| **Programme QA Assessment:**  |
| --- |
| **Overall Programme** |
| **Exemplary (5)****🞋🞋🞋🞋🞋** | **High (4)****🞋🞋🞋🞋⭘** | **Satisfactory (3)****🞋🞋🞋⭘⭘** | **Needs Improvement (2)****🞋🞋⭘⭘⭘** | **Inadequate (1)****🞋⭘⭘⭘⭘** |
| 65-75 points |  55-64 points | 45-54 points | 35-44 points | 25-34 points |
| **DECISION** |
| * **APPROVE** – the programme is of sufficient quality to continue as planned, taking the PAC feedback into account.
* **APPROVE WITH QUALIFICATIONS** – the programme has issues that must be addressed before the country programme document can be cleared for submission to the Executive Board.
* **DISAPPROVE** – the programme has significant issues that require substantial revision before it is reviewed again.
 |
| **RATING CRITERIA**  |
| **Strategic** |  |
| 1. **Is the programme’s analysis of the issues rigorous and credible, and does the Theory of Change specify an evidence-based and plausible change process/pathway?**
* **3:** The programme has an analysis and theory of change with a clear and plausible change pathway backed by credible evidence that has been used to define the programme priorities. The CPD describes why the programme’s strategy is the best approach to support UNCT and partners to achieve the SDGs.
* **2:** The programme has an analysis and theory of change backed by some evidence that has been used to define the programme priorities. It is clear how the programme will contribute to the SDGs.
* **1:** The programme is described in generic terms and analysis is not backed by credible evidence. There are no citations of evaluations, assessments, research or data. Programme priorities are poorly articulated.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Does the CPD adequately describe UNDP’s comparative advantage in the chosen programme priorities?**
* **3:** Analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners, including funding partners, in the areas that the programme intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and these partners through the programme, including through evaluations and past lessons learned (i.e., what has worked in similar contexts.)
* **2:** Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners, including funding partners, in the areas that the programme intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the programme.
* **1:** No analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners, including funding partners, in the areas that the programme intends to work to inform the design of the role envisioned by UNDP and other partners through the programme.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Is the programme aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?**
* **3:** Programme priorities explicitly reflect one or more of the development outcomes[[1]](#footnote-1) as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP). It integrates among programme priorities one or more of the Signature Solutions[[2]](#footnote-2) , enablers, and the programme’s RRF includes at least one SP output indicator per programme outcome.
* **2:** Programme priorities are consistent with the at least one development output as specified in the SP. The programme’s RRF includes at least one SP output indicator per programme outcome.
* **1:** Some programme priorities clearly fall outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Is UNDP working with other UN agencies to achieve joint results?**
* **3:** The programme includes up to four outcomes which exactly match the relevant UNSDCF[[3]](#footnote-3) outcomes. The CPD explains UNDP’s role in relation to other UN agencies in achieving these results, based on comparative advantage. Priorities for strengthening partnerships with other UN agencies are clearly identified.
* **2:** The programme includes up to four outcomes which exactly match the relevant UNSDCF outcomes. Some explanation is given of the roles of UNDP and other UN agencies in achieving these results, and of the partnerships required for this.
* **1:** Some programme outcomes may not be directly aligned with the UNSDCF outcomes. There is not a clear explanation of the roles of UNDP and other agencies in achieving joint results.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| **Relevant** |  |
| 1. **Is the proposed programme responsive to national priorities?**
* **3:** There is credible evidence that all of the proposed programme outcomes and indicative outputs are fully responsive to national priorities.
* **2:** There is some evidence that the proposed programme outcomes and indicative outputs contribute to national priorities.
* **1:**  There is no evidence that the programme responds to national priorities.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Does the CPD consistently apply an issue-based approach to its rationale, programme priorities, partnerships, communications, and monitoring and evaluation?**
* **3:** The programme rationale elaborates on multidimensional development issues in describing the development context of the country. Programme priorities involve collaborative and integrated multi-sectoral work (e.g., around target groups or geographic areas) and the engagement of partners, including funding partners, to complement UNDP expertise. Communication activities are adequately resourced and strategically planned. M&E frameworks are built around a broad range of evidence that facilitate understanding of interconnections among development results and challenges in different areas.
* **2:** The programme rational describes the development context of the country, exploring at least some interconnections among identified development challenges. Programme priorities are defined as collaborative and multi-sectoral areas of work, including by engaging partners for funding and engagement to complement UNDP expertise and using communication methods to reach out to external stakeholders. M&E frameworks help understand the interconnection of development results and challenges.
* **1:** The programme rationale mostly describes a list of development challenges, without exploring their interconnections, and the country profile is not clear. Programme priorities are mostly formulated on a sectoral/practice base and without a clear role for partners. The M&E framework relies mostly on sectoral evidence.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Has adequate gender analysis been conducted for the proposed programme, and has the design of the programme addressed the results of the gender analysis?**
* **3:** Gender analysis has been conducted, and gender equality concerns are fully and consistently reflected in the programme rationale, priority areas and corresponding RRF through indicative outputs and indicators, where appropriate, and at least 15% of the budget allocated for gender specific results.
* **2:** Gender analysis has been partially conducted, and gender equality concerns are reflected in the programme rationale, priority areas and corresponding RRF indicative outputs and indicators, where appropriate.
* **1:** Programme priorities do not consider gender-specific needs or issues.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| **Principled** |
| 8. Has the programme adequately considered the potential risks and opportunities related to gender equality and women’s empowerment? * **3:** The CPD explicitly describes how women will benefit from programme opportunities and benefits. The CPD has identified and fully addressed any relevant risks related to potential gender inequality and discrimination against women and girls.
* **2:** The CPD mentions how it intends to consider how women will benefit from programme opportunities and benefits. The CPD has identified and partially addressed any relevant risks related to potential gender inequality and the situation of women and girls.
* **1:** The CPD does not describe how women will benefit from programme opportunities and benefits. It does not identify or address relevant risks related to potential gender inequality and the situation of women and girls.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| **9. Does the programme apply a human rights-based approach adequately and evenly across the programme?*** **3:** Strong evidence that the programme actively promotes the fulfilment of human rights and prioritizes the principles of accountability, meaningful participation, and non-discrimination. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed and any relevant appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into programme rational, strategy, and results and resource framework.
* **2:** Partial evidence that the programme promotes the fulfilment of human rights and the principles of accountability, meaningful participation, and non-discrimination were considered. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were identified and assessed and any relevant appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the programme rationale, strategy, and results and resources framework.
* **1:** No evidence that opportunities to promote the fulfilment of human rights were considered in the programme, including consideration of the principles of accountability, meaningful participation and non-discrimination. Limited evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were considered.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
|  **10. Does the programme support the resilience and sustainability of societies and/or ecosystems?** * **3:** Credible evidence that the programme addresses sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges, which are integrated in the programme priorities and RRF. The programme priorities reflect the interconnections between the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, including poverty-environment linkages. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated. *(all must be true)*.
* **2:** The programme design integrates sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges, including poverty-environment linkages, as relevant. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and assessed, and relevant management and mitigation measures incorporated. *(both must be true)*
* **1:** Sustainability and resilience dimensions and impacts were not adequately considered.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| **Management & Monitoring** |
| 1. **Are the programme’s outcomes and indicative outputs at an appropriate level and relate clearly to the theory of change and selected priority areas as described in the narrative?**
* **3:** The programme’s proposed outcomes and indicative outputs are at an appropriate level and relate in a clear way to the programme’s theory of change. There is a strong congruence between the CPD rational, programme priorities and results framework.
* **2:** The programme’s proposed outcomes and indicative outputs are at an appropriate level and are consistent with the programme’s theory of change. There is general coherence between the CPD narrative and the results framework.
* **1:** The programme’s selection of outcomes and indicative outputs are not clearly justified in terms of a programme theory of change. There is no or limited relationship between the programme’s narrative and selected priority areas and the results framework.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Are the indicators selected to monitor the results of the programme appropriate with fully populated baselines and milestones?**
* **3:** Outcomes and indicative outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the key expected changes identified in the theory of change, each with credible data sources and fully populated baselines, milestones and targets, including appropriate use of gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated and/or target group-focused indicators where appropriate. The RRF includes all relevant IRRF indicators at the outcome and output levels.
* **2:** Outcomes and indicative outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators with specified data sources. Most baselines and targets populated. Some use of gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated and/or target group focused indicators, but there is scope to improve further. The RRF includes some relevant IRRF indicators.
* **1:** Indicators are, for the most part, not appropriately specified, corresponding baselines and targets not fully populated. No gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated or target group-focused indicators. No clear inclusion of relevant IRRF nor UNSDCF indicators in the RRF.
 | 3 | **2** |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Are the monitoring arrangements adequate?**
* **3:** Provides details on data sources to be used for monitoring all programme indicators, including responsibilities for data collection with timing and cost of direct data collection activities specified. Highlights particular issues regarding availability, quality, frequency or reliability of selected data sources, and appropriate plans to address these (e.g., systems strengthening, use of proxies, etc.) Plans are in place for generating appropriate analytics from available data and statistics, and ensuring adequate staff capabilities for enhanced M&E. Key risks relating to M&E are included in the programme risk log.
* **2:** Provides details on data sources identified in the RRF, with a particular focus on sources for which direct data collection is required or for which existing M&E or statistical systems need to be strengthened, with a budget allocated for these activities. Appropriate plans are in place to address major data gaps or weaknesses, with some reference to use of data for analytics and ensuring adequate staff capacities for enhanced M&E.
* **1:** Does not identify the main data sources to be used in tracking programme results or consider their quality. Does not clearly identify who will participate in generating data or using it for monitoring.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Is there an adequate, realistic, and costed evaluation plan?**
* **3:** Detailed fully costed evaluation plans (with rationale) are provided for an appropriate mix of strategic evaluations, (such as programme, outcome, portfolio, or thematic) including final and mid-term evaluations, as required, with timing and relevant partners specified. The Plan generates the most critical and useful information for UNDP and its partners for future programming accountability and learning from implementation. The plan complies with all five quality criteria [[4]](#footnote-4)
* **2:** An appropriate set of strategic and project evaluations (with rationale) are listed with timing and relevant partners specified that will generate the useful information for UNDP and its partners in future programming. The plan complies with most of the five criteria but needs specific reviews and updates in some areas.
* **1:** Insufficient details are provided to judge the suitability of evaluations planned. Some details are missing on the timing, evaluation type, relevant partners, or estimated cost of the evaluations, or stated costs are unrealistic. The plan needs a major review or updates in most of the five quality criteria.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Have the key programme risks and opportunities been identified, linked to the assumptions in the theory of change, with clear plans stated to respond?**
* **3:** Programme risks and opportunities fully described in the CPD, based on comprehensive analysis which references key assumptions made in the project’s theory of change. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk and take advantage of opportunities.
* **2:** Programme risks and opportunities identified in the CPD. Clear plan in place to manage and mitigate risks.
* **1:** Some risks identified in CPD, but no or inadequate response measures identified.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| **Efficient** |  |
| **16.** **Does the programme document include explicit consideration of strategies for scaling up to achieve greater impact?*** **3:** The CPD specifically mentions potential for scaling up to achieve greater impact with resources already available[[5]](#footnote-5) or to be mobilized, especially from the programme government(s) with available resources. The results framework includes suitable indicators to monitor changes in the scale of benefits achieved over time[[6]](#footnote-6).
* **2:** The CPD includes some consideration of current or future opportunities for scaling up to achieve greater impact with resources already available3 or to be mobilized, especially from the programme government(s) .
* **1:** The CPD does not consider strategies for scaling up in the programme priorities or results framework.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Doe****s the CPD provide a convincing account as to how the expected size and scope of the results can feasibly be delivered with the available resources and resource mobilization opportunities?**
* **3:** The size and scope of the programme is very congruent with the indicative resources available for the programme and resource mobilization opportunities emerging from donor intelligence. The CPD outlines a “Plan B” to scale down the expected results if there are challenges raising the required funds.
* **2:** The size and scope of the programme is consistent with the indicative resources available for the programme and resource mobilization opportunities emerging from donor intelligence. While the CPD does not outline a “Plan B” to scale down the expected results if there are challenges raising the required funds, it is reasonably likely that the country office will have the flexibility to adjust the programme if needed.
* **1:** The size and scope of the programme is not congruent with the indicative resources available for the programme and/or with the resource mobilization opportunities emerging from donor intelligence. It is not likely that the programme will be able to mobilize the required resources to implement the programme.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Has the programme made provisions to leverage volunteerism?**
* **3:** Volunteerism is featured in the CPD with specific references to results to be achieved in narrative and RRF. In the RRF, both output statement(s) and output indicator(s) reference volunteerism or volunteer(s) in the results framework.
* **2:**  The CPD describes how the programme intends to leverage volunteerism as one of the means to achieve intended results. In the RRF either output statement (s) or output indicator(s) reference volunteerism or volunteer(s).
* The CPD does not refer to volunteerism nor gives specific plans for how it will be used. In the RRF neither output statement(s) not output indicator(s) reference volunteerism or volunteer(s).
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| **Effective** |  |
| 1. **Has the proposed programme adequately used evaluation findings and other outcome-level evidence from other/prior programme performance?**
* **3:** Knowledge and lessons learned backed by credible evidence from evaluation, analysis, corporate policies/strategies, and monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to develop the programme’s theory of change and justify the approach used by the programme over alternatives.
* **2:** The programme design references knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence from evaluation, analysis, corporate policies/strategies, and monitoring and/or other sources, but these references have not been explicitly used to develop the programme’s theory of change or justify the approach used by the programme over alternatives.
* **1:**  There is only scant, or no, mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the programme design. Existing references are not backed by evidence.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| 1. **Has the programme effectively identified targeted groups/areas, prioritizing discriminated and marginalized groups left furthest behind, and are strategies in place for regular engagement throughout implementation to ensure voice and participation?**
* **3:** The target groups are clearly specified, prioritising discriminated and marginalized groups/areas left furthest behind, identified through a rigorous process based on evidence. The programme has a strategy to identify and engage target groups/areas through programme monitoring, governance and/or other means to ensure the programme remains relevant to their needs.
* **2:** Some target groups/areas are mentioned in the CPD in broad terms. The programme mentions how it will engage targeted groups/areas throughout implementation.
* **1:** The target groups/areas are not clearly specified in the CPD.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| **20. Has the CPD integrated adequate analysis and explicit measures to promote and utilize South-South and Triangular Cooperation?** * **3:** South-South and Triangular Cooperation partnership opportunities are fully described in the CPD, including the identification of specific countries and results to be achieved using SS&TrC. Clear indication of measurable results to be achieved through South-South and Triangular Cooperation in the narrative and RRF.
* **2:** Specific South-South and Triangular Cooperation opportunities are described in the CPD. Some indication of results to be achieved through South-South and Triangular Cooperation in the narrative.
* **1:** CPD may refer to South-South and Triangular Cooperation but does not give specific plans for how it will be used.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| **22. Has the programme adequately considered the potential opportunities and risks related to digital transformation?*** **3**: The CPD embraces digital as an enabler and explicitly describes how digital can support the achievement of programme results by addressing any relevant risks and opportunities related to digitalization, societal digital transformation, and inclusive digital ecosystems in an integrated and strategic manner. The CPD identifies specific initiatives and measurable results in the RRF.
* **2:** The CPD mentions how it intends to consider digital aspects in the solution pathways and partially provides some indication of how digital may support the achievement of programme results. The CPD has partially identified and addressed relevant risks and opportunities related to digitalization, societal digital transformation and inclusive digital ecosystems.
* **1**: “The narrative of the CPD refers to digital solutions in generic terms and without reference to intended results. There is no mention of risks or opportunities related to digitalization, societal digital transformation, or inclusive digital ecosystems.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| **Sustainability & National Ownership** |
| **23. Have national partners proactively engaged in the design of the programme?** * **3:** The programme has been developed jointly by UNDP and a range of national partners (government, donors, civil society, beneficiaries, etc.), with credible evidence of this provided in the CPD.
* **2:** The programme has been developed by UNDP in consultation with national partners (esp. government), with some evidence of this mentioned in the CPD.
* **1:** The programme has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners. There is little to no mention of engagement with national partners on the programme design in the CPD.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| **24. Are key institutions and actors identified, and is there a strategy to ensure the sustainability of results (i.e., to ensure that results last and even grow beyond UNDP’s engagement?)** * **3:** The programme has a strategy for strengthening capacities of national institutions and/or actors integrated throughout the programme, which is reflected in the identification of outcomes, indicative outputs, indicators and funding sources.
* **2:** The CPD has identified indicative outputs that will be undertaken to strengthen capacity of national institutions and/or actors, but these outputs are not part of a comprehensive strategy and it is not clear how capacity and sustainability of results will be measured.
* **1:** There is mention in the programme document of capacities of national institutions and/or actors to be strengthened through the programme, but there is no evidence of a specific strategy, measurement or incorporation into the results framework.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |
| **25. Does the programme include a strategy for using nationally-owned data sources and working with partners to strengthen national statistical systems and capacities?*** **3:** The RRF includes some relevant country-specific outcome and output indicators that will be monitored using nationally-owned data sources. The M&E section includes an analysis of the availability and quality of existing national data sources and states clear plans for how UNDP will work with partners to strengthen national M&E and statistical systems where needed, in a way that contributes towards sustainable country capacities.
* **2:** The RRF includes some relevant country-specific outcome and output indicators that will be monitored using nationally-owned data sources. The M&E section includes some consideration of the quality of relevant national data sources and states plans for how UNDP will work with partners to strengthen these, with some consideration of building sustainable country capacities.
* **1:** The RRF does not include relevant country-specific outcome or output indicators or does not identify relevant national sources to be used in monitoring. The M&E section may include some plans to develop M&E systems required for programme monitoring, but does not address weaknesses in the broader national statistical system or capacities.
 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 |
| **Evidence** |

**Formatting Checklist:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| CPD narrative + Annex A (RRF) does not exceed 6,000 words | Yes | No |
| CPD font is Times New Roman, 10pt | Yes | No |
| Margins have not been altered from the templateNarrative: top 0.81” (2.057cm); bottom 1” (2.54cm); left 0.83” (2.108cm); right 0.83” (2.108cm)RRF: top 1” (2.54cm); bottom 1” (2.54cm); left 0.8” (2.032cm); right 0.8” (2.032cm) | Yes | No |
| Four narrative headings adhere to the latest template1. UNDP within the UN Cooperation Framework; II. Programme Priorities and Partnerships; III. Programme and Risk Management; IV. Monitoring and Evaluation
 | Yes | No |
| The CPD has no more than 4 outcomes | Yes | No |
| The outcomes are copied verbatim from the UNSDCF/equivalent | Yes | No |
| Each CPD outcome is linked to only one SP outcome | Yes | No |
| CPD has adopted relevant strategic plan IRRF indicators, unless justified otherwise | Yes | No |

1. The three development settings in UNDP’s 2022-2025 Strategic Plan are: a) Structural transformation accelerated, particularly green, inclusive and digital transitions, b) No one left behind, centering on equitable access to opportunities and a rights-based approach to human agency and human development, c) resilience built to respond to systemic uncertainty and risk. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The six Signature Solutions of UNDP’s 2022-2025 Strategic Plan are: a) Poverty and inequality; b) Governance; c) Resilience; d) Environment; e) Energy; and f) Gender equality. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Including [UNSDCF in Exceptional Circumstances](https://unsdg.un.org/resources/guidance-un-country-level-strategic-planning-development-exceptional-circumstances) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 1) strategic in nature, 2) coverage is balanced and inclusive, 3) included mandatory evaluations, 4) timing, costs, resources and sequencing are realistic, and 5) ensure that influencing and constraining factors are fully considered. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. i.e., through significant geographic or target group coverage, strategic partnership strategies for upscaling UNDP pilots or innovations, and/or contribution to policy change that can affect results at scale. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. For example, indicators related to policy making processes do not measure just the adoption and implementation of a policy, but also its intended benefits on target groups. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)