

## Evaluation Audit Trail Template

*(To be completed by Project Management to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the evaluation report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the evaluation report.)*

### To the comments received on (23 August 2023) from the evaluation of the “Supporting the Yearly Training Programme of the École de Maintien de la Paix” Project

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

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft evaluation report	Evaluator response and actions taken
PTP	1		<p>Executive summary From the executive summary, Program notices that a significant confusion has happened between projects subject to the independent evaluation.</p> <p>Par. 4 makes reference to training of master trainers which wasn't part of the project.</p> <p>Par. On coherence makes reference to “needs of the security forces” while the trainings delivered by EMPABB address a wide range of participants – military, police and civilian. In addition, the same paragraph makes reference</p>	<p>The evaluation notes that there was some confusion. There were contributing factors for this confusion, including simultaneous delivery of the two projects (TARPT109, TARPT083), with some beneficiaries involved in the delivery of both projects. Data collection for the two evaluations was combined into a single mission. Evaluation has clarified and also included a limitation to this effect in the report.</p> <p>A short paragraph providing clarity on the confusion not coming from the evaluation team but from the beneficiaries who could not differentiate what projects the trainings they have received were under was added. It is not uncommon to have this situation amongst beneficiaries receiving support from different entities or from the same entity as EMPABB/UNITAR for many years.</p> <p>As to the confusion as to the ‘security forces’ and peacekeeping forces- please refer to the project document’s Prime goal’ <i>the project is to strengthen the impact of peace keeping operations (UN and Non UN) by directly addressing the challenges related to deficient preparation of deployed personnel</i>. Most of the participants of the trainings were military or police or security forces (guards, forest guards, presidential guard..). The evaluation found variations in the numbers of civilians indicated in the EMPABB training reports and the interim narrative report aggregated figures. From the training reports reviewed, not all training included civilians. EMPABB is a training center managed by police and</p>

			<p>army officers and their mandate is focused on strengthening these forces operating in Mali and in the region as well as UN and Non UN peacekeeping operations, e.g. African League, ECOWAS but and some civilians are trained but they are not the main target.</p> <p>Par. On impact makes reference to FPU's while none of the trainings delivered addressed FPU's</p> <p>Par. On sustainability makes reference to "EMPABB capacity to conduct independent training with trained trainers and master trainers" which is conflicting with the fact that EMPABB already provides training independently from UNITAR.</p> <p>Recommendations make reference to the importance of communicating regularly with other international organizations working in Mali and Sahel, while they were involved in the implementation of the project.</p>	<p>On FPU: The impact criteria looked at impact of the previous projects too in the absence of being able to assess impact of this project as of yet.</p> <p>See above, reference to master trainers was removed. ToT refresher continues to be organized and is not conflicting with the fact that EMPABB also provides independent training in our view. On sustainability, the project document discusses the PTP approach/model to ToT projects to ensure longevity in long term without UNITAR involvement.</p> <p>The degree of involvement of other International Organization involved in this project varies. The project document p.11 refers to the fact that UNITAR works and collaborates with many international organizations working in Mali. The level of involvement was minimal, but some of them, e.g., MINUSMA representatives attended some trainings. The trainings for this project were developed by EMPABB so the interviewees just mentioned that in some occasions they organize trainings jointly and with the support of other actors like EUCAP Sahel, and MINUSMA but UNITAR was not involved directly in the design and implementation of the trainings delivered under this project, besides the ToT refresher. According to interviews, greater communication could help for increasing the coherence of the different types of trainings delivered by each other them to the similar target trainees. The recommendation does not mean there is no communication but that it should be strengthened.</p>
PTP	2	Par. 2	<p>Program notes that the project subject to independent evaluation is not a phase or continuation of previous projects and - as explained on several occasions during the discussions with</p>	<p>The evaluation concurs with PTP that the 2022 project was the project subject to the evaluation with an institutional strengthening component not contemplated in previous experiences with EMPABB. However, the evaluation</p>

			the evaluators - it shall be addressed as a separate initiative.	does not conclude that the project can be evaluated in a vacuum, given e.g. the fact that some trained trainers have participated to the ToT refresher and to previous ToTs under the previous project interventions. While the objectives of the project were different, the Implementing Partner, country and some beneficiary groups (yet not all) were similar. The text was nevertheless adjusted accordingly to refer to the 2022 project as a project and not phase. We took note of the differences of this phase in comparison to previous ones. Yet, with the same beneficiary and related objectives, the evaluation chose not to look at the project in isolation and makes reference to previous project interventions instead of calling them phases. In addition, the 2022 project is now referred to as "project".
PTP	3	Par. 8	Training of master trainers was not part of the activities under the project. In addition, reference to the limited participation of women in the security sector in West Africa explains only partially the limited number of women trainers – as trainers encompassed also personnel from military and civilian sectors.	It is possible that there was misunderstanding on the term certified trainer and that the term was used interchangeably with master trainer.  Indeed, the EMPABB participants refer to the certified trainers as Master Trainers so it is a mistake in the description. It was removed from the report.
PTP	4	Par. 9	Reference to MINUSMA is irrelevant in this context.	Reference to MINUSMA was included with regards to the increasing presence of female officers since 2021 and as part of the objectives of the project to increase the number of trained female personnel.. and it was one of the questions in the evaluation matrix. It is also in favor of the project to show alignment with the UNSC on the WPS agenda.
PTP	5	Par. 14	See #2	Noted and text was adjusted to clearly state the project subject to the evaluation.
PTP	6	Par. 16	Program requests clarifications on which report is referred to, as no final report is submitted yet to the donor pending the finalization of the independent evaluations.	Noted and text adjusted.
PTP	7	Par. 19	Given the confusion mentioned under #1, Program raises concerns with regard to the accuracy of the survey.	A limitation with regards to the survey was included. Initially the evaluation wanted to conduct two separate surveys. However, due to the lack of contact details made available, the evaluation had to collect contacts during the field mission and learned that some trained

				trainers have participated to training under TARPT109, TARPT083 and previous phases. A survey question to distinguish between those events was included in the survey and used for data analysis in order to mitigate risks.
PTP	8	Par. 22	Program notes that Malian and African police forces deployed to peacekeeping are note the only target audience of the trainings.	Noted. This was not to suggest that the Malian and African police forces were the only targeted audiences. Text was adjusted for clarity.
PTP	9	Par. 23	See #2	Noted and text was adjusted to clearly state the project subject to the evaluation.
PTP	10	Par. 24	See #2	Noted and text was adjusted to clearly state the project subject to the evaluation.  Reference to previous project interventions on high impact training was merely intended to show consistency with earlier programming targeting the partner. However, the evaluation found that without evidence of a needs assessment, the concept of high-impact training from a relevance perspective was nonetheless a bit opaque.  Moreover, it is in the project's interest that it was evaluated within the larger framework of the previous 3 projects training FPU and strengthening peacekeeping operations in Mali, so this project showed some results, on the trainers' side, some WPS related trainings; and on the strengthening of EMPABB as well as an emphasis on sustainability. It is a good thing and not the opposite.
PTP	11	Par. 25	See #4	
PTP	12	Par. 26	See #2	
PTP	13	Par. 29	See #3 and 8	
PTP	14	Par. 32	See #2 and 4	
PTP	15	Par. 38	Indicator for project objective 1 refers to "within one year from the establishment of the project" not of the center.	The correction was made.
PTP	16	Par. 42	See #1 and 7	The text was be adjusted .
PTP	17	Par. 44	See #2	The text was adjusted
PTP	18	Par. 45	The project did not entail training on public safety. In addition, the women trainers who delivered training outside Bamako were involved in a different project. Again, reference to MINUSMA is irrelevant given the specific focus of the project.	Reference to training delivered by women outside of Bamako was removed.
PTP	19	Par. 46	Individual reports for the training sessions delivered by EMPABB were	Training reports included for 9 training events. The text was adjusted.

PTP	20	Par. 49	provided to the evaluation team, along with programs and list of participants. All financial and narrative reports for the IP were available as per the timeline set in the grant out document.	The text was adjusted.
PTP	21	Par. 50	See #2	The text was adjusted.
PTP	22	Par. 51	Program clarifies that the item listed as "internet security" did not refer to a training course, but to the provision of support for the actual activity.	Noted. The text was adjusted.
PTP	23	Par. 52	EUCAP, MINUSMA and UN DPA were not partner in the project, nor involved at any point.	Noted. The text does not refer to EUCAP, MINUSMA or DPA as partners, but text will be adjusted to refer to EMPABB recognized as one of three centres of excellence by ECOWAS.
PTP	24	Par. 52	Program notes a mistake in EMS recording as no certificates of completion were provided as training did not meet UNITAR standard for this level of certification, i.e. assessment of learning.	Noted. Footnote adjusted accordingly. The evaluation also noted that no learning objectives were indicated.
PTP	25	Par. 54	Program notes that the deadline of 30 June is for Program reporting to the donor, not for IP reporting.	Noted and amended.
PTP	26	Par. 58	Program notes that reporting in CFA is a UNITAR requirement. In addition, IP reporting was made in line with updated log frame.	Noted. This is simply an observation.
PTP	27	Par. 60	Program notes that the local liaison officer who ensured liaison with ministries and MSF was hired for a different project.	Noted and text was adjusted.
PTP	28	Title prior to par. 64	Project did not entail FPU training.	The impact criteria looked at impact of the previous projects too. Adjusted.
PTP	29	Par. 68	This refers only to police training.	The impact criteria looked at impact of the previous projects too.
PTP	30	Par. 69	See #2	Noted and removed.
PTP	31	Par. 75	Reference to MINUSMA is not relevant. In addition, target audience included civilian personnel.	Noted. MINUSMA was removed.
PTP	32	Par. 78	See #20	Reference to IP report replaced with final financial report of UNITAR.
PTP	33	Par. 80	Reference to FPU shall be removed.	Reference is made to impact from the previous project interventions , including the 2020-21 project which focused on FPUs.
PTP	34	R5	Reference to EUCAP shall be removed.	Noted. Reference to EUCAP removed.