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| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1.**Elaborate a comprehensive Theory of Change to underpin the future development of the GP, explicitly including the entire UNDP ROLSHR team’s scope of work. This TOC should define the strategy for bolstering ROLSHR in fragile and crisis-affected countries/regions as well as other contexts, and identify priorities among thematic areas to systematically guide the allocation of resources.  |
| **Management Response:**We fully agree with this recommendation and follow-up has begun through drafting of the Global Programme on Rule of Law and Human Rights Phase 4 (2022-2025) in consultation with a dedicated consultant and M&E specialist.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking\*** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 1.1 Conduct internal GP team workshop on new GP phase IV work going forward  |  May 2021  | GP Management in consultation with consultant  | Consultant and M&E specialist are on board to support with this.  | Completed  |
| 1.2 Develop a new theory of change of Phase IV | September 2021  | GP Management in consultation with consultant  |  | Initiated  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 2:**Continue to offer flexible support to ROLSHR programming and teams in need around the world, with timely provision of seed funding and/or technical advice.  * 1. This should include the types of support that have been found effective (by this evaluation and other analysis) at country or regional level, such as bridging gaps in funding for ongoing projects, launching pilot activities of various kinds, and hiring or retaining key technical staff (local or international).
	2. In consultation with Focal Points and key CO staff, consider creating a separate expedited pipeline process that could authorize smaller amounts (up to $25,000) for COs with a proven track record to meet emergency needs or experiment with new ideas.
 |
| **Management Response:**We partially agree with this recommendation and the technical and financial support to countries will be continued in Phase IV of the Global Programme, ensuring close coordination with regional bureaus, regional hubs, and country focal points. The suggestion for small, quick impacts funds will be explored to see if it is in line with the role of the GP and with UNDP policies and procedures.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 2.1 Develop new GP phase IV project document  | September 2021 | GP Management  |  | Initiated |
| 2.2 Review the pipeline process and possible quick small impact funds  | September 2021  | GP Management | This will be reviewed with the project board and through the drafting of phase 4.  | Initiated  |
| 2.3 Ensure learning and knowledge sharing between country offices, regional hubs, and HQ. Learning Strategy will be developed.  | January 2022 | GP Management  | Knowledge and learning will be a key component of GP phase IV. Some initiatives already started at HQ in coordination with COP. Knowledge management support is being brought on board.  | Initiated |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 3:**Consider increasing the focus of GP programming, staffing/standing capacity, and knowledge products in the following emerging subject areas (in close collaboration with related UN entities to make optimal use of specialized expertise and maintain clear allocation of lead responsibility): * 1. effects of digitalization on human rights/access to justice, access to information, equal voices, and participation in democratic processes, etc.
	2. climate justice
	3. business and human rights (already in early implementation)
	4. cyber-crime and hate speech
 |
| **Management Response:**We fully agree with this recommendation. New emerging areas are being explored such as climate justice, e-justice, digitalization, etc. and consultants to support have been brought on board to help us better explore the various options, such as a consultant currently reviewing the e-justice/digitalization work we do and how to scale up good CO level initiatives to the global level and provide strong technical and policy level support on this emerging area. Also, nearing completion of a procurement process for an IC on climate/green justice. We also have also brought on board additional capacity to provide training to GP staff on programming in the ROLSHR sphere.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 3.1 Consultant on-board to support exploring new thematic areas of work. I.e. Green justice/climate justice, e-justice/digitization  | September 2021 | GP Management  | Several consultants already engaged on new thematic areas of climate justice and programme management training support.  | Initiated |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 4.**Review the GP governance structure, including the Project Board’s role and composition.  |
| **Management Response:**We fully agree with this recommendation. As we are in the drafting stage of the GP phase 4, we are undertaking several internal and external consultations, a team strategy workshop, and a consultant is on board to review the governance structure and way forward for GP phase 4. The project board composition will be reviewed, and the project board ToR will be updated.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking\*** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 4.1 Update and review ToRs and project board roles and membership  | October 2021  | GP Management  |  | Initiated |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 5:**Review the staffing structure with a view to bolstering the core GP management team and clarifying the division of labor between headquarters and regions. |
| **Management Response:**We fully agree with this recommendation and this review is planned as part of the development of GP phase 4. We have already initiated a review of the staffing structure and will bolster the learning and M&E capacities within the team as well as the operational support, and upgrade certain posts within the GP management team. With a review of the overall staffing structure, the idea is to make the GP team more global in order to be able to be more adaptive, responsive and nimbler and to better respond to both CO and regional requests.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 5.1 Develop new post for M&E and learning unit  | January 2022 | GP Management  |  | Initiated |
| 5.2 Upgrade Programme Associate post and add further Programme Associate to support with operations and financial management | February 2022 | GP Management  |  | Not Initiated  |
| 5.3 Upgrade Project Manager post  | February 2022 | GP Management  |  | Not initiated  |
| 5.4 Review post locations and way of working to ensure GP is adaptive and context driven, which will be done through development of Phase IV.  | January 2022 | GP Management  |  | Initiated  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 6:**Revisit the mandate, role and weight of regional offices and hubs in GP business processes to enhance approaches to complex RoL and SDG16+ programming challenges.  |
| **Management Response:**We fully agree with this recommendation. The GP management is undertaking several internal and external consultations, a team strategy workshop, and a consultant is on board to review the structure and way forward for GP phase 4. The business processes of the GP will also be reviewed and will be adapted to ensure clarity between HQ and regional hubs. We will continue to underwrite regional project/programmes where possible and work closely with ROLSHR focal points in the regional hubs and country offices.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 6.1 Update GP business processes and role of hubs in phase IV project document  | January 2022 | GP Management  | Will be done as part of revision of SOPs and business processes for Phase 4  |  Initiated |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 7:**Base future GP targeting of contexts on the basis of evidence of effectiveness (including likelihood of catalytic effects), rather than pre-selecting a list of priority countries. * 1. As part of Phase 4 planning, conduct a comprehensive review of existing evidence (this report, country or project evaluation reports, annual reports, etc.) of where GP support has and has not been able to contribute to significant and sustainable results, with a view to identifying key success/failure factors that should strongly influence Phase 4 country targeting (as well as the criteria for pipeline funding).
	2. Critically assess the pros and cons of the priority country listing, with a view to either eliminating or clarifying this concept, which has been of limited utility in Phase 3. If a listing is maintained for Phase 4 (or established on an annual basis), the word “priority” should be replaced with a more accurate descriptor, and the exact significance of the list should be clarified and broadly disseminated along with the briefing document on GP funding and support.
 |
| **Management Response:**We fully agree with this recommendation and the review of GP areas of work and prioritization is already underway, through this midterm evaluation, ISSAT country evaluations and several internal and external consultations. The management plans to review and broaden the work to not focus on priority countries but focus on countries where ROLSHR support is needed and there is evidence of effectiveness. This will be done in close consultation with the project board and CB management to be integrated into GP Phase 4. We also plan on developing better M&E systems to be able to measure the catalytic nature of our funding over the next 4-year phase. This has been discussed with DCAF ISSAT and for the on-going evaluations in CAR and DRC we are hoping to see a more detailed analysis of the catalytic funding and its impact.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 7.1 Review the focus and structure of the GP, specifically on areas of work and prioritization which will be done through development of Phase IV project document development and approval.  | September 2021  | GP Management  |  | Initiated  |
| 7.2 Hiring of a dedicated M&E and learning specialist  | June 2022  | GP Management  |  | Not initiated  |
| 7.3 Develop a system to measure catalytic effectiveness of funds so they can be better tracked and evaluated  | March 2022 | GP Management  | This has already been discussed with ISSAT and they will try and integrate this into the CAR and DRC evaluation. We will also integrate this into our programming going forward using a similar system to PBF.  | Not initiated  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 8:**Clarify and streamline pipeline funding procedures, including enhanced transparency and more strategic approaches.  * 1. Document and systematize the entire request and approval procedure in detail as an SOP, with established criteria for single and multi-country requests (including any different rules applying to GFP requests), and clearly defined steps and responsibilities. (Flexibility can be maintained by having mandatory and optional criteria, and allowing waivers as needed.)
	2. Make the process more transparent, including openly shared funding purpose and conditions, country eligibility, selection criteria, funding schedules, and feedback to countries whose requests are not approved, etc. This should include a short briefing document on GP/GFP funding that is communicated globally to Resident Coordinators, UNDP Resident Representatives, and key UNDP staff, in all main UN languages.
	3. Review the funding criteria and review role of the Project Board carefully as part of Phase 4 design, to maximize impact of these modest investments on country/regional level and on the overall objectives of the GP. For example, the potential catalytic effect of seed funding should be prioritized, and the balance among the core thematic areas of the Programme should be monitored and funding awarded to advance strategic interests or neglected areas.
 |
| **Management Response:**We fully agree with this recommendation and pipeline process will be reviewed, and transparent and clear SOPs will be developed. The project board will also be involved in this process to ensure alignment with their roles and TOR.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 8.1 Develop transparent SOPs for the pipeline funding process including documentation processes, criteria, and clearly defined steps and responsibilities | January 2022 | GP Management  | Will be done through GP phase 4 development.  | Not Initiated  |
| 8.2 Review and update the TORs of the project board as needed to reflect the new SOPs | October 2021  | GP Management  | Will be done through GP phase 4 development.  | Not Initiated  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 9:**Invest in results-based management systems and reporting by the GP and the supported Country Offices.* 1. Improve the clarity and utility of indicator monitoring and annual reporting by delineating the GP’s role in the broader picture of UNDP programming in ROLSHR, to minimize conflation and promote transparency. This includes the contents as well as the “branding” of the annual reports, whether published as documents or in interactive online format.
	2. Enhance systems and methods for identification and sharing of lessons learned and “what did not work”, including by reincorporating that as a specific element in annual country reporting, and ensuring adequate attention in annual meetings and other internal exchange opportunities.
	3. Invest in building M&E capacity of country teams (as well as national counterparts, to the extent possible), including SDG16+ data collection capacity, capitalizing on the findings of the ISSAT evaluations in relation to effective in-country monitoring methods.
	4. Pilot the use of country-based third parties (from civil society, private sector or government) that can efficiently collect and analyze data to feed into results-based management of the Global Programme and UNDP, as well as SDG16, especially in conflict-affected contexts where mobility and access is constrained by security concerns, and where UNDP Country Office capacity is limited.
	5. Ensure the continuous engagement at headquarters of at least one experienced staff member or consultant dedicated to M&E, to support GP and country teams with RBM processes. This role should not continue to be combined with various other demanding duties such as reporting, advocacy and communications.
 |
| **Management Response:**We fully agree with this recommendation and understands the need to improve the monitoring, evaluation, and reporting system of the GP given how much the programme has developed over the last 5 years. A new staff capacity for focused on M&E will be included in the new staffing structure for phase 4. The GP has brought on an M&E specialist to support the development a new Results Framework to ensure better tracking and measurement of results. The GP has also contracted a consultant to support with RBM training for GP staff and will be developing a learning and adaptive management strategy. The GP has been partaking in cross regional learning with the office in Palestine, which has developed tools and systems to track data which can be replicated at the global/country office level. The GP management also understands that the M&E capacity at the country level needs to be improved and will see how we can better support that from the GP with virtual training tools and capacity development. The use of country-based third parties (from civil society, private sector or government) that can efficiently collect and analyze data to feed into results-based management of the Global Programme and UNDP, needs to be further explored on feasibility as well as UNDP policies and regulations.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 9.1 Develop a learning and adaptive management strategy  | January 2022 | GP Management  | IPSA will be brough on board in August to support with this.  | Initiated |
| 9.2 RMB capacity development training for GP staff  | December 2021  | GP Management  | IPSA has been brought on board already to support with this.  |  Initiated |
| 9.3 Support virtual RBM training for country staff  | June 2022 | GP Management  |  | Not Initiated  |
| 9.4 M&E and learning expert will be brought on board to the GP management team to support overall monitoring, evaluation as well as collect lessons learned, challenges and successes and better share these across HQ, regional and CO level | June 2022 | GP Management  |  | Not Initiated  |
| 9.5 Explore the use of country-based third parties (from civil society, private sector or government) that can efficiently collect and analyze data to feed into results-based management of the Global Programme and UNDP | June 2022 | GP Management  |  | Not Initiated  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 10:**Eliminate or reform monitoring practices and indicators that do not add specific value for measurement and management of GP results, and focus RBM efforts on a few data points that will generate useful information for and about the Programme. * 1. Report as needed on UNDP corporate indicators, but focus on reliably measuring meaningful customized indicators that relate ONLY to the support provided by GP (or enable disaggregation of the results of that support).
	2. Design of future GP-specific monitoring tools should be informed by a consultative process including technical guidance by M&E specialists, and consider both quantitative and qualitative measures. Tracking of catalytic effects should be a high priority, potentially via an annual/biannual study of a subset of countries to assess degree/type of catalytic and other effects of GP support, which would generate information for management and reporting, including decision-making on future funding based on those successes and failures. Work on defining and measuring catalytic effects should be informed by the extensive efforts of the PBF in this regard over the last 10 years.
	3. Conduct more analysis of newly-introduced GP-specific performance metrics to inform annual reports and for overall management of the Programme, including trends across countries, regions and years. This would enable the GP to find and present better evidence of impact over time, as well as identify challenges and needed adaptations.
	4. Negotiate with donors (and/or retain a proportion of INL fees) to fund creation of an “M&E window” within the GP Phase 4 to enable consistent prioritization of results measurement. This window should prioritize the testing of SDG16 data collection instruments at community level (Somalia approach), including incorporation of non-treatment communities to generate comparative data. This would advance the possibility of introducing true RBM for ROLSHR work at country level, serving as an incentive to CO programme/project staff to invest themselves in ensuring data quality.
	5. Make indicator monitoring more inclusive of ALL contexts receiving substantive GP support (ideally including all those funded via GP in last two years), rather than limiting to a pre-selected subset of countries. If universal annual monitoring is not feasible, then a random sample could be used as a proxy.
	6. For customized GP indicators, create indicator descriptions/methodological notes to guide headquarters and country staff on their interpretation and application, and ensure that key staff in COs understand how to report on these GP indicators.
	7. Adapt the data reported for mandatory UNDP corporate indicators to better reflect the results of the GP, for example: if a corporate indicator requires the GP to report the number of countries meeting a certain criterion, a sub-indicator could capture the percentage of GP-supported countries that meet that criterion out of all GP-supported countries. This would help show the effects of GP support with minimal extra monitoring effort.
 |
| **Management Response:**We partially agree with this recommendation. It is agreed that the monitoring and reporting practices need to be improved, especially given how much the GP phase 3 has evolved over the last 5 years. A new Results Framework is being developed for GP Phase 4 in consultations with an M&E expert to ensure that result and challenges will be measured in a more systematic way across the next 4-year programme. This will include a review of current indicator reporting and monitoring to be more inclusive of all contexts receiving substantive GP support. We also take into consideration the recommendation that there should be guidance developed for customized GP indicators, to guide headquarters and country staff on their interpretation and application, and ensure that key staff in COs understand how to report on these GP indicators.UNDP is also currently developing the new Strategic Plan and the GP management is involved to ensure that related ROLSHR outcomes, outputs and indicators are included to ensure that GP support can be measured accurately over the next four years. All recommendations must be further assessed for their feasibility.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 10.1 Develop new Results Framework for GP Phase 4  | October 2021  | GP Management  |  |  Initiated |
| 10.2 Develop guidance notes for GP specific indicators  | February 2022 | GP Management  |  | Not Initiated  |
| 10.3 Define catalytic and develop a tracking system through review of other programmes projects such as PBF.  | June 2022 | GP Management  |  | Initiated  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 11:**Increase GP’s contribution to ROLSHR knowledge management and thought leadership, in collaboration with other key actors such as the GPN.* 1. GP should organize regular structured opportunities for internal reflection and exchanges of experience among UNDP Country Offices, regional hubs and headquarters. These should take a constructive yet critical approach including analysis of what has not worked and how problems have been overcome, in addition to success stories. These processes will contribute to developing the body of evidence on ROLSHR assistance, but more specifically and urgently, feed into Phase 4 design and implementation.
	2. Encourage more South-South exchanges of experiences and expertise, including allocation of funding to enable learning/experience-sharing visits by key country programme staff to other countries and regions.
 |
| **Management Response:**We fully agrees with this recommendation and will aim to increase its contribution to policy work, knowledge management and though leadership in collaboration with GPN and ensure that the documents, reports, and analysis developed are adequately shared with relevant parties at HQ, regional and country office level. Regular exchanges, including South-South, will be systematized.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 11.1 Develop a knowledge management system to ensure information is adequately shared across the team and GPN. | March 2022  | GP Management  |  |  Initiated |
| 11.2 Systemize regular exchanges, both virtual and in person for better knowledge and experience sharing and learning.  | June 2022 | GP Management  |  | Not Initiated  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 12.**Enhance GP/GFP design features to support improved coherence and optimize effectiveness and reach of the GFP.1. Revisit the overall governance set-up, including study of the pros and cons of the following theoretically existing options: I. a) GFP as currently defined using GP Phase 4 as vehicle; I. b) GFP remains within GP, but with a separate GFP funding window; II.) GFP de-linked from GP (parallel mechanism/programme or even office, with stronger role for non-UNDP/DPO entities); III.) OneUN JP as new vehicle for GFP, outside UNDP.
2. Widen membership/attendance base of GFP governance structure and country level platform, by ensuring systematic inclusion of UNEP, UN Counter-Terrorism Organization, etc. so that interfacing aspects (climate justice, P-CVE) are taken into account and future collaboration can be deepened.
3. Ensure stability of GFP Core Team staffing to strengthen their ability to effectively coordinate partners and manage the new funding flows to countries.
4. Establish joint reporting modalities for GFP funding, which include all participating entities in gathering inputs to reporting and sharing of reports.
5. Coordinate global level fundraising efforts between and across UNDP and DPO, more evenly sharing responsibility and accountability for raising GFP funding.
6. At country and regional levels, raise profile of GP/GFP and share information including in French (at minimum) to ensure broader awareness of the support it can provide. Consider a specific communication/sensitization campaign on GFP (what it is, how it works, how to apply for funds etc.); by jointly organizing and conducting meetings with GFP managers or GFP presentations in the RR induction; sensitizing COs and field staff about the GFP, stressing the importance of integrated, coordinated and joint support by helping shift incentives and change behavior and organizational culture on the ground.
7. Advocate for a high-level executive task force to resolve GP/GFP interoperability issues (Mission/OROLSI – UNCT).
8. Strengthen collaboration between UNDP and OROLSI in non-mission settings. The new phase of GP could include the testing of partnerships in non-mission settings, such as the secondment of expertise, the coordination of rule of law priorities on the ground, and joint fundraising at country level.
9. Conduct or advocate for a detailed study of the consequences of the de-linking for UN country level coherence in ROLSHR, with objectives to include development of clear guidance with respect to allocation of responsibilities for convening and overseeing the GFP in country.
10. Develop guidance for in-country GFP Teams for how to design and manage ROLSHR programming in the context of post-Mission transition, building on lessons learned from relevant contexts (including in-depth case study on Haiti).
 |
| **Management Response:**We partially agree with this recommendation. There is agreement to review the overall GFP structure within the GP and how to optimize the relationship going forward. The structure of the GFP being operationalized through the GP needs to be assessed and to ensure that the partners are in agreement with the current structure or to decide on a better way forward. Possibilities for other suggested governance set-ups need to be further explored.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 12.1 Review the current GFP structure and develop SOPs for a clear way of working  | March 2022 | GP Management/GFP Management  |  | Not Initiated  |
| 12.2 Develop guidance materials for joint programming  | January 2022 | GP/GFP Management  |  | Initiated  |
| 12.3 Develop GFP guidance document templates in English and French.  | June 2022 | GP Management |  | Not Initiated |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 13.**Modify the arrangement with INL to enhance sustainability and results-based management.* 1. Negotiate to augment the management fees paid by INL, by demonstrating the significant value added by the GP team and the associated workload of such a major flow of funding, with reference to typical rates paid to other implementing partners of the U.S. Government.
	2. Pursue a more balanced division of the INL fees that recognizes the essential role played by the GP team, rather than channeling the totality of fees to Country Offices. These resources could assist in boosting the capacity of the headquarters team to support M&E functions, among others.
 |
| **Management Response:**We partially agree with this recommendation. The current partnership with INL is working well and we have received over $65 million USD for GP phase 3. Currently the GMS funds go to the Country Offices and the funds are not retained at HQ. This does support the work at the CO level. The GMS is a corporate standard set at 8% it will not be possible to augment, but we are in discussion with INL on Direct Project Costs (DPC) and developing a more standard approach at the country office level. Nonetheless, we can review the partnership agreement with INL and discuss with CB management the best way forward.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 13.1 Review the INL agreement with CB management  | January 2022 | GP Management/CB management  |  | Not Initiated  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 14.**Increase the focus on supporting design and implementation of ROLSHR interventions based on locally accepted and established customary/traditional mechanisms, starting with research on socio-culturally embedded practices for conflict prevention, dispute resolution and access to justice, ensuring that interventions are based on human rights principles.  |
| **Management Response:**We fully agree with this recommendation and more localized approaches will be reviewed as part of the development of phase 4 and our learning and results-based management review. It will be key to review some lessons learned and previous examples from other countries and see how that experienced can be shared across the GP networks.  |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** |
| **Comments** | **Status** |
| 14.2 Share lessons learned and best practices across the GP network on customary/traditional mechanism through virtual meetings/exchanges and assess best way forward.  | June 2022 | GP Management  |  | Not Initiated  |

Guidance on how to fill the above table:

Evaluation recommendation = please copy past this from the evaluation report – add all the recommendations included in the evaluation report

Management response = UNDP should develop a management response to address each recommendation
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