

RBAP Internal Checklist for Quality Assurance of Decentralized Evaluations Workflow and Checklist

Currently in UNDP (including RBAP), only around 20% of the decentralized evaluations are found to be satisfactory. This trend is recurrent and stagnant for several years. See snapshot from 2019.



The aim of this checklist is to enhance quality assurance to improve the quality of decentralized evaluations in RBAP. To ensure that the TORs and the Evaluation Reports of Decentralized Evaluations are closely aligned with the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) [Quality Assessment criteria](#) and the [Evaluation guidelines](#), starting Q1 of 2021, the RBAP RBM Group* is proposing to Country Offices (CO) and the Regional Programme to complete the below proposed checklists, before any TORs or Final Reports can be uploaded in the ERC.

1. Workflow for finalizing and Uploading Final Evaluation Reports in ERC:

- CO/RP shares the DRAFT evaluation report along with the completed evaluation report checklist below.
- The [draft evaluation report](#) should follow the outline detailed in the Evaluation guidelines.
- CO/RP should NOT proceed to pay for the final evaluation unless it completes the checklist and most of the questions are answered positively.
- If the CO/RP foresees that there are certain elements in the evaluation that need support and revision, CO/RP can reach out to RBAP RBM Group* anytime during the evaluation cycle, and BEFORE acceptance of the draft report and final payment for the evaluation is made.
- BRH Evaluation FP will not approve the uploading of an evaluation report to the ERC website unless the checklist is completed and at least 80% of the answers of the checklist are answered positively.
- For CO - the CO DRR and the CO RBM Focal Point should sign off the TOR checklist.
For RP - the Regional Programme Coordinator and the RP RBM Focal Point should sign off the TOR checklist.

Evaluation Report Checklist (based on the [Evaluation Outline](#) detailed in the guidelines)

Area	Yes	NO	If no, please

			explain why ¹
Does the draft evaluation report follow the UNDP standard report outline ?	Yes		
Methodology			
1. Well-balanced structure, clearly defined evaluation objectives	Yes – (Section 4 objectives have been clearly defined)		
2. Clearly outlined methodological approach, adequate stakeholders/partners involvement	Yes, it's well balanced and structured. Clear methodology has been outlined and all related information have been annexed as well- Stakeholder detail has been incorporated for federal level, province level and district level as well.(Section 5)		
3. Clearly defined and adequate data collection approach and scope	Yes. The data collection approach is well defined and covers the scope mentioned in the TOR as well. All methods used have been mentioned with rational behind that as well. The report also contains the limitations/risk and mitigation plan section as well regards to the methods used. (section 5)		
4. Evaluation of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability	Yes. The findings have been presented under four outputs of SDP based on the UNEG evaluation criteria of relevancy, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability (Section 6)		
5. Linkages with national strategies, CPD, UNDAF/ UNSDCF	Yes it has been covered under section 3(SDP intervention and strategic context where it discusses the alignment with national priorities,UNDAF and CPD and the outputs of project contributing towards these outcomes.		

¹ Add a row under the question to elaborate on your answer

6. Assessment of programme funding and utilization (not essential)		No, any detail has been given regarding the budget utilization /expenditure, but under sustainability the funding sources has been somehow discussed during the survey and interviews.	
7. Assessment of M&E design, implementation	Yes . Evaluation matrix- under effectiveness “To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?”		
Cross-cutting issues			
8. Adequately addresses cross-cutting areas including gender and human rights throughout, including methodology and data analysis, findings/conclusion/recommendations.	Yes, overall d31.2 % females as sample has been selected for the survey. Data analysis also discusses about women involvement but it could have been more gender focused if for each percentage the no of female were also mentioned. There are also recommendations related to gender as well. Human right has been discussed but not in detail.		
Report finding/ recommendations/ conclusions			
9. Findings and conclusions are logical, well-articulated, linked and supported by evidence.	Yes		
10. Recommendations are clear and actionable linked to country office outcomes, strategies	Yes		

Sign off

*Sabeeh***Mr. Syed Sabeeh Zaidi***RBM Analyst -HEAD MSU**United Nations Development Programme, Serena Business Complex, 4th floor,**Khayaban-e-Suhrawardy, Islamabad**Pakistan**Date: -*