



# **Evaluability Assessment of the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF)**

**September 2020**

This tool has been prepared by UNEG with the aim of strengthening and guide the UNSDCF monitoring, evaluation and reporting on results.

Contents

- 1. Technical focus of the Evaluability Assessment (EA) Tool ..... 3
- 2. Purpose and scope of the EA Tool ..... 3
- 3. Roles in administering the EA Tool ..... 4
- 4. Components of the EA Tool ..... 4
- 5. Process for administering the EA tool ..... 4
- 6. When to apply the EA Tool in the UNSDCF cycle ..... 5
- 7. List of Annexes ..... 5
- Annex 1: UNSDCF Evaluability Assessment (EA) Tool ..... 6
  - UNSDCF Evaluability Assessment (EA) Tool – Component 1: UNSDCF Macro Requirements ..... 7
  - UNSDCF Evaluability Assessment (EA) Tool – Component 2: UN Agency-Specific Component ..... 13
- Annex 2: The Nested Theories of Change underlying a UNSDCF ..... 16

## 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

In line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Standard 4.2<sup>2</sup>, this evaluability assessment (EA) serves as an initial step to increase the likelihood an evaluation will provide timely and credible information for decision-making<sup>3</sup>. **The Evaluability Assessment tool of the UNSDCF aims to enhance both *learning* and *accountability* as it provides a quick and relatively straightforward method for assessing the technical robustness of the UNSDCF insofar as monitoring, evaluation and reporting on UNSDCF ‘results’ is concerned.** The EA serves as a management tool that supports the development/improvement of the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) plans for the UNSDCF drawing on the UNSDCF guidelines as well as international good practices for results-based management (RBM) and evaluation.

## 2. Purpose and scope of the EA Tool

The EA Tool constitutes an ‘early warning’ mechanism for management as it highlights where there may be gaps associated with the coherence of the TOC and the capability to measure, monitor and report on ‘results’, that may need refinement/improvement well in advance of an evaluation of the UNCF. This information can be used by the **UN Resident Coordinator (RC), the UN Country Team (UNCT) and the MEL Group** to develop a strategy and an action plan to address priority areas for any UNCF design or process improvements, as needed.

**The EA Tool is intended to provide** insights on three important aspects for the evaluability of the UNSDCF:

- 1) The extent that a UNSDCF, developed by the UNCT in partnership with its national stakeholders, is designed and implemented (including its monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan) so as to ensure quality data is available or collectable and illustrate UN contribution to the SDGs and national priorities applying the Guiding Principles (gender equality and women’s empowerment, human rights based approaches, leaving no one behind);
- 2) The extent that formal mechanisms as well as governance and management are foreseen and in place to facilitate coordination across UN agencies, other development partners and national stakeholders to help ensure an appropriate follow-through on results measurement, reporting and evaluation; and,
- 3) The extent that there is clarity and coordination across UN agencies insofar as their alignment and input to support UNSDCF monitoring, evaluation and reporting on results is concerned and strategies are defined to mitigate factors that could hinder an impartial evaluation process.

---

<sup>1</sup> The tool was produced as a deliverable of the UNEG Working Group on Evaluations of the UNSDCF. The lead consultant was Robert Lahey, founding Head of Canada's Centre of Excellence for Evaluation. Masahiro Igarashi (UNEG Chair and Director, Evaluation Office at FAO), Guy Thijs (Director, Evaluation Office at ILO), Omar Awabdeh (FAO) and Patricia Vidal Hurtado (ILO), as task managers, provided oversight and guidance to ensure the quality of this tool.

<sup>2</sup> United Nations Evaluation Group, *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*, 2016

<sup>3</sup> The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) defines evaluability as the extent to which an activity or project can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion. OECD-DAC, *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management*, 2010: p.21

**The EA Tool can be usefully employed by UNCT members as a ‘checklist’ to help reinforce and guide the UNSDCF monitoring, evaluation and reporting on ‘results’ design and process.** If evaluability is not established, the EA will guide the identification of measures to address the problem, such as reconstructing the theory of change or readjusting MEL plans and processes.

### **3. Roles in administering the EA Tool**

**As a management tool, the MEL focal points within each UN agency and a suitable lead from the UNSDCF MEL Group will be the key players in administering the EA Tool,** working with the Results Groups, the UNCT and the Peer Support Group (if applicable).

A Regional Evaluation Network or Evaluation Officer could provide support to the UNSDCF MEL Group in the administration of the EA Tool and interpretation and reporting to the RC and UNCT on results of the EA.

### **4. Components of the EA Tool**

The EA Tool consists of two components, both of which are administered as part of the evaluability assessment exercise:

#### **1) Component 1: Evaluability assessment of the UNSDCF Macro Requirements**

This is an assessment of the UNSDCF with a broader and macro focus, to be carried out by the UNCT and relevant UNSDCF groups (the MEL Group, working with the Results Groups) collectively looking at aspects such as joint programming, coherence, alignment to guiding principles, and the coordination and readiness of UNSDCF monitoring, reporting and evaluation. The [EA Tool template for component 1](#) is used in this case (also available in Annex 1).

#### **2) Component 2: Evaluability assessment of the Agency-specific Requirements**

This is a self-assessment carried out by individual UNCT member agencies, examining individual programming frameworks, how they contribute to the broader UNSDCF objectives, and the appropriateness and adequacy of M&E systems (including the possibility of joint monitoring). The [EA Tool template for component 2](#) is used in this case (also available in Annex 1).

### **5. Process for administering the EA tool**

The EA Tool, by design, is intended to be relatively simple to administer, and be carried out and completed in a relatively short period of time – one week, no more than two weeks, depending on its use.

The two components of the EA are inter-related and in effect represent two steps in administering the EA Tool. As a result, application of the full EA process might not be linear, but a single exercise within a continuum.

## 6. When to apply the EA Tool in the UNSDCF cycle

The EA tool can be applied at two stages:

1) At the design stage of the UNSDCF

Assessing the evaluability of the UNSDCF at the design stage helps to ensure the cooperation framework and each agency programme have appropriate results frameworks (backed up by [integrated/'nested' Theories of Change<sup>4</sup>](#)) and appropriate performance indicators that can be monitored within reasonable costs commensurate with the nature and complexity of the indicators. An evaluability assessment at this stage provides a basis to inform the development of a follow-up Action Plan by the RC and the UNCT to improve technical aspects of UNCF monitoring, evaluation and reporting.

2) At an early stage of the UNSDCF implementation

Once the UNSDCF is rolled out, evaluability assessments can help ensure an adequate M&E system is in place and provide the needed results information for management, monitoring, evaluation and reporting. The EA provides an opportunity to review the practical and operational aspects of the UNSDCF that may lead to adjustments.

## 7. List of Annexes

### [Annex 1. The UNSDCF Evaluability Assessment \(EA\) Tool](#)

- [Component 1 – UNSDCF Macro component](#)
- [Component 2 – UN Agency-specific component](#)

### [Annex 2. The nested Theories of Change underlying a UNSDCF](#)

---

<sup>4</sup> The EA serves as a tool to identify any areas where gaps may exist and/or further work or research may be needed to improve understanding and possible development of the UNCF design – clarity, articulation of logic, roles & responsibilities, etc.

## Annexes

### Annex 1: UNSDCF Evaluability Assessment (EA) Tool

The UNSDCF Evaluability Assessment tool features two components. Component 1 relates to the UNSDCF macro requirements; Component 2 covers agency-specific requirements insofar as UNSDCF evaluability is concerned. For each component, dimensions of 'readiness' are identified<sup>5</sup> in the form of questions. Insights to assess the evaluability of the UNSDCF can be gathered via document review<sup>6</sup> and key informant interviews<sup>7</sup>.

A three-point scale is suggested (Figure 1) as guidance in assessing the response to individual questions that pertain to each dimension. It is important to ensure some level of 'triangulation' of the information; that is verifying that information from different sources coincides. This gives some level of certainty or reliability to the rating assigned. *The intent is not to arrive at a final 'score' for each component, but to identify areas of strength, weaknesses and gaps that ought to be addressed.* Group session of key stakeholders could be used to validate the ratings and the overall conclusions on key monitoring, evaluation, and reporting areas where the UNSDCF may need strengthening.

<b>Rating Level</b>	<b>Code</b>
<u>Strong</u> : Meets expectations for a UNSDCF, or at least is 'adequate'	<b>3</b>
<u>Moderate</u> : Partially meets UNSDCF expectations, but some elements missing to be deemed at least 'adequate'	<b>2</b>
<u>Poor</u> : Generally does not address the element or meet expectations for a UNSDCF	<b>1</b>
Don't Know; no information	<b>0</b>

The templates for the two components of the evaluability assessment can serve as the basis for reporting. These are included below.

---

<sup>5</sup> Readiness dimensions are drawn from the UNSDCF guidance documents and a range of current international sources reflective of approaches to evaluability assessment, theory of change, RBM and contribution analysis, and evaluation of the SDGs, including UNEG documents.

<sup>6</sup> An up-front and quick review of some key documents (CCA, UNSDCF, as well as agency-specific programme descriptions) provides a ready source of information on the level of detail provided for UNSDCF results monitoring, evaluation and reporting.

<sup>7</sup> Key officials to interview would be those most knowledgeable about the technical aspects of TOC, RBM, M&E systems and the monitoring, evaluation and reporting on 'results'.

## UNSDCF Evaluability Assessment (EA) Tool – Component 1: UNSDCF Macro Requirements

Key Considerations in Assessing Readiness (Questions for Consultation)	Rating (0-3)	Narrative/Comments (Strengths, weaknesses, capacity gaps, other)
<b>1. The Common Country Assessment (CCA)</b>		
1.1 Does the CCA analysis address the demographic, economic, environmental, political, regional and international trends likely to impact SDG achievement?		
1.2 Does the CCA analysis of SDG achievement identify structural barriers and current and emerging risks, and their potential impact on social, economic and environmental systems, with a focus on how it affects the well-being of the population, particularly the most vulnerable, and sustainability of gains?		
1.3 Does the CCA identify existing capacities to prevent or respond to hazards/shocks to the economic, social and environmental systems, including gaps requiring immediate attention?		
1.4 Does the CCA detail analysis, trends and commitments made by the country regarding human rights, gender and environment?		
1.5 Does the CCA include, for each UNSDCF guiding principle – gender equality and women’s empowerment ( <i>GEWE</i> ), human rights based approach ( <i>HRBA</i> ), leaving no one behind ( <i>LNOB</i> ) - an assessment of national progress, gaps, challenges and opportunities?		
1.6 Does the CCA identify gaps in national data systems to inform policy changes to support UNSDCF principles?		
1.7 Was the process of assessment and analysis underlying the CCA participatory, inclusive and transparent?		
<b>2. UNSDCF Objectives – Alignment with SDGs, national priorities, UNSDCF guiding principles and CCA</b>		
2.1 Is there clarity of the end state/expected results for the UNSDCF?		
2.2 Are UNSDCF objectives aligned with the SDGs? National priorities? CCA findings?		
2.3 Was there visioning about how the medium-term UNSDCF fits within the longer-term 2030 Agenda?		
2.4 Have UNSDCF objectives/goals been identified through an iterative process that is participatory and inclusive, involving national stakeholders and all UN entities?		
2.5 Does the UNSDCF give clear outcome statements and targets that reflect the UNSDCF guiding principles?		
2.6 Has the rationale for UNSDCF objectives and associated strategies been documented?		

Key Considerations in Assessing Readiness (Questions for Consultation)	Rating (0-3)	Narrative/Comments (Strengths, weaknesses, capacity gaps, other)
<b>3. Technical Robustness of the UNSDCF – Adequacy of the theory of change (TOC) detailed for the UNSDCF</b>		
3.1 Is the UNSDCF results logic ( <i>i.e., how change happens and the cause-effect rationale of the UNSDCF</i> ) – conceptually sound, clear and articulated in appropriate detail ( <i>i.e. detailing UN outputs and the resultant expected outcomes associated with each UNSDCF goal/objective</i> )? Is the articulation of the pathway reflective of the CCA analysis)?		
3.2 Is there sufficient articulation within the UNSDCF of the critical assumptions and risks that underlie the processes of change - e.g. the political, social or economic factors that drive or hinder change – any of which could impact the achievement of UNSDCF goals?		
3.3 Has the role of the public sector, private sector and civil society ( <i>including women, youth and groups left behind</i> ), and any other actors who could influence change ( <i>positively or negatively</i> ) been identified within the TOC?		
3.4 Is there a clear understanding of the relationship between UN entities and UNSDCF results logic, i.e. an understanding of the key strategies that link the activities and expected results of UN entities with the eventual expected change and achievement of UNSDCF outcomes, as per UNSDCF goals?		
3.5 Is there clarity of the ‘reach’ of the UNSDCF that identifies intended beneficiaries (including sub-groups)?		
3.6 Does the UNSDCF TOC address the legal, policy, capacity and resource gaps as identified in the CCA?		
<b>4. Performance Measurement Framework - Identification of UNSDCF Results Matrix and relevant indicators of performance</b>		
4.1 Does the UNSDCF Results Matrix include an articulation of ‘results’ at outputs and outcomes levels, and both outputs and outcomes are achievable within the timeframe of the UNSDCF?		
4.2 Is there agreement on which ‘results’ ( <i>i.e. outputs and outcomes</i> ) to measure? How is it being determined which ‘outcomes’ to measure?		
4.3 Are agency-level results and associated indicators aligned with the UNSDCF Results Matrix/Matrix of Indicators to eventually link UN contribution to progress on the SDGs and National priorities?		
4.4 Is there agreement that the indicators being used to measure performance and ‘success’ of the UNSDCF are appropriate?		
4.5 Is the appropriate level of disaggregation being identified for the measurement of indicators that are relevant to UNSDCF guiding principles ( <i>GEWE, HRBA, LNOB</i> ) and SDG reporting?		
4.6 Are the indicators SMART? <sup>8</sup>		

<sup>8</sup> Good indicators would be: Specific, Measurable, Atttributable, Realistic, Targeted.

Key Considerations in Assessing Readiness (Questions for Consultation)	Rating (0-3)	Narrative/Comments (Strengths, weaknesses, capacity gaps, other)
4.7 Are both qualitative and quantitative indicators being identified as measures of performance?		
4.8 Are UNSDCF indicators aligned with the SDG results frameworks and national results frameworks and monitoring systems for their national development plan?		
4.9 Does the Results Matrix/Matrix of Indicators provide clarity on the starting position ( <i>baseline</i> ) that would be considered reliable for each results indicator?		
4.10 Does the Results Matrix/Matrix of Indicators provide clear targets for all expected results ( <i>both outcome and output</i> )? Are the targets realistic for the duration of the UNSDCF?		
<b>5. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Plan for the UNSDCF</b>		
5.1 Are UN agency Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning ( <i>MEL</i> ) Plans and systems aligned with the requirements of a UNSDCF MEL Plan and system?		
5.2 Does the MEL Plan outline how joint and agency-specific MEL activities mutually reinforce each other? ( <i>e.g., where more than one UN agency is implicated in the achievement of a UNSDCF result, has there been coordination to gain agreement on issues of data, monitoring, evaluation and reporting</i> )		
5.3 Does the UNSDCF MEL Plan articulate, for each indicator: data sources (including national statistical systems), frequency of data collection; methods; data storage and accessibility; data reporting points; and, relevant roles, responsibilities and accountabilities to ensure timely measurement and reporting on the UNSDCF?		
5.4 Does the UNSDCF MEL Plan foresee defining, measuring and reporting on indicators at a disaggregated level for UNCT to measure the extent the UNSDCF has contributed to GEWE, HRBA and LNOB?		
5.5 Does the UNSDCF M&E system support both local-level monitoring as well as systematic centralized reporting?		
5.6 Does the UNSDCF MEL Plan call for the MEL Group, working with the Results Groups, to actively and regularly monitor and report on: UNSDCF progress towards planned results? Risks, opportunities and changing country context?		
5.7 Does the UNSDCF MEL Plan identify both the joint and system-wide evaluations of UNCT programming, as well as agency-specific evaluations to carry this out, addressing effectiveness/results achieved of UN contribution to SDG progress and performance? Have a timeframe and accountabilities been identified?		
5.8 Does the UNSDCF MEL Plan link UNSDCF monitoring and eventual evaluation with the following: monitoring of SDG indicators; UN agency programme and project evaluations; national country-led		

Key Considerations in Assessing Readiness (Questions for Consultation)	Rating (0-3)	Narrative/Comments (Strengths, weaknesses, capacity gaps, other)
evaluations; Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) and other government monitoring activities ( <i>surveys, census, poverty studies, etc.</i> )?		
5.9 Does the UNSDCF MEL Plan include reporting on the effectiveness of UN contributions to the SDGs and to the national development plans in the annual UNSDCF reporting (UN Annual Results Report)?		
5.10 Do all UN agencies monitor and report monthly in UNINFO on their ‘agency contribution’ and their progress against planned interventions?		
5.11 Have the UNCT/UN agencies identified the need to engage in capacity building efforts for augmenting national monitoring and evaluation capacity?		
<b>6. Availability of data and data collection</b>		
6.1 Is there data available to populate the indicators of the UNSDCF TOC process and reflected in the Results Matrix/Matrix of Indicators? Is data available to establish suitable baselines?		
6.2 Is there clarity on potential data sources for each indicator ( <i>e.g. government, UN entities, stakeholders</i> ), including frequency and cost of data/information collection and their possible use/incorporation within the UNSDCF monitoring processes?		
6.3 Has a plan of action for data development been put in place, identifying responsible parties and resources to carry it out?		
6.4 Is the data to populate the indicators seen to be valid? Reliable? Consistent in quality and accessibility at sub-national levels across the country?		
6.5 Has there been a stock-taking and development of a plan to improve availability, quality, frequency and reliability of national data sources?		
6.6 Is there a plan to collect data disaggregated by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographical location, etc. to track progress on GEWE, HRBA and NOLB principles?		
6.7 Are UN agencies working in support of the national statistics office and capacity building efforts of the government’s national SDG indicator framework?		
6.8 Is there clarity of roles and responsibilities associated with data development, storage and retrieval – across UN agencies and development partners and national institutions?		
<b>7. Process used for developing the UNSDCF – Coordination and Cooperation</b>		
7.1 Was the identification and prioritization of challenges and opportunities, and the development, validation and agreement on key UNSDCF goals/outcomes a broad-based participatory process involving all relevant UN		

Key Considerations in Assessing Readiness (Questions for Consultation)	Rating (0-3)	Narrative/Comments (Strengths, weaknesses, capacity gaps, other)
entities, development partners and national stakeholders from all sectors ( <i>public, private sectors and civil society</i> ), building on existing national mechanisms?		
7.2 Has the development of the UNSDCF involved discussion and analysis on the operational implications of integrating UN agency programmes into the UNSDCF in a coordinated fashion – in particular, implications for the design; delivery process; and intended reach to beneficiaries in the country?		
7.3 Has the UNCT reflected on whether the sum and synergy of all UN entity outputs ( <i>the ‘sub-outputs’ of the UNSDCF</i> ) adequately contribute to achieving UNSDCF results? Is it well documented, including clarification of where and how UN agency programme activities will need to be coordinated?		
7.4 Have the Joint Work Plans been discussed both within and across Results Groups to ensure that gaps, overlaps and fragmentation are identified and streamlined? Is there a level of agreement across key stakeholders?		
7.5 Has there been a follow-on discussion of implications for data gaps and data development and have conclusions being captured in the UNSDCF Results Matrix and associated indicators of performance?		
<b>8. UNSDCF Governance and Management Structures for M&amp;E</b>		
8.1 Is there clarity of roles and responsibilities for the monitoring, evaluation and reporting associated with UNSDCF and SDG programming across the RC, UNCT, Region, and UN Agencies and vis à vis national governments?		
8.2 Are there quality assurance and sign-off points in the development of the UNSDCF TOC, Results Matrix/Matrix of Indicators and M&E system, with accountable officials identified?		
8.3 Has the UNCT ensured that coordination groups for UNSDCF implementation ( <i>i.e., Results Groups, MEL Group, Operations Management Team (OMT), Communications Group</i> ) have capacities to implement the UNSDCF Guiding Principles (for example, gender focal points in all thematic/results groups)?		
8.4 Does the UNSDCF articulate a clear road map to provide ‘results’ information needed for ongoing management, CCA updating, regional and global reporting, and an eventual evaluation to support the UNSDCF?		
8.5 Have the Joint Work Plans been endorsed by the UNCT and the Joint National-UN Steering Committee as the basis of subsequent Annual Progress review?		
8.6 Are regular bi-monthly meetings of the Results Groups held to review progress and lessons learned?		
8.7 Does the MEL Group support the Results Group by reviewing Joint Work Plans to assist in the formulation of UN agency results (‘sub-outputs’), identification of indicators, baselines and targets, development of MEL Plans, as well as link to national monitoring systems and SDG framework?		

Key Considerations in Assessing Readiness (Questions for Consultation)	Rating (0-3)	Narrative/Comments (Strengths, weaknesses, capacity gaps, other)
8.8 Are the UNSDCF management structures active and resourced to oversee and support the delivery of coordinated and integrated programming of UN agencies? Does the UNCT regularly receive reports, data and analysis to keep abreast of the evolving country context?		
8.9 Is there capacity for the UNSDCF Results Group Annual Progress Report that is tabled with the Joint National-UN Steering Committee to report on: lessons learned to date; adequacy of the Results framework, a monitoring and evaluation system; etc.?		
<b>9. UNSDCF M&amp;E Resources</b>		
9.1 Is an experienced M&E Officer available to support the UNSDCF during its design phase as well as ongoing support for M&E issues during UNSDCF implementation?		
9.2 Is a Regional evaluation network / advisor available to support UNSDCF design and implementation? ( <i>i.e. TOC development; Results Matrix development; M&amp;E system development; UNSDCF evaluation</i> )		
9.3 Is there adequate funding for an eventual UNSDCF evaluation under the Special Purpose Trust Fund (from DCO to RCO)?		
9.4 Are resources (\$, expertise) available to support development of data at both the national and subnational/disaggregated level needed to monitor SDGs, UNSDCF guiding principles ( <i>GEWE, HRBA and LNOB</i> ) as well as progress on national priorities?		
9.5 Are resources and expertise being made available for evaluation capacity building to support country-led evaluation of the SDGs?		
9.6 Are the country programmes of UN agencies adequately resourced to meet the requirements associated with UNSDCF results?		
9.7 Are adequate resources being made available for the ongoing monitoring, analysis and reporting on UNSDCF implementation, progress and results to various audiences – RC/UNCT; national stakeholders; regional and global officials?		
9.8 Do the Joint Work Plans identified in UNINFO fully reflect the resources needed and being made available over the UNSDCF duration for each UNSDCF outcome/priority area?		

## UNSDCF Evaluability Assessment (EA) Tool – Component 2: UN Agency-Specific Component

UN Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Targeted UNSDCF Result(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Key Considerations in Assessing Readiness (Questions for Consultation)	Rating (0-3)	Narrative/Comments (Strengths, weaknesses, capacity gaps, other)
<b>1. Process for linking UNSDCF objectives/results and targets into UN agency-specific country programme development</b>		
1.1 Is there clarity on the process that UN agencies should follow to 're-purpose'/integrate the agency country programming to link it with UNSDCF objectives/expected results?		
1.2 Has the UN agency drawn on the Common Country Assessment in the development of its country programme?		
1.3 Is the UNSDCF guidance and Companion Package found to be adequate in developing the agency's country programme linked with the goals of the UNSDCF?		
1.4 Has there been a discussion with all UN agencies to identify UNSDCF strategies ( <i>in terms of operational and resource implications</i> ) in support of specific UNSDCF results? Did this include analysis of where and how programmes of individual UN agencies might need to link to like-programmes of other UN agencies for an integrated and coordinated UN approach? Is this documented?		
1.5 Has the development of the UN agency country programme included an examination of the potential for new assumptions/risks regarding the 'enabling environment' for the UNSDCF that may now be relevant for the success of the agency's results framework, given the link to the UNSDCF?		
1.6 Has the development of UNSDCF Joint Work Plans improved clarity on whether other UNCT members are also contributing to the same UNSDCF result, thus reducing fragmentation and improving coherence and synergy of UN agency collective programming?		
1.7 Is there general agreement about the nature and extent of the coordination needed across agencies that are implicated in the attainment of the same UNSDCF 'result'? ( <i>i.e., coordination on design; with country stakeholders, delivery process or activities; indicators to monitor and report on; M&amp;E responsibilities</i> )		
1.8 Has there been an RC-led validation process to ensure all proposed UN agency country programme instruments derive from/align with UNSDCF outcomes?		

Key Considerations in Assessing Readiness (Questions for Consultation)	Rating (0-3)	Narrative/Comments (Strengths, weaknesses, capacity gaps, other)
<b>2. Robustness of Agency-specific Theory of Change (TOC) and its Alignment with UNSDCF</b>		
2.1 Is the UN agency results logic ( <i>i.e., how the activities of the UN agency will cause the necessary change to contribute to the achievement of the UNSDCF result</i> )– conceptually sound, clear and articulated in appropriate detail?		
2.2 Does the UN agency TOC provide a relevant and appropriate articulation of the results pathway ( <i>process and milestones</i> ) that is reflective of the UNSDCF result and CCA analysis?		
2.3 Is there a clear understanding of the relationship between UN entity and UNSDCF results logic, i.e. an understanding of the causal pathway for change that sees the activities of UN entities eventually contributing to the achievement of UNSDCF outcomes?		
2.4 Is there an identification of which programme or project outputs of the UN agency represent ‘agency contributions’, contributing directly to a UNSDCF output?		
2.5 Is there sufficient acknowledgement/articulation within the Agency TOC of the assumptions and risks that underlie the processes of change ( <i>e.g. the political, social or economic factors that drive or hinder change</i> ) that could impact the agency’s contribution to achievement of UNSDCF goals?		
2.6 Has the UN agency, in developing its TOC, coordinated with other UN agencies implicated in the same UNSDCF result area, to ensure an alignment and coordination of efforts, as well as consistency across relevant UN agencies in the identification of ‘enablers’ for successful movement along the TOC pathway?		
2.7 Has the role of the public sector, private sector and civil society (including women, youth and groups left behind), as agents and enablers of change been identified within the TOC?		
2.8 Is there clarity of the ‘reach’ of the UN agency programme in its identification of intended beneficiaries, including relevant groups identified within the UNSDCF guiding principles?		
2.9 Has the RC reviewed and commented on the agency’s country development programming document, identifying opportunities for synergies and complementarities across UN agencies, so as to avoid duplication and overlap?		
<b>3. Performance Measurement Framework - Identification of UN Agency Results Matrix and Relevant Indicators of Performance</b>		
3.1 Are the relevant UNSDCF outcomes copied verbatim within the agency’s Results Matrix?		
3.2 Is there an alignment of the UN Agency’s results matrix with the UNSDCF results matrix? ( <i>i.e., are the set of Agency outputs and expected outcomes aimed at contributing to the UNSDCF expected result?</i> )		
3.3 Is there agreement with the UNCT and other agencies part of a specific UNSDCF result area on which outputs and immediate and intermediate outcomes the agency will be responsible to measure and report on?		

Key Considerations in Assessing Readiness (Questions for Consultation)	Rating (0-3)	Narrative/Comments (Strengths, weaknesses, capacity gaps, other)
3.4 Is there agreement that the indicators being used by the UN agency to measure performance and 'success' of its country programme are appropriate for UNSDCF measurement and reporting purposes?		
3.5 Are the performance indicators used by the Agency aligned with those of other agencies that are implicated in the same UNSDCF result area?		
3.6 Is the appropriate level of disaggregation being identified for the measurement of indicators that are relevant to UNSDCF guiding principles ( <i>GEWE, HRBA, LNOB</i> ) and SDG reporting?		
3.7 Are the indicators SMART?		
3.8 Are both <i>qualitative</i> and <i>quantitative</i> indicators being identified as measures of performance?		
3.9 Does the Results Matrix/Matrix of Indicators provide clarity on the starting position (baseline) for each result indicator, as well as clear targets for all expected results (both outcome and output)?		
<b>4. UN Agency Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) and Reporting Plans and resources supporting the UNSDCF</b>		
4.1 Is the UN agency Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Plan and system aligned with UNSDCF MEL Plan and system requirements?		
4.2 Is there clarity around roles and responsibilities of the UN agency insofar as monitoring and inputting information (nature, frequency and schedule for input) into the UNSDCF MEL system?		
4.3 Is there clarity of roles and responsibilities associated with future evaluation, analysis and reporting on UNSDCF progress and results?		
4.4 Is there clear guidance to UN agencies on when and how the M&E analysis and reporting will be supporting local reporting and decision-making, in the context of results management?		
4.5 Are adequate resources available for the ongoing monitoring, analysis and reporting on the UN agency contribution to UNSDCF implementation, progress and results?		

## Annex 2: The Nested Theories of Change underlying a UNSDCF

The UNSDCF, by its nature, is complex. To achieve UNSDCF goals, country strategies will need to be explicitly identified and, within each strategy, a set of relevant instruments employed. A great deal of coordination/ cooperation is required across agencies to help ensure alignment of results matrices, indicators, M&E plans and systems, as well as data gathering and analysis. All of this is important so as to achieve the requisite monitoring and learning to manage and stay abreast of UNSDCF progress and performance, key elements in helping to achieve the broad goals of the UNSDCF.

Mapping out a TOC for the UNSDCF could be conceived as a set of ‘nested’ TOC within a broader UNSDCF TOC. In the UNSDCF scenario, three levels of TOC could be considered to form the UNSDCF TOC:

- i. Level I: The macro TOC referring to achievement of UNSDCF goals/objectives, where the expected results reflect SDG goals, national priorities and the analysis drawn from the Common Country Assessment (CCA);
- ii. Level II: UNSDCF result-specific strategies (or ‘catalytic development solution’) that would identify for each expected result/goal of the UNSDCF, the particular UN agencies that would be implicated in coordination and delivery of efforts towards attainment of the particular UNSDCF goal/result; and,
- iii. Level III: TOC as applied to UNSDCF instruments, i.e. the particular UN agency programmes and projects being applied within the particular UNSDCF strategy. Here, the TOC shows the linkage, via a cause-effect relationship, between agency-specific (or coordinated activities across agencies) with a specific UNSDCF expected result.

With this cascading concept, the intent is to ensure that the goals/objectives/key results of the UNSDCF ultimately get reflected in the goals and objectives of the relevant programmes of individual UN agencies. But equally important, that this is done in such a way as to coordinate country efforts across UN agencies, as per a pre-determined strategy/set of strategies relevant to specific SDGs and national development plan goals. The

mapping of UN agency programmes/instruments into the broader UNSDCF macro framework is illustrated in Figure 2. From an ‘evaluability’ perspective, illustrating and understanding these causal relationships is a critical underpinning of correctly articulating ‘results’, identifying performance indicators and aligning results measurement, monitoring and reporting across agencies and between agencies and the UNSDCF M&E framework.

