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. B
- 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	N0	If no, please explain why[1]

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

Does the draft evaluation report follow the UNDP standard report outline?	Yes		
Methodology			
1. Well-balanced structure, clearly defined evaluation objectives	Yes – (Section 2 and 3 covers the scope and objectives of the Evaluation in detail along with the main evaluation questions.		
2. Clearly outlined methodological approach, adequate stakeholders/partners involvement	Yes, the section 3 of the report clearly outlines the methodology, the stakeholder involved (gender-based segregation as well) and the limitations with regards to the approach and methodology and also the ways adopted to overcome the gapes		
3. Clearly defined and adequate data collection approach and scope	Yes (section 3)		
4. Evaluation of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability	Yes. Each evaluation question has been analyzed with regards to the UNEG evaluation criteria (Section 4- findings and conclusions)		
5. Linkages with national strategies, CPD, UNDAF/ UNSDCF	Yes. the question "To what extent was the SELP project in line with the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs? Under section 4.1.1 and the conclusion 4.1.1.2 is all about the linkages between project and CPD, UNDAF-SP outcomes. "		
6. Assessment of programme funding and utilization (not essential)	Yes. Under efficiency (Heading 4.3) . this section has the data related to overall budget from 2016 to 2o2o , the evolution in budget and the spending		

	efficiency (graphical presentation as well)		
7. Assessment of M&E design, implementation	Yes to some extent		The report contains a brief analysys about the M&E system specially focusing the donor reporting.
Cross-cutting issues			
8. Adequately addresses cross-cutting areas including gender and human rights throughout, including methodology and data analysis, findings/conclusion/recommendations.	Yes, the methodology is also gender responsive, Gender based segregated data has been mentioned wherever applicable. Under each UNEG criteria the gender related question has been well addressed. Recommendations are also provided for the identified gender gape.		
Report finding/ recommendations/ conclusions			
9. Findings and conclusions are logical, well-articulated, linked and supported by evidence.	Yes the recommendations and findings are logical. But it would have been good to categorize/club the recommendations under the UNEG criteria's/standards, the way findings have been presented. It would have made the recommendations more logical, strategic and concreate.		
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: -