**Evaluation Audit Trail Template: Police Contributing Countries (PCC) Project Draft Evaluation Report**

*(To be completed by the Project Management (Peacekeeping Training Programme Unit).*

*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 pf comment (e.g. observation, question, wrong data, etc.** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft report** | **Evaluator response and actions taken** |
| Project Management (PM) | 1 | Executive summary p. 6 – par 1 | Observation | Please add “financial” before “support from the German Federal Office”. | Added |
| PM | 2 | Main findings – relevance p. 7 | Observation | “However, the evaluation also found that the project missed the opportunity to build on pre-existing work such as the DPO 2018 review of main obstacles to women’s representation or international initiatives such as the Canadian Elsie Initiative for Women in Peace Operations”.  Project Management (PM) strongly disagree with this statement. The project builds on the DPO review, as well as on outcomes from the Elsie Initiative. PM did not find explanation in the report that led to this conclusion. | See the revised text.  The evaluation heard about the Elsie initiative during interviews with project team and one focal point who mentioned UNITAR’s support in implementing ELSIE recommendations, but the evaluation found no evidence of it as a baseline for the project and for the RPA and APSTA needs assessments. The DPO review was not mentioned during interviews nor referred to in project documents. |
| PM | 3 | Main findings – relevance p. 7 | Observation | For training of trainers: pre-requisites from UNITAR on the selection of training participants were included in the official correspondence sent to PCCs at the beginning of the project. See attachment 1 to email.  For IPO / FPU training: pre-requisites are set by DPO and communicated to PCC through Permanent Missions in New York. | Only one interview with UNPOL in NYC referred to pre-requisites (one year in the police force), overall interviewees with other UN institutions and with PCCs highlighted i) the lack of stronger prerequisites, b) the loss of knowledge upon return/after training linked to inadequate selection |
| PM | 4 | Main findings – coherence p. 8 | Observation | Besides the inter-agency police task force, evaluators may wish to mention the launch of the Light Coordination Mechanism for Police. See attachment 2 to email. | Thank you. Agree the first reference appeared too late (page 42). Additional reference made in the executive summary |
| PM | 5 | Main findings – effectiveness p. 8 | Question | PM kindly request support from evaluators / PRMU for the review of the result framework. | Page 19 the evaluators reconstructed the result framework from the project documentation. Key terms and a logframe template were added page 19. See if you wish to move it as an annex or keep it in the main text. |
| PM | 6 | Main findings – effectiveness p. 8 | Observation | The toolbox is a repository of existing resources on training design, development, implementation and evaluation. Topics covered during TOT are selected among those including in the toolbox depending on the level of the participants – according to a certification framework that covers three progressive levels. All training of trainers delivered in the framework of the project situate at level I, which aims at enabling trainers to deliver thematic training. Please refer to levels of certification and TOT description (attachments 3 and 4).  PM strongly disagree with the statement that “by the end of the training of trainers, few participants are able to deliver a face-to-face training or will have the opportunity to practice”. PM did not find explanation in the report that led to this conclusion. | Reference to the certification and ToT description were added  This finding is based on the observation of one ToT in Mali (team member being himself a certified and senior trainer) and corroborated by training centres trainers. The wording has been nuanced a bit. Explanation was provided page 23, §56 but wording has been adapted here as well. (now 55 since §39 was removed – read below) |
| PM | 7 | Evaluation findings | Observation | Overall comment: PM finds very problematic explicit reference to focal persons in PCCs (ex. Focal person from Togo) - particularly considering that full details are provided as annex to the report. If reference is maintained, please note that the report will need to be approved by all those explicitly referenced. | Agree, references are anonymized and replaced with the following text “one focal point”. Except reference to Tanzania focal point which is quoting number of officers deployed to UNMISS  Kindly review and advise if names should be hidden in the list of interviewees. Thank you |
| PM | 8 | Relevance p. 13 par. 39 | Observation | Learning objectives of STM are set by DPO and are not open to review by UNITAR. Alignment with needs is ensured by DPO. Kindly request to reformulate the paragraph or remove. | Removed |
| PM | 9 | Effectiveness p. 18 par. 52 | Question | PM kindly request support from evaluators / PRMU on the best way to structure the report for the donor. | The template is standard/fine. The issue is the absence of elaborated answers. Reports reviewed are laconic. Two options exist to redress the problem: insist at project start and add mention in MOU about reporting obligations OR review the template, add questions, including space for self-evaluation to ensure minimum information are collected. These two options can be combined. A proper result framework with SMART indicators could also guide data collection (definition of key terms should be added as PCC won’t be expected to know about this terminology). |
| PM | 10 | Effectiveness p. 24 par. 59 | Observation / wrong data | Evaluation refers to FPU training as crowd management training. Please note that crowd management is only one aspect of FPU training. The full curriculum includes modules other than crowd management, as described in UN DPO Resource Hub (<https://research.un.org/en/peacekeeping-community/training/STM/en/peacekeeping-community/training/STMs/FPUs>). PM kindly requests for the reference to be corrected throughout the report. | Reference to the four core tasks added §59 (now 58) |
| PM | 11 | Effectiveness p. 25 par. 61 | Observation | The recommendation to include additional modules is well received. However, PM wants to stress that it is beyond UNITAR mandate to set standards for training. PM will report these observations during the review of the FPU training package that is scheduled for 2022. | Thanks, the evaluators were repeatedly told during interviews that one of UNITAR’s value added is its flexibility in approaching training, which includes more adaptability to context and scenario-based activities. This observation suggests this flexibility does not exist (in practice it meant that in addition to DPO modules, UNITAR could tailored training programs and adapt to country specifics; is it correct or wrong in your view?) |
| PM | 12 | Efficiency p. 34 par. 77 | Observation | Reference to EMPABB overall training calendar is not clear, but rather confusing. | Clarified  The point made is the low visibility on activities implemented as part of the project and on the side (via other donors) |
| PM | 13 | Sustainability p. 39 par. 75 | Observation | PM strongly disagrees with this statement. Please refer to observation 6.  In addition, the way members of FPU are selected is under the sole responsibility of Member States and nothing in the project is designed in a way of influencing this choice. It would have been interesting to further explore this specific aspect – as it was specifically requested by PM during the definition of TORs. Unfortunately, besides this mention in the report, no additional information is provided. | Clarified. The report suggests that if UNITAR cannot impose prerequisites it can provide guidance and share best practices such as job description for trainers, instructional plans or selection tests. |
| PM | 14 | Conclusions p. 42 | Observation | Conclusions and recommendations may need to be reviewed considering comments above. | Adapted |
| PM | 15 | List of persons interviewed p. 75 | Observation | PM wishes clarification on why the Director of the Division for Peace is not mentioned in the list of interviewed persons. PM wishes also clarification on why the Head of Bonn Office, liaison with German authority, was not consulted. | Thanks for spotting the error. Corrected  Interview with Bonn Director was organized in the meantime and name is added |

Add rows as needed