

## Evaluation Audit Trail Template: mid-term evaluation of the “Building capacity for the 2030 Agenda 2.0” project Draft Evaluation Report

(To be completed by the Project Management (Strategic Implementation of the 2030 Agenda Unit, Division for Satellite Analysis and Applied Research).

Following submission, the evaluator will consider and respond to all comments. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final evaluation report.

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft endline evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):

Author	#	Paragraph No.	Type of comment (e.g. observation, question, wrong data, etc.)	Comment/Feedback on the draft report	Evaluator response and actions taken
Madina Imaralieva	1	Acronyms and abbreviations	Question	MS?	corrected
Madina Imaralieva	2	Acronyms and abbreviations	Observation	Multi-Country	corrected
Madina Imaralieva	3	Acronyms and abbreviations	Question	Would you add also KII, PPME and WG?	added
Madina Imaralieva	4	3	Question	Perhaps principles of the 2030 Agenda instead?	indeed, corrected
Elena Proden	5	11	Observation	The linkages substantively are clear and learning content reflects them. I think what the evaluation alludes too is rather that we approached many pilot countries for 2 results areas separately depending on where the request came from Planning Departments or NSOs. As explained, in the case of Cyprus both strategic planning, governance and monitoring are approached together in response to the Government’s expressed needs.	<p>This section was approved in the inception report. The linkages between (R1 and R3) and (R2 and R3) are not clearly identified in the project theory of change, upon conception.</p> <p>The diagram illustrates the project's Theory of Change, structured into three main Results Areas, each with specific outputs, intermediate outcomes, and final outcomes, all contributing to an overall impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Strengthening data and evidence for decision-making and reporting on SDGs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OUTPUTS: Statact upgraded and administered for use by UN Member States; 2 pilot countries received tailored support for selected SDG data gaps; 30 countries trained on the use of data tools; 100 persons trained on the use of Statact; Statact library; 100 persons trained on data analysis as relevant for SDGs.</li> <li>INTERMEDIARY OUTCOMES: The relevant countries find Statact relevant and effective tool for data planning; Trained participants have improved their data analysis skills relevant for SDGs and had a chance to apply them in their professional context.</li> <li>FINAL OUTCOMES: Strengthened capacities of countries to close data gaps through better planning and partnerships; Strengthened capacities of countries to leverage data analysis to inform decision-making and reporting on the SDGs.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Result Area 1: Promoting policy coherence and LDCB:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OUTPUTS: 2-3 pilot countries received tailored support to apply a comprehensive, complex approach to policy coherence in support of the SDGs; 150 or more persons completed advanced training on policy coherence; Good practice stories collection; Learning follow-up.</li> <li>INTERMEDIARY OUTCOMES: Strengthened capacities of key stakeholders in selected countries to develop, implement and review integrated policies and promote policy coherence and equity orientation through more inclusive and agile institutions and boost stakeholder engagement.</li> <li>FINAL OUTCOMES: Strengthened capacities of countries to adjust systems for integrated and coherent policy design and implementation; Pilot countries take steps to promote more inclusive and agile institutions.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Result Area 3: Strengthening knowledge through learning:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OUTPUTS: 1 well promoted UN SDG Learn Platform with a range of services enabling users to identify local learning solutions and build learning paths; Platform factors effectively to various learners’ needs; Vibrant Partnership around UN SDG Learn leading to synergies; Set of new micro-learning and e-learning products made available through the Platform.</li> <li>INTERMEDIARY OUTCOMES: The Platform features relevant content and provides useful tools to search and compare what is available; UN SDG Learn users are better positioned to develop or implement coherent policies and practices aimed at ensuring No One is Left Behind.</li> <li>FINAL OUTCOMES: Well matched learning needs of individuals and organizations on SDGs ensuring effective SDG learning resulting in behavioural change.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Overall objective:</b> Transformation of the capacities of countries, institutions and individuals with a view to embedding key SDG principles into their daily analysis and practices, and enabling them to design, implement and review policies, strategies, programmes, actions and initiatives that are both coherent and highly effective reflecting the complex linkages between all SDGs and that contribute to making sure the world is a better place for all using LDCB as the guiding principle.</p>

					it is great to learn that Cyprus case is more integrative of the three RAs. Unfortunately, Cyprus (once selected by the evaluator to be case studied) was excluded from the evaluation upon inception due to possible bureaucratic impediments that may affect the evaluation, as communicated during the inception phase.
Elena Proden	6	11	Observation	This sentence is not clear and quotation mark is not closed.	This paragraph explains the linkages between the RAs. It was featured in the inception report. It does not present findings, but rather reflects how the evaluation was framed. With no linkages, as in the original TOC, the project reflects a siloed conceptualization and implementation approach. After reviewing the different docs (during the inception), the evaluator recognized the potential linkages, identified them and assessed them.
Elena Proden	7	11	Observation	There seems to be smth wrong in this sentence too. As it refers to using UNSDG:Learn for pilots, again we are doing this in Cyprus and are preparing now a blended program for Seychelles with online learning from RA3 and in-person training program from RA1. The link between RA1 and other areas was in fact strong at least in 1 sense that whatever e-learning we develop in RAs 1 and 2 we make them available on UNSDG:Learn.	same as above.  the last statement clearly confirms the evaluator's observation that RA3 provided, more or less, the platform to further propose the objectives of RA1 and RA2 through its different offerings - hence the proposed linkages from RA 3 toward RA 1 and 2 reflecting the RA potential to spread the knowledge related to policy coherence and SDGs data and stats.
Madina Imaralieva	8	17	Wrong statement	I thought it would be still overall Andean Community, not Peru as a separate country because Cynthia is conducted a separate national StaTact workshop for Peru. <a href="#">@Elena PRODEN</a> please advise	well noted and corrected
Elena Proden	9	17	Wrong statement	Madina is right, it should be Andean Community as the stakeholder works for regional organization which had a	well noted and corrected

				StaTact training in spring, not Government of Peru. Peru's training took place much later and the participants were not interviewed.	
Elena Proden	10	17	Observation	It would be good to put it in full as I didn't see this in the abbreviations list.	well noted and corrected
Madina Imaralieva	11	18	Question	Do you mean TARRD016?	yes indeed
Elena Proden	12	18	Observation	This is not clear. Indeed, some courses had been developed under previous projects but we continue running and updating them so their delivery and participants as of 2020 are beneficiaries of the current project. Without it, they could not have followed these courses.	The para simply lists (does not judge or qualify) the different offerings including the MOOCs offered in 2020 and continue to be offered in this phase!  Added as a footnote to shed some clarity.
Elena Proden	13	Table 2	Observation	There are 4 toolkits "National briefing package Introduction to 2030 Agenda" in EN, FR, SP, RU and 2 e-tutorial on "Mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda" in EN and AR that are missing here. EMS was separate from moodle in the past and those who accessed toolkits and e-tutorials didn't go through EMS, we used manual count to add them into our statistics. The data is available under RA3 in our Unita's monitoring table.	I extracted the list of courses from the databases shared by the evaluation team. In case of discrepancy, let's identify them in order to address them.
Madina Imaralieva	14	Table 2	Observation	We include Cyprus here, but not in the funding table afterwards. <a href="#">@Elena PRODEN</a>	indeed, Cyprus was excluded as a case study country for consultation BUT not from the list of event/ activities the project offered
Elena Proden	15	Table 2	Wrong data	We need to review this tagging as it does not seem to fully correspond to our monitoring table and interim reports. It should RA3 because it is not about policy coherence.	noted and amended (change the tagging to RA3)

Madina Imaralieva	16	Table 2	Observation	Not sure why it is 15	<i>Do you mean the courses tagged with 15 are not labelled TARRD015 but rather TARRD016?</i>
Elena Proden	17	Table 2	Observation	Yes, this tagging is strange we didn't use the project TARRD015 for this project. WE don't understand the difference between TAR16 and TAR15.	The labels (TARRD016 and TARRD015) appeared as codes of courses/ offerings in the database shared with the evaluator.
Elena Proden	18	Table 3	Observation	As all the work (except 1 workshop in Cyprus) until May 2022 was done remotely, I think having the evaluation remote also makes sense.	nevertheless, remote evaluation limits the possibility to assess the level 3 and 4 of the Kirkpatrick Approach
Elena Proden	19	Table 3	Observation	I think that the interviews period was not ideal as it has coincided with the HLPF for UN staff and summer holidays for those based in Europe and NA. I am not sure how many of 17 never replied? I understand Madina was not invited to an interview, most likely to summer holidays?	indeed. It was not a formal interview, but rather a couple of clarification meetings and discussion. By the time we were to schedule an interview. Madina was away on holidays
Elena Proden	20	Table 3	Observation	Maybe indicating the share of 17 here would be better? Otherwise many sounds like half or more to me at least... Not sure what limited means here. I think there were 3 persons interviewed at least for Seychelles?	As you know we attempted to interview a couple of informants (4) from the Philippines, but no one responded – not counted in the final count. A DESA informant never responded and among the Andean community, I managed to interview only two. Informants from Mexico never responded. This is not a finding per se. the importance of the message is that we managed through consultation with the project team to substitute those who did not respond.  Only 2 from Seychelles were interviewed out of the four originally identified.
Madina Imaralieva	21	23	Question	2030 Agenda principles?	noted and corrected
Elena Proden	22	26	Observation	I am struggling with this statement. While I agree that there are additional linkages that could have been explored more (the	this statement is further elaborated in the following paragraphs.

			<p>red ones you show), other linkages we have are still valid, i.e., system maps and dialogues with government are now followed by trainings for staff to ensure application in the context of the next NDP in Seychelles, for example. We will be training civil servants on applying system based approaches in their SDG planning and reporting work. The same is in Cyprus: we helped Government developed new governance - lead Ministry for each SDG will be coordinating reporting across other Ministries and they will introduce a multistakeholder forum- These are concrete institutional changes. The fact that these things happened after Feb 2022 does not mean the logic of the ToC is wrong.</p> <p>To me, the problem was not so much with the logic - and I appreciate the recommendation on additional linkages and having a more systemic approach to connecting planning, governance and monitoring - but with the fact that without sufficient bulk funding, search for matching projects (previous para) leads us to what you call diversity of project offerings and this does not seem to come out from the analysis. Flexibility is good but not having significant core funding is an impediment.</p> <p>In short, we do no search to promote diverse offerings on purpose but the matching funds part makes us search for</p>	<p>Well noted re the Seychelles but that was not the case for the period under review. All the proposed training came after the engagement the Team had with Seychelles after June 2022 (period outside of the scope of the evaluation).</p> <p><b>please note that the evaluation did not find the TOC is wrong!</b> This is not a correct statement. But the hypotheses underneath it are not sufficient and the efforts – if not coherent and comprehensive- might and will not lead to achieve the aspired outcomes.</p> <p>The evaluation recognized (and commended) the diversity of funding but also highlighted that such diversity and the projects’ multi-level outreach (targeting individuals, institutions, and countries) would limit the possibility for a targeted and a well-focused approach (para 27) which means they impede achieving the aspired outcomes as the Team concluded.</p> <p>I believe it is up to the Team to make the call to go wide stretch wide but thin OR focused the interventions while leveraging/ attracting matching funds. There is always pro/cons and trade-offs for each of the approaches. This is a key conclusion of the evaluation.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>funding which is always aligned with our main teams but may have strings attached to types of beneficiaries, specific area, mode of delivery etc. because of the donor's own programmatic objectives (e.g., UNDESA or UNEP's funds).</p>	
Elena Proden	23	Figure 4	Observation	<p>To me it is a bit confusing that Cyprus is counted in total geographical distribution but is not counted in pilots. Even if it was not included in the pool of KIIs and survey, maybe it could be reflected in a different colour or outline under RA1? Just a suggestion. If it is excluded from all statistics, etc., then it would be good to state it somewhere upfront</p>	Noted and added
Elena Proden	24	28	Wrong data	<p>This is not correct. We have not received a specific demand on data until I went to Seychelles in May and because of that we are now planning a workshop that will link the two.</p> <p>This sentence sounds like we have not responded to the demand, see my explanation above, I would appreciate if this were reflected correctly. In Seychelles we are not developing a training with UNDESA connecting mainstreaming of SDGs, reporting on SDGs and system thinking, so we are following up based on the request received in May. IN Cyprus the project combines governance assessment and SDG action plan for policy coherence with monitoring framework and a training since December 2020.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- The evaluation confirms the demand-driven nature of the TA provided by UNITAR</li> <li>2- The fact that the issue was raised in May reinforces the argument that there was need that was not raised! Presumably, such needs should have been identified in the scoping missions before tailoring the Tech Assistance.</li> </ol>

Elena Proden	25	28	Wrong data	Please see my comment above, it would not be entirely correct to say "any". One can refer to project document for Cyprus and interim report and UNDESA minutes for Seychelles.	Amended to read: "Against this RA--based approach, and <b>based on the consultations and reviewed documents</b> , the evaluation could not confirm any attempt by the project attempts to implement a more comprehensive approach across the two result areas in one country, <b>except for the case of Cyprus that was not studied in depth by the evaluation.</b> "
Elena Proden	26	29	Observation	Smth is wrong in the sentence.	corrected to read "challenged"
Elena Proden	27	30	Question	At?	corrected to read "targeted a well-identified"
Elena Proden	28	34	Observation	This needs to be specified: as "the number of actual UNITAR course participants under RA3 "Spearheading knowledge and building skillsets" is 13 per cent". Also, under RA3, UNSDG:Learn itself is a gateway with more than 150k users who can access both UNITAR and non-UNITAR learning. The sentence as it is now sounds misleading.	amended and clarified in the footnote (15)
Elena Proden	29	Footnote 16	Observation	I cannot understand the footnote: its seems like around 40 per cent benefitted from RA 1 or RA2. Was there a question on RA3 courses? It seems a bit strange than 60% of participants do not recall they took a course. Maybe there is a problem with the way the question was formulated: stakeholder engagement is not mentioned as a sperate topic under RA1 while the highest share of learning beneficiaries was those enrolled in the stakeholder engagement course...	yes the same questions was raised concerning other UNITAR learning offerings/ services. There are questions (11, 19 and 31)  these are findings of the survey that show the possible recall bias among respondents. The majority of the respondents clearly could not recall what type of service/ offering they benefited from.  amended and clarified the footnote
Elena Proden	30	36	Observation	It is the first time I see such presentation so I am a bit puzzled. I think indeed it	The graph is indicative of the distribution of the beneficiaries by regions, capturing the regions with the highest share of

				<p>may be a bit confusing to people that Europe appears as 1 region and other countries appear under sub-regions, and it may also give the impression that other sub-regions are not covered at all. Indeed, I understand that African population would be 1.2 against 0.75 for Europe but Eastern Africa would be 0.47. For RA1, for example, there are 40% unaccounted for, so I assume there are some regions or sub-regions that should still have relatively high shares - more than 6% - but they are not shown for some reason?</p>	<p>beneficiaries per RA. The regions that do not feature in the graph obviously have shares of less than 6%.</p> <p>The key learning from this graph is to show that the majority of the beneficiaries are from these five regions but distributed differently per RA.</p> <p>The Graph (8) is amended to include West Asia (highlighting the highest 5 regions)</p> <p>Detailed graphs are available (attached)</p>
Elena Proden	31	36	Wrong data	<p>Most of European learners under RA1 are from MOOC on stakeholder engagement.</p>	<p>noted and corrected</p>
Elena Proden	32	37	Question	<p>Please see my question above: what are the other regions (how are they define) and why 40% and 30% are not completed for RA1 and RA2?</p>	<p>Detailed graphs are available (attached)</p>
Elena Proden	33	37	Observation	<p>This is a matter also of making courses available in other languages, not only communication I suppose.</p>	<p>indeed, as elaborated later in the report (outreach strategy entails both communication, translation among other means)</p>
Elena Proden	34	37	Observation	<p>With SDC funding we have been targeting developing countries for pilot support on policy coherence and data: SIDS, LAC and Philipinnes (Cyprus is funded from a matching EC project).</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Elena Proden	35	37	Observation	<p>The next sentence answers this question. The sequence is the following: initially Governments approached us based on our promotion through key UN for a: HLPF side events and VNR labs. Gradually we have moved to a model</p>	<p>Noted, yet an outreach and promotion strategy might be needed to reach developing countries that are in need but do not know how to reach UNITAR or the offerings of UNITAR!</p>



				with RCOs started asking us because of the ongoing UN reform and an effort to channel all UN cooperation through RCOs. This is the main default model now.	
Elena Proden	36	39	Observation	Please see my comment above about Cyprus and Seychelles	same response.
Elena Proden	37	39	Observation	I don't know what this means, this is a general statement: rarely happens. All courses from policy coherence and data are featured on UNSDG:Learn, incl. micro-learning on data and policy coherence, incl. the ones shown below. What concretely is suggested here needs to be done differently? We also recommend e-learning courses when we work with countries depending on demands. I think the last point - on recommending e-learning courses to pilot countries is something we could do more consistently and regularly.	the para illustrates complementarity between R3 and the other Result areas by highlighting "typical examples" in para 40. Noting that it does not exclude other possibilities.  if you need to list addition examples, let me know.
Elena Proden	38	40	Observation	This is already done, please see my comment and question above.	Noted
Elena Proden	39	Table 4	Wrong data	This course is RA3 already, same for STI.	it is identified as Result Area 3
Elena Proden	40	Table 4	Wrong data	This is no product from our end at the end, we juts guide them so we cannot put it on UNSDG:Learn.	removed!
Elena Proden	41	49	Observation	As discussed earlier, to me this sentence would read negative for people who don't know that 84% is above average and is relatively high. I would assume that it is to be expected that the application rate	para 49 follows para 48 and maintains the flow to convey the message. well noted re removing "only".

				would be lower than the increase in knowledge and skills rate, although I agree we can make improvements in increasing the application.	
Elena Proden	42	50	Observation	<p>Firstly, It was impossible to do missions to Seychelles or Mauritius due to COVID until spring 2022 when the first one took place. Secondly, in Mauritius and Seychelles we had to go through RCO and unfortunately makes us depend on RCO's pace or work and prioritization. This is the disadvantage of working through RCO while the advantage is to ensure we avoid duplication and work as one UN. We had to wait for RCO to engage with Government more to establish a more direct link in Seychelles in may 2022 during Policy Dialogue with Ministers.</p>	well noted. The reasoning does not negate the need to
Elena Proden	43	51	Wrong statement	<p>This whole paragraph does not account for Cyprus approach. The project in Cyprus was co-developed with Government and we had been implementing it directly with Government. There had been many workshops (not 1) and everything was done with both government and non-government stakeholders. For other countries, this was done with RCOs as we have to go through them and we fully depend on the information we receive from RCO on what Government will be ready to do and at what point.</p>	<p>true. Because Cyprus was excluded from the review in the first place.</p> <p>I added a disclaimer re the above.</p>
Elena Proden	44	51	Wrong data	<p>This was only the case for Seyechelles (confusion created by our consultant with</p>	indeed, clearly the report mentioned that Seychelles was the only country for a relatively deeper dive (para 17) ...

				Government) but this sentence reads as if the unclarity was everywhere.	amended to reflect the case of Seychelles
Elena Proden	45	51	Observation	<p>Again, some advice is needed here on RCO's engagement. This whole paragraph gives the impression that UNITAR didn't think of engaging which is not true. I had been pushing for RCO to engagement Government since July 2021 when we started working closely on this.</p> <p>It would be good to reflect as a fact that we worked closely with and through RCO from the very beginning. Otherwise, this information is really incomplete and leads to wrong conclusions.</p> <p>Further, as discussed during the meeting, working in partnerships in general has its advantages and disadvantages. We were supporting pilot countries (not Cyprus but others) with DESA DPIDG and this collaboration was at times time consuming (e.g., I had to be involved in revising their internal documents, etc.), we were asked to adjust to their work schedule with some unexpected things to be done when we had other activities, etc., and at times there was no clarity who is responsible for follow-up. One thing we may need to do is to assign lead agency for each pilot country to overcome this problem.</p> <p>Maybe there are other tools and models we could use to better structure our</p>	the brokerage role of the UNRCO was raised in para 28, 31 and 37. The idea, I believe, is clear that UNITAR engages through RCO. Also added to this para (amended)

				collaboration with DESA and RCO on the project.	
Elena Proden	46	52	Wrong data	I think this does not include numbers for national briefing package and e-tutorial. Perhaps it should be mentioned somewhere in a footnote. Otherwise we would have different numbers in our interim reports and this evaluation report.	amended to reflect the MOOC only. footnote is added.
Elena Proden	47	53	Question	<a href="#">@Madina IMARALIEVA</a> , could you please check these numbers, they seem to be much lower than the participants of the sole SE course you told me about on Friday?	answered by Madina
Madina Imaralieva	48	53	Observation	SE course with the rest seems to match	noted
Madina Imaralieva	49	53	Observation	Please note that overall some events are not reported on EMS because the lead organizers maybe other programmes, so to avoid double reporting, it is reported once. This creates discrepancies between the monitoring table of our Unit and EMS statistics for such events.	well noted. This reflects the later findings related to monitoring and tracking the projects offering.
Madina Imaralieva	50	54	Question	Is it because of Cyprus?	because of SE as responded by Elena
Elena Proden	51	54	Observation	This is SE course, however this diagram is not consistent with the one shown earlier on geographic distribution. Here there is 10% from Western Africa while the other one does not show W. Africa at all and shows 6% for SEA. In terms of recommendations, for tailored TA we cannot target more than 2-3 countries and cannot have a	added West Africa to Figure (8)  consistency is maintained

				balanced geographic representation. For online courses, indeed, but this would require translation of e-learning...	
Elena Proden	52	55	Question	Middle Africa?	removed
Elena Proden	53	61	Observation	We cannot loosen the control entirely because of the confidentiality issue but we are creating special IOs landing pages so that they could manage their projects and communities from there. We are planning a workshop for IOs to introduce this to them and give access rights to designated focal points	well noted regarding the actions that were taken. These are, however, outside the scope of the evaluation. Then, not included in the report. It is to be included in the management response
Elena Proden	54	Table 7	Wrong data	Smth is wrong heread	adjusted. Removed Mexico and Andean community.
Elena Proden	55	67	Question	Is this quote about language barriers? It is not entirely straightforward here	yes. It is. Removed
Elena Proden	56	68	Question	A typo?	removed
Elena Proden	57	71.1	Observation	This is also one of the areas highlighted in the new UNSDG:Learn Partnership Strategy areas.	Great to learn so. It should appear in the management response
Elena Proden	58	71.2	Wrong statement	Our team cannot influence the fees and waivers but we did implement a change last year when the algorithm shows first all free courses and only afterwards paid ones. Many courses are free on UNSDG:Learn. <a href="#">@Madina IMARALIEVA</a> could we have a share of free and paid courses on UNSDG:Learn?	It should appear in the management response
Madina Imaralieva	59	71.2	Data	It is 11% for courses	noted

Madina Imaralieva	60	71.2	Observation	Not sure to which course they are referring to	
Elena Proden	61	71.2	Observation	WE don't have paid courses. It has to be noted here that most likely the person refers to a course found on UNSDG:Learn, not the ones developed/delivered by UNITAR under this project. Otherwise, this sounds incorrect.	well noted. Statements removed in order to avoid any confusion and mis-interpretation. Participants may not be able to distinguish between the free courses offered under the project and others!
Madina Imaralieva	62	71.4	Observation	All e-learning courses in our portfolio have certificates, except for the other products such as e-tutorial and toolkits.	well noted. Statements removed in order to avoid any confusion and mis-interpretation. Participants may not be able to distinguish which offering provide certificates!
Elena Proden	63	17.4	Observation	Again for courses which are not ours we cannot provide certificates. We are now trying to develop a certification pathway for business sector on the future business landing page. There we are thinking about joint UNSDG:Learn certification but that would require the development of controls and links with different course providers.	noted
Elena Proden	564	74	Observation	Smth is missing in this sentence	be a broker
Elena Proden	65	76	Observation	This is indeed an important question for the future phases: to what extent can all previous f2f events be replaced by online? To us it seems like some can be replaced successfully (this reduces our environmental impact and travel cost), but not others and some in-country missions for countries with long term collaboration may be required.	well noted

Elena Proden	66	Table 10	Observation	<p>It would be important to add here EC's contribution even if Cyprus was not sampled as this is part of the matching funds.</p> <p>In fact, this presentation gives the impression we have not met the target of 55% stated in the agreement, so it is kind of important. A foot note can be placed on Cyprus.</p>	Amended to account for the EU commission contribution (Table 10) and para 76
Madina Imaralieva	67	Table 10	Wrong data	Looks like the numbers above were taken from the financial reports. In this case, it should be: 51'980.48	noted and corrected
Madina Imaralieva	68	Table 10	Wrong data	The same the number from final financial report is 52'489.62	noted and corrected
Madina Imaralieva	69	Table 10	Wrong data	NOT correct, it is 20'605.55	noted and corrected
Elena Proden	70	77	Observation	<p>One of the challenges, our team had to deal with was linked to UN funds with partners contacting us just 6 months before the deadline for the use of such funds (st less than 6 months). The review of agreements at Partners' end had always been much longer (typically at least 1 month) than at UNITAR's end which has a standard of 7 working days. So UNITAR is processing agreements away faster than UN Secretariat's Divisions and Programs in my experience.</p>	<p>the quote is removed</p> <p>para 78 is reviewed to read:</p> <p>“The evaluation uncovered findings that reflect diverging perspectives related to aspect of project efficiency, mostly associated with (a) bureaucratic and sometimes cumbersome administrative management and (b) activity costing. While the project Team confirms that partners agreement reviews are swiftly done within days at UNITAR, while it might take the partners a couple of weeks, some partners see otherwise. Besides, the activity budgeting and costing was also a challenge to UNITAR project Team and some partners, for sometimes they have to engage in long negotiations for a short-term activity with minimal budget. The negotiations revolve around the project's indirect and direct costs. Most often, the project cost recovery is understood by the partners because of UNITAR is a project-based organization (with no regular budget allocation</p>

					beyond external grants and funds). Nevertheless, the evaluation could not establish the costing model adopted within UNITAR. When inquired about it, the evidence proves that this issue often emerges and there remains some ambiguity among UNITAR senior staff about the indirect and staff costing model. While the project team budgeting is defined on an activity-by-activity basis, the percentage of overhead and indirect cost differs across the projects and programmes within UNITAR.”
Elena Proden	71	77	Observation	I don't know what is meant here. As UNITAR staff I know that there is a clear formula we all apply when we develop project budgets for overheads which are composed of PSC and DSC amounting together to around 18% (there are exact numbers). When it comes to the costing of core costs, as explained during the meeting, each programs does it for themselves. In our case, we discuss the nature of the e-course project, for example, with the Partner (i.e., length, tools, inclusion of videos or not, use of scenarios or not, etc.) which provides a basis for us to estimate how many working days each team member or consultant will spend on this course. A related share of salary is then allocated from the project or paid under a contract to consultant or a company (e.g., translations that are based on number of words). As all programs do it on their own, indeed I can not compare our efficiency to other programs but we know exactly how the budget is built.	well noted re your confidence in calculating these costs. But obviously, within UNITAR the calculations might not be consistent.  Amended to <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- account for the EU commission contribution (Table 10) and para 76</li> <li>2- the text to add in para 78 (Refer to above comment)”</li> </ol> Quote removed



Elena Proden	72	78	Wrong statement	UNSDG:Learn meets throughout the year in Working Groups who help advance work. Annual meetings are used more to present results and define directions for the year ahead.	yet steering committee meeting remain annual
Elena Proden	73	78	Observation	The Partnerships Strategy was finalized on 25 March but KPIs were missing. We had a meeting in June to discuss them and are finalizing them now	noted and amended
Elena Proden	74	78	Observation	2022-2026, we have started implementing it already: created a TF on business landing page and did the mapping of learning materials, developed a CN on new curated learning features, etc.	noted and amended
Elena Proden	75	78	Observation	The strategy had been developed a TF of several Partners, it will be shared beforehand for endorsement and presented during Steering Group meeting on 1 December.	noted and amended
Elena Proden	76	79	Observation	This is already happening in Madagascar and e will be training Seychelles UNCT on systems thinking end Nov	Management response
Elena Proden	77	79	Observation	I don't know what is meant by mission. But physical mission was impossible due to COVID in 2021 while the activities started in 2021 (we could not wait much longer...) I think there is a misunderstanding here on how communication channels worked, RCO were the ones transmitting the information to the Government and from the Government and we had been in very close touch with them and defining	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- of course there was no mission in the real sense of the mission; nevertheless, local consultants were commissioned and deployed to do some assessment as part of the initiative.</li> <li>2- Obviously, the intervention "by proxy" was not optimal, as you describe it</li> <li>3- The mission report is the country report drafted and delivered after the intervention.</li> </ol>

				<p>the project jointly with them since May-June 2021. We had no direct access to Governments until May 2022, for protocol reasons RCOs had to even st. go through MOFAs on certain aspects. Please see above my comment on RCO who typically control communication channels. This is not smth that UNITAR can influence or change.</p> <p>I don't know what mission report you are referring to? We have never shared any mission reports because we worked on RPTC minutes for DESA instead that have captured what we had discussed with RCO and Government as the basis for the training program. It had to be shared by DESA or RCO in June and I had pushed and insisted on the meeting with Ministry of Finance in June despite the fact that RCO wanted to wait for another program to sort out their issues first. The meeting took place 2-3 weeks after thanks to UNITAR. So there has been no delays from our end, I think you would understand given the above that I find it quite unfair in this sense for UNITAR to be responsible for delays from RCO and DESA. Please refer to my comments related to challenges working in partnerships.</p>	<p>4- There is no statement in the whole report that pinpoint to UNITAR project team. the report, as well as the whole evaluation process, were conceived and then drafted with a high focus on the learning aspect of evaluation and less on accountability and "pointing fingers".</p> <p>5- In this para, and others, the report is referring to a process that should have been managed differently in order to avoid some of the confusion and challenges.</p>
Elena Proden	78	79	Observation	The deployed consultants had been managed very closely. It seems like one of the national consultants we hired who only worked for Government before didn't realize initially she was supposed	noted. But obviously, this has repercussions that were presumably solved during your visit in May.

				to discuss any actions with her supervisor first despite the fact we had many meetings. She has understood it afterwards.	
Elena Proden	79	79	Observation	This statement is unclear as practically all Organizations (not individuals) we have trained on StaTact specifically are data producers. They are all NSOs so I don't see how this is possible and who could have said that they are not data producers in fact. Maybe sub-regional statistical organizations think they are consumers? But please note this is an exception as you can judge from the list of trained organizations. Even for sub-regional organizations, we trained CARICOM recently and they want to use StaTact for their environmental WG.	<p>as you know, no informants from the Philippines showed up. Therefore, we shifted to the Andean community. The consulted stakeholders confirmed they are not data producers.</p> <p>I amended the statement to avoid generalization.</p> <p>Para 80</p>
Elena Proden	80	80	Observation	I understand that this paragraph was the basis for the recommendation on a more reliable monitoring system. The monitoring system is not unreliable, we track all key data - through UNITAR corporate mechanisms EMS by participant - and for the project overall through our team's Monitoring table. However, the challenge was that data on participants could not be extracted frequently because of the lack of a bridge between Event management System and Learning management System. Such data had been reviewed once a year and the resulting statistics were highly reliable. However the process was very time consuming. As of	<p>the fact that UNITAR relies on 2 systems that until very recently did not speak to each other is an indication of a flaw in the system across UNITAR.</p> <p>during this evaluation, we had to revisit the database and the EMS twice or three times before using the data for analysis.</p> <p>text is adjusted to read: "The evaluation confirms that this is a institutional deficiency within UNITAR, not necessarily related to the project, with the two existing between Event management System and Learning management System are not connected at the time of the evaluation"</p> <p>The other part of the statement should appear in the management response.</p>

				this year, they two systems communicate so it would be possible to extract data easier and more frequently.	
Elena Proden	81	80	Observation	<p>Madina sends updates to all partners upon request as all these data are available so this comment seems to be not very accurate.</p> <p>I think the combination of "many" and "any" idea sounds as an exaggeration to me for above mentioned reasons. As explained by Madina, it was extremely challenging and time consuming to report more than once a year with the previous UNITAR corporate systems but this will be possible as of this year thanks to their merger.</p>	partners have explicitly confirmed that they have no clue about the participation/ enrolment/ etc... they neither asked nor received such info... this means there is no systematic and consistent data sharing process among partners.
Elena Proden	82	80	Wrong statement	This is not correct. All our courses contain evaluation questionnaires to be completed at the end of the course (Level 1 evaluation) and some have Level 2.	Amended
Elena Proden	83	83	Wrong statement	<p>This does not cover Cyprus pilot. It would be good to state the exclusion of Cyprus somewhere on the scope of the evaluation. They have a new SDG governance, Action Plan and monitoring framework as a result of this project. In addition, we expect CCA and future UNDCF for Madagascar to be more integrated as a result of recent workshops and some changes to take place in Seychelles following the future trainings.</p>	<p>Cyprus exclusion is noted.</p> <p>the other part of the statement should appear in the management response.</p> <p>I am very happy to learn about it.</p>

Elena Proden	84	84	Observation	Again to me this reads as if we were doing one-off workshops. While this is more the case for RA2 and StaTact and INFF training under RA1, it is not the case for policy coherence pilots under RA1. They were not designed to be single workshops. We held focus groups in some that will be followed by trainings now in Seychelles, helped develop CCA or had a fully fledged program on governance review, participatory action planning and training in Cyprus.	I have not come across a cohort of individuals from the same institutions being followed with some offering over some time.
Elena Proden	85	85	Observation	Again in Cyprus institutional changes are owned by Government and in fact we had been expecting this in the case of Cyprus as they had requested this type of support to EC. We hope that our work in Seychelles (with MinFin) and Madagascar (with UNCT on UNDCF) will also lead to changes in a longer run, for now the latter was to help update CCA with system thinking (drafting is now in progress following the workshops held between 22 Sep and 4 Oct).	well noted. I suggest to include this in the management response.
Elena Proden	86	Recommendation 1	Observation	It would be good to receive more explanation on this suggestion. Unless we are lucky enough to have the person who actually can decide on introducing a methodology in the country (which often is at a very senior level), I don't think such mapping would help. In other words, if I understand correctly the recommendation, having more participants in learning from one country	indeed, this won't increase the political will BUT would create a mass / pool of people who think alike and whose capacity is developed in a manner that might accelerate a change

				does not mean there will be political will to implement this.	
Elena Proden	87	Recommendation 1	Observation	<p>It is not clear whom this statement is intended for. The data had been shared with Kassem by PPME using EMS sheets which I understand Kassem had difficulty with. We have a very detailed internal monitoring table organized by each of 3 result areas but we have not been asked to show it.</p> <p>After reading the report, I think I have an issue specifically with the word "reliable" here. We have a reliable tracking (that is data are accurate), but the periodicity of producing reports was low as explained above and indeed there was no systemic approach to sharing reports with small donors but it does not mean we had an unreliable monitoring...</p>	<p>I asked for all sorts of data used and generated by the project ,including the data used to generate the interim reports. Ideally, such data should be made at the disposal of the evaluator – especially that the EMS and database were shared more than once early in the process due to duplication in counting...</p> <p>noted re “reliable” - It is “systematic” and “consistent”</p> <p>amended to read “1.3 Develop a more reliable systematic project tracking and monitoring framework to allow periodic data reporting and analysis to be shared with partners ze performance and to inform decisions.”</p> <p>Internal monitoring data will be reviewed by the evaluation team.</p>
Elena Proden	88	Recommendation 1	Observation	We did Level 3 evaluations for past projects but didn't do it for this one to avoid duplication with the current evaluation. There may be also a time constraint to be doing both 3-6 and 6-12 months evaluations as this is time consuming exercise	noted
Elena Proden	89	Recommendation 2	Observation	I think we main to increase outreach for online learning, more specifically MOOCs and UNSDG:Learn. We cannot increase outreach for TA, pilots and country training with the same budget.	noted to be included in the management response
Elena Proden	90	Recommendation 2	Observation/Question	Joint with whom? We typically discuss the approach with the Government or UNCT and the partners we are working with if any. Typically when the request	noted

				<p>comes from Government, the scoping is done directly with them from the outset. However, when the request comes from UNCT, we have to do it with them and they manage initial contacts with Government. No missions were possible of course during COVID period. When I finally managed to go on mission to Seychelles, I met and discussed with Ministers and Principal Secretaries so we have now defined the approach together with Principal Secretary for the next year.</p> <p>Please see my earlier comments on RCO and partnerships. Here some recommendations on how to work with RCO would be great to have as they are the ones managing relationship with Government.</p>	
Elena Proden	91	Recommendation 2	Observation	Not sure what kind of teams are referred to here: we do not sub-contract work to teams. We typically work directly with consultants and they are very closely managed.	commissioned consultants.
Elena Proden	92	Recommendation 2	Observation	We cannot understand this recommendation. All of our courses are free	removed
Elena Proden	93	Recommendation 3	Observation	The Partnerships Strategy is finalized, and we have been implementing some of its parts already. KPIs were outstanding as members could not agree on how they want to measure progress.	noted, changed to reflect the performance measures