INTERMEDIATE EVALUATION OF THE UNDP GLOBAL ART INITIATIVE

ANNEX 4– EVALUATION MATRIX

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 1	**To what extent is the ART framework evolving and consolidating in accordance with international and national strategic development priorities?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources/level**
1.1	**How effectively is the overall programming framework favoring the consolidation of the ART initiative?**		
1.1.1	Trend/evolution of programming framework	▪ No. and type of programs (time series) ▪ Geographical coverage (time series): distribution, quantity and type of administrative units ▪ Changes in institutional frameworks (management arrangements and implementation modality, national counterpart institutions, etc…)	▪ Interviews with ART staff ▪ Questionnaire for ART Country Framework Programs (CFP) ▪ Docs review/collection of relevant figures (ART coordination)
1.1.2	Trends in funds mobilization and cost-effectiveness	▪ Ratio initial investment – additional mobilized funds	▪ Interviews with ART staff ▪ Collection of relevant figures
1.1.3	Expansion of the global partnership basis	▪ No. of partners involved in the ART initiative, at a national and global level. (time series)	▪ Docs review/collection of relevant figures (ART coordination)
1.2.	**How relevant is proving the evolution of the ART initiative focus and approach in relation to partner countries and international partners' priorities?**		
1.2.1	National and global strategic frameworks matching ART focus and approach	▪ Consistency between relevant strategic documents at national and global level and ART framework/approach	▪ Interviews with key informants at national (govts reps) and global level (donors, networks) ▪ Document analysis
1.2.2	Prospective evolution reflecting expectations of key stakeholders	▪ Perception and opinion of key stakeholders	▪ Interviews with ART staff (coordination and CFP), UNDP and key international partners
1.2.3	Lifecycle of the ART initiative and framework programs in relation to ownership and sustainability objectives	▪ No. of programs advancing through the standard sequence of implementation phases? (inception, consolidation, institutionalization, exit) ▪ Evolution of the ART initiative as a global facility beyond direct program implementation (perception and facts) ▪ No. of relevant international policy processes with substantive involvement of ART (Busan, RIO, LED…etc…)	▪ Interviews with ART staff ▪ Questionnaire for CFP ▪ Interviews with key informants at national (govts reps) and global level (donors, networks)

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 2	**To what extent is the global ART initiative contributing to the establishment of improved systems of actors for integrated and sustainable human development at the territorial level?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources/level**
2.1	**To what extent is the initiative contributing to an increase in institutional capacities for ISHD?**		
2.1.1	Introduction of relevant and effective instruments/mechanisms for promoting and steering integrated and sustainable territorial development processes	▪ Technical Working Groups and other structures established/strengthened and operational ▪ Number and representation/participation of relevant development actors (public, private and civil society) ▪ Evidence/perception of improvement in key related local governance functions (leadership and decision making, coordination of local actors, mobilization of funds and partners, outreach, accountability, strategies and policies for sustainable development) ▪ Evidence of coordinated (multi-actors) and integrated (cross-cutting) initiatives following the introduction of working groups and other mechanisms for shared discussion and planning ▪ Specific mechanisms and procedures facilitating the participatory formulation of plans ▪ Existence, relevance and quality of plans (inclusiveness, integration, sustainability, inclusion of relevant cross-cutting issues /indicators -gender, environment..) ▪ Adequate measures introduced for linking plans to implementation (funding, links to relevant mandates…) ▪ Perception/appreciation of relevant stakeholders	▪ Direct observation (in-country) ▪ Document analysis (guidelines and plans, CFP Prodocs and AWPs, progress reports) –(in country) ▪ Interviews with TWG members and other institutions, reg. and local administration , ART staff (in-country) ▪ Questionnaire for CFP
2.1.2	Capacities to identify and articulate the need of different segments of the population including marginal/vulnerable groups	▪ Responsiveness of formulated plans to local needs and opportunities for ISHD: coverage (thematic/functional, geographic…) and perceived relevance ▪ Evidence of relevant priorities and measures for inclusion of vulnerable groups (women, youth, disabled)	▪ Document analysis (guidelines and plans) ▪ Interviews with TWG members and other institutions, reg. and local administration, private sector, CSOs (in country) ▪ Questionnaire for CFP (Country Framework Programs)
2.1.3	Operational and administrative capacities in relation to the mobilization and use of funds	▪ Additional funds mobilization in relation to the formulation and implementation of plans ▪ Improved procedures for the use and account of funds for the implementation of identified priorities ▪ Perception of relevant stakeholders (local governments administrators) ▪ Accountability at local government level (accessible and transparent information on availability and use of funds)	▪ Interviews with reg. / local administration, other institutions (in-country) ▪ Questionnaire for CFP

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 2	**To what extent is the global ART initiative contributing to the establishment of improved systems of actors for integrated and sustainable human development at the territorial level?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources/level**
2.2.	**To what extent is the initiative contributing to enable improved processes for ISHD?**		
2.2.1	Social capital (participation, consensus and trust)	▪ Citizens' and communities' participation and influence on design and implementation of relevant policies and measures ▪ Perception of relevant stakeholders	▪ Focus group with local stakeholders (in country) ▪ Interviews with TWG members and key local/regional institutions/actors (administration, private sector, CSOs) –(in country)
2.2.2	Coordination and synergies among local actors	▪ No and type of joint initiatives ensuing from identified priorities for action ▪ No. and type of local actors involved	▪ Focus group with local stakeholders (in country) ▪ Docs review (CFP progress reports- in-country) ▪ Interviews with TWG members and key local/regional institutions/actors (administration, private sector, CSOs), ART staff –(in country) ▪ Questionnaire for CFP
2.2.3	Shared strategies and visions	▪ Formulation/adoption of shared strategic documents on relevant thematic issues ▪ Degree of involvement and ownership of local actors	▪ Document analysis ▪ Interview with TWG members and local/regional actors ▪ Questionnaire for CFP
2.3	**To what extent is the initiative contributing to the institutionalization of introduced instruments and processes within national/local governance systems?**		
2.3.1	Ownership by national and local institutions	▪ Framework programs (direct and facilitated) activities included in local/national development plans and budgets ▪ Degree of integration of introduced structures, mechanisms and procedures with mandatory local government functions ▪ Effective leadership of national/local governments and partners on external aid coordination ▪ Evidence of relevant complementary measures by local/nat. governments ▪ Participation and commitment of key institutional actors ▪ Perception/appreciation of relevant stakeholders ▪ Local govt staff seconded to programs ▪ Scaling-up of proposed/introduced mechanisms and practices (also ref EQ4)	▪ Document/data analysis – (in country) ▪ Interviews with national (NCC members/counterparts), regional/local administration and specific relevant (sectoral)

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 2	**To what extent is the global ART initiative contributing to the establishment of improved systems of actors for integrated and sustainable human development at the territorial level?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources/level**
2.3.2	Structural changes at relevant level	▪ Evidence of changes on the legal/institutional framework, mandates and attributions, approaches and tools, associated to a specific function ▪ Allocation of resources for implementing the improved function/framework	institutions, other actors, ART staff (in-country) ▪ Questionnaire for CFP
2.3.3	Alignment of framework programs (instruments and procedures) with partner countries' frameworks	▪ Degree of alignment with/use of national-local planning and budgeting cycles rules and procedures ▪ Definition and adoption of a common planning and budgeting framework for partners at local and national level ▪ Formulated territorial development plans and guidelines complement and integrate (where existing) local plans and budgets	
2.4	**To what extent are introduced instruments and processes contributing to aid effectiveness at the local level through the harmonization of donors' interventions?**		
2.4.1	Common structures and practice	▪ Donors' involvement and participation in programs' working groups and planning cycles ▪ Establishment and use of further specific coordination structures for donors' alignment and harmonization at local and/or national level (also ref EQ4) ▪ Adoption of common processes and tools for diagnostic, planning, M&E ▪ Knowledge and information sharing	▪ Interviews with donors and partners' representatives at regional/local level (in country) ▪ Docs review (specific programs/initiatives) ▪ Interviews with local actors involved as partners/beneficiaries (in country) ▪ Questionnaire for CFP
2.4.2	Level of synergy and complementarity among different donors' actions	▪ Degree of recognition and use of guidelines as basis for donors' intervention strategy at local/national level ▪ Shared external TA and support facilities ▪ Formulation and implementation of joint programs and projects ▪ Collaboration on/and co-funding of specific initiatives	
2.4.3	Consistency and integration of external dev. partners' support with local planning and budgeting processes	▪ Inclusion of external support actions in local development plans and budgets	▪ Docs reviews (plans and budget) ▪ Interviews with donors and local administration (in country) ▪ Questionnaire for CFP
2.5	**To what extent are innovative thematic practices introduced through the articulation of the ART initiative contributing to improved functioning at the territorial level (i.e. sectoral/thematic frameworks from an holistic perspective)?**		
2.5.1.	Specific improved functions (ex LED planning and promotion, water management, health services, capacity building…) at the relevant territorial level	▪ Evidence of innovative/value adding practices improving or changing specific thematic or sectoral functions ▪ Perception/appreciation of relevant stakeholders	▪ Focus group and interviews with relevant institutions and actors (administration and sectoral

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 2	**To what extent is the global ART initiative contributing to the establishment of improved systems of actors for integrated and sustainable human development at the territorial level?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources/level**
2.5.2	Integration of different actors and mandates within and across thematic areas/sectors	▪ Evidence (no. and type of activities and actors) of the involvement of different functions and mandates in relation to a specific topic/thematic area ▪ Examples of cross-sectoral integration and contamination in relation to specific topics and functions	organizations, CSOs), ART staff – (in country) ▪ Direct observation and relevant docs review (in country) ▪ Interview with relevant decentralized partners (in respective countries)

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 3	**To what extent is the ART initiative contributing to improved coordination and access to shared knowledge and resources for ISHD at the territorial level through dialogue and articulation of actors across territories?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources/level**
3.1	**To what extent is dialogue and the articulation of actors within the ART multilateral platform contributing to increase the effectiveness of decentralized cooperation action in meeting locally expressed demand for support?**		
3.1.1	Significance (volume and quality) of the intervention	▪ No. and trends of decentralized partnership agreements within the ART framework ▪ Geographical and thematic distribution ▪ Volume and type of channeled resources (e.g.% of TA/capacity building, financial support/investment, etc….) ▪ Evidence and perception/appreciation of relevant stakeholders' and partners on relevance and actual use/application of transferred resources and skills at local level	▪ Docs/data review (ART coordination) ▪ Interview with ART coordination staff ▪ Questionnaire for CFP ▪ Interviews with reg./local actors, TWG members (in country)
3.1.2	Effective supply-side coordination mechanisms	▪ Systematic information/promotion of local demand ▪ Effective promotion of dialogue and exchange between local actors and decentralized partners (no. and type of events, forums, debate..) ▪ Effective promotion of dialogue and exchange between decentralized partners' engaged in the same (geographical/thematic) areas ▪ Perception/appreciation of decentralized partners	▪ Interview with ART coordination staff and decentralized antennas ▪ Interviews with decentralized partners ▪ Document analysis (ART reports and other docs) ▪ Interviews with relevant international actors/partners (NGOs, donors)

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 3	**To what extent is the ART initiative contributing to improved coordination and access to shared knowledge and resources for ISHD at the territorial level through dialogue and articulation of actors across territories?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources/level**
3.1.3	Relevance, concentration and continuity/sustainability of decentralized support action	▪ Duration and continuity of support by decentralized partners (number, type and sequence of actions over time) ▪ Density/concentration of support actions in a given (geographical and/or thematic) area ▪ Relevance and evolution of support in specific thematic areas ▪ Perception and appreciation by local stakeholders	▪ Interview with ART coordination staff and decentralized antennas ▪ Interviews with reg./local actors (administration, TWG members, sectoral organizations and CSOs) (in country) ▪ Interviews with decentralized cooperation partners ▪ Questionnaire for CFP
3.1.4	Integration and complementarity between different interventions at the territorial level	▪ No. and % of joint actions by decentralized partners in a given territory or thematic area ▪ No and % of integrated/complementary actions by decentralized partners in a given territory or thematic area ▪ Evidence of joint initiatives between decentralized partners and other donors in a given territory and/or thematic area	▪ Docs review (ART and CFP progress reports) ▪ Interview with ART coordination staff and decentralized antennas ▪ Questionnaire for CFP ▪ Interviews with decentralized partners ▪ Interviews with reg./local actors (administration, TWG members, sectoral organizations and CSOs), ART staff (in country)
3.2	**To what extent is dialogue and articulation of actors contributing to the structuring and consolidation of territorial partnerships on functional and/or thematic basis?**		
3.2.1	Association of decentralized actors	▪ No. and role of associations and networks of decentralized actors' (local governments', regions, LEDAs etc…) involved in joint/coordinated initiatives through the ART framework	▪ Docs reviews (ART reports) ▪ Interviews with reg./local administration, TWG members , ART staff– (in country) ▪ Interviews with ART coordination staff and UNDP Regional Centers ▪ Questionnaire for CFP ▪ Interviews with decentralized partners
3.2.2	Up-scale/replication of pilot experiences	▪ No. and type of pilot experiences and practices replicated /up-scaled across countries through cross-border, South-South, (ART) program to program cooperation frameworks	
3.2.3	Joint initiatives for knowledge sharing, capacity building, improved services provision across-territories -South-(North)-South	▪ Evidence (no. and type) of joint/complementary initiatives involving local/decentralized partners in the same thematic or functional area across territories (South-North-South, cross-border, ART program to program) ▪ Evidence of joint applications for funds between local/decentralized partners (North-South, South-South) / additional resources raised	
3.2.4	Institutional/organizational arrangements for continued interaction between relevant actors across territories –South-(North)-South	▪ South-North-South / program to program cooperation agreements ▪ Specific structures and mechanisms introduced	

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 3	**To what extent is the ART initiative contributing to improved coordination and access to shared knowledge and resources for ISHD at the territorial level through dialogue and articulation of actors across territories?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources/level**
3.3	**How effectively is the knowledge and experience generated through decentralized cooperation across territories systematized and shared as a basis for mutual learning opportunities?**		
3.3.1	Relevance and use of knowledge production effort	▪ Resources and tools for effective inventory and systematization of local practices and experience at the level of ART framework programmes and general coordination ▪ No. and type of knowledge production and dissemination activities ▪ Perception of relevant stakeholders on improved access to relevant knowledge and skills ▪ Evidence of concrete use and application of acquired knowledge at the local level ▪ Time-frame/recent evolution of the Knowledge Production effort	▪ Docs review (ART report and knowledge products) ▪ Interviews with ART coordination staff ▪ Interviews with relevant actors at reg./local level, ART staff (in country) ▪ Interviews with decentralized partners Questionnaire for CFP
3.3.2	Integration of thematic areas	▪ No. , type of implemented partnerships on specific thematic issues ▪ Relevance and use of thematic platforms and networks for sharing of sectoral/thematic knowledge and practice	
3.3.3	Mutuality of learning opportunities	▪ Evidence of locally generated knowledge and experience feeding into aid and local development policies and tools in decentralized partners' territories ▪ Perception and appreciation of decentralized partners	

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 4	**To what extent is the ART initiative contributing to improved policy frameworks for decentralization and local development?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources**
4.1	**How effectively are practices and tools piloted locally being used as input for relevant policy development?**		
4.1.1	Ownership and up-take by national governments	▪ Effective participation and commitment by national government counterparts (regularity and content of NCC meetings, effective steering and coordination of relevant activities at national level..) ▪ Perception and appreciation by relevant stakeholders (nat. and local govts representatives) ▪ Improved mechanisms and structures (e.g. for donors' coordination) within national institutions/allocation of staff and functions to implement them ▪ Allocation of resources from national budget for implementing local plans and structures ▪ Overall extension of program to new regions	▪ Document analysis (ART reports) ▪ Interviews with national counterparts, NCC members and relevant institutions ▪ Interviews with relevant institutions, TWG members at reg./local level, ART CFP staff (in country) ▪ Interviews with decentralized partners ▪ Questionnaire for CFP

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 4	**To what extent is the ART initiative contributing to improved policy frameworks for decentralization and local development?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources**
4.1.2	Mainstreaming of piloted practices	▪ Evidence of specific practices replicated in other territories and/or formally adopted as (part of) national policies and (institutional, sectoral..) frameworks. ▪ Policies informed by specific experience at the local level (ex nat territorial planning frameworks, nat. framework for decentralized cooperation..)	

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 5	**To what extent is the ART initiative showing an added value in the evolution of the international development cooperation framework?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources**
5.1	**To what extent are the ART approach and methodology informing the global discourse and practice?**		
5.1.1	Extent of use of ART focus and approach by other donors	▪ Relevant donors' strategic documents with substantial reference to key aspects of the ART focus and approach ▪ Perception and appreciation of relevant stakeholders	▪ Documents analysis (ART/UNDP and other donors' strategic documents and reports, knowledge products) ▪ Interviews with relevant UNDP and other donors' staff ▪ Interviews with ART coordination staff ▪ Interviews with key decentralized and international partners
5.1.2	Integration between ART and other donors' programs' activities	▪ Evidence/No. of joint programs (co-funding and joint implementation) ▪ Mention/integration of ART within inter-(UN) agency coordination frameworks at country level (UNDAF/P) ▪ Other specific joint initiatives	
5.1.3	Locally tested practices and tools as input for operationalizing aid policies and processes	▪ Evidence of related provisions and measures in key donors' strategic and planning documents ▪ Perception and appreciation of relevant stakeholders	
5.1.4	ART recognition and positioning in the global aid framework	▪ Explicit reference to the ART initiative in strategic/policy documents of relevant donors ▪ Perception and appreciation of relevant stakeholders	
5.1.5	Facilitation of access to global knowledge and impulse to global partnership frameworks	▪ Existence, relevance and use of thematic platforms and networks by different stakeholders ▪ Participation of ART (and its partners) into multi-level and multi-stakeholders governance structures at the global level (consultative forums, multi-donors platforms etc..) ▪ Evidence and perception of effective contribution to relevant products (knowledge products/best practice reviews, positions papers etc…) enhancing the debate and policy framework on key relevant issues ▪ Perception and appreciation of relevant stakeholders	

EVALUATION QUESTION No. 5	**To what extent is the ART initiative showing an added value in the evolution of the international development cooperation framework?**		
Sub-questions		**Indicators**	**Data Collection Methods and Sources**
5.1.6	Contribution to strategic processes on aid effectiveness (Busan) and sustainable development (RIO+20)	▪ Participation and effective input by ART	
5.2	**How effectively is ART being mainstreamed as part of UNDP corporate framework?**		
5.2.1	Policies	▪ Relevant strategic documents referring to the ART approach and experience ▪ Evidence of relevant policies developments associated to the incorporation of the ART approach and experience ▪ Perception and appreciation of relevant stakeholders	▪ Documents analysis (ART/UNDP and other donors' strategic documents and reports) ▪ Interviews with relevant UNDP and other donors' staff ▪ Interviews with ART coordination staff
5.2.2	Integration of ART within corporate structures and procedures	▪ Evidence of integration of ART management within UNDP corporate framework ▪ Simplified/adjusted procedures for cooperation with decentralized partners	
5.2.3	Partnership and resources basis	▪ Allocation of corporate resources to the management/funding of the ART initiative ▪ Sharing of ART partnership and resources basis for joint/corporate undertakings ▪ Evidence of a multiplier effect (in terms of UNDP corporate access to partners and funds) associated to the mainstreaming of the ART initiative	
5.3	**To what extent is the initiative contributing to the integration of decentralized cooperation actors into the global development cooperation framework?**		
5.3.1	Legitimacy and recognition of decentralized actors as equal status partners	▪ Relevant strategic statements /policy documents making significant reference to the role of local governments and decentralized actors ▪ Perception and appreciation of relevant stakeholders ▪ Introduction of facilitating administrative modalities and procedures	▪ Interviews with decentralized cooperation partners ▪ Interviews with ART/UNDP and other donors staff
5.3.2	Integration of DC actors (territories, associations of territories) in global initiatives and processes	▪ No. of / effective participation and role of decentralized actors (local governments, networks) in global initiatives and processes ▪ Spaces for expression of local governments and associations in global events, policy forums	