

## 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 (04 August 2023) from the evaluation of the “Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces” 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	Pg. 14 par. 44 1) a.	Program availed reports to the evaluator, for both EASF and MODANS. Kindly clarify request for missing reports was made so that program can verify.	The evaluator received from PPME the final narrative and financial reports from EASF on 17 July 2023 (the same day PPME was informed that the reports were uploaded on the Project Tracking Tool by Project Management) and after numerous follow-up with Project Management. In this email it was also received the final narrative financial and narrative report from MODANS for 2022. Since these were received close to the date the report was delivered, the adjustment was not made to the section. Since these documents were not incorporated as part of the initial document review it is referred to as a limitation. <b>The paragraph has been adjusted to reflect this.</b>
PTP	2	Pg. 14 par. 44 1) b.	Program disagrees with the statement related to non facilitation of contact with EASF. Program took immediate action but was faced with the same challenges as the evaluator.	The evaluator did not receive contact information for this organization in the initial contact list provided. It was marked as pending. PPME also followed up via email with reply from PM on June 2 <sup>nd</sup> informing this request was forwarded to the Director of the Division who had the direct contact. The key person was contacted via WhatsApp with a number facilitated by PPME, with no response. <b>The evaluator has, however, rephrased the sentence.</b>
PTP	3	Pg. 20 par. 57	Program disagrees with the statement of limited	<b>Adjusted.</b> The paragraph initially referred to there being “less

			<p>coordination with GPOI. Program has systematically involved GPOI representative at TPTC in all the phases of the project, and has actively participated in GPOI activities (training and lessons learned workshop).</p>	<p>evidence” of the way in which these workshops turn into action for the adaptation of training content or other support for enhancement of pre-deployment activities.</p>
PTP	4	Pg. 20 par. 58	<p>Program notes that there are not UNITAR overall standards for TOT. Standards used for the training refer to those developed by the Learning Solution team at the Division for Peace.</p>	<p><b>Noted and adjusted.</b></p>
PTP	5	Pg. 20 par. 59	<p>Program disagrees with the statement related to the lack of supporting documents as these were provided by the consultant responsible for the training.</p>	<p>The evaluator received via email from the mentioned consultant, four documents at different moments: The outline of the training curricula, participants list, the overall assessment sheet, and a blank template showing the used score sheet. All these referred to training of trainers for TPTC. The evaluator did not receive any documentary evidence or supporting documentation of the ToT conducted with the TPF. This was also requested to the KI for TPF.</p>
PTP	6	Pg. 21 par. 60	<p>Program disagrees with the statement of the absence of gender sensitive content approach to the TOT, as program specifically relies of guidelines provided by LS, which are integrated in training delivery. The conclusion may be derived by the fact that the evaluator did not attend the training sessions.</p>	<p>The evaluation process relies on the triangulation of primary and secondary data collected. The evaluator conducted a thorough analysis of documentation received and hours of dialogue with informants across the stakeholders identified, including participants in the ToT. As standard, if the only evidence from a gender sensitive approach comes from the perspective of trainers who were in the training room, the evaluator must account for all the many others point of evidence and data triangulation.</p> <p>However, in line with a balanced and objective assessment, the evaluator acknowledges (par. 61, 62) evidence of a cross-cutting</p>

				gender sensitive and women empowerment approach and significant steps forward achieved from dedicated female leadership training.
PTP	7	Pg. 21 par. 61	Program underlines that it was not possible to develop a competency framework for the training as the audience was diversified. However, program conducted a needs assessment prior to the training whose results were shared with the evaluator.	The evaluator received the results of the institutional assessment conducted including mentions to training and human capacity needs across sections. The evaluator did not receive a dedicated “training needs assessment document”. A competency framework can be developed at the level of the tasks that the instructors participating in the various ToT levels can and should reflect as markers of learning application.
PTP	8	Pg. 23 par. 68	Program notes that the recommendation of the evaluator related to ensuring the strengthening of institutional / operational capacity of the center is at the core of Program engagement with TPTC. This shall be reflected in the report.	The evaluator has been consistent in highlighting throughout the report that the project has a high emphasis on institutional and operational capacity strengthening of the TPTC. Please indicate where exactly this should be restated.
PTP	9	Pg. 24 par. 71 and 72	Program refers to the background information provided in relation to the collaboration with GAFTAG. During several discussions, it was explained that the choice of the title “Research Hub” wasn’t resulting from an actual reflection on the vision of TPTC, but unilaterally adopted by the partner. Program requests this paragraph to be reformulated.	Please note that this was not corroborated by the TPTC informants, who were consistent in ensuring that Headquarters remain centred in moving forward a form of research centre of the TPTC. <b>The evaluator has then inserted the clarification from program management to provide all views.</b>
PTP	10	Pg. 26 par. 82	Program requests clarifications with regards to the other two dimensions of the assessment that are not mentioned in the report.	Paragraphs 16 and 17 refer in a descriptive form to the structure and dimensions of the tool. Table two summarizes areas and criteria. <u>The effectiveness section, as explained in par. 82</u> only addresses the results evidenced in these dimensions as result of thematic analysis of qualitative data collected and document records, showing, quote, <i>“that contributions to institutional capacity strengthening are clearly identified in four of the six dimensions, organized in Table 6 from higher recurrency and agreement amongst interviewees”</i> . A sentence expressing the lack of evidence towards contributions of

				the remaining two areas was added.
PTP	11	Pg. 30 par. 94	Program requests that the reference to the expansion of accommodation is removed as this was never part of the funded project.	Noted and removed.
PTP	12	Pg. 39 par. 135	Program notes that GAFTAG expansion plan is no longer unfolding as not aligned with the new strategic direction of the CENTRE.	Noted and removed.
During the presentation of findings				
PTP	13	Par. 95	The construction part of the project was a donor-required activity.	Noted and adjusted.