**Annex II: Evaluation Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Key Questions** | **Specific Sub-Questions** | **Data Sources** | **Data Collection Methods** | **Indicators/Success Standards** | **Methods of Data Analysis** |
| **RELEVANCE** | How relevant were the overall design and approaches of the project? | How well did design of the projects respond to the needs of the countries when it was prepared? | Project Documents, CPDs, RPD  Project Staff  Senior Mngrs | Desk Review  Interviews | No/Type of Design Flaws | Qualitative |
|  |  | Who were the main Government counterparts to the project, and were they appropriate and empowered to fulfil the role? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff | Interviews | N/A | Qualitative |
|  |  | What has changed in the national context in the course of project implementation, and with what bearing on the design and approaches of the projects? | Counterparts  CSOs  EU Staff  Project Staff  Senior Mngrs | Interviews | N/A | Qualitative |
|  |  | How well did the projects adopt a policy/context sensitive approach? | Counterparts  CSOs  EU Staff  Project Staff  Senior Mngrs | Interviews | No. of interviewees consider project to be policy/context sensitive | Qualitative/  Quantitative |
|  |  | How responsive were the projects to evolving needs of counterparts and partners (adaptability)? | Counterparts  CSOs  EU Staff  Project Staff  Senior Mngrs | Interviews | No. of interviewees consider project responsive to evolving needs | Qualitative/  Quantitative |
|  |  | How coherent is the project with higher-level policies and strategies? | Project Documents  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff | Desk Review | Yes/No/Partially | Qualitative |
|  |  | Does the project contribute to the outcome and output of the CPDs and the RPD? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs | Desk Review Interviews | Yes/No/Partially | Qualitative |
|  |  | Are the projects well integrated within broader UN/UNDP portfolios linked to SDG achievement? | UNDP info material/ Project Staff  Senior Mngrs | Desk Review  Interviews | Degree of integration | Qualitative |
|  |  | How clearly are the Results Frameworks for the projects aligned with SDG achievement? | Project Documents | Desk Review | Yes/No/Partially | Qualititative |
|  | To what extent are the objectives of the project design (inputs, activities, outputs and their indicators) and its theory of change logical and coherent? | Is there a clear hierarchy of project activities and outputs with objectives aligned to and coherent with, higher-level strategic policies and plans? | Project Documents, CPDs, RPD | Desk Review | Yes/No/Partially | Qualitative |
|  |  | Were adequate baselines in place to be able to monitor progress of the projects? | Project Documents | Desk Review | Yes/No/Partially | Qualitative |
|  |  | How ‘SMART’ are the success indicators of the project? | Project Documents | Desk Review | Yes/No/Partially | Qualitative |
|  |  | How well were gender issues reflected in the Results Frameworks, and what Gender marker was envisaged? | Project Documents | Desk Review | Yes/No/Partially | Qualitative |
|  | To what extent has the project been able to adapt to the needs of the different target groups (including tackling the gender dimension of PVE and social cohesion programing) in terms of creating enable environment for inclusive, affordable and people-centred PCVE policies and actions? | Who were the target groups identified by the project? | Project Staff  Counterparts  CSOs | Interviews | N/A | Qualitative |
|  |  | Did the project work to any specific LNOB or gender strategy during project implementation? | Project Staff | Interviews | Yes/No | Qualitative |
|  |  | How were target groups engaged by the project, and were any changes made to engagement methodology through the course of project implementation? | Project Staff  Counterparts  CSOs | Interviews | Project responded to needs of target groups re inclusivity | Qualitative |
|  |  | Were any target groups hesitant to become involved, and if so, why? | Project Staff  Counterparts  CSOs | Interviews | N/A | Qualitative |
| **EFFECTIVENESS** | What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended outputs? | Have activities/inputs secured the proposed Outputs as per the Results Frameworks? | Project Reports  Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff  Counterparts | Desk Review  Interviews | Yes/No | Qualitative |
|  |  | Have there been any specific factors that have contributed to achievement of Outputs, or challenges that have precluded achievement? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff  Counterparts  CSOs | Interviews | N/A | Qualitative |
|  |  | Have you noted any unforeseen results? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  Counterparts  CSOs | Interviews | N/A | Qualitative |
|  | Have effective relationships been formed and partnerships established with and between stakeholders? | How fully engaged were Government counterparts in the development and implementation of project activities with CSO implementing partners? | Project Staff  Counterparts  CSOs | Interviews | Yes/No/Partially | Qualitative |
|  |  | Were partnership/coordination meetings held by the projects bringing CSOs together with Government? | Project Staff  Counterparts  CSOs | Interviews | Yes/No | Qualitative |
|  |  | Has the project furthered the ‘whole of society’ approach to development of policy frameworks and strategy implementation, and if so, what next steps are foreseen? | Project Staff  Counterparts  CSOs  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff | Interviews | Yes/No | Qualitative |
|  |  | Do civil society and local government stakeholders feel as though the project has provided suitably forums for dialogue, and that their voices have been heard in a) project implementation; b) the national PCVE effort? | Counterparts  CSOs | Interviews | Yes/No | Qualitative |
|  | To what extent did changes in the context of project implementation affect the effectiveness of activities? | When was a COVID-19 mitigation strategy put in place, what were the main elements, and how did this impact project implementation and achievement of results? | Project Reports  Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff | Desk Review  Interviews | Yes/No | Qualitative |
|  |  | Were any activities significantly delayed in implementation for other reasons, and if so, what impact did this have on achievement of project results? | Project Reports  Project Staff | Desk Review  Interviews | Yes/No | Qualitative |
|  | To what extent have the South-South cooperation and regional knowledge management contributed to momentum on each country’s PCVE effort? | What S-S cooperation and knowledge management initiatives at regional level have contributed to project results in each country? | Project Staff  Counterparts  CSOs  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff | Interviews | Regional knowledge sharing acknowledged as useful | Qualitative |
|  |  | What S-S cooperation or knowledge sharing could have been improved or additionally offered, and to whom? | Project Staff  Counterparts  CSOs  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff | Interviews | Regional knowledge sharing acknowledged as useful | Qualitative |
|  | How effectively has project implementation supported human rights, GEWE and the interests of particular vulnerable groups? | In what ways has the project delivered a human rights-based approach to PCVE? | Project Reports  Project Staff | Desk Review  Interviews | Human-rights based approach is apparent | Qualitative |
|  |  | How have women benefited from the project? | Project Reports  Project Staff  Counterparts  CSOs | Desk Review  Interviews | Project has benefited GEWE | Qualitative |
|  |  | Have particular women or women’s groups played a lead role in project implementation? | Project Reports  Project Staff  EU Staff  Counterparts  CSOs | Desk Review  Interviews | Women have been empowered in project implementation | Qualitative |
|  |  | How has the project supported participation of different vulnerable groups and what benefit have they received from it? | Project Reports  Project Staff | Desk Review  Interviews | Project has been responsive to the needs of vulnerable groups | Qualitative |
| **EFFICIENCY** | To what extent were the project activities delivered effectively in terms of quality, quantity and timing? | Have all activities been concluded and all inputs delivered? | Project Reports  Project Staff | Desk Review Interviews | All proposed activities conducted | Quantitative |
|  |  | What was the final financial delivery in each country? | Project Reports  Project Staff | Desk Review  Interviews | % Delivery | Quantitative |
|  | To what extent was the existing project management structure appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results? | What staff and consultants were recruited to support project implementation? Was staffing sufficient and suitably qualified? Was gender parity achieved as per project document? | Project Reports  Project Staff | Desk Review  Interviews | Appropriateness of staffing structure | Qualitative |
|  |  | How supportive did COs find the role of BRH, in what ways positive and in which ways negative? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs | Interviews | BRH role viewed positively by COs | Qualitative |
|  | To what extent has the project implementation strategy and its execution been efficient and cost-effective? | What was the ratio of staffing and other direct costs to overall expenditure? How does this compare with the ratio of expenditures as originally planned? | Project Reports  Project Staff | Desk Review  Interviews | Planned vs Actual Direct Cost ratios | Quantitative |
|  |  | Did project implementing partners find UNDP administration efficient? Were UNDP procedures and reporting requirements explained and were payments made in timely fashion? | Project Contractors & Implementing Partners | Feedback Questionnaires | No. of positive responses | Quantitative |
|  |  | What impact did implementation of the COVID-19 mitigation strategy have on costs and the way activities were conducted? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff | Interviews | N/A | Qualitative |
|  |  | Did the EU as donor receive quality project reports on time, according to contractual requirements? Was the EU happy with project visibility provided? | Senior Mngrs  EU Staff | Interviews | Timely submission of quality reports to EU | Qualitative/ Quantitative |
| **SUSTAINABILITY** | To what extent did the project interventions contribute towards sustaining the results achieved by the project? | What results of the project are considered sustainable, and how will these be sustained (capacities, partnerships, knowledge etc)? | Project Reports  Project staff  Senior Mngrs  Counterparts  CSOs  EU Staff | Desk Review  Interviews | Project results are potentially sustainable | Qualitative |
|  |  | What plans exist to support sustainability of project activities after project closure? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  Counterparts  CSOs |  |  |  |
|  |  | What lessons have been learned, and are these captured in project reporting and/or other documentation? | Project Staff  EU Staff |  |  |  |
|  | What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability of the project? | What activities/outputs can be identified as logical next steps in supporting the national PCVE effort? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff  Counterparts  CSOs |  |  |  |
|  |  | Was the duration and the budget of the project(s) appropriate for the work envisaged? | Project Budgets  Counterparts  Project Staff  Senior Mngrs | Desk Review  Interviews | Yes/No | Qualitative |
| **HUMAN RIGHTS** | In what ways has the project taken a human rights-based approach, and how inclusive has it been in terms of participation? | Was an LNOB analysis undertaken during formulation or prior to implementation, and if so, how did it affect allocation of inputs or engagement strategy? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs | Interviews | LNOB analysis undertaken prior to implementation | Qualitative |
|  |  | Was the project subject to HRDDP analysis prior to implementation, and if so, with what results/ recommendations? | HRDDP analyses  Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff | Desk Review | N/A | Qualitative |
|  |  | How has engagement with, and impact on, vulnerable target groups been separately monitored? What results are recorded, how and where? | Project Staff | Desk Review  Interviews | LNOB and HR agenda were well-integrated in project implementation | Qualitative |
| **GENDER EQUALITY** | To what extent was the project approach effective in integrating and mainstreaming gender in its programming? | Was project implementation subject to a gender analysis or pre-existing gender strategy in either country? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs | Interviews | Gender analysis/strategy in place | Qualitative |
|  |  | Did women participate freely in all activities, in equal numbers and on the same basis as men? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  Counterparts  CSOs | Interviews | Projects were implemented in gender-inclusive manner | Qualitative |
|  |  | To what extent has the project promoted positive changes for women? | Project Reports  Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  EU Staff  Counterparts  CSOs | Desk Review  Interviews | The project can demonstrate positive impact on GEWE | Qualitative |
|  |  | Were there any unintended effects (positive or negative)? | Project Staff  Senior Mngrs  Counterparts  CSOs | Interviews | N/A | Qualitative |