projects/strategic interventions not part of a programme)** | | | | **Yes** | **No** |
| **Relevant** |  | | | | |
| 1. **Does the project target groups left furthest behind?**  * **3:** The target groups are clearly specified, prioritising discriminated and marginalized groups left furthest behind, identified through a rigorous process based on evidence. * **2:** The target groups are clearly specified, prioritizing groups left furthest behind. * **1:** The target groups are not clearly specified.   \*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1. *Projects that build institutional capacity should still identify targeted groups to justify support* | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  See Section I, 1.1 (Situation analysis); Section II, 2.4 (TOC statement and footnote 97); Section II, 2.5 (Guiding principles – people-centred). Also Section II, Output 1. See Eligibility criteria page 72 which asks for stakeholder engagement and prioritization. | |
| 1. **Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design?**  * **3:** Knowledge and lessons learned backed by credible evidence from sources such as evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, and/or monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to justify the approach used by the project. * **2:** The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence/sources, but have not been used to justify the approach selected. * **1:** There is little or no mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the project design. Any references made are anecdotal and not backed by evidence.   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  See Section II, 2.2 and 2.4; Table 1; and Section III, 3.1 which specifically mentions that main evaluations, assessments and learning relied on to develop the expected results. | |
| 1. **Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national/regional/global partners and other actors?**  * **3:** An analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project, including identification of potential funding partners. It is clear how results achieved by partners will complement the project’s intended results and a communication strategy is in place to communicate results and raise visibility vis-à-vis key partners. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have been considered, as appropriate. *(all must be true)* * **2:** Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of and division of labour between UNDP and partners through the project, with unclear funding and communications strategies or plans. * **1:** No clear analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area that the project intends to work. There is risk that the project overlaps and/or does not coordinate with partners’ interventions in this area. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have not been considered, despite its potential relevance.   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  See Section II, 2.3 Comparative advantage; Section III, 3.2 on partnerships detailing the strategic advantage of existing partnerships built up during Phase 3. See also Box 1 regarding the GFP and the operational enabler: A strategic approach to partnerships, emphasizing the Global Programme's contribution to One UN and Triple Nexus approaches, for example see indicator 4.4. See also Output 6 and the Results Framework indicator 6.5 for specific focus on partnerships. Also see the Annexes for the Terms of Reference for the Partners/Experts Advisory Groups. | |
| **Principled** | | | | | |
| 1. **Does the project apply a human rights-based approach?**  * **3:** The project is guided by human rights and incorporates the principles of accountability, meaningful participation, and non-discrimination in the project’s strategy. The project upholds the relevant international and national laws and standards. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed as relevant, with appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into project design and budget.*(all must be true)* * **2:** The project is guided by human rights by prioritizing accountability, meaningful participation and non-discrimination. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were identified and assessed as relevant, and appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget. *(both must be true)* * **1:** No evidence that the project is guided by human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were considered.   \*Note: Management action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  See Section II, 2.5 – human rights is a core thematic area of the GP and also a guiding principle. See also Outputs 1, 2 and 4 for specific interventions related to accountability, meaningful participation, and non-discrimination, HRBA and HRDDP. See also Operational Effectiveness indicator 1 which measures integration of human rights based approaches in projects/programmes of the GP. | |
| 1. **Does the project use gender analysis in the project design?**  * **3:** A participatory gender analysis has been conducted and results from this gender analysis inform the development challenge, strategy and expected results sections of the project document. Outputs and indicators of the results framework include explicit references to gender equality, and specific indicators measure and monitor results to ensure women are fully benefitting from the project. *(all must be true)* * **2:** A basic gender analysis has been carried out and results from this analysis are scattered (i.e., fragmented and not consistent) across the development challenge and strategy sections of the project document. The results framework may include some gender sensitive outputs and/or activities but gender inequalities are not consistently integrated across each output. *(all must be true)* * **1:** The project design may or may not mention information and/or data on the differential impact of the project’s development situation on gender relations, women and men, but the gender inequalities have not been clearly identified and reflected in the project document.   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  Section I includes gender analysis in each section of the situation analysis; Section II, 2.5 - gender equality is a guiding principle. All outputs contain reference to gender and include gender-related activities.  The Results Framework has specific gender indicators, see indicator 1.6, 3.4, 3.6, 4.2, Operational Effectiveness 2 and 3.  Global Programme Pipeline support eligibility criteria states that projects must promote gender equality in a significant way (Gender Marker 2 or 3) and assign a minimum of 15% of their funding to activities related to gender equality and women’s empowerment. | |
| **9. Did the project support the resilience and sustainability of societies and/or ecosystems?**   * **3:** Credible evidence that the project addresses sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges, which are integrated in the project strategy and design. The project reflects the interconnections between the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. *(all must be true)*. * **2:** The project design integrates sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and assessed, and relevant management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. *(both must be true)* * **1:** Sustainability and resilience dimensions and impacts were not adequately considered.   \*Note: Management action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  See Output 4, specifically examining community resilience from a human security perspective. Also Section II, 2.5, operational enabler: integrated responses to complex challenges.  See SESP (attached). | |
| **10. Has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks?** The SESP is not required for projects in which UNDP is Administrative Agent only and/or projects comprised solely of reports, coordination of events, trainings, workshops, meetings, conferences and/or communication materials and information dissemination. [if yes, upload the completed checklist. If SESP is not required, provide the reason for the exemption in the evidence section.] | | | | Yes | No |
|  | |
| **Management & Monitoring** | | | | | |
| 1. **Does the project have a strong results framework?**  * **3:** The project’s selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the key expected development changes, each with credible data sources and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate. *(all must be true)* * **2:** The project’s selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators, but baselines, targets and data sources may not yet be fully specified. Some use of target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators, as appropriate. *(all must be true)* * **1:** The project’s selection of outputs and activities are not at an appropriate level; outputs are not accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the expected change and have not been populated with baselines and targets; data sources are not specified, and/or no gender sensitive, sex-disaggregation of indicators. *(if any is true)*   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  See Section V on the Results Framework and accompanying methodological note. | |
| **12. Is the project’s governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including composition of the project board?**   * **3:** The project’s governance mechanism is fully defined. Individuals have been specified for each position in the governance mechanism (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference. The ToR of the project board has been attached to the project document. *(all must be true)*. * **2:** The project’s governance mechanism is defined; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not have been specified yet. The project document lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles. *(all must be true)* * **1:** The project’s governance mechanism is loosely defined in the project document, only mentioning key roles that will need to be filled at a later date. No information on the responsibilities of key positions in the governance mechanism is provided.   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  See Section VIII on Governance and Management Arrangements, and the accompanying annex – Terms of Reference for the Project Board. Also see Section 4.2 on Project Management. | |
| **13.** **Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risk?**   * **3:** Project risks related to the achievement of results are fully described in the project risk log, based on comprehensive analysis drawing on the programme’s theory of change, Social and Environmental Standards and screening, situation analysis, capacity assessments and other analysis such as funding potential and reputational risk. Risks have been identified through a consultative process with key internal and external stakeholders. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk, reflected in project budgeting and monitoring plans. *(both must be true)* * **2:** Project risks related to the achievement of results are identified in the initial project risk log based on a minimum level of analysis and consultation, with mitigation measures identified for each risk. * **1:** Some risks may be identified in the initial project risk log, but no evidence of consultation or analysis and no clear risk mitigation measures identified. This option is also selected if risks are not clearly identified and/or no initial risk log is included with the project document.   \*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1 | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  See Section III and Risks and Mitigation, Section X on Risk Management, Section IX on the Legal Context and the accompanying risk log in Annex 3.  Additional risk assessments were undertaken by prospective donors during prodoc development. | |
| **Efficient** |  | | | | |
| 1. **Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design? This can include, for example: i) using the theory of change analysis to explore different options of achieving the maximum results with the resources available; ii) using a portfolio management approach to improve cost effectiveness through synergies with other interventions; iii) through joint operations (e.g., monitoring or procurement) with other partners; iv) sharing resources or coordinating delivery with other projects, v) using innovative approaches and technologies to reduce the cost of service delivery or other types of interventions.**   *(Note: Evidence of at least one measure must be provided to answer yes for this question)* | | | | Yes (3) | No (1) |
| **15. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?**   * **3:** The project’s budget is at the activity level with funding sources, and is specified for the duration of the project period in a multi-year budget. Realistic resource mobilisation plans are in place to fill unfunded components. Costs are supported with valid estimates using benchmarks from similar projects or activities. Cost implications from inflation and foreign exchange exposure have been estimated and incorporated in the budget. Adequate costs for monitoring, evaluation, communications and security have been incorporated. * **2:** The project’s budget is at the activity level with funding sources, when possible, and is specified for the duration of the project in a multi-year budget, but no funding plan is in place. Costs are supported with valid estimates based on prevailing rates. * **1:** The project’s budget is not specified at the activity level, and/or may not be captured in a multi-year budget. | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  The 4-year budget costs are supported with valid estimates based on the previous phases of the programme and is in line with the overall lifetime delivery of the Global Programme. Adequate costs for monitoring, evaluation, communications and security have been incorporated. | |
| 1. **Is the Country Office/Regional Hub/Global Project fully recovering the costs involved with project implementation?**  * **3:** The budget fully covers all project costs that are attributable to the project, including programme management and development effectiveness services related to strategic country programme planning, quality assurance, pipeline development, policy advocacy services, finance, procurement, human resources, administration, issuance of contracts, security, travel, assets, general services, information and communications based on full costing in accordance with prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL.) * **2:** The budget covers significant project costs that are attributable to the project based on prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL) as relevant. * **1:** The budget does not adequately cover project costs that are attributable to the project, and UNDP is cross-subsidizing the project.   \*Note: Management Action must be given for a score of 1. The budget must be revised to fully reflect the costs of implementation before the project commences. | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  Project management and support, delivery enabling services, GMS, M&E are included in the budget. The last phase of the project fully encompassed these costs at global level as well as many of these costs at country level. This phase of the project has been designed to do so as well. | |
| **Effective** |  | | | | |
| **17. Have targeted groups been engaged in the design of the project?**   * 3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritising discriminated and marginalized populations that will be involved in or affected by the project, have been actively engaged in the design of the project. The project has an explicit strategy to identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of target groups as stakeholders throughout the project, including through monitoring and decision-making (e.g., representation on the project board, inclusion in samples for evaluations, etc.) * 2: Some evidence that key targeted groups have been consulted in the design of the project. * 1: No evidence of engagement with targeted groups during project design. | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  The midterm evaluation of Phase 3 included extensive stakeholder perspectives, which directly impacted the design of this phase (see Section 2.2 on Lessons Learned from Phase III). Additionally, key stakeholders and partners to the Global Programme have been consulted throughout the project design phase through mechanisms such as the Partners Advisory Group, the ROL Annual Meeting and SparkBlue consultations. Stakeholder engagement and prioritization of those most marginalized and furthest left behind if part of the eligibility criteria for GP funding. | |
| **18. Does the project plan for adaptation and course correction if regular monitoring activities, evaluation, and lesson learned demonstrate there are better approaches to achieve the intended results and/or circumstances change during implementation?** | | | | Yes  (3) | No  (1) |
| **19. The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2 or GEN3, indicating that gender has been fully mainstreamed into all project outputs at a minimum.**  \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of “no” | | | | Yes  (3) | No  (1) |
| **Evidence** | |
| **Sustainability & National Ownership** | | | | | |
| **20. Have national/regional/global partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the project?**   * **3:** National partners (or regional/global partners for regional and global projects) have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP. * **2:** The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with national/regional/global partners. * **1:** The project has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners. | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  This project is directly implemented by UNDP, but has been developed in close consultation with relevant partners (see evidence for Question 17 above). Consultations with colleagues in headquarters, regional hubs and regional bureaus took place during project development. Responsibility for liaising with national partners – especially government counterpart – is vested in Resident Representatives and is decentralized tothe Country Offices receiving funding through the Global Programme. | |
| **21. Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific/ comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted?**   * **3:** The project has a strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on a completed capacity assessment. This strategy includes an approach to regularly monitor national capacities using clear indicators and rigorous methods of data collection, and adjust the strategy to strengthen national capacities accordingly. * **2:** A capacity assessment has been completed. There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on the results of the capacity assessment. * **1:** Capacity assessments have not been carried out. | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence**  The GP promotes activities aimed at transforming justice and security institutions and systems – see Section II, 2.5 (guiding principle: transformative) See Section III, 3.1; and also Output 3 and the strategy for change that articulates how the GP will support country offices to design context-specific interventions.  The GP prioritizes support to country offices to strengthen MEL systems and measurement to better reflect impact and enable learning and adaptation (see Output 5, also the operational enabler: robust systems for MEL). | |
| **22. Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the** **project will use national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc.,) to the extent possible?** | | | | Yes (3) | No (1) |
| **23. Is there a clear transition arrangement/ phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilisation and communications strategy)?** | | | | Yes (3) | No (1) |

**Annex 6: GP4 Risk Analysis**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Title: The Global Programme for Strengthening the Rule of Law, Human Rights, Justice and Security for Sustainable Peace and Development**  **(Phase IV)** | **Project Number:** | **Date: August 2021** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Description** | **Risk Category** | **Impact &**  **Likelihood = Risk Level** | **Risk Treatment / Management Measures** | **Risk Owner** |
| 1 | Changing political environments and national priorities undermine or compromise institutional capacity development efforts. | Political | Due to the nature of the Global Programme’s engagement in crisis and fragile contexts, it is sometimes the case that conflict, crisis, etc. affect the ability to operate. This has previously been the case in countries such as Syria, Yemen, CAR, etc.  P = 5  I = 5 | Engage in early warning scanning to identify potential hotspots for crisis and ensure fluid and regular communication between country level counterparts, regional advisors and HQ.  Plan jointly with other UN and multilateral entities to access entry points in other areas of engagement, including those where needs have shifted from those identified in earlier analysis.  Creating flexible, quality programme frameworks at country level allows projects to overcome setbacks, such as a delay in activity due to instability, and resume successful implementation at the appropriate time. Reprogramme funds where needed to areas where ROLSHR interventions can take place. | ROLSHR/GFP and country-level leadership |
| 2 | Changing priorities within the international community weaken efforts to integrate rule of law and human rights in peacebuilding, stabilization and recovery processes, or other initiatives to address or prevent fragility and conflict. | Political | Major crises such as the ongoing Syrian crisis, security concerns such terrorism and border control, and/or decisions taken in the coming months regarding financing across humanitarian, peacebuilding and development sectors could shift international priorities away from investing in UNDP ROLSHR efforts. Given the current COVID-19 pandemic, and the decrease in ODA and core contributions from member states could further weaken the ROLSHR sector.  P = 3  I = 3 | Continue efforts to promote the SDGs, in particular Goal 16, as the building block for sustaining peace and fostering development in fragile and crisis contexts.  Continue to build partnerships and position UNDP as the key leader in coordinating and delivering rule of law and human rights assistance in the international community, as well as on promoting SDG 16.  Improve understanding of donor interests and priorities for in-country programming, and engage in regular dialogue to build coalition around aligned strategies for implementation.  Further understanding and implications of COVID-19 pandemic on donor funding cuts. | ROLSHR/GFP and country level leadership |
| 3 | Weak inter-agency engagement from partners at headquarters and country level. | Operational, strategic | HQ coordination is strong due to the GFP. However, the GFP has been less successful at mobilizing UN actors in the field to jointly engage and deliver on rule of law assistance due to low visibility and lack of communication.  P = 4  I = 3 | Strengthen communications and engagement from relevant UN agencies/bodies, and improve HQ ability to navigate and overcome administrative obstacles to joint efforts. Ensure the development of communications materials in French and Spanish to further understanding and buy-in at the country level.  Improve efforts and ability to engage, understand and meet UN senior management and/or political leadership immediate concerns and needs to allow for future rule of law and human rights engagement.  Encourage more joint practices at field level and showcase positive results. | ROLSHR/GFP leadership |
| 4 | Inadequate response to resource mobilisation efforts hamper the programme’s capacity to respond to increasing demand for support from UNDP Country Offices, regional hubs and host governments. | Financial | The current global COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in a significant reduction of ODA and may continue to do so over the next years. This has directly impacted the core funding made available to the ROLSHR team to sustain operational activities. Additionally, many Global Programme partners are unable to secure and commit to multiyear funding proposals.  P = 4  P = 4 | Resource mobilization for the programme is ongoing with both traditional and non-traditional partners, and multiyear donor commitments are in the process of being secured.  Each member of the ROLSHR team shares responsibility to mobilize financial resources (and in-kind resources where appropriate), and should work to better understand donor interest for in-country ROLSHR programming.  Creating flexible programme frameworks at country level allows projects to overcome setbacks, such as lack of funding, and reorient activities utilizing available resources. The new MEL unit will also support countries in measure success and reprogramme when there are challenges.  Following the 2021 Annual Meeting on Strengthening the Rule of Law in Crisis Contexts, resource mobilization prospects are positive with some key donors and there is renewed interest in new areas of work such as business and human rights, climate justice etc. | ROLSHR/GFP leadership |
| 5 | Unpredictable management, lack of buy in, and/or financial or personnel constraints within Country Offices prevent UNDP rule of law and human rights assistance from achieving maximum effect. | Operational | In certain contexts during previous phases, COs would shift priorities and focus of programmatic activities, leaving little resources for developing a comprehensive rule of law and human rights programme. In other cases, CO management has been altogether resistant to engage in the rule of law and human rights area. This may sometimes be due to the political context in country, lack of resources, or lack of staff and capacities.  P = 3  I = 3 | ROLSHR team can work across UNDP technical teams and through the GPN as well as GFP entities to identify areas where rule of law and human rights programming can be implemented into broader stabilization and peacebuilding programmes. This can serve as a reasonable stop-gap measure until support is garnered for development engagement across the whole rule of law and human rights sector. | ROLSHR/GFP leadership |
| 6 | Challenges in identifying highly qualified and experienced rule of law and human rights experts with whom to partner for rapid deployment. | Organizational | The ROLSHR team has faced this challenge consistently when faced with a need for technical or substantive expertise in Arab and French speaking contexts.  P = 5  I= 3 | Arabic and French speaking members of the ROLSHR team have been available for short-term missions and detailed assignments to places such as Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Burkina Faso, CAR, etc.  Additionally, CSMT maintains an express roster of rapidly deployable personnel. Efforts should be made to strengthen capacities where gaps exist, such as that of Arab and French speakers.  Agreements are also being formalized with bilateral partners for future access to standing expert capacities for rapid deployment.  Some of the regional advisor post recently filled did address some of these concerns. | ROLSHR/CB management |
| 7 | Lack of operational or technical capacities, including MEL capacities, in UNDP Country Offices limits delivery and reporting of catalytic effect of pipeline funding. | Operational | Given the ongoing COVID-19 crisis as well as the continuing refugee crisis caused by the conflict in Syria, and other economic/crisis situations across the MENA and Afghanistan region have impacted places such as Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey. These now-host communities have not in recent years been classified as “crisis-affected or fragile,” however the rapid influx of refugees to these countries has resulted in a significant need for assistance from UNDP and the international community to provide services including those related to rule of law and human rights. As a result of this increased demand, COs which are not typically active in rule of law programming do not hold the technical capacities necessary to deliver in this area. There has also been an influx of migration across Central America as well as political crisis requiring new types of support such as work on constitutional processes. The COVID crisis has affected all countries and increased digitalization and digitization work where further skills will need to be developed at all levels.  P = 2  I = 4 | ROLSHR has deployed technical experts on short-term missions to these COs to assess needs in these host communities, and aid in the design of country-level projects and programmes. The development of the GPN has helped ensure that experts are in place when and where they need to be. While most COs supported by the Global Programme maintain technical capacities to implement rule of law and human rights programming, the capacities available at the HQ and regional level can stop-gap these needs when they arise until longer-term solutions are found. | ROLSHR leadership |
| 8 | Reduced or limited access and ability to work in some settings due to security restrictions for programme staff and consultants. | Security | The contexts supported by the Global Programme are, on the whole, classified as crisis/conflict-affected or fragile. These contexts present challenging operational environments where staff security needs are often elevated from those in normal development contexts.  P = 3  I = 5 | Security situations are continuously monitored with Country Offices to ensure that staff are safe, and to determine the feasibility of continuing programmatic assistance. | ROLSHR leadership |
| 9 | Interoperability challenges such as incompatibilities across finance systems negatively affects inter-agency joint rule of law programming, especially in Mission settings, and slows delivery. | Operational | As the Global programme is the financial vehicle for the GFP and in country joint programmes, and the known challenges across the carious UN operational and management systems, the joint programming can often raise challenges and slow down implementation of projects.  P=4  I=1 | The UNDP ROLSHR team and the GFP core team is currently drafting a GFP joint programming guidance note which will address some of these challenges. This may also leads to greater understanding between the operational and management systems of the various UN agencies, funds and programmes. | ROLSHR leadership and GFP Managers |

1. Evaluations were conducted in Central African Republic, Colombia, Jordan, Guinea Bissau, Palestine, and the Democratic Republic of Congo. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For example, the UNU Study on rule of law support to conflict prevention and sustaining peace, lessons from the field, see <https://unu.edu/projects/rule-of-law-support-to-conflict-prevention-and-sustaining-peace-lessons-from-the-field.html#outline>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Interim evaluation; ISSAT evaluations for Colombia, Jordan, Guinea-Bissau; UNDP Conflict Country Evaluation (December 2020); UNDP Strategic Plan 2022–2025; MOPAN 2020 Assessment Cycle, Draft Institutional Assessment: UNDP, Version 16 July 2021 also noted that UNDP’s results management approach (institution-wide) “remains the weakest link, as previous MOPAN assessments and the evaluation of the Strategic Plan 2018–21 demonstrate.” [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See, for example: <https://medium.com/@undp.innovation/rethinking-monitoring-and-evaluation-in-complex-systems-when-learning-is-a-result-in-itself-3d1fc90d22fc> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Please see Annex IV of the GP4 project document for the latest version of the methodological note as well as the full GP4 results framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The GP4 Theory of Change can be found in section 2.4 of the project document. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Terms of Reference for the MEL Unit positions are available in Annex IV and also in Annex IV of the GP4 project document. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. GP4 also meets corporate guidelines for Quality Assurance and Risk Monitoring (see Annex V and VI). These markers are required to be revisited biennially and annually, respectively, to ensure compliance is retained throughout the GP4 lifecycle. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. While small-scale tailoring to donor requests may be needed on an ad hoc basis, the GP4 results framework, for all intents and purposes, should be considered sufficient to meet donor reporting requirements. Should donors require specific information for their own reporting purposes, these requests should be made early on to ensure the MEL Unit sufficient time to analyze and synthesize the needed data. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Annual Reports during the GP4 lifecycle will also feature lessons learned, learning, knowledge curation and risk management more prominently. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. For more on evaluating contribution versus attribution for M&E in complex systems, please see: <https://medium.com/@undp.innovation/rethinking-monitoring-and-evaluation-in-complex-systems-when-learning-is-a-result-in-itself-3d1fc90d22fc> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. See Annex II for the GP4 provisional learning plan. This plan will be validated by the MEL Unit, once recruited, in conjunction with the ROLSHR team inputs and advice. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. As with the COP learning agendas, the GP4 learning agenda model draws heavily on the methodology and recommendations of the USAID Learning Lab, available at: <https://usaidlearninglab.org/cla/cla-toolkit> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Relevant functions in the Crisis Bureau may shift, pending the results and recommendations of the OUMA process. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The ROLSHR team should explore collaboration on the COP-anchored events, especially on politically-smart thinking as the 2016 paper could feature as a key guide/product. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. The three development settings in UNDP’s 2018-2021 Strategic Plan are: a) Eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions; b) Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development; and c) Build resilience to shocks and crises [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. The six Signature Solutions of UNDP’s 2018-2021 Strategic Plan are: a) Keeping people out of poverty; b) Strengthen effective, inclusive and accountable governance; c) Enhance national prevention and recovery capacities for resilient societies; d) Promote nature based solutions for a sustainable planet; e) Close the energy gap; and f) Strengthen gender equality and the empowerment

    of women and girls. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)